

AN ANALYSIS OF NEGOTIATION OF MEANING IN STUDENTS' SPEAKING THROUGH INFORMATION GAP

Meilia Rachmawati, Hery Yufrizal, Budi Kadaryanto
Email: meilia_rachmawati@ymail.com
Institution: Lampung University

Abstract

The objectives of this research are 1) to investigate whether students use negotiation of meaning in their speaking; 2) to investigate which component in negotiation of meaning that is mostly used by the students. The research design is qualitative descriptive research. The data were obtained by the students' conversation using audio and video recorder. Then the writer made a transcription of the conversation and analyzed the data by classifying based on Pica's study. (1989). The results of this research show that all components in negotiation of meaning are used by students. The highest component is Trigger 32 items (26.66%) and the lowest component Response Other-Modification 2 items (1.66%). Therefore it can be concluded that the highest frequency is Trigger. Moreover, negotiation of meaning can increase the students' conversation continuity and open more chances for them to produce comprehensible input and produce more comprehensible output.

Keywords: information gap, negotiation of meaning, speaking.

ANALISIS NEGOSIASI MAKNA DI BERBICARA SISWA MELALUI KESENJANGAN INFORMASI

Meilia Rachmawati, Hery Yufrizal, Budi Kadaryanto
Email: meilia_rachmawati@ymail.com
Institusi: Universitas Lampung

Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah 1) untuk menyelidiki Apakah siswa menggunakan negosiasi makna dalam berbicara mereka; 2) untuk menyelidiki mana komponen dalam negosiasi yang sebagian besar digunakan oleh siswa. Desain Penelitian adalah deskriptif kualitatif. Pengambilan data diperoleh dari percakapan siswa percakapan menggunakan Perekam video dan audio. Kemudian penulis membuat transkripsi dari percakapan dan menganalisis data dengan mengklasifikasikan berdasarkan studi Pica (1989). Hasil penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa semua komponen dalam negosiasi makna digunakan oleh siswa. Komponen tertinggi adalah pemicu 32 item (26.66%) dan komponen terendah adalah modifikasi respon lainnya 2 item (1.66%). Oleh karena itu dapat disimpulkan bahwa frekuensi tertinggi adalah pemicu. Selain itu, negosiasi makna dapat meningkatkan keberlanjutan percakapan siswa dan membuka kesempatan lebih untuk mereka untuk menghasilkan masukan yang dapat dipahami dan menghasilkan lebih output yang dapat dipahami.

Kata Kunci: berbicara, kesenjangan informasi, negosiasi makna.

INTRODUCTION

Language is important to communicate with other people. The importance of communication has brought people to learn an International language, which is English. Nowadays Indonesian students learn English language as a foreign language. English has become a compulsory subject that is taught and learnt at Elementary school up to University level. According to School Based Curriculum (KTSP 2006), the students are expected to master four ability in English subject. The four skills are listening, speaking, reading and writing.

Commonly, spoken test is done in written task rather than oral activity. Learning speaking just becomes a problem of book-based activities. It mostly emphasizes on grammar instead of giving speaking practice. As a result, speaking target will not be mastered and the students will not learn to communicate orally because language is only from a book and written task.

Speaking is a process of communication between at least two people. 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 skill and receptive skill of understanding. It means that in the speaking process, they are sender who sends message and receptor that receives or responds the message given. They try to communicate each other.

The general aim of speaking skill is communicative efficiency. By having a good ability in speaking, the students can communicate fluently to other people. So

they are able to express the idea, work out in some aspect and maintain social relationship by communicating with others in the society. That is why the students should be successful in learning the second language especially in speaking skill.

Therefore, it can be said that the students have strong willing to communicate each other in English. But, then they feel disappointed when they realize that they are unable to speak English well. They rarely practice the language in oral communication and there is gap in the language knowledge.

Meanwhile Brown (2001:250) states, that speaking is an interactive process of constructing meaning that involves producing, receiving, and processing information. Based on this idea, there are three important points that must be occurred to the participants of communication (speaker and listener) to construct the meaning during the interaction among.

According to Neu and Reeser (1997) in Information gap activity, one person has certain information that must share with others in order to solve a problem, gather information or make decisions. Based on the theory, the writer thinks that Information Gap is the most interactive technique for the student in creating communicative learning, because it will help them speak actively in the class by using conversation. Information Gap should be done in a pair or group work. By appropriating Information gap, the students become comfortable to speak everything.

Negotiation of meaning is defined as series of exchanges conducted by addressors and addressees to help themselves understand and be understood by their interlocutors (Yufrizal, 2007 p.14.). In this case, when native speakers and non native speakers are involved in an interaction, both interlocutors 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, 1991).

Then negotiation of meaning is regarded to be more effective in order to avoid misunderstanding in the interaction. Negotiation of meaning also can avoid the obstacles in interaction. The more the participants negotiate the more interaction occur. It occurs when two or more participants involved in oral interaction and found a potential for the communication to breakdown.

There are many components of negotiation of meaning that can appear during process of interaction. In order to know what component of negotiation of meaning are widely used by students, the writer did the research entitle "An Analysis of Negotiation of Meaning in Students' Speaking through Information Gap at the Second Year of SMPN 29 Bandar Lampung".

METHOD

This research is qualitative descriptive research. Leedy (1974:79) suggests that a descriptive method simply looks with intense accuracy at the phenomena of the

moment and then describes precisely what the writer has seen. In this research, the writer tried to investigate types of signals in negotiation of meaning that were used by the students. By recording the students' speaking. The writer gathered the data with video and audio recording. After gathering the data, the writer transcribed and coded each student's interaction then analyzed the data by classifying the component of negotiation of meaning based on Pica's study (1989). The design of the research is based on : Recording, Transcribing, Coding, and Analyzing the students' conversation based on the task given.

The writer used one class at the second year of SMPN 29 Bandar Lampung. The writer took only one of class to be sample and was chosen randomly. The class which was chosen is VIII A and number of students is 38. The writer chose this school because it provides certain days to hold speaking class where the students are given the material.

Before applying the procedures of the research, the writer did some planning, they were: determining the subject of the research, preparing the materials, and discussing the procedures of applying Information Gap. Then instructing the students to take conversation about the topic that had been determined in task.

In the application, The writer as an observer, directly observed the classroom and fulfilled the classroom observation sheet while the teaching and learning process was going on. Classroom observation also noted the components in negotiation of meaning was used. Then the writer recorded the students' conversation with their partner. The writer recorded the students' conversation by using audio and video

recorder. She recorded their conversation from the beginning until the end of the conversation. Besides that, the writer conducted interview to the students. To know the reason they used negotiation of meaning in their conversation.

After recording the student's conversation, the writer transcribed the conversation. Then the writer code each transcription of conversation. It necessary for the writer to give code for each conversation so it can be easily understood by the reader. Then analyzing the data from transcriptions. The writer analysed the data from transcriptions completely to find out what the writer was looking for (based on research questions in chapter 1).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This research was conducted at the second year of SMP N 29 Bandar Lampung. It was carried out at the second year of SMP N 29 Bandar Lampung class VIII A consisting of 38 participants. To investigate the component in negotiation of meaning used by the participants, the writer used Information Gap.

Firstly, the students would be required to complete a picture. It contained two pictures. The first picture was incomplete and the second picture was complete. There were student A and student B. Student A tried to find the place of things in the picture and student B gave the information that the student A needed.

Secondly, the writer instructed the participants to take the interaction. After receiving the picture, the student discussed or practice with his or her partner. When the students took interaction in front of the class, the writer recorded it by using handycam and audio recording. The writer record the conversation of the student from the beginning until the end. After transcribing and coding each student's conversation, the writer analyzed all data from transcriptions of interactions among students.

In order to investigate the components for negotiation of meaning that were used by students in their conversation, the writer used Information gap. The process of students' conversation happened smoothly and naturally. Peer by peer of student did conversation in the class. Most of them seem got difficulties to understand each other because of some misunderstandings. To overcome the obstacles, they used negotiation of meaning.

In this research, the writer found that few of students (18 students) used negotiation of meaning. It means that their English ability is good enough. It also can be seen from their conversation and from the use of negotiation of meaning in their speaking. Besides that, the writer hoped that by using the negotiation of meaning students can solve obstacles that occur in the interaction.

The students commonly used "trigger" in their conversation. It occurred when the student got difficulties in comprehending the conversation. In trigger, the students produced an utterance which contained unclear word or phrase and produce a

comprehension check that required further clarification work from the listener. The participants used trigger because they still confused to answer or ask the question. So In their conversation still contained unclear word or phrase. Then the voice of their partner wasn't clear. The total number of trigger is 32 items (26.66%)

Then Follow-up is 24 items (20%) since participants tried to check modification in interaction success or not. In Follow up, the students applied Follow Up Full comprehension of message beings confirmed and Continuation Move. Both of them was used by the students. In Follow up in comprehension message, the students really understand what his or her friend said before.

Then Clarification of Request is 17 items (14.16%) since one of participant totally didn't comprehend what speaker has said. So the participant asked clarification from his or her partner. In clarification request, the students expressed clarification check signal through special expression " sorry" and WH-question, namely "what ". They used Clarification Request because they didn't hear what his or friend said. Besides that, they gave the confirmation to his or her friend to repeat the question. Then the student used " response self-repetition" in their conversation. The students repeat all or part of the sentence in trigger. The students used this component because they just repeat the question. The total number of response- self repetition is 13 items (10.83%).

Then Confirmation Check through Repetition is 5 items equal (4.16%). In the confirmation check trough repetition, the students repeat the part of the speaker's

utterance. They applied Confirmation Check through Repetition because they are uncertain what his or her friend said. So they often repeat the part of his or her friend said. Then Confirmation Check through Modification is 7 items (5.83%). Beside of components that have been explained above, students also use other components of negotiation of meaning. They are Confirm or Negate Response is 6 items (5%). In Confirm or Negate response, the student said 'yes' to confirm what the speaker said before.

During the interaction, the writer found that there are three components of negotiation of meaning that are rarely used. They are, Confirmation Check through Completion is 3 items (2.5%) since the participant as speaker got difficulties in expressing her/his idea. Response Other-Modification is 2 items (1.66%). Other modification response in this phenomena occurred in modification at level of morphology and. Response Self-Modification is 4 items (3.33%). Response Self-Modification in this phenomena occurred at modification of morphosyntactic level. Response Other-Repetition 7 items equal (5.83%). In Response Other-Repetition, speaker repeated what the listener said in the signal. Total both of them are 16 items (13.33%).

In this research, the writer found that a few of students (consist 18 students) used negotiation of meaning. It means that their English ability is good enough. It can be seen also from their conversation and from the use of negotiation of meaning in their speaking. Besides that, the writer hoped that by using the negotiation of meaning, the students can solve obstacles that can occur in the interaction.

Then Pica (1996:5) in Yufrizal (2001:103) admits that firstly, through negotiation of meaning the speaker obtain comprehensible input necessary for second language acquisition much more frequently than in the interaction without negotiation of meaning. It means that the language learners can develop their language knowledge by comprehending the target language in interaction. It can be seen when the second speaker gave a signal of misunderstanding from the first speaker's utterance, than the first speaker would respond to the signal.

Secondly, negotiation of meaning provides many opportunities for the speakers to produce comprehensible output necessary for second language acquisition much more frequently than interaction without negotiation of meaning. It means that in interaction through negotiation of meaning the language learners have many chances to produce the target language because sometimes the learners were compelled to produce the target language to clarify the misunderstanding of the utterances by modifying the meaning. So, by producing the target language the learners can produce the comprehensible output.

Thirdly, it is important element for the second language learning through communication that can be as an indicator of pursuit of communication. It means that an interaction through negotiation of meaning has a function as an enhancement for the language learners to find the target of learning.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

After collecting the data from recording, the writer would like to draw conclusions as follows:

A few students (consist 18 students) at the second year of SMPN 29 Bandar Lampung apply negotiation of meaning in their conversation by using Information Gap. All components in negotiation of meaning are used by students. The highest frequency in negotiation of meaning that they used is trigger. The lowest frequency is and response other-modification.

The component of negotiation of meaning can be ranked as follow:

(a) The highest frequency is trigger (b) The second frequency is follow-up since participants tried to check modification in interaction success or not. (c) The third frequency is clarification of request since one of participant totally didn't comprehend what speaker has said. (d) The fourth frequency is response self-repetition. (e) The fifth frequency is response other-repetition. (f) The sixth frequency is confirmation check through modification (g) The seventh frequency is confirm or negate response. (h) The eight frequency is confirmation check through repetition.(i) The ninth Response self-modification (j) The tenth confirmation check trough completion since the participant as speaker got difficulties in expressing her/his idea Then, response other modification.

Referring to the research findings on the last chapter, the writer would like to propose some recommendations as follows:

1. Students can be more motivated and more active to practice English in order to improve their English ability. The students are expected to practice their speaking whether in class or out class. For example they can practice their speaking with his or her friends.
2. The teacher is expected to give the students the knowledge about negotiation of meaning. For example, teacher gives the explanation about negotiation of meaning and the examples of negotiation of meaning especially trigger and signals in the conversation.

References

- Brown, H. Douglass. 2001. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. San Fransisco: State University.
- Bryne, Donn. 1984. *Teaching Oral English : Longman Handbooks for English Teacher*. Singapore: Longman Group.
- Diknas. 2006 . *Buku Satuan Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Depdiknas.
- Leedy, Paul.1974. *Practical Research Planning and Design*. New York: Mac Millan Publishing Co. Inc.
- Neu, H. And Reeser, T.W.1997. *Parle-mol un! PEU Information Gap Activities For The Beginners*. Paris: Boston Heinle and Heinle.
- 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, 11, 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 Language Acquisition, 11. 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 Needs of L2 learners?* *TESOL Quarterly*, 30, 59-84.

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

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