

Language Convergence of English Native Teachers at Their Workplace

Alvionita Yusnanda

English Literature, Faculty of Languages and Arts, State University of Surabaya
email: 11020154229.alvionita@gmail.com

Slamet Setiawan

English Literature, Faculty of Languages and Arts, State University of Surabaya
email: slametsetiawan@unesa.ac.id

Abstrak

Studi ini fokus pada konvergensi bahasa yang dilakukan oleh dua pekerja migran, guru *native* bahasa Inggris berkebangsaan Inggris terhadap pekerja lokal di EF Pakuwon Trade Centre, Surabaya. Pekerja lokal diartikan sebagai pekerja EF berdasarkan divisi staf, yaitu: (1) guru lokal; (2) konsultan kursus lokal; (3) office boy lokal; and (4) orang tua murid sebagai konsumen yang statusnya tertinggi dalam dunia kerja. Konvergensi mencerminkan usaha guru *native* bahasa Inggris sebagai *speaker* dalam menurunkan gaya bahasa untuk beradaptasi dengan lawan bicara yang kemampuannya berbeda dalam memahami bahasa Inggris sebab bahasa pertama lawan bicara adalah bahasa Indonesia. Studi ini menggunakan teori akomodasi oleh Giles (1975), SPEAKING model oleh Hymes (1974), dan konteks sosial dalam bahasa, dimensi sosial oleh Holmes (1992). Analisis dalam studi ini berisi penjabaran dari bagaimana guru *native* bahasa Inggris mengkonvergensi bahasa mereka terhadap para pekerja lokal. Riset ini menggunakan metode deskriptif kualitatif dengan transkripsi *orthographic* yang dikembangkan oleh Gail Jefferson (Wray, Trott, Bloomer, Reay, & Butler, 1998; Litosseliti, 2010).

Hasil dari studi ini menunjukkan bahwa dalam mengkonvergensi bahasa, pembicara memiliki pola yang sama dari: penggunaan intonasi yang tinggi; pertimbangan pola tata bahasa dalam percakapan yang pada dasarnya, tidak semua lawan bicara memahami penggunaan tata bahasa dalam bahasa Inggris; penggunaan medium verbal dan non-verbal dalam percakapan yaitu, gestur dan *verbal fillers*; penerapan penurunan kecepatan berbicara; penggunaan panjang ucapan yang normal pada kalimat-kalimat *complex* dan *compound*; dan penerapan *pause* per kata. Di samping itu, mereka cenderung menghindari penggunaan dimensi sosial dalam berbicara. Tiga skala formalitas, keintiman, dan status tidak mempengaruhi perubahan kode dan pengucapan pembicara. Konvergensi bahasa berdampak terhadap bahasa Inggris yang diketahui oleh baik pembicara maupun lawan bicara. Sesuai dengan teori yang ada, studi ini mengusulkan bahwa tujuan konvergensi bahasa yang dilakukan oleh pekerja migran adalah untuk: (1) membangun hubungan emosional antara pembicara dan lawan bicara yang menandai kebutuhan pemahaman yang seringnya dilakukan secara tidak sadar dalam integrasi atau identifikasi sosial; (2) mempersilahkan lawan bicara atau member lawan bicara rasa nyaman dalam percakapan; (3) memenuhi persyaratan yang ditafsirkan oleh pendengar atau lawan bicara; (4) membuat komunikasi lebih mudah dipahami oleh lawan bicara atau sebaliknya; (5) dan diterima secara sosial.

Kata kunci: *teori akomodasi, konvergensi, tempat bekerja.*

Abstract

This study focuses on language convergence done by two migrant workers, British English teachers toward Indonesian or local co-workers in EF (English First) at Pakuwon Trade Centre, Surabaya. The local co-workers are defined as EF employers based on staff division, they are: (1) local teachers; (2) local course consultants; (3) local office boys; and (4) EF student's parents as the consumers whose status is the highest in business world. The convergence reflects the British English teachers' effort as the speakers in lowering speech to adapt the interlocutors' different skills of English comprehension as their mother language is bahasa Indonesia. This study uses theories of accommodation theory proposed by Giles (1975), SPEAKING tongue model proposed by Hymes (1974), and social context in language, social dimension proposed by Holmes (1992). The analysis of this study consists of elaboration on how English native teachers converge their language toward local workers. This research uses descriptive qualitative method using the orthographical transcription developed by Gail Jefferson (Wray, Trott, Bloomer, Reay, & Butler, 1998; Litosseliti, 2010).

The result shows that in converging the language, the speakers have the same patterns of: using high intonation; considering grammar pattern in conversation that in fact, not all of the interlocutors understand the use of grammars in English; using verbal and non-verbal medium in conversation, that are gestures and verbal fillers; applying adjustment of speech rate; using normal utterance lengths of complex and compound sentences; and applying pause per words. Besides, they tend to avoid the use of social dimension in speaking. The three scales of formality, intimacy, and status do not influence the speakers' change of code and pronunciation. In line with the theories, this study proposes that the purposes of language convergence done are to: (1) build emotional link between speaker and interlocutor that reflects the needs of comprehension often non-conscious for social integration or identification; (2) please the interlocutors or putting them at ease; (3) meet the interpreted requirements of the listener; (4) make the communication more understandable to the partner or not; (5) and get social approval.

Keywords: *accommodation theory, convergence, workplace.*

INTRODUCTION

Within the reason that English is now becoming the most widely taught as foreign language in over 100 countries in the world (Crystal, 2003), the increasing number of English Institutes spread, including the spread in Indonesia. English First (abbreviated as EF) is one of the most popular English institutes in Indonesia. EF runs over 65 schools throughout more than 20 Indonesian cities. This institution deliberately provides English native teachers that are directly imported from five countries which use English as their first language, that are; United Kingdom, United State, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. EF employs English *native* teachers with the aim of improving local students' English skills more quickly, and making their pronunciation more accurate. For some people, learning English with native teachers is more exciting. Moreover, it enables students' self-confidence and mental trained. Besides, EF also employs *non-native* English teachers (*local* people or *Indonesians* who learn English) for its teaching and learning process. In addition, EF provides professional staffs called *Course Consultants* to organize the system of the courses in the office that most of them are Indonesian. English native teachers (**NT**), local teachers (**LT**) and course consultants (**CC**) obviously get communicating each other at the workplace in frequent that the accommodation of the speech or the process of language contact between two different languages, English and bahasa Indonesia, cannot be avoided. The existence of Office Boys (**OB**) and EF students' parents (**Parent**) also cannot be ignored since the migrants also get interaction with them.

Due to this condition, the migrants must adapt in order to be able to get interacting. Normally, in such case, people tend to accommodate their language by selecting the code that is most comfortable for their interlocutors. In other words each person's speech converges towards the speech of the person they are

talking to or their speech styles become somewhat similar (Holmes, 1992, p. 255). In this case, the EF native English teachers that are British, struggle the most to adapt locals' way of speaking since they are widely known for their distinct *non-rhotic* and unique accent explored in *British Received Pronunciation* or *British RP* (Wray, Trott, Bloomer, Reay, & Butler, 1998, p. 198).

To deal with problems of language contact, people in interaction of different languages need to accommodate their communication one another. It then suits to what Howard Giles had proposed as *Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT)*. CAT is devised as a strategy to explain some of the motivations underlying certain shifts in people's speech styles during social encounters and some of the social consequences arising from the phenomena. More specifically, it originates to elucidate the cognitive and affective process underlying speech convergence and divergence (Street and Giles, 1982). Convergence has been defined as a linguistic strategy whereby individuals adapt each other's speech by means of a wide range of linguistics features including speech rates, pause, utterance lengths, and pronunciation. CAT points out that the speakers directly adjust their speech rate in order to make themselves sound likeable to their interlocutors (Giles and Powesland, 1975).

This study discusses the language accommodation process between migrants and locals happens in workplace. Different from those previous studies, this study focuses on language convergence that occurs during the interaction and the relationship between the contexts of language use and the convergence uttered by the migrants to the different interlocutors with different levels of English. By using the *SPEAKING theory* from Dell Hymes (1974), this study also discusses the impacts of language convergence of English native teachers in their workplace, EF. The impacts are for both the native teachers themselves and their co-workers.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Language and Society

The society uses social categories to organize the environment and diminishes the complexities of the world. Language is one of the major factors society uses to categorize others. Language concerns aspects of human social behavior. The use of language influences the formation of ethnic identity, but otherwise, language identity enables influence to the language attitudes and language use (Gudykunst, 1988). To Bourhis, there are three categories of factors influence shift in the language use in intercultural communication: microsociolinguistic, macrosociolinguistic, and social psychological.

The microsociolinguistic factors include topic, setting, and purpose of conversation as well as the characteristics of the interlocutors. In this case, based on the research done by Banks, the boundary between marked and unmarked discourse is soft and permeable in line with Scherer and Giles (1979), but the boundary between low and high positions is hard and less permeable. Sometimes, there will be a case that the person could make the original language less-used than the new one the person has been adopted. The macrosociolinguistic factors rely on the sociostructural factors that influence speech strategies. For example, a research of McNamara that demonstrated social identity influences language attitudes or a research done by Giles and Young that indicated language preference relates to self categorisation. The last is social psychological factor of speech accommodation (Gudykunst, 1988).

Language varies not only to the social characteristic of the speaker, but also the contexts or the language use. Here, two kinds of contexts are relevant, linguistic context and situational context. In the linguistic context, a discourse provides phrases and sentences to be meant and/or interpreted. Meanwhile, situational context refers to total nonlinguistic environment of the speaker. Situational context includes the speaker, hearer, and any third subjects exist: physical environment, social milieu, subject of the conversation, the time of day, etc (Fromkin, Robert, & Hyams, 2011, p. 207). Further distinctions of situational context made in semantics and stylistics that distinguish for example, referential and emotive meaning from the contextual ones; and the use of a linguistic unit has in its social context, or how it relates to such factors of age, sex, or class, and in particular the role relationships and relative statuses of the participants in a discourse (Crytal, 2008).

The use of language in societies is different as there are social factors and dimensions that influence. The social factors related to *the participants* (the speaker and the interlocutor), *the setting*, *the topic*, and *the function* (the purpose of the communication). Meanwhile, the social dimension refers to social distance or solidarity, status scale (low or high position belonged in the society), formality scale (type of interaction), and other two functional scale of referential and affective function scales. Language conveys objective information of a referential kind, and it also expresses how someone is feeling. Generally, the more referentially oriented an interaction is, the less it tends to express the feelings of the speaker (Holmes, 1992).

The SPEAKING Model

Hymes developed a valuable model to assist the identification and labeling of components of linguistic interaction that was driven by his view that, in order to speak a language correctly, one needs not only to learn its vocabulary and grammar, but also the context in which words are used. The model had sixteen components that can be applied to many sorts of discourse: message form; message content; setting; scene; speaker/sender; addressor; hearer/receiver/audience; addressee; purposes (outcomes); purposes (goals); key; channels; forms of speech; norms of interaction; norms of interpretation; and genres (Hymes, 1974).

Hymes constructed the SPEAKING, under which he grouped the sixteen components within eight divisions (Hymes, 1974):

- S** : It includes both setting and scene. This analyzes where the activity are taking place and the scene.
- P** : It refers to participants. This explores a person who is the speaker, sender, or addressor and the hearer, receiver, audience, or addressee.
- E** : It means ends. This is purposes and goals the interaction.
- A** : Act sequences include message form and content. This explains the meaning to the participants.
- K** : Key concentrates to the key of tone or manner.
- I** : Instrumentalities is channel (verbal, nonverbal, physical) which communication flows can be examined.
- N** : The norms of interaction and interpretation specify the properties attached to speaking and

interpret the norms within cultural belief system.

G : The last is genre of the interaction.

Communication Accommodation Theory

The life of communication accommodation theory (CAT) can be traced back to the development of speech accommodation theory (SAT) devised in the early 1970s by social psychologist Howard Giles. To address these concerns, Giles developed SAT, a socio-psychological model that proposed “speakers use linguistic strategies to gain approval or to show distinctiveness in their interaction with others” (Gudykunst, 1988; Giles & Powesland, 1975; Giles, Coupland, & Coupland, 1991). Accommodation theory clarifies two kinds of linguistic phenomena, speech convergence and speech divergence. Speech divergence is referred to the manner by which speaker accentuate vocal differences between themselves and others, while speech convergence has been defined as a linguistic strategy whereby individuals adapt to each other speech by means of a wide range of linguistic features. Besides, Holmes states that speech accommodation tends to happen when the speakers like one another or where one speaker has a vested interest in pleasing the other or putting them at ease (Holmes, 1992, p. 225).

Accordingly, during an interaction, a speaker may converge their speech styles to meet the interpreted requirements of the listener (Giles, Coupland, & Coupland, 1991). For example, if communicators speak different languages, one, or both, a speaker may alter his/her speech style by slowing their speech to allow their partner time to interpret the message. It is achieved this extension for convergence but not for divergence. Arguably the most significant development to the theory came with its name change to CAT, when the communicative behaviors studied expanded beyond speech styles and encompassed the entire communication process, including non-verbal. According to Giles, accommodation theory proposes that individuals make adjustments to their communicative behavior as a function of their assessment of their conversational partners’ communicative characteristics, as well as their desire to establish and maintain a positive personal and social identity.

Interpretability strategies defined as tactics used by an individual to either make their communication more understandable to their partner or not (Giles & Powesland, 1975; Giles, Coupland, & Coupland, 1991). Understanding CAT leads to conclusion that convergence involves studying how

partners merge voice elements to one another, with no specific attention devoted to their roles in producing the adaptation. On the other hand, accommodation emphasizes studying how partners perform a service or provide a convenience in the interaction. In conversation, then, partners control their acts of accommodation, and this control mechanism is closely associated with manipulation of social status perceptions by one or both partners (Giles & Powesland, 1975).

Convergence then has been defined as act to achieve closeness in an interaction through linguistic tactics such alterations of linguistic-prosodic-nonverbal features including speech rate, pauses/pausal phenomena, utterance length, phonological variants/pronunciation, intonation, and voice pitch, smiling, gaze, and so on (vocabulary grammatical patterns use, verbal fillers or pragmatic particles (such as *sort of*, *you know*, and *you see*) (Giles, Coupland, & Coupland, 1991; Holmes, 1992, p. 255). Moreover, Holmes added that there are two kinds of convergence, that are: *upward convergence* that refers to convergence towards the speech of someone with more power or status, or someone deserves respect in the context, and *downward convergence* that refers to convergence towards the speech of someone with less status or power (Holmes, 1992, p. 256).

It is also convergence when a communicator alters his/her communication style to be more similar to whom they are communicating with in the situation of both speaker and interlocutor may best receive it. Furthermore, convergence accommodation theory is considered as an active process. Convergence strategy is also used to build emotional link between speaker and interlocutor that reflects the needs of comprehension often non-conscious for social integration or identification (Giles & Powesland, 1975). As Giles (1987) has been explained, accommodation can reduce the power and social status between one and others. In this case, it can give its own benefit that there is no discrimination between powerful and powerless people or low and high in social status. Indeed, it is also used to show the mutual intelligibility between the speaker and his partners (Tani, p. 13). All of the motivations above can be said as an effort to build effectiveness of communication.

RESEARCH METHOD

Subject and Setting

This research is included as *qualitative* which explains social phenomena to understand the world

through social behavior, social opinions and attitudes, the impacts of the phenomena, and factors and practices in the certain phenomena happen (Hancock, Ockleford, & and Windridge, 2009, pp. 6-7). As in qualitative research the researcher requires a rational identification and a certain setting as a data collection site (Berg, 2001, p. 29), English First (abbreviated as EF), functioned as the setting in this study. It is a well-known English institution that helps students to improve their English skills with such high provided courses offered. In Surabaya, EF has about six branches that take place in *Bukit Mas, Jemursari, Kayun, Klampis, Plaza, and PTC*. The setting used in this study then was in EF PTC. There are 28 employers in EF PTC that eight of them are local staffs staying as course consultant, nine of them as local teachers, six of them are English native teachers, and three people as office boys. This study also concerned on small samples of participants or subjects to represent the wider population based on the basic sampling of qualitative research (Berg, 2001). The subjects in this study were *the English native teachers as the speakers* and *the local co-workers as the interlocutors* involved in adapted conversation or the migrants tried to adjust their language toward their interlocutors (Hancock, 1998).

As workplace becomes one of settings where communication across different cultures and languages could begin (Crystal, 2003), then language contact and the relation exists in the society considered as a main point in this study. The research in this study aimed to explore the phenomenon of language convergence done by English native teachers (labeled as NT) toward local co-workers in their workplace. To get the result, this study involved the English native teachers as the subjects that took place in the natural conversation among Indonesian or local teachers (labeled as LT), and other local staffs like course consultants (CC) and office boys (OB) at English First (EF) Pakuwon Trade Centre (PTC), Surabaya, as the setting. The existence of the EF students' parents (labeled as Parent) also considered here since their position as 'consumer' important in business world. The focus then was on English native speakers' struggle to fit the environment which involved local co-workers as their interlocutors.

The significant subjects here were two English native teachers: Miss A and Mr. B originally come from United Kingdom. This study deliberately made British migrants as the object since the British accent is hard to understand. To make it clear, British accent has special aspects that makes this accent is hard to comprehend like: non-rhoticity (meaning the r in the ends of words isn't pronounced), the vowel sounds are shifted around (e.g. "day" (/deɪ/) sounds is pronounce dæi close to

American "die"), glottal stopping (e.g. "better" (/ˈbetə/) sounds like "be'uh"), and *th*-fronting (the *thin* word "this" (/ðɪs/) is pronounced with a more forward consonant depending on the word: this become *dis*). All of the sounds formed as *British Received Pronunciation* (British RP) (Wray, Trott, Bloomer, Reay, & Butler, 1998). Both of British migrants stay as teachers in EF assessed as their adaptation in conversing with local co-workers is quite unique. Related to the period of staying in Indonesia; both of the British migrants tried to understand bahasa Indonesia. The interesting part of this research is that the interlocutors or the local co-workers also came from different social and language (of English) backgrounds to be involved in conversation with British native teachers. With the setting of EF is accessible (the researcher of this study easily connects to EF as she is one of the course consultants); observation including background checking was worth doing.

Data Collection and Analyzing Technique

In collecting the data, observation was done to the extent of limited value exists or are difficult to validate. As participants cannot guarantee that they actually do what they say they do, observing them can be more valid and can produce data verification and information nullification (Hancock, Ockleford, & and Windridge, 2009). Here, the data were collected through participant observation with the researcher as 'participant observer' to gather the data dealing with how English native speakers adjusted their language, the contexts they used toward local co-workers in their daily conversation. Questionnaires were also employed to collect the data. The use of questionnaires usually requires responses depict the opinions or views of the subjects in the research written in blank spaces (Hancock, Ockleford, & and Windridge, 2009; Creswell, 2003). The last technique of data collection applied in this study was material documentation.

Conversation analysis was used in this study. This technique applied written documents or transcriptions of recorded verbal communications (Berg, 2001, p. 240). Firstly, the conversations of subjects collected from the direct observation and voice recording transcribed. The transcription also includes the utterances of the interlocutors. Here, both phonetical and orthographical transcription developed by Jefferson (1984) (Wray, Trott, Bloomer, Reay, & Butler, 1998; Litosseliti, 2010, p. 174) applied. After transcribed, those conversations analyzed based on convergence process that employs aspects of: speech rates, pauses, utterance lengths, pronunciation, grammatical patterns, intonation, and

vocabulary adjustment (Giles and Coupland, 1998). For making the identification easier, the conversations categorized according to the subjects' division.

DISCUSSION

There are four conversation divisions of data obtained: the conversation of English native teachers toward Indonesian English teachers; English native teachers toward Indonesian course consultants; English native teachers toward Indonesian office boys; and English native teachers toward EF students' parents. The division done based on the differences of English skills. As the local teachers get the first rank in the English comprehension skill, this research then focused on the revelation of convergence, contexts, and the application of social dimension in the talks of English native teachers to them. The same concept also applied on the convergence practice towards other local co-workers: course consultants, office boys, and EF students' parents.

English Native Teacher's (NT) Convergence toward Local Teacher (LT)

Data [1]

Miss A : Miss, where have you been? You've been gone(.) for many days. I thought you were missing. I wanted to go to police station.(h) to report you missing.

LT 1 : [No(.) I had my holiday for two weeks.]

Miss A : That's blo: :ody awesome. Where did (.) you go?

LT 1 : [>Nowhere. I stayed at home.<] ((American English))

Miss A : [>What did you do? Don't you get bored?<] ((British RP))

LT1 : [No(.) I was busy. I babysitted mybaby.] ((silence)) ((opened her jacket))

Miss A : How did you get so: :ma: :ny ↑holidays?

LT 1 : I booked it.

Miss A : [>When did you booked it? Like a year ago?<]((British RP)) ((laughing))

LT 1 : Yeah(0.3). I DID.

Miss A : O: :h(.)↑re: :ally?

LT 1 : I've booked it si: :nce (0.2) January. I talked to Alex.

Miss A : Yeah yeah, [>I think I suppose to do the same thing to get two weeks holiday.<] ((British RP)) ((laughing))

S : The setting of the conversation is in the office of English First, EF of Pakuwon Trade Centre, Surabaya. The subjects, both Miss A and LT 1 involved in greeting conversation after times they do not meet. The scene contains of sense of play as both of them try to get closer.

P : The participants in the conversation are Miss A and LT 1.

E : Miss A starts the conversation to state a purpose of greeting. To Miss A, starting conversation first and greeting a co-worker as she and her work together in the same place is considered as a part of manner.

A : The act sequence of conversation above refers to "questioning and answering" and "commenting". Miss A playfully comments and questions LT 1 on how she could have her break time from work for days.

K : Miss a questions LT 1 mostly in a high intonation to state her curiosity to the case of LT 1's break days. Miss A may stretch her words to emphasize her excitement playfully towards LT 1.

I : Both Miss A and LT 1 talk in a casual way.

N : Both Miss A and LT 1 state their jokes in collaboration with no interruption.

G : The genre of the conversation is small talk or jokes.

English Native Teacher's (NT) Convergence toward Local Course Consultant (CC)

Data [5]

Mr. B : [>Sorry?<] ((British RP))

CC A : YES?

Mr. B : [>Look at THIS!= ((pointing out the paper)) =(h) in this lesson by lesson(.) today(0.1) is my sche: dule to give them TEST. But(0.1) we haven't FINISHED YET the last(h) CHAPTER. Is it RIGHT?<] ((British RP))

CC A : Emm?

Mr. B : [>Okay<] = ((British RP))

CC A : Oh: : let me check.

- S : The setting of the talk is in the course consulting room. The scene is that Mr. B confirms his students' test schedule with the fact that that his last chapter has not finished yet.
- P : The participants of the conversation are Mr. B and CC A.
- E : The purpose of the conversation is confirming whether it is okay for Mr. B to run the test or otherwise.
- A : The speech act most frequently refers to confirmation. The confirmation relates to the case (of running the test) checking.
- K : The tone is mostly high intonation.
- I : Both of Mr. B and CC A seem to use formal speech. As for Mr. B, he uses stretched words and gestures to imply his meaning for CC A to understand.
- N : CC A does not get the talk of Mr. B as he uses British RP in the conversation, there then such interruption happens.
- G : The genre is problem talk or confirming.

English Native Teacher's (NT) Convergence toward Local Course Consultant (CC)

Data [12]

Miss A : [>Can you buy me some food?<] ((British RP))

OB 1 : ((Silence))

Miss A : [{fu: :: d}] ((demonstrating how to eat, directs the hand that brought the spoon to the mouth))

OB 1 : Ya(.) ya.

Miss A : [Pangsit]

OB 1 : Ya:

Miss A : [>This is the money<] ((British RP)) ((show the money))= [sepuluhribu. Terimakasih.]

- S : The setting of the conversation is in the pantry. The scene refers to the situation where Miss A would like to order OB 1 buying some food.

- P : The participants in the conversation are Miss A and OB 1.
- E : The purpose of the conversation is for asking a help.
- A : The act sequence refers to telling and ordering.
- K : The tone is flat.
- I : In asking for OB 1's help, Miss A uses gesture to convey her meaning that OB 1 could understand.
- N : The speech is considered casual.
- G : The genre is small talk of instructing.

English Native Teacher's (NT) Convergence toward EF Students' Parent (Parent)

Data [15]

Miss A : [>Hallo(0.1) I'm Miss A. Nice to meet you.<] ((British RP))

Parent 1 : Yes ((Shake hand)).

Miss A : Student 1's father?

Parent 1 : Yes.((smirking))

Miss A : Ca: : n (0.3) y. you(.) spea: : k(.)ing(h)Eng: :lish(h)?

Parent 1 : Yes, I understand little. ((smirking))

Miss A : ((laughing)) Oka: :y then(.) LOOK!(0.4)= ((Show student 1's report)) =He is(0.2) go: :od(0.1) ((show thumbs up)) boy. He { 'lis(.)(ə)n } well. He is(0.2) an { 'ak(.).tr:v } boy. He { 'ɔ:l(.).we: :rɪ } (h)(0.3) pay { ə't(.).e:n/(ə)n } to my(0.2) { eks(.).plə'nei:f(ə)n }. His score is(hh) (0.3)good. [>EIGHTY for WRITING(.) EIGHTY THREE for SPEAKING(.) EIGHTY NINE for READING(.) but(.SEVENTY THREE for LISTENING.<] ((British RP))= ((pointing to the report))=He has quite(0.2) WEAK in { 'lr: :s(.)(ə)nɪŋ } skill. He(.) NEEDS { 'pra(.).ktɪs } MORE at home. But(0.2) don't worry. This is NOT a big { 'prɒ(.).bləm }(.). Sir. He(0.2) can catch up the lesson well in the class. So: : IF HE HAS(0.3) FREE TIME(.) just ASK(0.2) him to { 'pra(.).ktɪs } the listening

- skill= ((pointing to her ear))
=by listen to { 'ɪŋg(.)lɪf
(.) 'mu: .vi}
or(0.3){ 'ɪŋg(.)lɪf}(.) SONG.
Do you understand?
Parent 1 : Yes. So he is(0.3) not good
in listening? Practice more
RIGHT?
Miss A : ((laughing)) ye: :s ↑
EXCELLENT. No
worries(.) he is a
{ 'klɛ(.və)}(.) boy(.) Sir. Do
you have any(.h)(0.3)
question?
Parent 1 : No(.) thank you ↓
Miss A : [Yes(.).teri::ma::kasih(0.2)]
((smile))
- S : The setting of the conversation is in the consulting room. Miss A tries to deliver one of EF students learning improvement to the parent.
- P : The participants are Miss A and Parent 1.
- E : The purpose of the conversation is that Parent 1 getting confirmation on his son's English skills.
- A : The act sequence refers to telling and confirming.
- K : In stating statements, Miss A uses rising and falling intonation to emphasize words she conveys for Parent 1 gets understanding regarding the talks.
- I : Miss A uses gestures and emphasized or bold words in the way she talks to Parent 1.
- N : Even though both participants involve in formal situation, still, both of them talk in casual way to get mutual understanding and comfortable talks.
- G : The genre is problem talk.

In converging the language, both Miss A and Mr. B have the same patterns of tendency in some aspects. (1) The first, to most of the interlocutors, Miss A and Mr. B often use high intonation while talking. They tend to use the high intonation as they have stressed words they want to convey to their interlocutors. They somehow use emphasized and stretched words as they have a will to fulfill their interlocutors' requirement in the conversation. As for rising-falling and flat intonation, they do them as it is how the intonation supposed to be. In fact, not all of the interlocutors understand what they convey in such intonation. (2) The second, the consideration on the grammar pattern is obvious in the conversation. Miss A and Mr. B somehow try to use the standard English by

considering the grammar as their focus. In fact, not all of the interlocutors understand the use of grammars in English. Even though learning English for such purpose, the co-workers somehow do not too care on the use of grammar. (3) The third is the use of verbal and non-verbal medium in conversation. Both Miss A and Mr. B use gestures and verbal fillers to the most of the interlocutors in this study. The use of gestures indicates their effort in resolving the misunderstanding of each interlocutor in the conversation. The use of verbal fillers then signals their understanding on their interlocutors' comprehension. Somehow they do not need to consider the medium both verbal and non-verbal as they know their interlocutors will understand what they say.

The fourth to the seventh related to the aspects of speech rate, utterance lengths, pause, and vocabulary use. (4) In the case of speech rate, Miss A and Mr. B often adjust their speech rate longer than 12s per sentence. They do it to the needs of their interlocutors' comprehension. For normal speech rate, they do it only while they are talking to the interlocutors with the advanced English skills. (5) The fifth, both Miss A and Mr. B use normal utterance lengths of complex and compound sentences in speaking to their interlocutors. They do the shorts one to as it is how the length of the utterance supposed to be. (6) The sixth, the frequency of both Miss A and Mr. B's pauses is up to 0.2s per words. They intend to do it as the interlocutors cannot catch up their speech rates in normal. There are times when they do not use the pause that are: when they know the ability of the interlocutors; when they consider it is how the sentence supposed to be; and when they focus on their style shifting. (7) The last, both Miss A and Mr. B tend to use their vocabularies as they accustomed to. The adjustment of vocabulary is obvious when they try to simplifying their utterance regarding their interlocutors' comprehension.

The Unuse of Social Dimension to the English Native Teacher

Both of English native teachers, Miss A and Mr. B, seem agree in dividing their interlocutors based on the understanding levels of English. Both have the same consideration on: local teachers have advanced English; office boys have basic level of English or beginner; and both course consultants and EF students' parents have intermediate English. Miss A and Mr. B use the same strategy of downward convergence when talk to the Indonesian/local co-workers. To all of those different interlocutors whose English level is different, they tend to use downward convergence and never have practiced the upward convergence in the daily

convergence. Normally, in English conversation, the speaker with such low status will adapt the language said by the interlocutors from the higher status by borrowing words or fully use the same high level of utterances (Holmes, 1992). Here, Miss A and Mr. B do bahasa Indonesia as their strategy in lowering their speech towards the interlocutors that have basic or no level in English.

As stated by Holmes, the social dimension refers to social distance or solidarity, status (low or high position belonged in the society), formality (type of interaction), and other two referential and affective functional scales. Other two functional scales used as language conveys objective information of a referential kind, and it also expresses how someone is feeling (Holmes, 1992). Based on the result, there is no synchronization on the utterances and the social dimension application done by Miss A and Mr. B. Both Miss A and Mr. B use downward convergence without considering the intimacy, status, and formality. Those three scales also do not affect the change of the code in the conversation. There is no change of code and there is also tendency to avoid any scales in the conversation to the distant and higher status interlocutors in both formal and informal situation to create a warm and friendlier atmosphere in line with the purpose of convergence proposed by Giles (Giles & Powesland, 1975). To higher status interlocutors, both Miss A and Mr. B used the same pattern in daily conversation. No matter how the relationship is, Miss A and Mr. B do not change their code or switch their code. The formality scale also does not affect the code used. That is why; the use of the scale seems go roundabout. The explanation on the goal of the convergence use then makes it clear that Miss A and Mr. B want to get accepted in the environment and that the interlocutors will act favorably if they adapt the way of the interlocutors talking (Gudykunst, 1988). The only right pattern then occurs in the convergence done by Miss A and Mr. B towards lower status interlocutors, in this case, office boys. Their higher status than the office boys' even though the relationship is distant are reasonable to Miss A and Mr. B to do code switching in such informal situation.

In line with as what Giles (1987) has explained, speech accommodation (of both convergence and divergence, in this case, convergence) can reduce the power and social status between one and others. Miss A and Mr. B show how all of the scales do not affect the language use in both linguistics and social contexts. Their efforts of convergence aimed for the adaptation within the new environment of people with different language and culture. Their use of such strategy of downward convergence indicates their

intention of going closer in step by step to all of the local co-workers in EF. In this case, such strategy can give its own benefit that there is no discrimination between powerful and powerless people or low and high in social status. Besides, the strategy can also be used to show the mutual intelligibility or equal understanding between the British native teachers and all of their Indonesian/local interlocutors at the workplace. All of the motivations above can be said as an effort to build effectiveness of communication (Giles, Coupland, & Coupland, 1991).

CONCLUSION

The phenomenon of migration from country to country could affect the use of language to the migrants and the locals involved in daily communication. Regarding the phenomenon of migration and the effect to the language contexts, this study then uses the subjects of two British migrants, the speakers in this study, live in Indonesia that both have the same profession as English teacher in the Indonesian English institution, EF (English First) of Pakuwon Trade Centre, Surabaya. This study concerns on how both migrants communicate to the Indonesian or local co-workers whose English competence is different. With the observation and analysis done, it is then known that both migrants use the same speech style while talking to all of the local co-workers. Here, both of them use convergence, the downward one as their strategy to build effective communication in daily conversation happens in the workplace in line with the proposed theory of communication accommodation strategy.

In converging the language, the English native teachers use the same patterns of lowering their speech in talking: the tendency of using high intonation; the consideration of grammar pattern in conversation that in fact, not all of the interlocutors understand the use of grammars in English; the use verbal and non-verbal medium in conversation, that are gestures and verbal fillers; the adjustment of speech rate; the use normal utterance lengths of complex and compound sentences; and the tendency to apply pause per words. Here, they may adjust their speech in speaking to the local interlocutors, but their pronunciation and their code are still on their own. They do not want to follow how the local co-workers pronounce each English word nor they want to speak bahasa Indonesia completely. They only use bahasa Indonesia to the interlocutors that have no comprehension of English at all.

The elaboration of the aspects of convergence above included as the linguistics context. Meanwhile, the social context used here includes the application or

consideration of social dimension in speaking. The social dimension observed and revealed from the analysis is the scales of intimacy, formality, and status scales that most of the times do not really influence the downward strategy they use. It can be seen that all of those three scales are avoided to use. The speakers, in this study, ignore to consider the status between themselves and interlocutors in speaking. Besides, there is no difference in speaking to the closer and distant interlocutors. Normally, there will be differences when people speak to strangers or others whose relationship is not that close enough moreover the occasion is formal. This avoidance of language use is intended to obtain effective communication and mutual understanding in adapting the new environment of EF as the workplace to the speakers that are migrants in Indonesia.

SUGGESTION

It is highly suggested that this study can be a relevant study to the linguistics field. The researcher hopes that the further research will be able to dig more on convergence aspects and provide more complex data since the data forms in this study conducted in EF institution which has its limit. Further, the researcher hopes that this study can inspire another researcher to find out more about not only the language convergence, but also the language divergence and help another researcher to go deeper dealing with language contexts and social dimension of language in order to find out the more complex understanding about the process of language contact. Concerning to this study, the researcher thinks that it would be good if the following study of this case will analyze the language convergence and divergence that focus on the accent and dialect. Moreover, it will also be good if the impacts of the language phenomenon regarding language convergence and divergence are proposed in the existed theories that this study only focuses on impacts after the analysis and observation done, that is related to the social dimension application in speaking. The more proposed impacts in the theories exist, the better understanding the readers get.

REFERENCES

- Berg, B. L. (2001). *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences* (4th ed.). United States: A Pearson Education Company.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research Design Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (2nd ed.). London: Sage Publications.

- Crystal, D. (2003). *English as A Global Language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crytal, D. (2008). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics* (6th ed.). UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Fromkin, V., Robert, R., & Hyams, N. (2011). *An Introduction to Language* (9th ed.). United States: Wadsworth.
- Giles, H., & Powesland, P. (1975). *Speech Style and Social Evaluation*. London: Academic Press.
- Giles, H., Coupland, N., & Coupland, J. (1991). Communication, Context, and Consequence. In H. Giles, N. Coupland, & J. Coupland, *Accommodation Theory: Communication, Context, and Consequence* (pp. 7-21). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gudykunst, W. B. (1988). *Language and Ethnic Identity*. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
- Hancock, B. (1998). *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*. Nottingham: Trent Focus Group.
- Hancock, B., Ockleford, E., & and Windridge, K. (2009). *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*. Yorkshire: The NIHR Research Design Service for Yorkshire and the Humber.
- Holmes, J. (1992). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. London and New York: Longman.
- Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations of Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P.
- Litosseliti, L. (Ed.). (2010). *Research Methods in Linguistics*. London and New York: Continuum.
- Wardhaugh, R. (2006). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (5th ed.). UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Wray, A., Trott, K., Bloomer, A., Reay, S., & Butler, C. (1998). *Projects in Linguistics: A Practical Guide to Researching Language*. Republic of China: Edward Arnold (Publisher).