

## **IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

This chapter discusses the result after the research was conducted. It includes descriptions and discussions of the research.

### **4.1 Results of the Research**

This research was conducted at the second year of SMAN 5 Bandar Lampung. It was carried out at class XI Science II which was consisted of 37 participants. The process placed once a week on March 8<sup>th</sup> 2013 in duration 90 minutes.

The aim of this research was to investigate to what extend negotiation of meaning is used by the students and what component of negotiation of meaning is mostly used by the students in speaking activity in Task-based Learning. After gathering the data by means of recording, the researcher transcribed and coded the students' speaking then analyzed by classified it based on Pica's study (1989) in Yufrizal (2007).

The researcher used inter-rater to make the analysis of the components of negotiation of meaning becomes valid. They were 11 components which were analyzed by the inter-raters:

A. Trigger

B. Signals

1. Confirmation check
  - a. Confirmation check through repetition
  - b. Confirmation check through modification
  - c. Confirmation check through completion
2. Clarification request

C. Responses

1. Self-Repetition Response
2. Other-Repetition Response
3. Self-Modification Response
4. Other-Modification Response
5. Confirm or Negate Response
6. Follow-up

The inter-raters were 2 persons who have the same field with the researcher in the research about negotiation of meaning. They were Meilia Rachmawati and Dian Pratiwi. The researcher was also followed as the first inter-rater. The result of inter-raters' analysis can be seen on table below:

**Table 4.1 Inter-raters' Frequency Analysis of the Components of Negotiation of Meaning**

No.	Component of Negotiation of Meaning	Raters		
		R1	R2	R3
1	Trigger (T)	24	27	24
2	Confirmation Check through Repetition (CCR)	2	2	2
3	Confirmation Check through Modification (CCM)	4	4	4
4	Confirmation Check through Completion (CCC)	5	5	5

<b>5</b>	Clarification of Request (CR)	40	40	40
<b>6</b>	Response Self-Repetition (RSR)	3	3	3
<b>7</b>	Response Other-Repetition (ROP)	3	4	3
<b>8</b>	Response Self-Modification (RSM)	-	-	-
<b>9</b>	Response Other-Modification (ROM)	-	-	-
<b>10</b>	Confirm or Negate Response (RCoN)	17	17	17
<b>11</b>	Follow-up (F)	33	26	33
<b>Total</b>		131	128	131

Based on the table above, the 3 raters agreed with all item numbers of students' negotiation of meaning. Though one of the raters disagreed with some item numbers, such as in item number 1, 7, and 11; but since the 2 other raters agreed with those number items; thus, they were taken and considered valid. The differences analysis between R2 and the other raters are:

#### 1. Trigger

The difference of total number in trigger component was caused by R2's analysis. For example:

AF : *"So do I."*(T)

MA : *"Any way, I heard that your father was sick, wasn't he?"*(CR)

AF : *"Yes(RCoN).....yes, I'm so sad, because he was .... I'm so sad."*(ROP)

(Transcription 1 in R2' analysis)

The comparison from the others rater' analysis:

AF : *"So do I."*

MA : *"Any way, I heard that your father was sick, wasn't he?"*(CR)

AF : *"Yes(RCoN).....yes. I'm so sad, because he was .... I'm so sad."*(F)

(Transcription 1)

R2 states that the phenomenon which is occurring signal is called trigger. The utterances are **"So do I."** In the other side, R1 and R3 disagreed with that analysis. This utterance which produced comprehension check is **"Any way, I heard that your father was sick,"** which occurred the clarification request from the listener in the form of a wh-question or a yes/no question with rising

intonation. Its form is question tag such “**wasn’t he?**”. The speaker gives confirmation response from the listener’s utterance such “**Yes.....yes.**”

## 2. Response Other-Repetition (ROP)

The difference of total number in response other-repetition was caused by R2’s analysis. For example:

MA : “*Any way, I heard that your father was sick, wasn’t he?*”(CR)  
AF : “*Yes(RCoN).....yes, **I’m so sad, because he was .... I’m so sad.***”(ROP)  
MA : “What kind of sick does he suffer from?”  
(Transcription 1 in R2’s analysis)

The comparison from the others rater’ analysis:

MA : “*Any way, I heard that your father was sick, wasn’t he?*”(CR)  
AF : “*Yes(RCoN).....yes, **I’m so sad, because he was .... I’m so sad.***”(F)  
MA : “What kind of sick does he suffer from?”  
(Transcription 1)

In the analysis above, the R2 analyzed utterances as *ROP* such “***I’m so sad, because he was .... I’m so sad.***” The others rater disagreed with the analysis. It is not called as *ROP* because of the signal from the speaker (the student MA) was already responded by the listener (the students AF) by *RCoN*. There is also no repetition from the speaker about what the listener said in the signal. R1 and R3 analyzed it as follow-up. It is because of the utterances above comprehended the message/information from the speaker.

## 3. Follow-up

The difference of total number in response other-repetition was caused by R2’s analysis. For example:

AF : “*So do I.*”(T)  
MA : “*Any way, I heard that your father was sick, wasn’t he?*”(CR)  
AF : “*Yes(RCoN).....yes, **I’m so sad, because he was .... I’m so sad.***”(ROP)  
(Transcription 1 in R2’s analysis)

The comparison from the others rater' analysis:

AF : “So do I.”(T)

MA : “Any way, I heard that your father was sick, wasn't he?”(CR)

AF : “Yes(RCoN).....yes, **I'm so sad, because he was .... I'm so sad.**”(F)

(Transcription 1)

In the analysis above, the rater 2 analyzed the utterances such “**I'm so sad, because he was .... I'm so sad.**” as *ROP*. The others rater disagreed with the analysis. It is not called as *ROP* because of the signal from the speaker (the student MA) was already responded by the listener (the student AF) by *RCoN*. There is also no repetition from the speaker about what the listener said in the signal. R1 and R3 analyzed it as follow-up. It is because of the utterances above comprehended the message/information from the speaker.

The differences in the total number of negotiation of meaning in the students' speaking activity are caused by some of differences in analysis between the R2 and the others rater. It does not influence the validity of the data because of the analysis between R1 and R3 is mostly the same. The result of the frequency and percentage of students' negotiation of meaning can be seen on table 3 below:

**Table 4.2 Frequency and Percentage of the Students' Negotiation of Meaning based on Yufrizal's study (2007)**

No.	Component of Negotiation of Meaning	Frequency	Percentage
1	Trigger (T)	24	18.32%
2	Confirmation Check through Repetition (CCR)	2	1.53%
3	Confirmation Check through Modification (CCM)	4	3.10%
4	Confirmation Check through Completion (CCC)	5	3.82%
5	Clarification of Request (CR)	40	30.53%
6	Response Self-Repetition (RSR)	3	2.30%
7	Response Other-Repetition (ROP)	3	2.30%
8	Response Self-Modification (RSM)	-	-
9	Response Other-Modification (ROM)	-	-

<b>10</b>	Confirm or Negate Response (RCoN)	17	12.98%
<b>11</b>	Follow-up (F)	33	25.20%
<b>Total</b>		131	100%

The table above shows the distribution frequency of the students' negotiation of meaning in their speaking activity after Task-based Learning was implemented.

The total number of negotiation of meaning was 131 items based on the 2 raters' agreement in the analysis.

#### 4.1.1 Results of the Interview

The interview was conducted to investigate the students to know about their comments why clarification request was mostly used by them in conversation. It is hoped that the participants tend to become involved in the subject matter of the conversation and consequently produce more spontaneous speech (Johnston, 1985) in Suparman (2009). 9 representatives of the students as the interviewees were chosen from the class. The interview was in the form of open and formal questions (the questions must be in the form of explanation or description rather than "yes" or "no" answers, to avoid the students from being reluctant to answer the questions given).

**Table 4.3. Result of Interview**

<b>The Interviewees</b>	<b>The Problems</b>
The Student 1	To make the conversation more interesting.
The Student 2	To certain the truth of previous utterances.
The Student 3	Need some further information from the interlocutors.
The Student 4	The activity was more active because they practice directly.
The Student 5	Need some further information from the interlocutors.
The Student 6	Need some further information from the interlocutors.
The Student 7	To avoid the conversation breakdown, therefore need some further information from interlocutors.
The Student 8	To clear up the information from the interlocutors.
The Student 9	Need further information to make sure the truth of utterances.

Based on the result of the interview, it could be concluded that clarification request appeared in the students' conversations because the listener need further information about the interlocutors' utterances. The listener produced clarification request to avoid the conversation breakdown. Therefore, the sustainability communication between the speaker and listener still go on. It was occurred in form of special expression, wh-questions, and back-channel clue.

#### **4.1.2. Result of the Observation**

Based on the researcher's monitoring, more a half students in the class were interesting in following the class. The students kept their attention for the teacher's explanation in which made them able to understand the rule of the task. In the end of learning process, the students also keep their attention for teacher's reflection. The result of the observation during the learning process, the students mostly used negotiation of meaning. They were 2 components of negotiation of meaning which not occurred in the students' conversation: response self modification and response other modification. It is proved in the observation sheet (see appendix, p. 146).

#### **4.2 Discussion**

The researcher implemented Task-based Learning in students' speaking activity. Because it is more student-centered, allows for more meaningful communication. Task is an activity where the target language is used by the learner for a communicative purpose (goal) in order to achieve an outcome (Willis, 1996). It

means that the learning process is focused on the use of authentic language and meaningful in using the target language. As long as there are any communicative purposes, certainly there any productive and receptive skill of understanding. Negotiation of meaning appears to be an important element in facilitating the learners to gain comprehensible input for non-native speaker based responses or signals of understanding. 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). Negotiation of meaning can function as an indication of pursuit of communication.

The task is closed to the problem in which they have in their daily life. Therefore, the process of the students' interaction happened smoothly and naturally. Peer by peer of the students did conversation in the class. Firstly, the students chose one of themes, such as Sad Expressions, Embarrassment Expressions, Anger Expressions, and Annoyance Expression. The differences of each theme are the situations and the use of words list. How they provide the theme to be speaking activity. Secondly, they discussed the problem, situation, and using of words based on the theme which was they chose. Thirdly, they performed it into a dialogue conversation. The researcher recoded the students' conversation from the beginning until the end by using digital camera. After that, she transcribed and coded each the students' conversation. After transcribed it, she analyzed all the data by coding the transcriptions.

In their conversation, they mostly got difficulties to understand each other and made the breakdown for the conversation. To overcome the obstacles, they used negotiation of meaning which is considered as the effective communication strategies. The coding results, there are any negotiation of meaning in the students' conversation. The samples of each component of negotiation of meaning from it as follow:

A. Trigger

In this phenomenon, the participants as speaker showed trigger because of some reasons. They were uncertainty or hesitation; produced a comprehension check that required further responses work from the listener, for example:

ARW : Uh, solution? *My solution is you immediately homework after school and writing....uh....*

MYY : Homework?

ARW : Homework in the book. *So you don't forget it....uh....*

MYY : Homework?

ARW : Homework.

(Transcription 12)

In the conversation above, the student ARW as the speaker produced hesitation in utterance which was containing unclear word or phrase such *“My solution is you immediately homework after school and writing....uh....”* which created communication breakdown. This phenomenon was occurring confirmation check through modification from the student MYY as a listener when she asked *“Homework?”* as a signal of completion or correction. Then the student ARW gave response to the student MYY by other repetition response by said *“Homework in the book”*.

In the same expression, the student ARW wanted to give a follow up for comprehending the message. But that moment made the student ARW did trigger again by produced utterance which was containing unclear word or phrase such **“So you don’t forget it....uh....”** which created communication breakdown again. It produced a confirmation check through modification again from the student MYY as a listener by asked **“Homework?”** which was produced response self through repetition from the student ARW by said **“Homework“**. Trigger occurred 24 times equal to 18.32% in the interaction.

## B. Signals for Negotiation of Meaning

There are two types of signals for negotiation of meaning:

### 1. Confirmation Check

It is divided into three types:

#### a. Confirmation Check through Repetition

It means that the interlocutor repeated all of parts of the speaker’s utterance, for example:

MYY : I’m sad because I forget do homework. I forget because I tired and I don’t know homework. What you have a solution?

ARW : **Uh, solution?** My solution is you immediately homework after school and writing....uh....

MYY : Homework?

(Transcription 12)

In the conversation above, the student ARW was confused to information the student MYY such **“What you have a solution?”**. Therefore the student ARW repeated what the student MYY has said by said **“Uh, solution?”** to

emphasize the confirmation meaning in form of confirmation check through repetition to the student MYY. It is caused by the student ARW only repeated what the speaker said without any modification aspect. Then the student ARW wanted to follow up the signal by gave a comprehending a message but it made the student ARW did trigger again such “*My solution is you immediately homework after school and writing....uh....*” which was created the communication breakdown.

From that phenomenon, it made a changing position between the student MYY and the student ARW. The student ARW’s position was changed as the speaker. The student MYY’s position was changed as a listener. The student ARW’s trigger produced a signal of confirmation meaning from the student MYY such “**Homework?**” in form of confirmation check through repetition. Confirmation check through repetition occurred 2 times equal to 1.53% in the interaction.

b. Confirmation Check through Completion

It means that the interlocutor elaborated or modified what the speaker has said in order to confirm whether his/her understanding what the speaker has said was correct, for example:

KW : Uh...because I’m not expressly fall the favorite vas have my mother.  
KD : I’m sorry to hear that. ***But not before you get good grades?***  
KW : Yes, right.

(Transcription 5)

In the conversation above, the student KD tried to modify the long explanation from the student KW such *“Uh...because I’m not expressly fall the favorite vas have my mother.”* into a short utterance such *“I’m sorry to hear that. But not before you get good grades?”* in ordered to confirm whether her understanding what the speaker has said was correct. The student KD tried to modify the meaning by gave an elaboration such *“But not before you get good grades?”* to conclude the explanation of situation from the student KW. While the student KD produced a confirmation check through completion, it was occurring confirm response from the student KW as the speaker such *“Yes, right.”*

The other examples of confirmation check through modification which was occurred in the students’ interaction:

ISD : My friend is falling in love with the boy that I love. And I don’t know what should I do.

DLO : I’m so sorry to hear that. *You must be so hurt?*

ISD : Yes, of course. She is successfully hurt my heart.

(Transcription 9)

In the conversation above, the student DLO tried to elaborate utterances such *“My friend is falling in love with the boy that I love. And I don’t know what should I do.”* from the students ISD by her elaboration *“You must be so hurt?”* in ordered to confirm whether her understanding about what the speaker has said was correct. The student DLO produced confirmation check through completion.

It was caused by the student DLO as listener tried to elaborate the explanation from the student ISD as speaker by gave the conclusion. But her conclusion still needed a response from the student ISD whether her confirmation of meaning of the student ISD's statement was correct or not. That was why at that conversation the student ISD gave a response in form of confirm response such "**Yes, of course**" to the student DLO. Then the student ISD produced follow up through comprehending message such "**She is successfully hurt my heart.**" to emphasize her response to the student DLO. Confirmation check through completion occurred 5 times equal to 3.82% in the interaction.

c. Confirmation Check through Modification

It means that the interlocutor corrected or completed what the previous speaker has said. Because the speaker got difficulties in expressing what he/she wanted to tell to the listener, he/she tried, to correct or complete it, for example:

S : I want to....I want to give you one of my cats to change your cat that....

M : **That has been died?**

S : That has been died.

(Transcription 3)

In the conversation above, the student M supplied a phrase such "**that has been died?**" as confirmation check of uncertainty expression by the student S such "**I want to....I want to give you one of my cats to change your cat that....**". It was occurred when the student S as the speaker got difficulties

in expressing her idea in the conversation. That was why the student M as the listener tried to complete it by producing confirmation check through modification. From the signal from the student M, the student S produced a response of confirmation such *“That has been died.”* as a response self repetition.

The other examples of confirmation check through modification which was occurred in the students’ interaction:

- MYY : Uh, solution? My solution is you immediately homework after school and writing....uh....  
ARW : ***Homework?***  
MYY : Homework in the book. So you don’t forget it....uh....  
ARW : ***Homework?***  
MYY : Homework.

(Transcription 12)

In the conversation above, the researcher found two of confirmation check through modifications as a signal. First, the student ARW as listener supplied word such *“homework?”* as confirmation meaning of trigger from the student MY Y as speaker such *“Uh, solution? My solution is you immediately homework after school and writing....uh....”*. This phenomenon appeared when the student MY Y produced an utterance which was containing unclear word or phrase such *“writing....uh....”* which was created communication breakdown. This phenomenon was occurring confirmation check through modification from the student ARW when she asked *“Homework?”* as a signal of confirmation check. Then the student MY Y gave response to the student ARW with other repetition response by said *“Homework in the book”*.

In the same expression, the student MYY wanted to give a follow up for comprehending the message. But it made the student MYY did trigger which was produced an utterances which was containing unclear word or phrase such *“So you don’t forget it....uh....”* which was created communication breakdown again. It produced a confirmation check through modification again from the student ARW by asked *“Homework?”* which was produced response self through repetition from the student MYY by said *“Homework”*. Confirmation check through modification occurred 4 times equal to 3.10% in the interaction.

## 2. Clarification Request.

A clarification request is a request for further information from an interlocutor about a previous utterance (Foster: 1998). Clarification request could be expressed in back channel clue, for example:

RV : No, I don’t. Why?  
FSK : Tonight, someone sent me a message. She said she loving me. I don’t know her. But I think she is my friend when I’m elementary school.  
RV : *Oh, yeah, really?*  
FSK : Yeah, Ratih.

(Transcription 7)

In the conversation above, the student RV as listener gave a special expression such *“Oh, yeah, really?”* as a signal which needed some clarification of meaning from the statement such *“Tonight, someone sent me a message. She said she loving me. I don’t know her. But I think she is my friend when I’m elementary school.”* from the student FSK as speaker. Clarification of request was produced

by the student RV was causing a response from the student FSK such “*Yeah, Ratih.*” in form of confirm response.

The other examples of clarification request which was occurred in the students’ interaction:

Y : “I felt down into the ditch behind my school.”  
IRD : “*Really? Are you okay?*”  
Y : “I’m fine. But I was so embarrassed because my body full of mud.”  
IRD : “*You must be very ashamed?*”  
(Transcription 14)

In the conversation above, the student IRD gave a special expression such “*Really? Are you okay?*” as a signal which needed some clarification of meaning from the student Y as speaker. Clarification of request was mostly use by the students in their interaction which occurred 40 times equal to 30.53% in the interaction.

### C. Responses for negotiation of Meaning

#### 1. Response Self Repetition

In this type, the second the student as the speaker repeated what has been said in the trigger, for example:

ARW : Uh, solution? My solution is you immediately homework after school and writing....uh.....  
MYY : Homework?  
ARW : Homework in the book. So you don’t forget it....uh....  
MYY : Homework?  
ARW : *Homework.*  
(Transcription 12)

In the conversation above, the student ARW as the speaker only repeated the word “*homework*” that had been said previously in the signal of confirmation

check through modification such **“Homework?”** from the student MYY as listener which appeared by trigger from her. It was caused by there was no indicator of self modification in any level of language production which was showed by the student ARW as the speaker when she gave the response. The speaker response was exactly a repetition of what had been said before by listener. This response occurred 3 times equal to 2.30% in the interaction.

## 2. Response Other Repetition

In this category, the speaker repeated what the listener said in the signal. Therefore, it was called other repetition. In the speaker response, we could see that the speaker has changed his output based on input from listener, for example:

ARW : Uh, solution? My solution is you immediately homework after school and writing....uh....  
MYY : Homework?  
ARW : **Homework in the book.** So you don't forget it....uh....  
(Transcription 12)

In the conversation above, the response **“homework in the book”** which was produced by the student ARW as the speaker in a repetition of the confirmation check which was produced by the student MYY as the listener. Here the speaker changed her trigger to match the expression from the listener. The student MYY tried to complete the unclear word **“Homework?”** based on the trigger **“Uh, solution? My solution is you immediately homework after school and writing....uh....”** which was produced by the student ARW. Based on that signal, the student ARW matched her response by gave a little

comprehending message "*Homework in the book.*" for confirmation check through completion from the student MYY. It was caused by the student ARW produced a response other repetition. Response other repetition occurred 3 times equal to 2.30% in the interaction.

### 3. Response Self Modification

In this category, the speaker modified the trigger as response to the listener signal for negotiation of meaning. The modification made by speaker could be at level of phonology, morphology, syntax, or at the semantic level. But this category was not occurring in the interaction.

### 4. Response Other Modification

Other modification response could also involve modification of multiple language aspects, phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantic level. But this category was not occurring in the interaction.

### 5. Confirmation or Negation Response.

In this category, most participants as speaker showed confirmation or negate. A response could also be a short confirmation or negation. Confirmation response appears when the confirmation or clarification meaning in the message which is produced by the listener is correct. Negation response appears when the confirmation or clarification meaning in the message which is produced by the listener is not correct which produced follow up to comprehending the message from the speaker. The form of response could be

expressed by some expression “yes” or “no”. A “yes” confirmation response was usually short, for example:

KW : Uh...because I'm not expressly fall the favorite was have my mother.  
KD : I'm sorry to hear that. But not before you get good grades?  
KW : *Yes, right.*

(Transcription 5)

In the conversation above, the student KW as speaker expressed such “*yes, alright*” as short confirmation response which was produced by the student KD as listener. This response was short with an expression “*yes, alright*” because of the confirmation check which was produced by the student KD was correct. Therefore, the student KW didn't need to comprehend more about the message. This type of response occurred 17 times equal to 12.98% in the interaction.

#### D. Follow-Up

There are two kind of follow-up:

##### 1. Follow up in comprehension message.

It is occurred when the speaker or listener try to comprehend the message of signal or response. It is full of comprehension being confirmed, for example:

ISD : My friend is falling in love with the boy that I love. And I don't know what should I do.  
DLO : I'm so sorry to hear that. You must be so hurt?  
ISD : Yes, of course. *She is successfully hurt my heart.*

(Transcription 9)

Based on interaction above, the student ISD as speaker gave a confirmation response such “*Yes, of course.*” of confirmation check “*You must be so hurt?*” from the student DLO as listener. It means that the confirmation check which

was produced from the student DLO was correct. To emphasize her confirmation response, the student ISD tried to give follow up in form of comprehension message *“She is successfully hurt my heart.”*

2. Follow up in continuation move.

It is occurred when the speaker or listener changed the topic of conversation after a process response happened.

KW : Are you certain my mother angry with.....not angry with me again?

KD : Yes, you try it.

KW : I love it. Because if I show good grades for my mother, my mother can happy.

KD : *Bell was ringing.*

KW : Yes, the bell was already ringing.

(Transcription 5)

In the conversation above, the student KD changed the topic of conversation after a response process. The interaction reveals the student KD gave follow up in form of continuation move such *“Bell was ringing.”* from her response such *“Yes, you try it.”* to give confirmation check by the student KW such *“Are you certain my mother angry with.....not angry with me again? “.* From this phenomenon, the topic of interaction was changed to another topic when the student KD said *“Bell was ringing.”* which produced another response from the student KW such *“Yes, the bell was already ringing.”* in form of other repetition responses.

From all of follow up that happened in the interaction occurred 33 times equal to 25.30% which was calculated from follow up in comprehending the message and follow up in the continuation move in the interaction.

In Task-based Learning, the students mostly used clarification request as signal of negotiation of meaning in their interaction. The total number of clarification request was 40 items (30.53%). It occurred when the students as listener need a clarification about what the speaker said. They expressed this signal by using question tag and special expression such as “really” or “are you sure?” and “why” to get the response from the speaker. What the listener needs in clarification request is confirmation or negation response from the listener. Moreover, the listener need follow up from the speaker to comprehend the message.

The component of negotiation of meaning which was rarely used in the students’ activity was Confirmation Check through Repetition. Its total number was 2 items (1.53%). This finding is same as the previous research’s finding from Nurdiana (2011). It was caused by that the listener need some follow up from the speaker to emphasize the meaning of message. Because the listener was lack to understand what the speaker has said before. But in the conversation, the students mostly understand the message from the speaker. Therefore, the listener mostly needed some clarifications from the speaker in form of response or follow up.

The components of negotiation of meaning which did not appear in the students’ activity were Response Self Modification and Response Other Modification. These responses involve modification which could be at level of phonology, morphology, syntax, or at the semantic level. Response Self Modification is when the speaker modifies trigger as response to the listener signal for negotiation of

meaning. But in Response Other Modification, there is no trigger modification. It modifies the message only from the listener.

These responses did not occur in the interaction because the listener mostly understood about what the speaker said even many ungrammatical statement from the speaker. It was because of their knowledge in multiple language aspects were mostly equal. Therefore the listeners still catch what the meaning of message from the speaker.

The frequency and percentage of the students' negotiation of meaning could be seen below:

**Table 4.4 Frequency and Percentage of the Students' Negotiation of Meaning based on Yufrizal's study (2007)**

No.	Component of Negotiation of Meaning	Frequency	Percentage
1	Trigger (T)	24	18.32%
2	Confirmation Check through Repetition (CCR)	2	1.53%
3	Confirmation Check through Modification (CCM)	4	3.10%
4	Confirmation Check through Completion (CCC)	5	3.82%
5	Clarification of Request (CR)	40	30.53%
6	Response Self-Repetition (RSR)	3	2.30%
7	Response Other-Repetition (ROP)	3	2.30%
8	Response Self-Modification (RSM)	-	-
9	Response Other-Modification (ROM)	-	-
10	Confirm or Negate Response (RCoN)	17	12.98%
11	Follow-up	33	25.20%
<b>Total</b>		131	100%

The researcher found that the students mostly used negotiation of meaning in their speaking activity. It could increase the sustainability of the conversation and open

more opportunities for participants to provide comprehensible input and produced more comprehensible output.