

## A Review in Spoken Language Teaching

Salmia Syarifuddin<sup>1</sup>, Irmawaty Hasyim<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup> English Education Department, Faculty of Letters, Universitas Muslim Indonesia

<sup>1</sup> salmia.syarifuddin@umi.ac.id

<sup>2</sup> irmawaty.hasyim@umi.ac.id

### Abstract

This paper aims to describe the types of spoken language for English Language teaching. Spoken language' types considered to be varied and complex particularly to the country which its first language is not English. To implement the spoken language type in the subject, such speaking class, it is crucial to comprehend these types of spoken language. It is found that adjacency, turn-taking, and exchange were the most implemented types during the presenting speaking in the class. It is resolved that the vary the types applied in the class, the more the knowledge and classroom's situation would be delighted.

**Keywords :** Spoken language, adjacency, turn-taking, types, language teaching

### 1. Introduction

Spoken language is a vast subject, and little is known in hard statistical terms of the distribution of different types of speech in people's everyday lives. If we list at random a number of different types of speech and consider how much of each day or week we spend engaged in each one, we can only roughly guess at some sort of frequency ranking, other than to say that casual conversation is almost certainly the most frequent for most people. The rest will depend on our daily occupation and what sorts of contacts we have with others.

We use spoken a language to express our ideas, opinions, and feelings. We also use it to make sense of and confirm our understandings, to question and test our assumptions and to explore meaning. Children who have been learning English since birth will have developed and honed their speaking and listening skills in English through their contact with trusted adults and peers and learned to use English to support their developing understanding of the world. They will have learned to use spoken language to interact with others for different purposes and have begun to develop their understanding of different registers, tones and the use of expressive language. Children who have learned another language

from birth will have done all the same things but in a different language with different conventions and within a different cultural context. It is important to note that for most children they learn to listen before they learn to talk and it is, therefore, no surprise that opportunities to listen to a new language are also critical in learning to talk in that language. Some types of spoken language which mostly used when handling speaking class or discussion are; adjacency pairs, exchange, turn-taking, transaction & topics, interactional and transactional talk, stories, anecdotes, jokes, other spoken discourse types, speech & grammar.

Teaching the Spoken Language is about teaching the spoken language. It presents in a highly accessible form the results of the author's important research on teaching and assessing effective spoken communication (Yule et.al, 1983). Speaking is one of the most important skills to be developed and enhanced as means of effective communication. Speaking skill is regarded one of the most difficult aspects of language learning (Leong & Ahmadi, 2017). As one of the most difficult things in language learning, it is clearly a need for a teacher or a lecturer as the one who is standing in front of the learner to apply classroom instruction. Classroom instruction provides a limited amount of

quality speaking practice for language learners. Asynchronous multimedia-based oral communication is one way to provide learners with quality speaking practice outside of class. Asynchronous multimedia-based oral communication helps learners develop presentational speaking skills and raise their linguistic self-awareness (Young & West, 2018).

## **2. Findings and Discussion**

### **2.1 Adjacency Pairs**

Pairs of utterances in the talk are often mutually dependent; a most obvious example is that a question predicts an answer and that an answer proposes a question. It is possible to state the requirements, in normal conversational sequence, for many types of utterances, in terms of what is expected as a response and what certain responses presuppose.

Pairs of utterances such as greeting-greeting and apology-acceptance are called adjacency pairs. The mutual dependence of such utterances is underlined by the fact that we can only be absolutely sure of the function of the initiating utterance when it is contextualized with the response it gets, and vice versa.

Adjacency pairs are of different types. Some ritualized first pair-parts may have an identical second pair part such as 'hello – hello' or 'Happy New Year - Happy New Year'. While others expect a different second pair part such as 'congratulation-thanks'. Equally, the second pair of parts like offers, apologies, informing moves, congratulations, commiserations, etc.

### **2.2 Exchange**

Exchanges are independently observable entities; adjacency pairs may be found within the boundaries, but first and second pair parts do not necessarily coincide with initiating and responding moves. A coincidence can be shown such as 'Congratulations on the new job, by the way – Oh, thanks'. And adjacency pairing occurs in the initiation and response such as

'I've just passed my driving test – Oh, congratulations – thanks'.

The pattern of the three-part exchange in traditional classrooms, where the teacher made the initiation and follow-up move, where pupils were restricted to responding moves. In a good many language classes this is still the pattern, especially in situations where large classes of perhaps 40 to 50 pupils are the norm. Where this happens, it is likely that pupils will have the chance to practice only a very impoverished range of utterance functions. In such language classroom, learners rarely get the opportunity to take other than the responding role, and even in cases where students are encouraged to initiate, the follow-up move is often still in the hands of the teacher, and learners get little or no practice in this particular discourse function.

Analyses of classroom discourse and teacher-pupil interactions, in particular, suggest that much of the language that children will hear is associated with directives (instructions, requests, and commands in particular). The teacher uses this type of language to organize what the children have to do. Teachers also use questions, mostly of the closed variety to confirm children have understood what to do. Research suggests that many teachers ask questions that they already know the answer to - to check children's understanding they initiate a question, a pupil responds and the teacher then provides feedback – what is sometimes referred to as an IRF sequence (Mercer 2001, van Lier, 2001). Whilst teachers may use this approach to explore understanding and ask questions to which there is no preconceived answer this is rare. Teachers also tend to do a lot of the talking in classrooms with an emphasis on whole-class teaching in National Strategies. These language interactions will be repeated often in many classrooms but they do not in themselves help bilingual children to develop the linguistic repertoires they need to learn curriculum subjects. Bilingual pupils need opportunities to engage in genuine dialogue with other pupils and teachers if they are to develop

their understanding of how language is used for different purposes and how these differ in different areas of the curriculum. Talk needs to play a major part in the planned curriculum if pupils are going to be enabled to become active learners and extend their language repertoires. Sometimes teachers will also need to plan for opportunities for explicit teaching of language forms and functions.

### 2.3 Turn-taking

Much has been made in discourse analysis of the study of turn-taking, and one can hardly write an introductory survey of discourse studies without noting the work done in this field. In the classic ethnomethodological way, discourse analysts have observed how participants organize themselves to take turns at talk. In any piece of natural English discourse, turns will occur smoothly, with only little overlap and interruption, and only very brief silences between turns (on average, less than a second). People take turns when they are selected or nominated by the current speaker, or if no one is selected, they may speak of their own accord (self-selection). If neither of these conditions applies, the person who is currently speaking may continue (Sacks et al. 1974). These are usually referred to as back-channel responses, and consist of vocalizations such as mm, ah-ha, and short words and phrases such as yeah, no, right, sure (see Yngve. 1970). Backchannel realizations vary interestingly from culture to culture (some languages have back-channelled vocalizations that sound odd in English, such as eh-eh, or highly nasalized sounds). Another feature of turn-taking is the way speakers predict one another's utterances and often complete them for them, or overlap with them as they complete.

This extract is not at all untypical. Such a transcript looks so messy that we would probably never dream of using it in an English language class as a dialogue for learners. Even in the rare occasions when authentic dialogue is transcribed in teaching materials, it is usually so 'cleaned up' that it

bears little resemblance to raw data. Such real data are a reminder of how idealized are the representations of speech not only in teaching materials but in novels, so-called 'verbatim' reports (such as reports of parliamentary debates), radio and television soap operas and drama in general. Raw data of this kind, if well-recorded, still have a use in extensive listening activities for more advanced learners, but we have to resign ourselves to the inevitability that most conversational data used in class or transcribed in materials will have ordered non-overlapping turn-taking. Discourse analysts have looked at such phenomena and try to describe the different norms that speakers from different cultures orient to during such behavior. A set of norms in one culture might decree that talk must be kept going, whenever possible, even if only to buy time; another culture might decree that face must be preserved wherever possible, and not put at risk by unconsidered talk. Rule-conflicts of this type are often seen to be an underlying cause of conversational breakdowns (e.g. for Javanese versus American norms, see Noguchi 1987).

Our overall conclusion is that turn-taking in itself is something that may not need to be 'taught', but specific linguistics realizations can be presented and practiced and significant cultural differences can at least be pointed out to the learner.

### 2.4 Transaction and Topics

#### 2.4.1 Transaction

Here we are concerned with how speakers manage longer stretches of talk, especially marking out openings and closing. We also considered the question of realizations of markers in a different language.

The teacher can isolate, present and exemplify a set of useful transaction markers such as right, now, so, okay, and so on, for example, by drawing attention to how he/she uses markers to divide up a lesson. It is often interesting to get learners to see if these translate directly into their L1, and to ask them to consider what words L1 uses to

mark such boundaries and to compare these across languages if possible. But providing a context in which learners can then practice these markers is more difficult.

Task-based learning seems especially well suited to this sort of learner-management of the larger discourse, when groups have to achieve a specified goal, arrive at decisions or produce some other recognizable ‘real world’ outcome as stages along the way of completing some preconceived task or set of tasks. One actual example from which the next data samples are taken is a task where advanced learners, in groups, have to decide on how to arrange a room for a school open day.

The instruction to the learners (in pairs or in groups) is to add a beginning and an end so that the dialogue represents a meeting between two friends who talk briefly and then have to part. This generates greeting and leave-taking adjacency pairs, but also produces a need for opening and closing markers (e.g. ‘Hello, what’s new?, ‘Anyway, I must go’, ‘Well, I’ll give you a ring soon’, ‘Look, I can’t stop now’).

#### **2.4.2 Topics**

Several questions arise around the notion of the topic, not least, what is a topic? Another set of questions concerns how the topic is opened, developed, changed and closed, and what linguistic resources are available for this.

The question “What is a Topic?” may strike many language teachers as otiose, but there are different ways of looking at the topic. The topic could be defined, on a formal level, as stretches of talk bounded by certain topic and/or transactional markers, such as lexical ones (by the way, to change the subject) or phonological ones (changes in pitch). Or we could take a semantic framework, and try to express the content of different segments of talk according to single-word or phrasal titles (e.g. ‘holiday’, buying a house’), or else we could use interactive criteria and say that something is only a topic if more than one

speaker makes an utterance relevant to it. All of these approaches are valid in some measure; the one that tends to dominate language teaching materials is the expression of topic as the titles for the ‘subject matter’ of speech events. Here we are hoping to supplement that view with a consideration of structural and interactive features of topics.

A topic can be the reason for talk or they can arise because people are already talking. The former situation is exemplified in this extract, a group of four people is having a New Year drink together, and A has been recounting the story of how his luggage got sent to the wrong airport on a recent skiing holiday.

The speakers do give lexical and phonological cues that they a particular sub-topic has been sufficiently explored: as the first sub-topic is exhausted, B and A both use still ( a typical boundary marker, with falling intonation and a short pause), and both give a summary or general evaluation of what has gone before, another typical closing move. C introduces that new sub-topic, skiing, with the characteristic jump to high key we have noted elsewhere. Skiing has been an element from a just-completed story as the topic of subsequent conversation has been observed to be a very common speaker behavior (Jefferson 1978). A’s reply includes a drop-in pitch on yes, then a pause, and a shift to talking about keeping his weight down, meals and exercise, which are associatively linked sub-topics (see Stech 1982), triggered off by one another, an extremely common feature in this kind of casual conversation. We might also note that topic shifts occur in the vicinity of short silences, indicated by’ ...’ in the transcript; this has also been observed as a regular feature of casual conversation (see Maynard 1980).

#### **2.5 Interactional and Transactional Talk**

A distinction is often made by discourse analysts between interactional and

transactional talk. Interactional talk is for getting business done in the world, i.e. in order to produce some change in the situation that pertains. It could be to tell somebody something they need to know, to affect the purchase of something, to get someone to do something, or many other world-changing things. Transactional talk, on the other hand, has as its primary function of the social wheels, establishing roles and relationships with another person prior to the transactional talk, confirming and consolidating relationships, expressing solidarity, and so on.

Belton (1988) criticizes what he sees as a tendency in language teaching of the notional-functional school to overemphasize transactional language at the expense of interactional, and makes a plea for a better balance between the two. This implies that some sort of unpredictability is built into activities such as services encounter role plays, or, perhaps most effectively, in listening activities. The general point also reflects the experience of many Languages for Specific Purposes (LSP) teachers who are told by course participants that it is the unpredictable social talk that throws them rather than talk in their specialist contexts.

## 2.6 Stories, Anecdotes, Jokes

The ability to tell a good story or jokes is a highly regarded talent, probably in all cultures. As with other types of language events, discourse analysis has sought to describe what all narratives have in common. Below is the example of jokes:

Help Wanted Message!

Must be a good typist and be good with a computer.

Successful applicant must be bilingual. We are an Equal Opportunity Employer.

A short time later a lovely golden retriever dog trotted up to the window, saw the sign and went inside. He looked at the receptionist and wagged his tail, then

walked over to the sign, looked at it, whined and pawed the air.

The receptionist called the office manager. He was surprised, to say the least, to see a canine applicant. However, the dog looked determined, so he led him into the office.

Inside, the dog jumped up on a chair and stared at the manager expectantly. The manager said, "I can't hire you. The sign says you must be able to type." The dog jumped down, went to the typewriter and proceeded to quickly type a perfect business letter. He took out the page and trotted over to the manager, gave it to him, then jumped back up on the chair.

The manager was stunned, but told the dog, "That was fantastic, but I'm sorry. The sign clearly says that whoever I hire has to be good with a computer." The dog jumped down again, went to the computer and proceeded to demonstrate his expertise with various programs produced a sample spreadsheet and database then presented them to the manager.

The manager was dumbfounded! He said to the dog, "Hey, I realize that you are a very intelligent applicant and have fantastic talent, but you're a dog -- no way could I hire you." The dog jumped down and went to the sign in the window and pointed his paw at the words, "Equal Opportunity Employer."

The exasperated manager said, "Yes, I know what the sign says. But the sign also says you have to be bilingual." The dog looked him straight in the eye and said... "Meow."

Ministry of Education formulation to be analyzed and discussed in this study.

## 2. Method

This study used the descriptive qualitative method. The study design was selected for this research data obtained based on the fact that the form of writing, which were then analyzed and interpreted objectively

### 2.7 Other Spoken Discourse Types

Applied linguistics has always taken elements from different fields of study in order to provide language teachers and learners with effective tools for teaching ESL courses. The field of discourse analysis is one of those areas. For this reason, language instructors should get acquainted with discourse analysis tools. As a matter of fact, many language programs do not emphasize the essential characteristics of authentic spoken texts. This kind of texts provides learners with important features of the spoken mode that do not necessarily take place in written language. In many language courses, instructors and learners take a lot of time analyzing examples of adapted written language rather than observing and studying samples of real spoken language. In fact, since language learners start acquiring a second language, they are exposed to a wide variety of written texts such as modified paragraphs, short stories, letters, excerpts from well-known newspapers or magazines, or essays.

Unfortunately, in most cases, teachers do not take samples of spoken language into account in their ESL or ESL courses in order to help students understand different types of texts such as narratives or descriptions. What elements from discourse analysis can teachers use while using narratives? Can language teachers help students analyze and understand samples of spoken language? Are there any advantages in using spoken texts rather than written ones?

It is widely known that there are many differences between the written and the spoken mode that need to be considered. As a matter of fact, these characteristics can derive in a better understanding of the target language. The main objectives of this article are to explain key concepts in the area of discourse analysis and to demonstrate how they can be used in order to analyze an oral narrative recorded from a native speaker of English. The use of spoken texts such as oral narratives is more significant and appealing for students in order to comprehend how the spoken mode functions in real contexts. Unfortunately there are two difficulties in collecting oral texts. First, it is somewhat difficult to obtain appropriate narratives. To avoid this problem, the researcher should previously find out if

his or her speakers have interesting or appealing stories that might arouse learner's interest. Secondly, transcribing oral stories is a time-consuming task. Some elements that make the preparation of scripts are the narrator's articulation and intonation patterns. Besides, the quality of the recording is crucial.

## 2.8 Speech and Grammar

The benchmarks for spoken language understanding involve spontaneous speech input usually involving a real system, and sometimes with a human in the loop. The systems are scored in terms of the correctness of the response from the common database of information including flight and fare information. Performing this evaluation automatically requires human annotation to select the correct answer, define the minimal and maximal answers accepted, and to decide whether the query is ambiguous and/or answerable.

Several mechanisms for communication among components have been explored. There is much evidence that human speech understanding involves the integration of a great variety of knowledge sources, including knowledge of the world or context, knowledge of the speaker and/or topic, lexical frequency, previous uses of a word or a semantically related topic, facial expressions, prosody, in addition to the acoustic attributes of the words. In Speech Recognition (SR), tighter integration of components has consistently led to improved performance, and tight integration of SR and Natural Language (NL) has been a rather consistent goal. However, as grammatical coverage increases, standard NL techniques can become computationally difficult. Further, with increased coverage, NL tends to provide less constraint for SR.

To combat the mismatch between existing SR and NL modules, two trends have been observed. The first is increased use of semantic (as opposed to syntactic grammars). Such grammars rely on finding an interpretation without requiring grammatical input (where grammatical may be interpreted either in terms of traditional textbook grammaticality, or in terms of a particular grammar constructed for the task). Be-

cause semantic grammars focus on meaning in terms of the particular application, they can be more robust to grammatical deviations.

### 3. Conclusion

Spoken language as a vast subject, it is crucial to explore the distribution of different types of speech in people's everyday lives. Besides, it is almost certainly the most frequent for most people know about the types of this spoken language. To understand about these types of spoken language, it is recommended to know its types before applying it in the class.

### Reference

- Cable, Carrie. 2005. Spoken Language. <http://naldic.org.uk/ITTSEAL2/teaching/SpokenLanguage.cfm>. Accessed on June 17, 2019.
- César A. Navas Brenes. 2005. Analyzing an Oral Narrative Using Discourse Analysis Tools: Observing How Spoken Language Works. <http://revista.inie.ucr.ac.cr/articulos/1-2005/articulos/narrative>. Accessed on June 15, 2019.
- Kidsource. 1995. Spoken Language Problems. [http://kidsource.com/LDA/spoken\\_language.html](http://kidsource.com/LDA/spoken_language.html). Accessed on June 17, 2019.
- Leong, Lai-Mei & Ahmadi, Seyedeh Masoumeh. 2017. An Analysis of Factors Influencing Learners' English Speaking Skill. *International Journal of Research in English Education*. Vol 2 (1): 34-41.
- Price, Patti. 2005. Spoken Language Understanding. <http://cslu.cse.ogi.edu/HLTsurvey/ch1node10.html>. Accessed on June 17, 2019.
- Young, Eric H & West, Rick E. 2018. Speaking Practice Outside the Classroom: A Literature Review of Asynchronous Multimedia-based Oral Communication in Language Learning. *European Association for Computer-Assisted Language Learning (The EUROCALL Review)*. Vol. 26 (1): 59-78.
- Yule, G., Brown, G., & Brown, G.D. 1983. *Teaching the Spoken Language*. Vol-

ume 2 UK: Cambridge University Press.