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Abstract

This paper reports on analysis the negotiation of meaning strategy employed by English teacher in classroom interaction. This qualitative research conducted at SMAN 3 Banda Aceh. The result of the research showed that the second-grade English teacher used negotiation of meaning strategy in which appeared in different amount and frequency. Trigger appeared as the most frequent component of negotiation of meaning strategy produced by the teacher during the interaction, meanwhile, self-modification of response (SMR) is the most significance way the teacher response the students’ signal in negotiating the conversation. In the wake of conducting this research, bringing negotiation of meaning strategy in dealing with communication impasses in the classroom in exceptionally proposed for both teacher and EFL students.
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1. INTRODUCTION

English become a fundamental aspect in life, since English is served as international language; it is used in so many countries around the world whether as second language or foreign language. It is undeniable that English capability needs to be acquired for those who do not share English as their first language. Thus, Based on no. 52 year 2014 article 7, English is served as a foreign language (EFL) which is aimed to improve quality of education, communication, and technology. Ellis (2015:22) explained that there are some various ways English are viewed; EFL is the way language is viewed, where the speakers’ environment is not practically use English in daily basis. Furthermore, Brown (2001:116) defined EFL as language context where the used of the language is not commonly spoken in community, foreign language is only used in certain occasions, such as for education or politic matters.

Further detailed, education system in Indonesia, based on 2013 curriculum underscores the development of students’ skills and behaviors. There from, speaking took place as one of the crucial aspect in learning language skills. In addition to, speaking is the most fundamental skill in language learning (Komariah,
Erdiana, Mutia (2020, p. 27). However, in learning speaking, it also cannot be mastered easily. According to Ellis (2015:321) learning speaking is not a simple matter, in order to master speaking ability, the learners need to cope the linguistic aspects as well, such as, morphology, phonology, syntax and sociolinguistics; thus, the message can be constructed properly. Thus, Pica (1991) believed negotiation of meaning is crucial in order to assist L2 learners in receiving L2 language exposures.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Classroom Interaction

Classroom is one of social environments which language is used for certain functions and roles (Hall & Walsh, 2002). Classroom interaction symbolized as the classroom itself, it plays a big role in learning process (Brown, 2000, p. 165). Ellis (2008:565) defined classroom interaction as sequence of events in which the language exposures are gathered from various sources. Hall (2002) indicated classroom interaction as learning process where language is not only constructed by realizing the structure but also realizes the language use. In the classroom interaction might appear from any classroom members, it can be initiated by either teacher or students. Moreover, the classroom interaction is conducted for many purposes, such as for telling information, asking information, giving opinion or showing expression. Recent research found that in order to learn second language better, the learning process must be brought to application. The students need to communicate in the language they are learning (Ellis, 1990). The interaction can be the source of the L2 linguistic information, with interact verbally, the input can be received neatly rather than pushing the learning material to the students. Furthermore, Dagarin (2004: 128) considered classroom as a place in which the students are developed, the classroom interaction itself as a learning process, where the constructing and building understanding happens among the classroom members. In conclusion, learning L2 is a complex thing, nevertheless, the students can receive L2 input to construct their confidence and understanding though verbal interaction with their friends and teacher in the classroom.

According to Ellis (2015) there were three sequences of interaction, it is named initiation-response-feedback (IRF) structure also called as recitation script. Initiation is categorized as the stimulus or the starting point of the interaction, initiation can be started by either the teacher or the students. However, in the classroom the interaction is often started by the teacher. Line with this statement Hall (1995) investigated that in EFL classroom, teacher often begins to point a student to answer his/her question to stimulate the interaction. The second component is response; it is a reply toward the initiation. Response contains interlocutor’s idea, thought, and expression. Response can be delivered verbally or nonverbally (Hall, 1995). Verbal response is the utterance that the interlocutor produces to reply the initiation; on the other hands, nonverbal response is the expression or the body language of the interlocutor toward upbringing topic (Dagarin, 2004; Hall, 1995). The third component is feedback; it is usually done by the teacher as the appreciation for the students’ participation. Feedback is very important, it shows whether the students’ contribution is accepted or not. Feedback can be done by praising the students’ work (good work, very nice, etc), accepting student’s idea and giving motivation (Ellis, 2015, p. 165). Feedback can be followed with evaluation and correction, therefore, the students are able to improve themselves with the new input that are given (Hall, 2003; Steve walsh, 2006, p. 5).
Teacher: what’s the last day of the month? I
Student: Friday R
Teacher: okay F.

2.2 Negotiation of meaning strategy

In learning target language, practice and time compatible to students’ improvement. Through interacting with each other, L2 learners could learn and evaluate one another. However, during this learning process, the interaction might not always go smoothly; due to the fact that L2 learners still have limitation in mastering the target language. The lack of vocabulary store, incorrect grammar and weak pronunciation often cause communication impasses between speakers. In order to keep the conversation, negotiation of meaning strategy appears to assist L2 student’s in dealing with communication problems and gathering better L2 input from their interlocutors (Gass, 2015, p. 182; Pica, 1991a). Input itself is defined language exposure in which recognized; it can be proposed by including morphology, phonology, syntax and semantic (Ellis, 2015; Hartono & Ihsan, 2017; Pica, 1994). However, Mackey (2003) argued that input not only has to be recognized but also has to be comprehensible. By relying on Long’s hypothesis (1985) in which comprehensible is formulated $i + 1$; comprehensible input indicated as how far the language input should be proposed. It is only one level up of students current level of competence, therefore, input still make sense to the learners and stimulated their competence.

Pica (1991) mentioned four interrelated components in negotiation of meaning; namely; trigger, signal, response and follow-up. Trigger is defined as utterance that contains elements causes misunderstanding or non-understanding to the interlocutor during the conversation; it stimulates the negotiation exists. The lack of L2 proficiency put the possibility for trigger to appear is higher; The second component called signal, it is viewed as an utterance that produced by the interlocutor in order to receive better comprehension (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005, p. 185; Pica, 1994). Signal is sent as message that greater comprehensibility is needed. Pica (1991) divided signals into two types; clarification request and confirmation request.

Clarification request is an utterance in which expresses the interlocutor’s non-understanding about the speaker’s line; it can be identified by the existence of WH- questions; such as what?, another word? Pardon?, etc (Brown, 2000; Pica, 1996). Gass (1985) on his research found that NNS students often use Clarification request in elaborating signal. On the other hand, confirmation check is an indicator that the message is not fully understood by the interlocutor (Gass, 1985; Pica, 1991b). Confirmation check can be done by repeating of some or the whole part of the speaker’s line; trough segmentation or filling the speaker’s impasses and comprehension check (Varonis & Gass, 1985). Confirmation check trough segmentation is done by repairing the speaker sentence or modified the sentence (Long, 1983; Pica, 1994). Furthermore, Pica (1991) stated that segmentation can be done by substituting lexical, for instance, substitution trough synonym or paraphrase the trigger; inflectional, by adding, deleting or repairing structure. Confirmation trough completion happens when the speaker cannot state the statement properly, thus, the interlocutor try to guess what the speaker is trying to say by giving suggestion (Masrizal, 2014; Pica, 1989). Furthermore, Pica (1994) found that this type of confirmation check is often happened in NNS and NS speaker.
The third component of negotiation of meaning is response, response refers to a speaker’s attempt to give an input, which is produced clarify the misunderstanding or non-understanding between the speaker and the interlocutor (Ellis, 2008, p. 264; Pica, 1996). Pica proposed 7 ways to response interlocutor’s signal in negotiating. This is the types of response provided by Pica (1991).

### Table 2.1 The types of response provided by Pica (1991)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>TYPE OF RESPONSE</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Response neither with repetitions or modification of caretaker's/interlocutor's speech</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Indication Of Inability To Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Change To Other topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Response with repetitions of caretaker's/interlocutor's speech</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Self-Repetition Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Other-repetition Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Self-Modification Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Phonology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Morphology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Syntax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Semantic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Other-Modification Response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table there are three classification of response, first class indicates the types of response in which do not include neither repetition or modified the utterance in the trigger or signal. In this case, the caretaker speech responds the interlocutor’s signal neither by repeating the interlocutor production in the signal nor his in trigger; IIR to respond and CTR are kinds of response that concluded in this class. Pica (1991) defined IIR and CTR as types of response or expression in which the shows the speaker's incapability to provide comprehensible input to the interlocutor. IIR can be followed by CTR during the negotiation; thus, in order to continue the conversation, the speaker tried to change the topic which can be easier
to bring than the first matter they are talking, or giving some relevant information to the topic in order to smoothly move the topic of the talk (Ellis et al., 2009). Line with this statement, Pica (1994) mentioned that negotiation is not always ended with comprehensible input or the achievement of mutual understanding. IIR and CTR are the capable moves in order to maintain the conversation despite the communication problems.

The second classification of response is by included repetition, this class included repetitions of the caretaker’s utterance in the trigger or the interlocutor’s production in the signal. The repetition can be partial or the whole line of the speakers (Gass, 2015; Pica, 1994). There are two types of response that included in this class, namely, self-repetition of response (SRR) and other-repetition response (ORR). SRR indicated as the response by repeat the speaker’s line in the trigger; on the other hand, SRR defined as a type of response where the speaker repeats the interlocutor’s signal as a response.

The third class is responses with modification of the speaker’s/interlocutor’s line. SMR and OMR are the type of response that mentioned in this class. SMR is a type of response where the speaker changes her production in the trigger; the segmentation could include phonology, morphology, syntax, semantic. Moreover, Ellis (2008) added that SMR can be done by simplify or expand the production the speaker’s utters in the trigger; meanwhile, the OMR the type of response where the speaker do medication with the interlocutor’s line in the signal.

3. METHODS

In this research the researcher conducted the qualitative descriptive study. It is often used in education, epidemiology, and behavioral sciences research (Koh & Owen, 2000, p. 221). In conducting this type of research, the observation is commonly used and will be measured by using nominal or ordinal scale (qualitative measurement scale) (Kumar, 2011, p. 43). The researcher conducted the observation in investigating the existed phenomenon. The data that gathered by the researcher was the teacher’s and students’ utterances of negotiation of meaning during the class. The researcher brought the observation checklist adapted from Pica 1991 as an instrument in collecting data. Furthermore, in order to ensure the data that have been collected, the researcher recorded the whole duration of classroom activities; therefore, no interaction that would be missed. The recording also used to recheck the data that have been collected during the observation.

4. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Results

From observation result and video recording footage, the existence of negotiation of meaning strategy can be illustrated as below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>COMPONENT OF NEGOTIATION OF MEANING</th>
<th>EXISTANCE</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Day 1</td>
<td>Day 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Trigger</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signal:</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation through</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>segmentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation through</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repetition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation through</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response:</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change to other topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indication of inability to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negate or acknowledgment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-repetition Response</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-repetition Response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-modification Response</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-modification Response</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each meeting has significant different amount of negotiation. The productive observation of negotiation of meaning strategy appeared in the first observation; there are 112 utterances of negotiation of meaning produced by teacher. This is lined with the amount of students that conducted the speaking task. More than half of the class performed task, therefore, the amount of negotiation in the first meeting exists more than other two meetings. The amount of negotiation was also affected by the proficiency of the students who were doing the task, in the first meeting mostly the students who were conducting the conversation had low L2 proficiency, they cannot neither construct sentence properly or listen clearly the teacher’s utterances during the conversation, therefore, negotiation always brought to overcome communication impasses during the interaction. Later, on the second meeting, the teacher attempted the same task in the same class, the rest of the students who have not done the task were asked to wait for their turn. The negotiation appeared for 67 productions, about a half of the production on the first meeting. The production of negotiation often appeared because the destruction from other students, the loud noise disturb the conversation, therefore, the negotiation appeared to help both speakers to get better understanding about the
talk. On the other hand, the third observation was done in different class; still, the teacher did the same task. The researcher found that negotiation only produced 46 utterances. This meeting produced the fewest production of negotiation of meaning strategy. In this class the student more interactive rather than the other class. The students are more active and engaged to the conversation. Although most of the students’ conversation held until five minutes, negotiation rarely appeared. The students were able to elaborate their ideas and giving response to teacher’s questions, therefore, negotiation of meaning was not needed, since the messages were already clear.

The researcher illustrated the observation result from table 4.1 in pie diagram. The diagram is aimed to picture the significance of negotiation of meaning components, the figure is mentioned below.

![Pie Chart](image)

Figure 4.2. The Percentage Of Each Component Of Negotiation Of Meaning Strategy Used By The Teacher In Classroom Interaction Adapted From Ellis (1991)

**Detail information:**
- **T**: Trigger
- **CR**: Clarification Request
- **CCR**: Confirmation Check trough Repetition
- **CCS**: Confirmation Check trough Segmentation
- **CCC**: Confirmation Check trough Completion
- **CTR**: Change Topic Response
- **IIR**: Indication of Inability to Respond
- **NAR**: Negate/ Acknowledgement Response
- **SRR**: Self-Repetition Response
- **ORR**: Other-Repetition Response
- **SMR**: Self-Modification Response
- **OMR**: Other-Modification Response

### 4.2 Discussion
4.2.1. Trigger

Based on figure 4.2 it can be informed that trigger appeared to be the most frequent component produced by the teacher during negotiation. It caused by several matters; from field observation, the trigger often appeared because the students are lack of listening capability, the student were not able to notice the teacher's line during the conversation; it is also exacerbated by the student’s low vocabulary store and unclear pronunciation in which caused confusion and misunderstanding. Line with this statement, Mayo and Soler (2013; p. 210) mentioned due to low L2 capability, the tendency of the impasses during communication is higher. From the data above, trigger exit for 35 times (26.75%).

E1: Teacher: who accompany you?
Student: my niphiu and nice (T)
Teacher: sorry? Who?

As shown in examples above, E1 shows the student mispronounced “nephew [nɛfju]” and “niece [nis]” as [niph’u] and [nais]. Student's unclear production leaded the teacher to confusion. The teacher cannot understand the whole point of the student’s utterance; the teacher replied by expressing her confusion by saying ‘sorry, who?’.

4.2.2. Signal

Signal existed as retaliation to the trigger, this move defined as process for seeking better L2 input from interlocutor. From three observations that researcher conducted at SMAN 3 Banda Aceh, signal appeared in various ways and reasons. Signal is delivered to assist the teacher seeking better understanding from the student or even proposed input. Signal existed with different amount and frequency. During negotiation, all type of signal are produced by the teacher, namely, clarification request (CR), confirmation through repetition (CCR), confirmation through segmentation (CCS) and confirmation through completion.

After analyzing the data, CCS appeared more frequent than the rest types of signal. CCS exited for 38 utterances (12.28%). This type of signal carried input which proposed by the teacher; however, the input can be either accepted or rejected by the interlocutor (Pica, 1991a; Yang, 2017). The teacher segmented the trigger by involving phonology, morphology and syntax. Furthermore, the researcher found the segmentation often happened by re-constructing new sentence from the caretaker’s speech but still remained the same idea. Meanwhile, CCR appeared with 16 utterances (17.11%). CCR often indicated teacher’s uncertainty about what she heard, therefore, CCR is proposed in order to assure that the teacher gets the message correctly. CCR is done by repeating a part or the whole trigger as indication the speaker seeking for confirmation (Mackey, Oliver, & Leeman, 2003). On the other hand, CCC only produced for 7 times (3.02%). Pica (1996) explained CCC as a move in which indented to suggest L2 input to interlocutor in order to maintain the conversation.

E15. S: they are...e...in the same... (T)
T: department? (CCC)

From this example, it can be informed that the student cannot complete the sentence due to the limited vocabulary access. Therefore, the teacher tried to
predict what the next word that might be suitable to complete the student's utterance. The teacher proposed L2 input to the student; the word “department” was delivered to whether the suggestion can be used as a completion or not.

E.6:  
S: Becoz…I’m e…exercise is nice…but jogging is a bit lacking  
T: Teacher: what? I don’t understand can you repeat?  
S: I’m e…exercise nice…but jogging… lacking  
T: you don’t like jogging?  
S: yes… but, exercise…I do, I do exercise  
T: alright, you do exercise?  

Extract E.6 illustrated how multiples signals occur in one negotiation. This could happened when the speakers still seeking for a way to reach mutual understanding, thus, the interaction will be developed until the negotiation is cleared (Ellis, 2008). From above, it can be informed that trigger (T) appeared due to student’s poorly constructed sentence, where there are humming and incorrect grammar, this leaves the message was unclear to the teacher, therefore, the teacher send CR as indication that the message was not understandable, the teacher replied by using 5W+H question, “what” represented CR. However, the students’ response was still unclear and confusing, the student replied “I’m e…exercise nice…but jogging… lacking”; form this sentence, the student’s production was grammatically incorrect, moreover, many pauses along the sentence caused the sentence more confusing. Despite, the problems, the teacher try to induce input trough the signal. From the teacher’ signal “you don’t like jogging?” the teacher proposed CCS by reducing the student’s lie in the trigger, also, the grammatical repair also done to give better message. However, CSS is possible to be rejected since the CCS applied only as suggestion. From the student’s response it showed that the signal is accepted, the student replied “yes, but, exercise…I do, I do exercise” as the indication that the teacher’s suggested input is accepted. Pica (1996) mentioned that signal also contained with input in which can be implied in response. after proposing two signals, the negotiation still continue; the teacher sent the third signal in form of CCR, the teacher proposed CCR by repeating part of student’s line “you do exercise?”. It seems that CCR was proposed for assurance; the teacher sent signal in order to assure that the teacher heard the student’s line right.

4.2.3. Response

In attempting negotiation of meaning, gaining comprehensible input is the aim of negotiation. Based on figure 2.1 response can be done by including repetition, segmentation or giving new statement. In the first group (neither with repetition or segmentation of speaker’s/interlocutor’s line), there are IIR, CTR and NAR. From three observations, IIR and CTR placed at the lowest frequency of component that exited during the negotiation; both IIR and CTR produced the same amount of production, those produced 3 times with 1.33% of total production.

E. 19.  
S: Household?  
T: e…its e., okay, by the way, what about yourself? What your activity at home?  

E.23.  
S: what is kantor pajak in English?  
T: It e...hmm...I forget, I will check dictionary later  

E19 illustrated that the negotiation appeared to negate the word “household”. After signal was sent, the teacher showed incapability to reply
student's signal. In negotiating, negotiation might not always ended with comprehensible input; instead, the speakers can decided to ignore the problem and try to bring new topic (Gass & Selinker, 2008, p. 304). Thus, the teacher ignored the signal and proposed new topic to student. In E.23 IIR appeared explicitly during the negotiation, the teacher admitted her limitation in providing input to the student. She acknowledged her incapability to provide student better input about “kantor pajak”. Thus, negotiation is closed, yet, the comprehensible input was not conveyed to the student. This case is explained by Pica (1994) on her research that negotiation might not always end with receiving input and mutual understanding.

Meanwhile, NAR appeared for 17 times (7.46%) during the negotiation. NAR was employed in order to acknowledge or deny the signal. Sometimes, the short response caused the students feel uneasy; thus, other negotiation is possible to appear (Ellis et al., 2009; Hartono & Ihsan, 2017; Pica, 1991a).

E37. T: what time did you wake up this morning? T
   S: get up? Time I get up? S
   Teacher: yes NAR

E39. S: you not pass the exam? S
   T: no…I didn’t NAR

E37 illustrated the existence of acknowledgement, where the teacher replies the student's signal by saying “yes”. The reply was send as indication the student's proposal with “get up” was acceptable. In example 39 the response is formed in negative statement, which indicated the negate response. The signal “you not pass the exam?” was delivered to make sure whether the student hear the teacher's line correctly or not. In this case, the teacher not only replied the student's signal but also gave L2 input in grammar aspect. The teacher implicitly gave L2 input by saying “no, I didn’t”; modal was applied by using in past form since the story talked about past event. Input was given implicitly so the student can notice the mistake themselves.

Response also can be delivered by repeating the speaker's or the interlocutor's utterance. SRR existed for 21 times (9.08%). It often appeared because of student's incomplete understanding about teacher's message. The researcher found that this type of response often proposed because student's lack listening skill, they cannot interpret what they heard. ORR appeared only for 5 times (2.22%). Moreover, the research finding showed that ORR employed to assure the interlocutor that they heard the caretaker's speech correctly. ORR proposed by repeating interlocutor's line in the signal as an assertion that both speakers shared mutual understanding.

E24. T: my plan is...e...hm.....Postponed, yes T
   S: Ha? S
   T: my plan is postponed SRR

E30. T: do you like chocolate? T
   S: hm?”Do you...like chocolate”? S
   T: you...do you like chocolate? ORR

Here, student's CR appeared due to her confusion about the teacher's point. This caused by the humming that separate the verb from the subject, thus, left the unclear massage what happened to the “plan” that the teacher had. Therefore, the teacher repeated her line to the student, so the student can accept proper understanding about the message. In E.30 the signal was produced by repeating T
“do you like chocolate”; here, the student’s did not change the subject as “I” although the subject of the topic is the student; instead, he repeat the teacher’s utterance in the trigger; this, the signal aimed for confirmation whether the student heard the message correctly; later, the signal was responded with ORR; where the teacher repeat the exact same signal as response, this move proposed as assertion that the student is correct.

In term of segmented response, SMR happened to be the most frequent response among others. It appeared 35 productions, equally 16%. The researcher found that the SMR often delivered to help student’s non-understanding. The teacher expended or compressed the message in order to simplify the message so it is comprehensible to the students. On the other hand, OMR only exited for 6 times (2.64%). OMR constructed by reflecting the interlocutor’s production in the signal; the caretaker speech took a part of the whole of the interlocutor’s line in the signal to make a response.

T: light out...it is light out, electricity is off, black out...like the fan stop working...the infocus... 

E40. T: what do you think about my class 
S: do you mean like 'like’ e...enjoy class? 
T: right, do you enjoy the class with me? 

4.2.4. Follow-up

Follow-up employed for 16 times (7.02%). Follow-up often occur by repeating the interlocutor’s line in the signal or response. Pica (1999) divided follow-up into 2 different types, confirmation move and continuation move. Both of these types of follow up occurred during the negotiation that happened in the classroom.

E43. Student: I...like chocolate 
Teacher: okay, you like chocolate 

E46. Teacher: do you have two sisters? 
Student: yes 
Teacher: nice, are they younger?

In example E43, the follow up appeared with comprehension move, the teacher said “a course...course” to emphasis input that has been proposed in the signal. Here, follow-up presented by reflecting the signal that teacher produced. The
teacher repeat the signal in order to assure L2 input was achieved. In E46, the continuation appeared the teacher still not really sure whether the student really understood the message, therefore, follow-up was sent to repeat the production in the signal.

5. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

From the observation result and recording footage, it can be informed that the second-grade English teacher in SMAN3 Banda Aceh used negotiation of meaning strategy in dealing with communication obstacles in classroom interaction. Trigger appears as the most frequent component of negotiation of meaning strategy applied by the teacher. In relation to the first question of the research on finding whether the second-grade English teacher used negotiation of meaning strategy adopted from Pica (1991). In addition, regarding the second research question, the most frequent component of negotiation used by teacher in negotiation is trigger with total production is 61 utterances; it got 27.11% of total negotiation. Trigger appeared as an indication of teacher’s incomplete understanding toward student’s message. Furthermore, confirmation trough segmentation (CCS) placed as the most frequent signal used by teacher in order to reply the trigger, CCS was produced with 28 productions (12.44%). Meanwhile, self-modification response is the most frequent response that appeared in negotiation, the teacher produced 35 utterances of SMR, equally 16% of total negotiation.
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