TEACHER’S COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE OF ENGLISH FOR MATHS

Ima Isnaini Taufiqur Rohmah
Faculty of Art and Language Education
IKIP PGRI Bojonegoro
Bojonegoro, East Java Indonesia
rimataufiq83@gmail.com

Abstract
The aim of this study is to describe the communicative competence possessed by “English for Math” teacher in handling the teaching and learning. Considered under the qualitative case study, observation conducted to get the data of the teacher’s communicative competence based on Celce-Murcia’s model of communicative competence (2007) which is consist of discourse, linguistic, socio-cultural, strategic, interactional, and formulaic competence. Interview also conducted to support the data from observation. This study conducted at Mathematics Study Program IKIP PGRI Bojonegoro and the teacher as the respondent. The result of the study reveals that teacher’s sociocultural, discourse and linguistics competence were not good but she has good formulaic, interactional, and strategic competences. Developing sociocultural, discourse and linguistics competence are needed to be able to give a good model for the students, since as a teacher, we much influence our students.
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Introduction
Communicative competence in language teaching today is very crucial to be discussed, introduced and possessed by the teachers and the students now a day. The goal of language teaching today is actually not only concern with grammatical competence but also more specifically communicative competence. It is in line with Richard (2006, p.3) who stated that “grammatical competence is an important dimension of language learning, it is clearly not all that is involved in learning a language since one can master the rules of sentence formation in a language and still not be very successful at being able to use the language for meaningful communication”.

To achieve successful and effective communication and to have the ability to use cultural patterns or codes appropriately is the fundamental element to participate in social life, which is the issue we concerned here, communicative competence. As stated by Byers and Byers (1972, p. 7) that “the basic processes of human communication through all verbal and nonverbal modalities must be learned with an appropriate competence before any subject matter can be placed in an appropriate human context”.

Theoretically, communicative competence as stated in Celce-Murcia (2007) is a term coined by the anthropological linguist Dell Hymes (1967, 1972). Hymes puts forward this notion in response to the theories of the formal linguist Noam Chomsky (1957; 1965) who focused on linguistic competence and claimed that social factors were outside the domain of linguistics. Then, in 1980, Canale and Swain added strategic competence (i.e. the ability to compensate for problems or deficits in communication and do various types of planning) to the communicative competence. A few years later, Canale (1983) added discourse competence (the ability to produce and interpret language beyond the sentence level) to the model.
The idea of the recent communicative model proposed by Celce-murcia (2007) was different from the old one, the new model of communicative competence involves; first, sociocultural competence deals with how to express messages appropriately within the overall social and cultural context of communication; second, discourse competence refers to the ability to select, sequencing and arrange the words, structures and utterances to achieve a unified spoken message; third, linguistics competence involves phonological, lexical, phonological and syntactic order; fourth, formulaic competence refers to fixed and prefabricated chunks of language that speakers use heavily in every interactions, fifth, interactional competence consisted of actional competence (knowledge how to perform common speech acts) and conversational competence (turn-taking system in conversation); sixth, strategic competence is specific behaviors or thought processes that students use to enhance their own L2 learning.

Consisting of sixth elements as mentioned above, this model has various implications for language pedagogy. Since the goal of language instruction is communicative competence, so language instruction must be integrated with cultural and cross-cultural instruction. In addition Celce-Murcia and Olstrain (2000) also argue that instructors should use materials that are well contextualized and meaningful to learners. However, a communicative focus which includes mastery of systems such as conversational turn-taking and speech-act sets means that many set phrases and other formulaic elements of language use also need attention.

Moreover, the practice of dynamic nature of genuine interaction in their target language such as the rhythm and intonation, the body and eye movement and the other face-to-face communication need to be implemented in the classroom. Practically, the teacher can record learners’ performances to be observed and seen where they need to improve. That is why, language learning strategy is needed and the teachers should regularly integrate some strategies into their language classes.

Methodology
The design of this research was a qualitative case study. The data were dig up from the teacher of English for Math in Mathematic education study program IKIP PGRI Bojonegoro. The data were obtained from observing two meetings, interviewed the teacher and also distributing the questionnaire to the teacher. The researcher used communicative competence model proposed by Celce-murcia (2007) as the guideline. Interactive model of analysis proposed by Miles and Huberman (1994) were used in analyzing data, the three main components were data reduction, data display, conclusion drawing/ verification. In this research there were some strategies used to obtain the trustworthiness of the data, the researcher used data and method of triangulation.

Finding and Discussion
Based on the observation conducted during the teaching process reveals that In some occasion, the teacher unable to express messages to the students appropriately within the overall social and cultural context of
communication. For example when she said “from this mmm (inaudible word) that we can learn that we do it in good intention, OK, good intention, we will have the return in the good things too”. Most of teacher’s words arrangement were unstructured and not in a good grammatical order. For example “Mmm, I do like you to join with your pair, jadi your friend, bisa you, to discuss this one. And I hope that after you have finished, you tell about it. I give you for about ten minutes to discuss with your friend”. But in phonological aspects, includes both segmentals (vowels, consonants, syllable types) and supra segmentals (prominence/stress, intonation, and rhythm), the teacher has good enough quality to pronounce English words.

Other than that, she was lack in the three last components such as lexical, that is knowledge of both content words (nouns, verbs, adjectives) and function words (pronouns, determiners, prepositions, verbal auxiliaries). Morphological which I includes parts of speech, grammatical inflections, productive derivational processes. Syntactic, which is constituent/phrase structure, word order (both canonical and marked), basic sentence types, modification, coordination, subordination, embedding. In other hand, the teacher able to use and construct routines, collocations, verb object, idioms, and lexical frames. In activity to construct routine, such as when she said a fixed phrases like the words “of course, “all of a sudden” and formulaic chunks like “How do you do?”, “I’m fine”, “thanks”, “how are you?”.

Collocations such as: 1) verb-object, like the words “spend money, “play the video”; 2) adverb adjective, such as “statistically significant”, “mutually intelligible”; 3) adjective-noun, i.e. “tall building”, “legible task”; 4) idioms e.g., “to kick the bucket” is similar with “to die”, “to get the ax” is “to be fired”/”terminated”; 5) lexical frames, such as “I’m looking for”, “See you next week”, etc.

Based on the observation, the teacher has good actional competence that is the knowledge of how to perform common speech acts and speech act sets in the target language involving interactions such as information exchanges, interpersonal exchanges, expression of opinions and feelings, problems (complaining, blaming, regretting, apologizing, etc.), future scenarios (hopes, goals, promises, predictions, etc. For example when she express opinion, i.e. “Mmm… Sometimes , in our lives-in our lives, we want to be someone who are ideal for us”.

Conversational competence is inherent to the turn-taking system in conversation, includes, how to open and close conversations, how to establish and change topics, how to get, hold, and relinquish the floor, how to interrupting, stalling or time gaining using phrases like “Where was I?”, “Could you repeat that?”. Self-monitoring such using phrases that allow for self-repair like “I mean”. Interacting which is includes strategies that include appeals for help/clarification, that involve meaning negotiation. Social which is strategies involve seeking out native speakers to practice with, actively looking for and opportunities to use the target language.

Formulaic competence as the additional competence in Murcia’s revised model plays significant role and has a great deal of language that will be acquired. As stated by Wood (2015) that the role of formulaic competence is to help the adults to achieve greater fluency and native-like mastery of their second language. Moreover, Wood stated that being communicatively competent speaker leads the language user to avoid any kind of communication breakdown. Thus, reaching fluency is the main aim of foreign language learners (EFL learners) and formulaic competence provides a great deal of help for EFL learners to achieve native-like language proficiency.
Rethinking of the communicative competence’s role in language teaching proposed by Murcia, in my opinion, there are some aspects that are crucial to adjust in order to be able to shape the soul of communicative language teaching. First, the design and designer of curriculum. In order that the designed curriculum brings the soul of communicative language teaching, it must cover all required competences, teaching methods and materials chosen. It is in line with Richard (2006, p. 9) said that “language teachers and teaching institution all around the world soon began to rethink their teaching, syllabuses, and classroom materials”. Moreover, curriculum designer is the key responsible person to handle this job. The designer needs to have a good understanding of communicative competence and how to incorporate in language teaching process.

Second, teacher is the key person in the classroom. Many English teachers today still adopt traditional English teaching which grammar is the most view point of English literacy. It happens because they do not understand the needs of communicative language teaching today. It is in line with Richard (2006, p. 9) who argued that “communicative competence and not simply grammatical competence, should be the goal of language teaching”. I would argue that mostly teachers teach traditional grammar as a set of rules and forms in written language. They feel ambitious to put those sets of grammatical rules and norms in the real context of the communication. However, some students successfully bring them in appropriate context, their oral language production in conversation is unnatural because lack of spoken language features. Halliday as cited in Mickan (2013) defines a text as semantic structure which is formed out of a continuous process of choice among innumerable interrelated sets of semantic option. Thus, this misconception is interesting to investigate in order to bridge students linguistic competence in using different perspective as well as utilize communicative competence.

Conclusions
Teacher’s Sociocultural, Discourse and linguistics competence are not good but she has good communicative competence in some element such, formulaic, interactional, and strategic competences.
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