AN ANALYSIS OF NEGOTIATION OF MEANING IN SPEAKING CLASS AT THE SECOND GRADE OF SMAN 1 BARRU

Helmi[1], Radiah Hamid[2], Sujariati[3]

[1,2,3]Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar, Indonesia
hamidhelmi8@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The main objective of this research was to find out which component in negotiation of meaning that is mostly used by the students at the second grade of SMAN 1 Barru in speaking class. This research used descriptive qualitative approach. The data in this research taken by using observation sheet and recording. Based on research findings. A few students at the Second Grade of SMAN 1 Barru apply negotiation of meaning in their conversation. All components in negotiation of meaning are used by the students. The highest frequency is response. Therefore, it could be concluded that component in negotiation of meaning that is mostly used by the students is trigger.

Keywords: *Speaking, Negotiation of Meaning, Descriptive Qualitative Approach.*

ABSTRAK

Tujuan utama dari penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui komponen mana dalam negosiasi makna yang sebagian besar digunakan oleh siswa di kelas dua SMAN 1 Barru di kelas berbicara. Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan deskriptif kualitatif. Data dalam penelitian ini diambil dengan menggunakan lembar observasi dan rekaman. Berdasarkan temuan penelitian, beberapa siswa di kelas dua SMAN 1 Barru menerapkan negosiasi makna dalam percakapan mereka. Semua komponen dalam negosiasi makna digunakan oleh siswa. Frekuensi tertinggi dalam negosiasi makna yang mereka gunakan adalah trigger (pemicu). Frekuensi terendah adalah respons. Oleh karena itu, dapat disimpulkan bahwa komponen dalam negosiasi makna yang banyak digunakan oleh siswa adalah pemicu.

Kata kunci: *Berbicara dan Negosiasi Makna*

Introduction

Students face some difficulties if they were asked by the teacher to come in front of the class. It makes them unable to speak English well. The problems in speaking were caused by a number of factors such as limited number of vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, and fluency. Students often make mistake in speaking and misunderstanding can happen when they tried to transfer the ideas. So, when they had to explain someting using English they confused. Then when they tried to

communication, sometimes they used mimic, body language, or sentences as the feed back to their interlocutor like saying "pardon", "uh…", "emmm" in the conversation. To solve their problem in speaking, the students used negotiation of meaning.It can help them in communication and minimize misunderstanding.

SMAN 1 Barru is a superior school in the city of Barru. The researcher also carried out Magang 2 program there. This research refers to speaking skill, so I have to find school that has students active in the classroom, so that the data collection can be obtained properly and smoothly. Based on the statement above, the researcher is very interest to identify negotiation of meaning students at SMAN 1 Barru and do the research with the title *"An Analysis of Negotiation of Meaning in Speaking Class at the Second Grade of SMAN 1 Barru"*.

Materials and Method

Material

1. Definition of negotiation of Meaning

    Negotiation of meaning is defined as a series of exhanges conducted by addressors and addressees to help themselves understand and be understood by their interlocutor (Yufrizal, 2007). In other words negotiation of meaning is a process that speakers go through to reach a clear understanding of each other. It is used by learners of second or foreign language to overcome some misunderstandings that might occur in an interaction. When misunderstandings occur in the process of interaction the interlocutor gets dificulties to keep their interaction going on so they try to alter communication strategies including negotiation of meaning as the efective solution.

2. Components in Negotiation of Meaning

    According to pica et.al (1991) there are basically four components in negotiation of meaning, that are :

    a. Trigger

        Trigger is the utterance that contains elements that create. It can also be defined as prime of negotiation of meaning which invokes or stimulate incomplete understanding on the part of the listener (Grass and Varonis : 1984)

93

b. Signals

This component refers to an indicator from a listener that understanding is not complete Grass and Varonis (1985). signal are devided into two concepts they are cofirmation check and clarification request.

c. Response

In many studies of negotiation of meaning response were related to the discussion of the repair, correction made by NNS as a response to a modification of input action by native speaker (Foster. 1998).

d. Follow-up

It refers to information about whether the communication modifications have been succesful or not. In a long negotiation of meaning, interlocutors usually repeat the signals-response exchange until an agreement is achieved.

Method

In this study the researcher used a Descriptive Qualitative Research. In a research is very important to know research variable. One variable between another variable certainly has a relationship. The variable of the research divided into two, first variable Y namely negotiation of meaning and variable X namely Speaking. Where all of the process of variable X is influenced by variable Y in the classroom activity.

The sample of this research determined through non Probability Sampling Technique, namely Purposive Sampling Technique of this research. The class was XI Science 1 Class which consist of 30 students. The reasons choose XI Science 1 Class because the class has good enthusiasm in learning English than other classes in the same grade.

Instrument of the research is something that will be used to support the on going research. There are two instruments used include:

1. Observation Sheet

Observation sheet is a list of things that an observer is going to look at when observing a class. This list may have been prepared by the

observer or the teacher or both. Observation checklists not only give an observer a structure and framework for an observation but also serve as a contract of understanding with the teacher.

2. Supporting Instrument

Supporting instrument, namely tools intended for research support such as cell phone cameras, recording devices (cell phone).

To obtain data and information needed in this study, researcher use several data collection techniques as follows:

1. Recording

In collecting the data, the researcher record the conversation of participants from beginning until the end. Then, the researcher transcribe the data that she get by recording technique.

2. Conducting Classroom Observation

The researcher as an observation, directly observed the classroom and fulfille the classroom observation sheet while the teaching and learning process is going on. The researcher transcribe student's interaction then analyze the data by classifying the component of negotiation of meaning.

Miles (1994:246) states that three are three activities in qualitative data analysis. They are reducting the data, data display, and drawing/verification.

1. Reducting the Data

The researcher make transcript of record data and written data, identify components in Negotiation of Meaning based on the interaction between teacher and students in the classroom.

2. Data Display

The researcher analyze the classification of negotiation of meaning and display the data about teacher and students utterances by using tables, explanation and making percentage

Table 1.Negotiation of Meaning produce by the Students

Time	Negotiation of Meaning	Classification	Frequency
1	Trigger	*That uh..can what it can..*	2

The researcher make percentage of the data to know usage of components in Negotiation of Meaning. Sugiyono (2014: 170) states that the analysis is looking presentage. The percentage used formula:

$$P = \frac{F}{N} \times 100\%$$

Notes:　P =percentage

　　　　F = frequency

　　　　N = the sum of the frequencies

Result

The Components in Negotiation of Meaning that is Mostly used by the Students

1. Trigger

The researchers founds 7 utterances of trigger produced by the students in the conversation. In the first meeting, the students produced 4 utterances and the second meeting 2 utterances.

2. Signals

The researchers founds 5 utterances of signal produced by the students in the conversation. In the first meeting, the students produced 2 utterances and the second meeting 3 utterances.

3. Response

The researchers founds 3 utterances of response produced by the students in the conversation. In the first meeting, the students produced 1 utterances and the second meeting 2 utterances.

4. Follow-up

The researchers founds 5 utterances of follow up produced by the students in the conversation. In the first meeting, the students produced 3 utterances and the second meeting 2 utterances.

Discussion

The Components in Negotiation of Meaning that is Mostly used by the Students

1. Trigger

The students produced an utterance which contained unclear word or phrase and produce a comprehension check that required further clarificatons work from the listener. The participants used trigger bacause they still confused to answer or ask the question.

2. Signals

During observation, the teacher ask the students to make conversation about negotiation of meaning. The students put the signals sentences to give signal to confirm or clarify incomplete sentences from other speaker.

3. Response

During observation, the teacher ask the students to make conversation about negotiation of meaning. The students put the response sentences to give respond about the sentences that speaker's discus before.

4. Follow-up

During observation, the teacher ask the students to make conversation about negotiation of meaning. The students put the follow-up sentences to give respond to make the disscusion clearly or succesful.

Based on data finding, the researcher can concluded that the component in negotiation of meaning that is mostly used by the students at the Second Grade of SMAN 1 Barru is trigger. from 20 utterances trigger is mostly usedby the students that produced 7 utterances. Then signals 5 utterances, response 3 utterances and follow-up same with signals that produced 5 utterances.

Conclusion

Based on the findings and discussion, a few students at the Second Grade of SMAN 1 Barru apply negotiation of meaning in their conversation. the researcher can concluded that the component in negotiation of meaning that is mostly used by the students at the Second Grade of SMAN 1 Barru is trigger. from 20 utterances trigger is mostly used by the students that produced 7 utterances. Then signals 5 utterances, response 3 utterances and follow-up same with signals that produced 5 utterances.

References

Bialystok, Ellen. 1990. *Communication Strategies: a Psychological Analysis of Second Language Use.* London: T.J. Press. Ltd.

Branden K. 1997. *Effects of Negotiation of Language Learner's Output.* Language Learning. Vol 47. No 4. Pp 589-636.

Brown , D. H., & Yule, G. 1983. *Teaching Sspoken Language: Approach Based on the Analysis of Conversational English.* Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Brown H, Douglas. 1994. *Teaching by Principles.* New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regent

Brown, H. Douglass. 2001. *Teaching by Principles*: *An Interactive Aproach to Language Pedadogy.* San Fransisco: State University.

Byrne, Don. 1984. *Teaching Oral English.* New Jersey: Lingman Group Ltd.

Chaney, A.L., and T.L. Burk. 1998. *Teaching Oral Communication in Grades K-8.* Boston*:* Allyn&Bacon.

Duff, P. (1986). *Another Look at Interlanguage Talk; Taking Task to Task.* Rowley Mass: New Burry House Publisher.

Foster, P. 1998. *A Classroom Prespective on the Negotiation of Meaning.* Applied Linguistic. Vol 19. No 1. Pp 1-23.

Grass, S.M. and Varonis, E.M. 1984. *The Effect of Familiarity on the Comprehensibility of Non-Native Speech.* Language Learning. Vol. 34. No 1.Pp 65-89.

Harmer, Jeremy. 2007. *The Practice of English Language Teaching.* Harlow: Pearson Education Limited

Harris, David. 1974. *English as Second Language*. New York: Mc, Graw Mill.

Husni, Na'imatul (2015). *Techniques of Negotiation of Meaning Used by English Departement Students in Speaking Activity*. Thesis. Universitas Negeri Padang.

Lado, Robert. 1961. *Language Teaching a Scientific Approach*. New York: Mc.GrewHill Inc.

Lado, Robert. 1977. *Language Testing*. Tata Mc. Gorw. New Dehli: Hill Publishing Co. Ltd.

Leedy, Paul.1974. *Practical Research Planning and Design*. New Jersey: Mac Millan Publishing Company Co. Inc.

Miles, M.B. 1994. *Qualitative Data Analysis*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Murcia, M. C. (1978). *Teaching English as Second or Foreign Language. (2nd ed.).*New York: Harper Collins Ltd.

Nunan, D., 2003. *Practical English Language Teaching*. NY:McGraw-Hill.

Pica, T. 1987. *Interlanguage Adjustments as an Outcome of NS-NNS Negotiated Interaction.* Language Learning.Vol. 38. No 1.Pp 45-73.

Pica, T. and Doughty, C.1985. *The Role of Group Work in Classroom Second Language Acquisition.* Studies in Second language acquisition.Vol. 7.Pp 233-248.

Pica, T. Holliday, L. Lewis, N. Berducci, D. And Newman, J. 1991. *Language Learning through Interaction: What Roles does Gender Play?* Studies in Second Language Acquisition.Vol. 11.Pp 63-90.

Pica, T. Holliday, L. Lewis, N. and Morgenthaler, L. 1989. *Comprehensible Output as an Outcome of Linguistic Demands on the learner*. Studies in Second Laqnguage Acquisition. Vol. 11. Pp 63-90.

Pica, T. Lincoln-Parker, F. Paninos, D. and Linnel, J. 1996. *Language Learner's Interaction: How does it Address the Input, Output, and Feed Back Need of L2 learners?* TESOL Quarterly. Vol 30.Pp 59-84.

Pica, T. and Young, R. 1986. *Making Input Comprehensible. Do Interactional Modifications Help ?* I.T.L. Review of Applied Linguistics. Vol 72.Pp 1-25

Rivers. W.M. 1978. *Teaching Foreign Language Skills*. Chicago: University Press.

Sarah. 2016. *Exploring Critical Thinking and Negotiation of Meaning Through MinecraftEDU: A Case Study of Elementary Language Learners.* Thesis. Boise State University.

Setiawati, N. (2017). *An Analysis of Negotiation of Meaning in Speaking Class at the Second Grade of SMAN 1 Pasir Sakti*. Bandar Lampung: University of Lampung.

Setiyadi, A. B. (2006). *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu

Sugiono. 2014. *Metode Penelitian Management*. Bandung: Alfabeta

Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar. 2018. *Pedoman Penulisan Skripsi.* Makassar: Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar.

Varonis, E.M. and Gass, S. M. 1985. *Non-native/ Non-native conversations: A Model for Negotiation of Meaning.* Applied Linguistics. Vol 6. No.1. Pp 71-90.

Welty, D. A., & Dorothy, R. W. (1976). *The Teacher Aids in the Interlocutor Team.* New York: Mc Grew Hill.

Yufrizal, Hery. 2001. *Language Acquisition Student Text Book.* Bandar Lampung: Lampung University

Yufrizal, Hery. 2007. *Negotiation of Meaning by Indonesian EFL Learners.* Bandung. Pustaka Reka Cipta.

Yufrizal, Hery. 2008. *An Introduction to Second Language Acquisition (A Text Book for ESL Learners and ESL Teachers).* Bandung: Pustaka Reika Cipta.