

JAPANESE LANGUAGE RHETORIC OF THE JAPANESE EDUCATION STUDENTS' AT THE SPEECH CONTEST

Rike Febriyanti

Japanese Language Education Study Program, Faculty of Cultural Studies, Brawijaya University
Jl. Veteran Malang 65145, Indonesia
febriyanti_rike@ub.ac.id

Received: 09th July 2019/**Revised:** 18th July 2019/**Accepted:** 01st August 2019

How to Cite: Febriyanti, R. (2019). Japanese language rhetoric of the Japanese education students' at the speech contest. *Lingua Cultura*, 13(3), 181-189.
<https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v13i3.5742>

ABSTRACT

The research aimed to analyze the speech rhetoric quality of the students of Japanese Language Education, Brawijaya University using a descriptive qualitative design. The method applied a discourse analysis method written by Krippendoff which included coding, classification, interpretation, and evaluation. The object of this research was students' speech for Japanese Speech Contest of UB 2018. The data were seven video recordings of seven speeches delivered by seven students who participated in this speech contest. It concluded that the quality of the students' speech is not satisfactory in the criteria of content and expression. The students also show weaknesses in pronunciation and grammar in their speech. This research indicates that when the students are allowed to be honest to express their mind freely in the Japanese language, the speech will reflect each student's actual language mastery, because language teaching inside the classroom is the most dominant language exposure for the students, any advancement in Japanese language teaching will significantly uplift the quality of the speech.

Keywords: Japanese language, Japanese rhetoric, speech contest

INTRODUCTION

Annually, the students of Japanese Language in Indonesia compete in the Japanese Speech Contest held by the Japan Foundation. In the contest, students compose and deliver their own speeches because the Japan Foundation does not provide any specific themes as the mainframe of the speech. Because of the condition, the students have total freedom to choose their own topics and ways to deliver their speech. As a result, the topics and the techniques that they present are various.

In this contest, native speakers assess the students' speech based on its content, language, and fluency aspects. The researcher who is at the moment recording and observing the students directly during the speech contest has found that in performing their speeches, most students chose to tell their life experience. That statement is in accordance with what is suggested by Arsyad and Mukti (2005) that speech is an activity to convey thoughts, ideas, or messages to other people or listeners. On the other hand, Littlejohn and Foss (2014) have suggested that the practice of language can be done through two-way items, oral and writing. Both oral and written forms require language skills.

In the speech contest, students can express their opinions to the audience about their feeling, desire, and thought through the draft of the speech and the performance. Therefore, the language used when writing must be coherent in writing narrative essays, descriptions, and expositions in a speech text. All of that requires precision and accuracy in composing sentence by sentence so that the results of the writing that they want are arranged.

Before someone starts a speech, of course, the speech manuscript must be prepared first. To compile this speech, the students need skills in selecting words that are needed, composing sentences that must be proficient, the structures that are also cohesive as well as coherent, arguments and rhetoric in a text speech, so that the composition of the text of the speech is formed (Wiyanto, 2001). In speech writing, art or rhetoric are needed. These are two aspects of language items, namely writing and speaking that are closely related to one another.

The weight of the previously mentioned freedom during speech writing activity is noticeable, as mentioned by Taufiquilloh, Yuvita, & Sulistianingsih (2018). They say that writing activities become not only standard parts of classroom life but also the opportunities for the

students to achieve success in improving their writing skill. Furthermore, this total freedom is actually a massive opportunity for the students to write based on and beyond rules that they have learned in the classroom. As stated by Syarofi, Kuswahono, and Rizky (2018) that nowadays it is more important to create an environment that encourages students to take risks in their writing which means less concentration on conventional rules of writing and more on the expression of ideas.

So far, the Japanese Language Education study program has never conducted research on the quality of the rhetoric of its students. The Japanese Language Education study program has only concentrated on the implementation of contests and preparations for students before joining the contest. Therefore the department does not have data about the rhetoric quality of its students' speech. After spending some moments to find out previous studies in this, the researcher finds that this topic is not in the radar of any Japanese Language Education Department in Indonesia.

There is the fact that high school teachers and university students majoring in Indonesian Language Education study program have donated a lot of research on the ability of rhetoric as practiced by Widiantera, Wendra, & Sriasih (2014), which have examined the rhetoric of Indonesian language speech delivered by high school students in Bali. On the other hand, Hendarto (2012) has examined the anatomy of rhetoric in parliamentary debate contest of high school student in Yogyakarta. Other researchers examine the rhetoric of political figures in Indonesia such as Joko Widodo (Noermanzah, Emzir, & Lustyantje, 2018) and a comparative analysis of the speech former President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono and Barack Hussein Obama (Livia & Suenarto, 2015).

The researcher, by means of this research, also wants to know the effect of the teaching program in Sakubun, Bunpo, Hatsuon, and Kaiwa subjects on students' speech quality. In addition to academic purposes mentioned, this research will be beneficial to evaluate the success of the supporting program for students who want to follow the Japanese Speech Contest in the upcoming years. To investigate and accommodate various ways of delivering the speech and the content of the speeches that, the researcher presents this research.

METHODS

This research utilizes a qualitative approach with the aims to obtain a picture or to describe in a systematic, current, and accurate of an object under research as indicated by Sugiyono (2012) and Syaifudin (2001). Therefore, this research mainly focuses on analyzing the content and the delivery of speeches as defined by Gall, Gall, and Borg in Nassaji (2015). The results can then be used to determine the structure of the rhetoric, and to assess the depth of content of speech. The researcher does not give any treatment, preparation, or training to the students before the speech contest, so the researcher does not have any data about their initial ability.

The location of this research is the Japanese Language Education study program, Brawijaya University. The object of this research is students' speech of Japanese Language Education study program, Brawijaya University for Japanese Speech Contest of UB 2018. Data collection is performed using whole samples, and then the data are obtained without randomization. The data are directly

taken as many as seven video recordings of seven speeches delivered by seven students who are participating in the Japanese Speech Contest of Brawijaya University. The researcher works as a non-participatory observer of the speech contest.

The data analysis is based on the text of the speech so that the analysis is using discourse analysis method. Doing analysis means conducting a study to identify the structure of the speech as a whole. This discourse analysis technique is focusing on analyzing the structure of speeches; rhetoric speeches by model Bottom-Up. The stage analysis by Bermami, Safnil, and Arono (2019) is prior to the discourse analysis, discourse reading, and watching carefully to understand the ideas, then each speech is divided into units (T-units). According to Krippendorff in Bermami, Safnil, Arono (2019), the component of content analysis are coding, classification, and interpretation.

By combining of these analyzes, the steps of data analysis are; first, the researcher give each source code on the data obtained for example text N-01, N-02, N-03, and so on. After coding the text, the researcher reads the text of the speech carefully and understand the entire speech and text content. The next step is that the researcher makes a tabulation of data by using tabulation format for each analysis. Based on the previous step, the researcher enters text into a table by separating each unit of grammatical or t-unit. For example is a sentence or clause 1 is given a code number t-unit 1, t-unit 2, t-unit 3, and so on. After putting the text into the table, the researcher describes and discusses the results of the data analysis, then he/she concludes rhetoric of the speech and the speech of students.

In order to achieve a comprehensive understanding, the researcher seeks to perform a quantitative assessment that is followed by a qualitative analysis. Both methods are carried out each three times or when data has been showing redundancy. Each score and qualitative analysis are then combined into a complete analysis. The researcher has divided the assessment into four areas; content or *naiyou*, expression or *hyougen*, pronunciation or *hatsuon*, and then the ability to answer questions or *shitsumon*. As for the qualitative analysis, the researcher makes several criteria using scaled questions which would be exposed in the attachment, which later can be found in Appendices.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Table 1 to Table 3 show the data from seven speeches of seven students. Table 1 presents the results of three stages of assessment for all students. In presenting the results of this research, P (Presenter) and followed by a serial number 1-7 are used. After presenting the assessment data, the analysis is conducted descriptively.

From Table 2, P1 has obtained an average score of 67 for his speech which consists of average score of 18 of the contents of his speech (*naiyou*), the average score of 18 for expression (*hyougen*), the average score of 22,7 for pronunciation (*hatsuon*), and the average score of 13 for the ability to answer questions (*shitsumon*). From these scores, there are some very interesting notes. First, the scores of the content and expression are exceeding the scores of the pronunciation and the ability to answer questions. Second, the score on pronunciation is the highest score obtained by P1. From further observation on the recorded speeches of presenter repeatedly, there are several facts from P1.

Table 1 Results of Three Stages Assessment of All Students

First stage								
No.	Aspects	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7
1	<i>Naiyou</i>	20	20	20	15	25	25	20
2	<i>Hyougen</i>	30	20	25	20	20	25	20
3	<i>Hatsuon</i>	15	15	15	15	15	15	15
4	<i>Shitsumon</i>	15	15	15	15	15	15	10
Total		80	70	75	65	75	80	65

Second stage								
No.	Aspects	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7
1	<i>Naiyou</i>	15	18	28	10	20	23	12
2	<i>Hyougen</i>	15	20	30	20	15	30	12
3	<i>Hatsuon</i>	10	15	18	18	10	18	10
4	<i>Shitsumon</i>	10	15	15	15	15	15	5
Total		50	68	91	63	60	86	39

Third stage								
No.	Aspects	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7
1	<i>Naiyou</i>	19	23	20	18	21	25	16
2	<i>Hyougen</i>	23	25	18	18	19	25	15
3	<i>Hatsuon</i>	14	15	15	16	13	19	13
4	<i>Shitsumon</i>	15	15	10	15	10	15	5
Total		71	78	63	67	63	84	49

First, the form of speech that P1 conveyed in the speech contest is descriptive. P1 describes his personal experience on *Kokusai Kekkon* (wedding of different nationalities). Unfortunately, the topic is too personal, and it is not in accordance with the Japanese culture. Japanese people tend to be less personal and hiding the personal life of its people. From the opening of his speech to the closing, P1 delivers the speech that is quite interesting. Although interesting, the speech is not directly leading the listeners into the core of the speech. Besides all aspects as mentioned earlier, there are some interesting things that he expresses about his unique name. Second, the opening part, main body, and closing speech delivered by P1 are not cohesive. In the opening section, P1 speaks about his unique name. However, right on the content, P1 is reciting marriage between two people of different nationalities. Later at the end of his speech, P1 does not provide a closing statement at all. Third, P1 uses the Japanese language, which is appropriate to the audience of the speech contest. He used language that is concise, simple, polite, and not too formal. The language is actually in line with the vocabulary and sentence structure that he has learned during college in the first and second years.

Fourth, the message that P1 delivered is clear and simple. Fifth, although the whole speech could be heard clearly, P1 uses loud and soft dynamics, which is correspond to the message he wants to convey. The dynamics he used are not in line with the rules of intonation in Japanese (*Nihonjin rashii hatsuon*). Sixth, P1 is delivering his speech at normal speed (*Choudou ii*). Seventh, P1 uses

Table 2 The Average Scores of All Students

		P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7
1	AS	67	72	76,3	65	66	83,3	51
2	AN	18	20,3	22,7	14,3	22	24,3	16
3	AHy	22,7	21,7	24,3	19,3	18	26,7	15,7
4	AHt	13	15	16	16,3	12,6	17,3	12,7
5	ASh	13,3	15	13,3	15	13,3	15	6,7

Note: AS (Average Score), AN (Average of *Naiyou* Score), Ahy (Average of *Hyougen* Score), Aht (Average of *Hatsuon* Score), Ash (Average of *Shitsumon* Score).

Table 3 Statistics of All Students' Score

		P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7
1	DS	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
2	Mean	16,5	17,8	18,8	16	16,3	21	12,3
3	Error	2,2	1,6	2,6	1,1	2,3	2,7	2,3
4	StD	4,4	3,2	5,1	2,2	4,7	5,3	4,5
5	C.I (95%)	6,9	5,1	8,2	3,4	7,4	8,4	7,2
6	C.V.	26,4	18	27,3	13,5	28,5	25,9	36,7
7	G.M	16,1	17,5	18,2	15,9	15,8	19,9	11,4
8	Skew	0,6	0,08	-0,2	1,19	0,05	0	-1,2
9	Kurt	-2,2	-5,5	-3,7	1,5	-2,4	-4,7	0,9
10	P.V	0,75	0,60	0,89	0,86	0,86	0,81	0,80

appropriate pauses to make the audience understands his speech and to evoke emotion from the audience (*Egao de hyoujou wo arawashimasu*). Eighth, P1 delivers a speech in a polite manner (*Jishin motteiru*) because his body movement is natural, and he makes eye contact with the audience confidently. Ninth, P1 is very enthusiastic to face the audience. Moreover, the last, in his speech, P1 performs many grammatical errors.

From Table 2, P2 obtains an average score of 72 for his speech which consisted from average score of 20,3 for the content of his speech (*naiyou*), the average score of 21,7 for the expression (*hyougen*), the average score of 15 for the pronunciation (*hatsuon*), and average score an average of 15 for the ability to answer questions (*shitsumon*). From the results of the assessment in Table 1, there are two very interesting notes. First, the scores on content and pronunciation are exceeding the score of the ability to answer questions. Second, the score of the expression is exceeding the score obtained on the pronunciation and the ability to answer questions.

From further observation, there are several notes could be made. First, the form of speech that P2 used in a speech contest is descriptive. P2 describes his impressive personal view of his cousin, who lives in the countryside. P2 maintains the audience's enthusiasm about *Indonesia no kyouiku joutai wo setsumeisuru* (explaining about the state of education in Indonesia) and the story of the tribes living in remote areas. Second, the opening part, core, and closing speech delivered by P2 are not cohesive. In the opening part, P2 speaks interesting sentences about the unique conditions

and problems that are faced by tribes in remote areas. The opening is interesting to move the audience on education issue faced by his cousin, who could not speak Indonesian, because they live in the remote area of Borneo. In the concluding section, P2 only provides closing salutation without conclusion.

Third, P2 is using polite, informal, and simple language using vocabulary and sentence structure that he has learned in his first and second years in college. Fourth, the message he delivered is clear. Fifth, P2 delivers his speech using loud and soft dynamics. However, the dynamics are not following the rules in the Japanese language. Sixth, P2 uses normal speed in his speech. Seventh, P2 uses appropriate pauses. Eighth, P2 is a little bit nervous, although he does not show unnecessary body movement. Ninth, P2 is quite enthusiastic to face the audience to make interaction with the audience.

From the observation in Table 2, P3 obtains an average score of 76,3 for his speech. It consists of the average score of 22,7 for the content (*naiyou*), the average score of 24,3 for the expression (*hyougen*), the average score of 16 for the pronunciation (*hatsugon*), and the average score of 13,3 for the ability to answer questions (*shitsumon*). From the results of the assessment in Table 1, there are two very interesting notes. The scores on the content of speech and pronunciation exceed the score of the ability to answer questions. Second, the score of the expression exceeds the score on pronunciation and the ability to answer questions.

From the further observation of the recorded speech of presenter repeatedly, there are several notes to be made. First, P3 uses the descriptive form to convey her mind. She describes her personal experience as a mentor. In the opening until the closing, P3 delivers a speech in a way that is not attractive to direct listeners to her speech. P3 is using Javanese term *Gething Nyanding* (things we usually hate often be close to us). Second, the opening part, core, and closing speech delivered by P3 are not cohesive. In the opening section, P3 speaks about the conditions and problems faced by tribes in remote areas. Then P3 describes her reason to refuse to be a mentor. It is difficult to understand the core of her speech – *Muzukashii, Saigo made kikanai to wakarimasen*.

Third, P3 uses simple, polite, and not too formal language in accordance with the vocabulary and sentence structure that she has learned during college in the first and second years. Fourth, her pronunciation is very clear. Fifth, P3 delivers her speech using loud and soft dynamics, although her speech is not in accordance with the rules of intonation in Japanese. Sixth, P3 speaks at normal speed. Seventh, P3 is using appropriate pauses. Eighth, P3 is quite nervous in delivering her speech. Ninth, P3 uses hand gestures too often that can be classified in Japanese term as *Zutto te ga Karada no mae ni aru* (hand is always in front of the body) and *Te ga ugokisugi* (hands move too much). Tenth, P3 does not make too many grammatical errors during the speech.

According to Table 2, P4 obtains an average score of 65 for his speech which consists average score of 14,3 for the content of his speech (*naiyou*), the average score of 19,3 for the expression (*hyougen*), the average score of 16,3 for pronunciation (*hatsuon*), and the average score of 15 for the ability to answer questions (*shitsumon*). Based on that score, there are several notes to be made. P4 is the only presenter who gains low scores for all aspects.

Based on further observation, there are several records to be mentioned. First, P4 speaks his mind in a

descriptive way. He describes his personal experience - *Jibun no Keiken*. He talks about his experience when he is being disciplined by his *pesantren* teacher if he does not wake up at 3 a.m. Unfortunately, the interesting topic is delivered in a boring way. The topic is not being followed by interesting supporting sentences by P4 to maintain a sense of enthusiasm. Second, the opening part, core, and closing speech are quite cohesive. In the opening section, P4 speaks an interesting sentence about his overweight body, but he is still able to get up in the morning. This exciting opening directs the audience to live at *pesantren*, where students must get up around 3 a.m. In the concluding section, P4 provides greeting and conclusions that, unfortunately, are difficult to understand or *Nanika itteruka wakarimasen. Matomenai*.

Third, P4 uses very simple, quite polite, and not too formal language that he has learned at university. Fourth, P4 speaks in clear pronunciation. Fifth, P4 delivers his speech almost without loud and soft dynamics. Sixth, P4 speaks at normal speed. Seventh, P4 is using appropriate pauses. Eighth, P4 is confident. He does not make hand gestures, and his facial expression is flat. Ninth, P4 delivers a speech in a way that is fairly quiet, not excessive, and in accordance with the audience. Tenth, one of the strengths of the P4 that he is quite excited to face the audience. Eleventh, P4 does not make a lot of grammatical errors because he uses very simple Japanese.

P5 gains an average score of 66 for his speech (Table 2) that consists an average score of 22 to the contents of his speech (*naiyou*), the average score of 18 for expression (*hyougen*), the average score of 12,7 for pronunciation (*hatsuon*), and average score 13,3 average for the ability to answer questions (*shitsumon*). It can be stated that P5 gains a very high score on the content of speech and expression fields but makes low scores in pronunciation and answering questions.

From further observation, there are several points to be made. First, the form of speech P5 conveyed in a speech contest is descriptive. He describes his personal experience with his disabled friends - *Tomodachi no Keiken no Hanashi*. From the opening until the closing, P5 speaks in an interesting way by demonstrating sign language. Second, the opening part, core, and closing speech are cohesive. In the opening section, P5 speaks in simple and easy to understand language about *Tsuwa* or sign language. In the concluding section, P5 draws very interesting conclusions about *Tomodachi wa mimi ga kikenaido, genki wo dashimashita* (Although his ear could not hear, finally he is in good condition) and an example of Steven Hawkins who is also suffering from a disability.

Third, P5 uses very simple, quite polite, and informal language. Fourth, P5 speaks very clearly. Fifth, P5 is making speeches without using loud and soft. Sixth, P5 speaks at normal speed. Seventh, P5 is using appropriate pauses. Eighth, P5 is confident in delivering his speech, although his facial expression is flat. Ninth, P5 delivers a speech calm gesture. Moreover, last, P5 is not making a lot of grammatical errors because he uses very simple Japanese.

Based on Table 2, P6 obtains an average score of 83,3 for his speech. P6 is making the highest total score of all participants of the speech contest. Furthermore, P6 obtains an average score of 24,3 for the content of his speech (*naiyou*), the average score of 26,7 for the expression (*hyougen*), the average score of 17,3 for pronunciation (*hatsuon*), and the average score of 15 for the ability to answer questions (*shitsumon*). The gap between P6 with other competitors is

enormous, so it can be said that P6 is the best presenter in the speech contest. All the average scores obtained by P6 is always superior when compares to all other presenters. Although the average gain score is very high, P6 excels in the field of content and expression. He is weak in the area of pronunciation and ability to answer questions.

From further observation, there are some notes to be made. First, P6 speaks in descriptive about his touching personal experience or *-Jibun no Keiken*. He describes his mother's homemade soup. In the opening until the closing, he delivers his speech in an interesting way. The speech opening is unique and interesting. Second, the opening part, the core, and the closing are closely connected. In the opening section, P6 is displaying the touching sentences about his mother's advice when he is bullied by his friends. Third, P6 uses very simple, quite polite, and not too formal language. Fourth, his pronunciation is very clear. Fifth, P6 uses loud and soft dynamics. Sixth, P6 uses normal speed when he speaks. Seventh, P6 is using the appropriate pauses. Eighth, P6 makes some hand gestures and small facial expression. Ninth, P6 is very enthusiastic and confident to face the audience. Tenth, P6 does not make many grammatical errors, although the grammar he used is quite difficult for a student of his level.

According to Table 2, P7 obtains an average score of 51 for his speech. The average score is the lowest score of all participants. The score consists of the average score of 16 to the contents (*naiyou*), the average score of 15,7 for the expression (*hyougen*), the average score of 12,7 for pronunciation (*hatsuon*), and score an average of 6,7 for the ability to answer questions (*shitsumon*). The average score of the contents of his speech is the second-lowest among all presenters of the speech contest. In terms of expression, P7 obtains the lowest score compares to all presenters of the speech contest. When P7 is pronouncing sentences in the Japanese language, P7 and P5 obtain the lowest score compared to the other presenters. Besides, P7 obtains the lowest score when answering questions.

From further observation, it can make some notes. First, P7 speaks in a descriptive format where he describes his personal experience *-Jibun no Keiken-*. Unfortunately, his speech is not interesting, so he cannot maintain the enthusiasm of the audience. Second, the opening part, main body, and closing speech are not cohesive. Third, P7's language option is not appropriate for an audience of the speech contest because it is too formal. Fourth, his pronunciation is quite clear. Fifth, P7 delivers his speech without loud and soft dynamics. Sixth, in terms of speed of delivery of a speech, the researcher has found that P7 is delivering his speech at normal speed. Seventh, P7 uses inappropriate pauses. Eighth, P7 is confident enough although he does not use hand gestures, make eye contact with the audience, and his expression is flat. Ninth, P7 delivers a speech in a quiet manner. Tenth, P7 does not make a lot of grammatical errors because P7 uses very simple Japanese.

From these data in Table 1 to Table 3, there are some insights that could be made. The students are using the descriptive format in preparing and delivering their speech material. The use of the descriptive form is because the students do not know about narrative, argumentation, and persuasion format in the Japanese language. The students do not use details such as metaphors, symbols, data, and humor to support their rhetoric. It can be seen that they are still struggling in simple sentences. This weakness occurs due to lack of exposure to the Japanese language outside

the classroom.

The students gain very high scores in the areas of content and expression, but they are getting very low scores in the areas of pronunciation and ability to answer questions. This finding is significant because it proves that student speech contest presenters actually possess a very strong motivation to follow the speech contest. In the field of high-score in expression, the researcher believes that the presenters are confident in delivering their speech. The researcher perceives that the probable reason for nervous students is because of a lack of preparation and lack of vocabulary to express their ideas. This finding is particularly in line with the notion stated by Schmitt in Alqahtani (2015) that lexical knowledge is central to communicative competence and the acquisition of a second language.

Low scores in the field of pronunciation could possibly occur for several internal and external reasons. In terms of internal reason, the researcher is focusing on the influence of mother tongue (Indonesian) on the presenters' pronunciation in Japanese. It happens mainly because the students are more exposed to their mother tongue, Indonesian, rather than Japanese that they learn only a few hours per week on campus. From the external side, the researcher has found that the learning portion in the field of pronunciation is still inadequate because the subject is sharing hours of lessons with other subjects. In the field of answering the question, the researcher notices that the inability of students occur because the vocabulary and sentence patterns that are owned by them are still very few.

Five of the seven students who participate in the contest are making numerous grammatical errors when giving a speech. The researcher believes that there should be further study to investigate the reason students still making grammatical mistakes while the grammar has been studied comprehensively. As a consequence, they communicate in low concentration mode, and they do not remember about other sides of their speech such grammar, word choice, and vocabulary (Almuhimedi & Alshumaimeri, 2015). Lastly, the researcher has found that all students are able to make a speech with a very enthusiastic manner and by making eye contact to establish interaction with the audience. It suggests that presenters have a very high spirit to show interest in their ability to speak Japanese.

CONCLUSIONS

From the data and analysis from the previous section, all the presenters use only descriptive type of discourse in preparing and delivering a speech material. Because of that, the researcher believes that students need to be trained in various type of discourse, such as descriptive, argumentation, narrative, and persuasion. It would be useful for any language teacher to provide various writing forms options for students while expressing their thoughts. The researcher does not see participants using details such as metaphors, symbols, data, and humor to support their speech, so it looks and sounds real and convincing because they are not exposed to various types language input either inside or outside of the classroom environment. It is believed that students need to be exposed in various media such as television, movies, songs, novels, short stories, and others so that students would possess larger vocabulary size, various sentence patterns, humor, and figurative language in Japanese.

The researcher perceives that the presenters gain very

high marks in the areas of content and expression, but they are getting very low scores in the areas of pronunciation and ability to answer questions. Low scores in the field of pronunciation could happen because of some internal and external things; therefore, the researcher expects further studies on the influence of the mother tongue in Japanese pronunciation in the rhetoric produced by students.

There are five out of seven students who participate in the contest are doing numerous grammatical mistakes in giving a speech. The researcher argues that there should be a further study to investigate the reason students still performed grammatical mistakes in delivering a speech while the grammar they produced is completely familiar and has been studied in early years in Japanese Language Education Brawijaya University. The researcher needs to conduct further study to prove that the probable source of grammatical errors is that students frequently produce an effort to do communication (orally or in written form) faster so they can build language fluency. The researcher has found that all students are able to deliver the speech in a very enthusiastic manner, and they are able to make eye contact and establish interaction with the audience. This achievement suggests that all presenters have a very high spirit to show interest in their ability to speak Japanese. Therefore, this speech contest should be conducted more frequently and should involve the Japanese Education students of Brawijaya University with a more elaborate, intensive, and extensive preparation.

This research indicates that when the students are allowed to be honest to express their mind freely in the Japanese language, the speech contest reflects the students' actual language mastery. Because language teaching inside the classroom is the most dominant language exposure for the students, any advancement in Japanese language teaching will significantly uplift the quality of the speech. Action research which investigates the effect of certain treatment during speech preparation phase will be constructive to improve the students' speech quality.

REFERENCES

- Almuhimedi, R. A., & Alshumaimeri, Y. A. (2015). Effective error correction in grammar classes: A students' perspective. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, 5(6), 127-138.
- Alqahtani, M. (2015). The importance of vocabulary in language learning and how to be taught. *International Journal of Teaching and Education*, 3(3), 21-34. <https://doi.org/10.20472/TE.2015.3.3.002>
- Arsyad, M. G., & Mukti, U. S. (2005). *Pembinaan kemampuan berbicara bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Bermani, R. A., Safnil, S., & Arono, A. (2019). An analysis of argument structure of research article of English Postgraduate program of Bengkulu University published in journal. *JOALL (Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literature)*, 2(2), 47-64. <https://doi.org/10.33369/joall.v2i2.5954>.
- Hendarto, E. (2012). *The use of project work to promote students' motivation toward English class among 10 graders of State Senior High School 1 Purworejo*. Yogyakarta: Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta.
- Littlejohn, S. W., & Foss, K. A. (2014). *Teori komunikasi manusia* (9th Ed.). Translated by Mohammad Yusuf Hamdan. Jakarta: Salemba Humanika.
- Livia, L., & Suenarto, S. (2015). Retorika Barack Hussein Obama dan Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono dalam menanggapi isu ISIS di dunia. *Jurnal Komunikasi*, 7(1), 70-80.
- Nassaji, H. (2015). Qualitative and descriptive research: Data type and data analysis. *Language Teaching Research*, 19(2), 129-132. doi: 10.1177/1362168815572747.
- Noermanzah, N., Emzir, E., & Lustyantje, N. (2017). Variety of rhetorics in political speech president of the Republic of Indonesia Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono and Joko Widodo in educational field. *Humanus: Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu-Ilmu Humaniora*, 16(2), 221-238. <https://doi.org/10.24036/humanus.v16i2.8103>.
- Sugiyono. (2012). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>.
- Syaifudin, A. (2001). *Metodologi penelitian*. Yogyakarta: Perpustakaan Pelajar.
- Syarofi, A., Kuswahono, D., & Rizky, H. (2018). Implementing process writing strategy using weblogs to improve students' ability in writing descriptive text. *Lingua Cultura*, 12(4), 351-355. <https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v12i4.4142>.
- Taufiqulloh., Yuvita., & Sulistianingsih, E. (2018). Analysis of student attitudes to develop a self-assessment model of genre-based writing class. *Lingua Cultura*, 12(3), 253-258. <https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v12i3.4064>.
- Widiantara, I. W. P., Wendra, I. W., & Sriasih, S. A. P. (2014). Kajian retorika dalam naskah pidato pada siswa kelas X.I SMA Negeri 1 Pupuan. *E-Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia, Undiksha*, 2(1), 1-10.
- Wiyanto, A. (2001). *Terampil pidato*. Jakarta: Grasindo.

APPENDICES

Table 1 Questions of The Researcher's Impression after Viewing Speech

1. How do you feel after seeing the presentation?
 - Very happy
 - Happy
 - Ordinary
 - Not happy
 - Very unhappy
2. Does the presentation make you feel confident?
 - Very sure
 - Sure
 - Ordinary
 - Not sure
 - Very unsure
3. Do you want to listen to this presenter again in the future?
 - Really want to
 - Want
 - Ordinary
 - Do not want
 - I really don't want to
4. Are there original ideas or techniques in the presentation?
 - There is
 - There is no
 - If there are, specify

Table 2 Questions on Types of Presentation

1. What kind of presentation? Argument? Description? Narration? Persuasion? Or you don't know the type?
 - Argumentation
 - Description
 - Narration
 - Persuasion
 - Do not know

Table 3 Questions on Speech Opening

1. Did the opening of his speech attract the attention of the audience to follow the next sentences?
 - Very interesting
 - Interesting
 - Ordinary
 - Not attractive
 - Very uninteresting
2. Does the opening of his speech use humor, statistical data, and stories to make the audience follow the next sentences?
3. Did the opening of his speech show the direction of the main contents of the speech?
4. Is the opening of the speech easy to remember?
 - Very memorable
 - Memorable
 - Ordinary
 - Not memorable
 - So forgettable

Table 4 Questions on Speech Content

1. Does each part (opening, filling, closing) of the presentation connect into one whole unit?
 - Yes
 - Not
 - Do not know
2. Does the presenter use examples to clarify his presentation?
 - Yes
 - Not
 - Do not know
3. Does the presenter use symbols or parables / metaphors?
 - Yes
 - Not
 - Do not know
4. Is it easy for you to follow sentence after sentence from the beginning of the presentation to the end?
 - Yes
 - Not
 - Do not know

Table 5 Questions on Speech Closing

1. Did the presenter make clear conclusions for his speech?
 - Yes
 - Not
 - Do not know
2. Is the closing statement delivered by the presenter interesting?
 - Yes
 - Not
 - Do not know

Table 6 Questions on Language Used

1. Is the style of language used right for the audience?
 - Very clear
 - Clear
 - Ordinary
 - Not clear
 - Very unclear
2. Does the speaker express his ideas clearly?
 - Very clear
 - Clear
 - Ordinary
 - Not clear
 - Very unclear
3. Is the sentence length easy to understand?
 - Very easy
 - Easy
 - Ordinary
 - Difficult
 - Very difficult

Table 6 Questions on Language Used (Continued)

-
4. Do participants use unnecessary technical jargon or complex language?
 - Yes
 - Not
 - If yes, specify
 5. Is the choice of words used right for the audience?
 - Very precise
 - Right
 - Ordinary
 - Not exactly
 - It's not right
 - If it's not right, mention it
-

Table 7 Questions on Vocal

-
1. Is the speaker easy to hear?
 - Very easy
 - Easy
 - Ordinary
 - Difficult
 - Very difficult
 2. Are hard and soft variations used correctly?
 - Very precise
 - Right
 - Ordinary
 - Not exactly
 - Inaccurate
 3. Does the speed vary? Is that slow / too fast to be understood as a whole?
 - Too fast
 - Fast
 - Ordinary
 - Slow
 - Too slow
 4. Are pauses used correctly to help understanding, increase excitement, or provide emotions?
 - Very precise
 - Right
 - Ordinary
 - Not exactly
 - Inaccurate
 5. Is the choice of words used right for the audience?
 - Very precise
 - Right
 - Ordinary
 - Not exactly
 - It's not right
 - If it's not right, mention it
-

Table 8 Questions on Gestures/Physical Expressions

-
1. Does the speaker's posture show confidence and calmness?
 - Very calm
 - Quiet
 - Ordinary
 - Nervous
 - Very nervous
-

Table 8 Questions on Gestures/Physical Expressions (Continued)

-
2. Are gestures natural, timely and complementary?
 - Very natural
 - Natural
 - Ordinary
 - Unnatural
 - Very unnatural
 3. Are signals easy to see?
 - Very easy
 - Easy
 - Ordinary
 - Not easy
 - It's not easy
 4. Does the speaker have disturbing behavior?
 - Yes
 - Not
 - If yes, specify
 5. Is eye contact effective in connecting the speaker to the entire audience?
 - Very effective
 - Effective
 - Ordinary
 - Ineffective
 - Very ineffective
-

Table 9 Questions on Humor

-
1. Is humor used by presenters?
 - Yes
 - Not
 - If yes, specify
 2. Is the right humor given to the audience?
 - Very precise
 - Right
 - Ordinary
 - Not exactly
 - Inaccurate
 3. Is humor relevant to speech?
 - Very relevant
 - Relevant
 - Ordinary
 - Irrelevant
 - Very irrelevant
-

Table 10 Questions on Enthusiasm

-
1. Are the speakers enthusiastic? How do you know?
 - Very enthusiastic
 - Enthusiastic
 - Ordinary
 - Not enthusiastic
 - Very unenthusiastic
 2. Are there interactions between the presenter and the audience? Is that effective?
 - There, it is very effective
 - There is. Effective
 - Ordinary
 - Yes, it is not effective
 - There are no interactions
-

Table 11 Questions on Grammar

-
1. Are there grammatical errors in the presentation?
 - Very much
 - Many
 - Ordinary
 - Not much
 - There is no
 - If there are many or very many, specify
-