

Analyzing Negotiation of Meaning in Speaking Class at Second Grade SMAN

Ning Setiawati, Hery Yufrizal, Muhammad Sukirlan
ningsetiawati1606@gmail.com

Abstract

Tujuan penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui (1) apakah siswa menggunakan negosiasi makna pada dua jenis dari *tasks* (tugas) yaitu *jigsaw* dan *information gap*, (2) komponen dari negosiasi makna yang paling sering digunakan oleh siswa pada dua jenis *tasks*, dan (3) perbedaan negosiasi makna pada percakapan siswa di kedua *tasks*. Metode penelitian dari penelitian ini adalah deskripsi kualitatif. Instrumen penelitian pada penelitian ini adalah *tasks* yaitu *jigsaw* dan *information gap*. Subjek dari penelitian ini adalah 30 siswa XI IPA 1 SMAN 1 Pasir Sakti. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa (1) siswa menggunakan negosiasi makna pada percakapan mereka, (2) *jigsaw task* menyebabkan negosiasi makna tertinggi pada *trigger*, namun pada *information gap task* mengakibatkan *negate response* (RN) menjadi frekuensi tertinggi berbeda dengan *jigsaw task*, dan (3) terdapat perbedaan negosiasi makna pada kedua jenis *tasks*. Hal ini menunjukkan bahwa perbedaan *tasks* memfasilitasi siswa untuk bernegosiasi makna.

The aims of this research were to investigate (1) whether the students used negotiation of meaning in the two types of the task i.e., *jigsaw* and *information gap*, (2) the component of negotiation of meaning mostly used by students in two types of the tasks, and (3) the differences of negotiation of meaning in the students' conversation in both tasks. The method of this research was qualitative descriptive research. The instrument for electing data in this research were tasks i.e., *jigsaw* and *information gap*. The subjects of this research were 30 students of XI science 1 SMAN 1 Pasir Sakti. The result of the study showed that (1) the students used negotiation of meaning on their conversation, (2) the *jigsaw task* led to the highest negotiation of meaning in terms of trigger, while the *information gap task* resulted in *negate response* (RN) most frequently by contrast to the *jigsaw task*, and (3) there were differences of negotiation of meaning in both types of the tasks. This suggests that different tasks facilitate students to negotiate meaning.

Keywords: *negotiation of meaning, jigsaw, information gap*

INTRODUCTION

Teaching Language as a Foreign Language (TEFL) has been carried out in all levels of education in Indonesia (Sadikin: 2011). In learning English, there are four skills that students should master i.e., listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Speaking is one of the important language skills in learning language. Speaking is a process of communication between at least two people or more. It is a way to express someone's idea to his or her interlocutor. Bryne (1984) defines speaking as a two-way process between speaker and listener and it involves the productive skills and receptive skills of understanding. It means that in the speaking process, there are sender (who sends message) and receptor (who receives or responds the message given) then they tried to communicate each other.

Based on the researcher's teacher training experience conducted in

SMPN 3 Cukuh Balak Tanggamus, it was found that there are many students' problem in speaking English. In practicing dialogue, students face some difficulties if they are asked by the teacher to come in front of the class. It makes them unable to speak English well. The problems in speaking are 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 try to transfer the ideas. So, when they have to expalain someting using English they are confused. Then when they try to communication, sometimes they use mimic, body language, or sentences as the feed back to their interlocutor like saying "pardon", "uh...", "emmm" in the conversation. Negotiation of meaning is used by the students when students when they communicate with their friends

Negotiation of meaning is defined as a series of exchanges conducted by addressors and addressees to help themselves understand and be understood by their interlocutors (Yufrizal, 2007). In this case, when native speakers (NSs) and non native speakers (NNSs) are involved in an interaction, they work together to solve any potential misunderstanding or non understanding that occurs, by checking each others' comprehension, requesting clarification and confirmation and by repairing and adjusting speech (Pica, T. & Doughty : 1988). Negotiation of meaning is regarded to be more effective in order to avoid misunderstanding in conversation. Negotiation of meaning also functioned as an indication of communication pursuit. More students negotiate, more interaction occurs. It occurs when 2 or more

students involve in oral interaction and they find a potential for the communication breakdown.

In this research, the researcher choose negotiation of meaning is defined as a series of exchanges conducted by addressors and addressees to help themselves understand and be understood by their interlocutors (Yufrizal, 2007).

There are many components of negotiation of meaning that could appear during speaking class.

So, this research was aimed at investigating the analysis of negotiation of meaning in speaking class using negotiation in jigsaw and information gap tasks.

METHOD

The research is a qualitative study by employing a descriptive research.

Descriptive method is used to present a board spectrum of research activities having a common purpose

of describing situations events or phenomena (Mason and Bramble: 1997). The Subject of this research was the second grade SMAN 1 Pasir Sakti in even semester academic year 2016/2017. SMPN 1 Pasir Sakti employed KTSP (Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan) in second and third grade. There were six classes in second grade of senior high school in 2016/2017 school year. Each class consisted of 30- 35 students. The researcher used one class as the sample of this research. The sample was not chosen randomly. The class was XI science 1 class which consists of 30 students. The reason chooses XI science 1 class because the class has good enthusiasm in learning English than other classes.

The researcher used two tasks i.e., jigsaw task and information gap task. These tasks are used by researcher to obtain the data. It is important

because the researcher will know how and is the negotiation happens in the speaking class. In jigsaw task the students work in pairs, then teacher give them picture after that they try to describe the differences both picture A and picture B. After finished doing the jigsaw task, the students discuss about information gap task. The maps were given to students, then they made the conversation between describer and information seeker. The researcher transcribed and coded each interaction the analyzed the data by classified it based on Pica's study (Pica, T. Hollyday, L. Lewis, N. & Morgenthaler, L. : 1989).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The result of the research showed that students used negotiation of meaning in their conversation.

Table2. Specification of Negotiation of Meaning components' Used in Jigsaw and information gap Tasks

N O	Component	Sub Components	Frequency
1	Trigger (T)	-	39
2	Signal	Confirmation Check: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Confirmation Check through Repetition (CCR) - Confirmation Check through Modification (CCM) - Confirmation Check through Completion (CCC) 	15 4 9
		Clarification of Request (CR)	3
3	Response	Self-Repetition (RSP)	17
		Response Other - Repetition (ROP)	2
		Response Self - Modification (RSM)	2
		Response Other - Modification (ROM)	1
		Confirm or Negate Response (RN)	15
11	Follow Up	-	20
TOTAL			117

The component of negotiation of meaning was different both component of negotiation of meaning that used in Jigsaw task and Information gap task. The components of negotiation of meaning were most used in jigsaw task than in information gap task, 66 items in jigsaw and 51 in information gap. The highest number of component in Negotiation of meaning was Trigger from jigsaw and Confirm or Negate Response (RN) from information gap.

There were 66 items in negotiation of meaning used jigsaw task they are Trigger (T) 29 items (43.93%), Confirmation Check through Repetition (CCR) 4 items (10.6%), Confirmation Check through Modification (CCM) 3 items (4.54%), Confirmation Check through Completion (CCC) 9 items (13.63%), Clarification of Request

(CR) 2 items (3.03%), Self-Repetition (RSP) 7 items (10.60%), Response Other - Repetition (ROP) 1 item (1.51%), Response Self - Modification (RSM) 1 item (1.51%), Response Other - Modification (ROM) 0 item (0 %), Confirm or Negate Response (RN) 4 items (6.06%), and Follow-up 13 items (19.69%).

There were 51 items in negotiation of meaning used information gap task they are: Trigger (T) 11 items (21.56 %), Confirmation Check through Repetition (CCR) 7 items (15.68%), Confirmation Check through Modification (CCM) 1 item (1.96%), Confirmation Check through Completion (CCC) 0 item (0 %), Clarification of Request (CR) 1 item (1.96%), Self-Repetition Response (RSP) 10 items (19.60%) Response Other - Repetition (ROP) 1 item (1.96%), Response Self -

Modification (RSM) 1 item (1.96 %), Response Other - Modification (ROM) 1 item (1.96 %), Confirm or Negate Response (RN) 11 items (21.56 %), and Follow-up 7 items (13.72%). From the data, the most component that the student used in Jigsaw task is Trigger with 29 items. Then, from Information gap were Confirm or Negate Response (RN) with 11 items.

From the research result the differences between components of negotiation of meaning used in jigsaw and information gap are number of items of negotiation of meanings' component used in jigsaw higher than used in information gap, 66 items from used jigsaw and 51 items from used information gap, From 11 of negotiation of meanings' component, there was one component that unused in jigsaw and information gap, but the component

was different it was Response Other-repetition/ROM from used jigsaw and Confirmation Check through Completion (CCC), The sentences of components of negotiation of meaning used jigsaw more interactive than used in information gap.

CONCLUSION

Referring to the findings of the research, it is concluded that the students use negotiation of meaning in their conversation in speaking class with jigsaw and information gap task. In speaking class, the students use components in negotiation of meaning to solve their misunderstanding. The component of negotiation of meaning that mostly used in Jigsaw task was Trigger and mostly used in Information gap were Confirm or Negate Response (RN). But overall

both used jigsaw and information gap the component of negotiation of meaning mostly used was trigger. This research also shows the differences of components use between in jigsaw and information gap tasks, the differences includes number of items, the use of component and the sentence that students used in their conversation.

SUGGESTIONS

The researcher would like to propose some suggestions as follows:

1. Suggestion for English

Teaching

When the researcher collected the data, the researcher found that students do not know about negotiation of meaning, they confused how they used negotiation of meaning in their conversation. Thus, it is important to give information and comprehending about negotiation of meaning.

Therefore, the future research, it is important to give knowledge about negotiation first before start collects the data.

2. Suggestion for Future

Research

In this research the researcher used two situations of speaking jigsaw and information gap, it made students

twice in work and made student confused and bored. During collecting the data in first task (Jigsaw) students still focus, but in the second task students already tired and not focus. Therefore, for the future research to make an interactive task and give ice breaking when student getting bored to make students' focus back.

REFERENCES

- Bryne, D. 1984. *Teaching Oral English*. New Jersey: Longman Group Ltd.
- Mason, I. & Bramble, C. 1997. *The Role of Description Method Theory in Teaching Class*. Quinquereme: Cornell University.
- Pica, T. & Doughty, C. 1988. *Variation in Classroom Interaction as a Function of Participation Pattern and Task*. New York: Abex.
- Pica, T. Holliday, L. Lewis, N. & Morgenthaler, L. 1989. *Comprehensible Output as an Outcome of Linguistic Demand on the Learner*. *Studies Second Language Acquisition* 11, 63-69.
- Sadikin, LS. 2011. *Young learners' vocabulary improvement through audio visual by using youtube videos: A case study at EEP English course in Bandung, West Java*. Bandung: Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia.
- Yufrizal, H. 2007. *Negotiation of Meaning by Indonesia EFL Learners*. Bandung: Pustaka Reka Cipta.