CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

This chapter presents the results of the study and answer the research question stated in chapter one. This chapter is divided into two main sections. The first section presents the findings and followed by the discussion.

4.1 Findings

This section outlined the findings on the investigation of proficiency-based pairing to plan a presentation in English for Social Communication course. The findings will be presented by referring to the research questions.

4.1.1 What types of pair work pattern do students perform in pair work?

The research question number one was to identify types of students' pair work pattern. Based on Storch's model (2002, 2009) there are four patterns of interaction and this study tried to identify which pattern is perform most. Students' pair work pattern is seen from the patterns of interaction and number of LREs per proficiency grouping.

Table 4.1 Pattern of dyadic interaction

H–L pairs	Patterns of interaction	L–L pairs	Patterns of interaction
Ss 3 & Ss 4	Collaborative	Ss 1 & Ss 2	Collaborative

Ss 5 & Ss 6	Collaborative	Ss 11 & Ss 12	Collaborative
Ss 7 & Ss 8	Expert/Novice	Ss 13 & Ss 14	Collaborative
Ss 9 & Ss 10	Dominant/ Passive	Ss 15 & Ss 16	Collaborative
Ss 17 & Ss 18	Collaborative		

There were three patterns which appear in the data: collaborative, expert/novice and dominant/passive. Table 4.1 shows that whereas all L–L pairs collaborated, H–L pairs formed various patterns. Three pairs worked collaboratively, one formed an expert/novice pattern and one dominant/passive pattern. In expert/novice pattern case, it was the lower proficiency learner who performs as novice, while in dominant/passive pattern; it was the higher proficiency learner who performs as passive.

Table 4.2 Dyadic relationship, proficiency grouping and number of LREs

	Number of LREs Per Pair	Total Number	Mean
Collaborative			
H-L (*n* = 3)			
Ss 3 & Ss 4	2	6	2.00
Ss 5 & Ss 6	1		
Ss 17 & Ss 18	3		
L-L (*n* = 4)			

Ss 1 & Ss 2	5	16	4.00
Ss 11 & Ss 12	5		
Ss 13 & Ss 14	4		
Ss 15 & Ss 16	2		
Total LREs in collaborative pairs		22	3.14
Expert/Novice			
H-L (*n* = 1)			
Ss 7 & Ss 8	3	3	3.00
Total LREs in expert/novice pair		3	3.00
Dominant/Passive			
H-L *(n* = 1*)*			
Ss 9 & Ss 10	3	3	3.00
Total LREs in dominant/passive pair		3	3.00

Table 4.2 shows that, pairs that felt into collaborative pattern produced more LREs (3.14) than those who formed an expert/novice pattern (3.00) and dominant/passive pattern (3.00). In the case of low and low proficiency learners (L–L), they tended to produce more LREs (in the range of 2 to 5) and formed collaborative pattern. However, when high proficiency learners were paired with low proficiency learners (H–L), they

produce less LREs (in the range of 1 to 3), even when they formed collaborative, expert/novice or dominant/passive patterns.

4.1.2 What are the results of proficiency pairing on students' language production?

The second research question was to examine the results of proficiency pairing toward students' language production. The findings for LREs and amount of L2 use were used to see students' language production.

Table 4.3 Number and type of LREs

Proficiency pairing	LRE Focus	H-L	L-L
F-LREs	*N*	8	9
	Percentage	67	53
	M	1.6	2.25
	Range	1-3	2-3
L-LREs	*N*	3	6
	Percentage	25	35
	M	0.6	1.5
	Range	1-2	0-2
M-LREs	*N*	1	2
	Percentage	8	12

	M	0.25	0.5
	Range	0-1	0-2
Total			
N		12	17
M		2.4	4.25
Range		1-3	2-6
Correctly resolved (Percentage of total LREs)		10 (83)	12 (71)

Table 4.3 summarized the findings for LREs found in the data. As the table shows, L–L pairs produced the largest number of LREs (*n*=17), followed by the H–L pairs (*n*=12). The largest proportion of LREs dealt with grammatical form both in L–L and H–L pairs. Most of the LREs were resolved correctly (over 80% for H–L pairs and 71% for L–L pairs).

Table 4.4 L2 turns: Number and length

	Total turns (L1+L2)	L2 turns	Percentage of L2 turns	Average length of L2 turns (in words)
H-L (*n*=5)	276	137	50	7.39
L-L (*n*=4)	204	115	56	6.18

Table 4.4 presents the number of L2 turns and the percentage they formed of total turns. The table also shows the average length of the L2 turns in words for each proficiency group. As the table shows, the proportion of L2 turns was a half of total turns. The highest number of L2 turns are from L–L pairs (56%) followed by H–L pairs (50%). The data for average length of L2 turns shows even H–L pairs have less L2 turns than L–L pairs, they formed higher average length of turns (7.39 words).

Table 4.5 Amount of L2 words

	Total words (L1 + L2)	L2 words	Percentage of Total L2 words	Range
H-L (*n*=5)	3540	1013	29	12-43
L-L (*n*=4)	1972	711	36	19-57

Table 4.5 shows the amount of L2 words produce by the learners. It shows that L2 words formed only 32% of all talk. The H–L pairs formed the lower percentage of L2 talk (29%) compared with L–L pairs (36%).

4.2 Discussions

This section elaborated the findings which were connected with the previous studies. The discussions were explained by referring to the research questions.

4.2.1 What types of pair work pattern do students perform in pair work?

Data analysis in the findings shows that three major patterns formed in this study were collaborative, expert/novice and dominant/passive. However, it can be seen from table 4.1 that collaborative pattern was the pattern that formed most. These findings were similar with the previous study by Storch & Aldosari (2012). In that study, from 15 pairs, there were 9 pairs who formed collaborative pattern, followed by 4 pairs for expert/novice pattern and 2 pairs for dominant/passive pattern. The previous study also found that, in expert/novice and dominant/passive patterns, the lower proficiency learners performed as the novice and the passive roles. Meanwhile, in this study, the pair who formed as dominant/passive pattern had different result; the higher proficiency learner tended to perform as passive role. The lower proficiency learner took control over the task by giving lot of ideas and suggestions. From the excerpt 3.6, it can be seen that Ss 10 (the lower) more understands the topic of the task (social media). He also tended to use L1 in explaining his ideas rather than L2. This gives evidence that in this case English proficiency did not matter. In other studies, the conversation between learners were used English, that is why proficiency matter.

Previous study showed that a collaborative pair produced a large number of ‘other-repetitions’ which helped to construct a mutual perspective (Storch, 2002b, Wattanabe, 2008). This study had a similar finding with the previous one. Students produced a large number of sentence repetitions from his/her pair to have same perspectives and added some words suggestions.

Excerpt 4.1 Other-repetitions

21 Student 9 : *How to earn money…*

22 Student 10 : *How to get benefit or…*

23 Student 9 : *How to… how to… how to get benefit from Instagram*

24 Student 10 : *How to get benefit…*

In the case of Storch and Aldosari (2012) study, H-L pairings tended to produce asymmetric pattern (expert/novice and dominant/passive), because the higher proficiency learners tended to take control over the task. However, this study found H-L pairings produce more symmetric pattern (collaborative). From 5 H-L pairs, there are 3 pairs (60%) which formed symmetric pattern. The high proficiency learners tended to work collaboratively with low proficiency learners rather than took control over the task.

Excerpt 4.2 H–L Collaborative Pattern

24 Student 18 : Setelah punya ini dia punya ini…

25 Student 17 : Iya, dia punya *social media*. Berarti dari sini ya, *people are almost using* ini, terus *then if from… from*

26 Student 18 : *From their Smartphone*

27 Student 17 : Ohya, *from their Smartphone, people*, apa ya? *Start to create their own social media like Whatsapp, line*. Ini harus disebutin gitu ga sih? Disebutin aja ya?

28 Student 18 : Iya

Storch and Aldosari (2012) also suggested that pairs which formed collaborative pattern also produced more language (L2 turns and L2 words). In this study, the pattern did not seem influence the L2 turns and L2 words, but the proficiency pairings matter.

4.2.2 What are the results of proficiency pairing on students' language production?

The second research question in this study was to examine the results of proficiency pairing toward students' language production related to suggestion by the previous study. Storch and Aldosari (2012) suggested that the optimal pairing of students may depend on the goal of the activity. If the goal is to develop fluency, then the optimal pairing for lower proficiency learner is with fellow low proficiency learner (L–L) and if the goal is to encourage a focus on language use, then the mixed proficiency pairing (H–L) may benefit proficiency learner. Table 4.4 shows that the highest number of L2 turns was from L–L pairs (56%). It also can be seen from table 4.5 which present the amount of L2 talk that the highest L2 production (36%) is from low proficiency learners who paired with low proficiency learners (L–L). This result similar and support the suggestion by Storch and Aldosari

(2012) that the optimal pairing for develop fluency activity is lower proficiency learner with a fellow low proficiency learner (L–L).

The findings also presented the number and type of LREs. As the table 4.3 presents, the L–L pairs (*n*=17) produced more LREs than H–L pairs (*n*=12). When lower proficiency learners working with fellow low proficiency learners (L–L), there was more attention paid on language use. They weren't hesitate to asking for aspect of language, particularly grammatical form and definition of sentence or words. All L–L pairs also formed collaborative patterns. This result might be different from Storch and Aldosari (2012) suggestion that the mixed proficiency learner (H–L) might be optimal if the goal of activity is to encourage a focus on language use