

STUDENT'S MISTAKES AWARENESS IN PROCESS OF NEGOTIATION OF MEANING BASED ON STUDENT'S LEVEL PROFICIENCY LEVEL

Arpinda Syifaa Awalin¹
Universitas Negeri Surabaya

Syafi'ul Anam²
Universitas Negeri Surabaya

Oikurema Purwanti³
Universitas Negeri Surabaya

arfindasyifa@gmail.com¹

Submit, 04-07-2020

Accepted, 02-02-2021

Publish, 02-02-2021

ABSTRACT

This study aims to know students making mistakes during the negotiation process based on their level of proficiency. This study was conducted at one of a university in Surabaya. The case study is used to know the differences of student's mistake awareness in different level proficiencies. The instruments of data collection were observation, audiovisual recording and interview. The source of data was student's utterances. This study showed that every criterion has different mistakes that students made during the process of negotiation of meaning. The addition of student's level proficiency influenced their mistakes awareness in process negotiation of meaning.

Keyword: Case Study, Level of Proficiency, Mistake, Negotiation of Meaning

INTRODUCTION

Numerous studies have been undertaken on how vital language awareness is (Piper, 2003; Oel, 2016; Gavidia, 2012; Khandari et al., 2019). Language awareness is essential for learners who learn English as a Language subject. Language awareness can be considered a crucial factor in acquiring language since it can help learners explore and discover the language feature (Khandari et al., 2019). Meanwhile, Carter (2003) defines language awareness as a process of development in learners of an improved sensitivity to and consciousness of functions and language forms. Language awareness can be defined as sensitivity to those needs and the ability to accommodate those needs in learning the language in language learning and how learner's language awareness. Language

awareness gives advantages in learning a language since it has a crucial role in developing the target language. Through language awareness, student's understanding of language makes learners more confident in using the target language (Rahmi & Erlinda, 2014). Young (2000) in Saenz (2016) also adds that language awareness can influence all learners to acquire the target language, starting from an early age, passion and motivation to reach the target language. Someone who has a high awareness of language will think critically about his/her utterance when communicating with another person. Yet, someone who lacks understanding will not care about the language use and will not think critically about his/her statements. Then, someone who lacks awareness will lose their passion for acquiring English and affect them to be demotivated.

Several studies about language awareness have been done, especially in grammar instruction and language awareness as linguistic-problem solving (Perez, 2006; Bourke, 2008). Since grammar pattern plays a role in acquiring the second language, it can help the learner foster their awareness of language features. Grammar also can help learners to construct their grammar structure in using a second language. Language awareness can be defined as one of the kinds of language features, which can help the learners motivate them to use language.

In acquiring the target language, learners still face difficulties in constructing sentences that can be understood by other people during the interaction. Interaction and speaking also relate to each other and give benefit in acquiring the target language. Pica, Kanagy & Falodun in Yufrizal (2015) claim that business can be the best way to teach and learn English. Since interaction can force the learners to express their opinions and ideas and foster their oral fluency and accuracy, it helps the success of using English in communication. Additionally, people who interact in English class have to speak in English to communicate. Therefore, oral interaction can be used to teach learning in the classroom because it can give and force the language learners to use the target language. That is an important reason why interaction is necessary and useful as an educational way to improve learning a foreign language.

In interaction, the learners will obtain the target language if they gain the target language output ahead of their current level of proficiency. Moreover, in business, the learners should force their skill and ability to produce precise, comprehended utterances of the target language to avoid misunderstanding. Probably, it happens in the interaction process, which is called "negotiation of meaning". Long introduced this term in the early 1980s. In this process, the speaker and listener try to change their contribution and production to have a smooth conversation. They must maintain a certain level of mutual understanding.

Numerous recent studies have researched topic negotiation of meaning (Pica et al., 1989; Palma, 2014; Cook, 2015; Ibarrola & Martinez, 2015). Those

have made negotiation of meaning one of the subjects that can be analyzed. But it did not confirm whether the negotiation of meaning can help learners in acquiring the target language. Pica et al., (1989), as cited in Champakaew & Pencingkam (2001), claim that learners obtain chances to produce target language and grammatical patterns using negotiation of meaning. Moreover, a study conducted by Cook (2015) describes specific inputs that can be made through negotiation. Her result showed that the kinds of negotiation of meaning offer the learners chances to recognize language use in intensions conditions rather than only focus on understanding.

In this study, level proficiency plays a part that can influence the learner's language awareness in negotiating to mean. Level proficiency can give benefit learners in exchanging ideas and opinions during the interaction. In line with Yule & Macdonald (1990) in Watanabe & Swain (2008), they claim that groups with different proficiency levels in their participants can be successful in pair work and can change the interactive roles. Moreover, the learners who have more level proficiency need to negotiate less because they will face fewer communication breakdowns. Meanwhile, the learners who have less ability will neglect their errors in using language. Yet, both learners still possibly create mistakes during the conversation on a different level.

Since investigating language awareness and negotiation of meaning become the focus of study, the researcher provides research questions to help the readers understand this study. Does the researcher wonder about the language awareness of mistakes in the negotiation of meaning among students with different proficiency levels?

LITERATURE REVIEW

A mistake can occur during the negotiation of meaning, which showed by the users. Student's errors when using their language awareness involving classroom interaction include three aspects; grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation. Those mistakes proved when the students involved conversation with another conversation. Through classroom interaction, the interaction between teacher and students occurs in the classroom (Sari, 2005). Besides, Eriba & Achor (2010) state that business within the school can be called techniques consisting of objectives and systematic observation of the classroom activities to study teacher action and interaction within the classroom.

Meanwhile, classroom interaction is distinguished into two kinds; non-verbal interaction and verbal interaction (Ulrica et al., 2017). Nonverbal-verbal business can be defined as a behavioral response in the classroom by expressing head nodding, hand raising, body gestures, and eye contact. The verbal interaction contains written interaction and oral interaction. The classroom interaction's

success can happen when the students can speak appropriately in conversation to avoid misunderstanding in the classroom.

Language awareness can be defined as explicit knowledge about language, conscious perception and sensitivity in language learners, language teaching, and language use (Ulrica et al., 2017). It is also stated by Donmall (1997) that language awareness is a person's sensitivity to and conscious understanding of the nature of language and its role in human life. Language awareness can help the students become aware of their mistakes and remember these errors.

Meanwhile, negotiation of meaning occurred when addresses and addressees conducted the conversation exchanges to help themselves understand and be understood by their interlocutors (Yufrizal, 2007). In case, speaker and listener worked together to solve any potential misunderstanding or understanding that occurred. Shortreed (1993) in Yufrizal (2007) shows that although negotiation of meaning can be manifested in various ways and forms, the basic idea of negotiation is still the same. That is, it is a way to overcome potential communication breakdown.

RESEARCH METHODS

This research employed a case study. The model used by the researcher is qualitative descriptive. This study's participants are six college students with a different proficiency level in one of the University of Surabaya, which focused on English. Moreover, the researcher used several instruments to gain the data; observation and interview. Data collection is obtained by observing student's interactions during the exchange. The researcher also recorded and took notes and interviewed to describe student's language awareness in making mistakes in the negotiation of meaning by dividing them into three groups, which is classified based on student's English proficiency. The researcher employed interview for how depth the students were aware of the use of language.

RESULT

Researchers obtained data through observations made on student interactions. After that, the researcher summarized the data about the students who made a mistake during the exchange. Most of the errors occurred in the language component, such as grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary. According to the interview, students focused on meaning than the language components. They did not pay attention or aware of the language features.

Based on the research results, it is known that grammar is the component with the highest error rate found from observations and interviews, after which pronunciation and vocabulary.

Table 1. The Result of Language Aspect of student's Mistake

No	Pairs		Aspect of Language		
	High/Low	High/Low	Grammar	Pronunciation	Vocabulary
1.	High	High	High	Average	low
2.	Low	Low	Very High	High	High
3	High	Low	High	Average	Average

According to Riduan (2009) in Ulrica et al., (2017), these are the criteria of the mistakes that made by student; in range, 0%-20% was categorized very low, in 20%-40% was categorized average, 61%-80% is high level, and the last field 81%-100% is very high.

According to table 4.1, it can explain that students made mistakes in each language component and were not aware. Talk spontaneously became one reason the students were not aware of making mistakes and there were no correction mistakes from their interlocutor during the interaction. The students did not recognize if they have made mistakes and thought their interlocutor understood their utterances. Every pair has different criteria for making mistakes for each component, but all teams mostly made grammar mistakes. At the same time, pronunciation and vocabulary have various standards. In the interview section, the students said that they tend to focus on meanings rather than structures.

DISCUSSION

Grammar is one of the linguistic fields that the study contains of the language pattern, which how the language can go together. In this study, almost all participants made mistakes in choosing proper grammar (i.e., to be, verb) during an interaction. Every student has different characteristics in learning a second language, and their proficiency level can affect their individual development, such as grammatical sensitivity (Oel, 2016). The result showed that different levels of proficiency influence student's grammatical sensitivity and lack of awareness. If the students were unaware of using proper language structure and being clueless in correcting mistakes, it could be said. So, the pair which consists of high and high learners has high criteria in making mistakes. The next team (i.e., low-low students) has very high standards in making mistakes and the last pair (i.e., high-low students) has high criteria in making mistakes.

Moreover, pronunciation and vocabulary have various criteria in each pair and are displayed into different team standards. For accent, the requirements showed that students did average measures with high-level proficiency. Students who have low-level ability have more chances of making pronunciation mistakes. The students with high and low-level proficiency have intermediate pronunciation mistakes. The pronunciation is related to how the students produce understandable language when speaking (Ulrica et al., 2017). In this study, the students make

mistakes in pronunciation because of their first language. Almost all students have difficulties in pronouncing English words. Their words still sounded Indonesia. Many aspects of pronunciation influenced it, such as mother tongue interference, English phonology, English phonetics and learner's age (Zhang & Yin, 2009).

The last mistakes came from vocabulary and the data showed that each pair has different criteria in making vocabulary mistakes. According to table 4.1, students with high proficiency made common mistakes in using vocabulary while interacting. The next team (low-low students) were in high criteria in making vocabulary mistakes and lacking in remembering the speech list. And the last pair (high-low students) were in average criteria for making vocabulary mistakes during an interaction.

According to the result, the writer found that the second pair (low-low students) and third pair (high-low students) still used the wrong vocabulary. They always asked the teacher during interaction and even used their mother tongue to make conversation. The students did not chance to train their vocabulary than when they were asked to create a discussion and they often did not understand which proper language should be used. Besides it, their environment did not force them to practice their vocabulary. Furthermore, the researcher found that the students liked to use code-switching (i.e., English-Indonesia or Indonesia-English) when they forgot English vocabulary) during interaction. The students also used code-switching in using language because they wanted to ignore misunderstandings with their interlocutors during the conversation. Since they have the same mother tongue (L1), it will make them easier to speak English and they felt no pressure when they are saying in the form of their first language (Ur, 1996, in Khandari et al., 2019).

From all the explanation, the mistakes which produced by students did not interfere the students while maintaining the communication's flow. The students were concerned about expressing their ideas and used code-switching (i.e., English to Indonesia) to avoid misunderstanding during the conversation. So, whether the students have difficulties using grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary while expressing their message, they tended to use their mother tongue to help them make exact conversation (Ibarrola & Martinez, 2015). Since almost all the participant used their first language during the discussion were coded. Code-switching appeared in the interaction process when the students made mistakes, especially in grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary, helping students make clear conversations.

Code-switching can be said to change between two languages and is usually found in bilingual conversation. According to Musysken (1995) in Shay (2015), code-switching is usually faced in bilingual conversation. Bilingualism in this study related to the not English outputs when they produced those during the

conversation. Bilingualism was found when the participants did code-switching from their target language to their first language (Khandari et al., 2019).

CONCLUSION

The results showed that the students made various criteria in each language component while they made mistakes. Making grammar mistakes have a high up to a very high level in each pair and they still have a lack in realizing which should use proper grammar in the process of interaction. Next, the pronunciation component has various criteria in each pair; average (pair 1), high (pair 2), and average (pair 3). Those interpreted that students with low-level proficiency face more mistakes in using pronunciation during the interaction. The last component is vocabulary, as same as pronunciation. The vocabulary component has various criteria; low (pair 1), high (pair 2), and average (pair 3). For pair 2, the students were not aware of using proper vocabulary and often used code-switching to avoid misunderstanding. Besides those, their interlocutor did not correct those mistakes instead and they only focused on the meanings. The researcher only found in pair three, who consists of students with high and low proficiency levels, who are aware of correcting their interlocutor.

REFERENCES

- Bourke, J. M. (2008). A Rough Guide to Language Awareness. *English Teaching Forum*, 46(1), 12–21
- Carter, R. (2003). Language awareness. *ELT Journal*, 57(1), 64–65. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/57.1.64>
- Champakaew, W., & Pencingkarn, W. (2001). *The Effectiveness of Negotiation of Meaning Strategies on Developing Grammar Usage in Two-way Communication Tasks Wilawan Champakaew 1 Wanida Pencingkarn 2*. 3(1), 87–114
- Cook, J. (2015). Negotiation for Meaning and Feedback among Language Learners. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 6(2), 250. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0602.02>
- Gavidia, J. L. (2012). *Using Language Awareness Techniques to Improve The Level of Achievement in The English Skills of The Students Taking a Master Program in Education In A Private Jessy Lostaunau Gavidia*. Thesis. Universidad De Piura Facultad
- Ibarrola, A. L., & Martinez, R. A. (2015). Investigating Negotiation of Meaning in EFL Children with Very Low Levels of Proficiency. *International Journal of English Studies*, 15(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.6018/ijes/2015/1/203751>
- Khandari, A., Flora, & Sukirlan, M. (2019). *Investigating Learner's Negotiation of Meaning and Language Awareness Based on Learner's Level of Proficiency*. Thesis. Universitas Lampung
- Oel, M. Van. (2016). *Language Awareness in EFL Grammar Assignments*. Thesis. Radboud University

- Palma, G. (2014). A Classroom View of Negotiation of Meaning with EFL Adult Mexican Pupils. *SAGE Open*, 4(2), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244014535941>
- Perez, A. I. R. (2006). Implementing a Language Awareness Approach to Grammar Through Topics. *Global Shadows: Africa in the Neoliberal World Order*, 44(2), 1-30
- Pica, T., Holliday, L., Lewis, N., & Morgenthaler, L. (1989). Comprehensible output as an outcome of linguistic demands on the learner. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 11(1), 63–90. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S027226310000783X>
- Piper, D. (2003). Language Awareness in Nova Scotia Schools: An Exploratory Study. *Brock Education Journal*, 13(1), 61–71. <https://doi.org/10.26522/brocked.v13i1.44>
- Rahmi, M. M., & Erlinda, R. (2014). Developing Student's Language Awareness Through Discovery Learning in English Language Teaching. *Proceedings of ISELT FBS Universitas Negeri Padang*. Padang
- Saenz, D. M. C. (2016). *Exploring Language Awareness in EFL Second Graders*. Thesis. Universidad Distrital Francisco José De Caldas
- Shay, O. (2015). To Switch or Not to Switch: Code-switching in a Multilingual Country. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 209, 462–469. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.11.253>
- Tomlinson, B. (2013). Developing Materials for Language. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Society* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc
- Ulrica, F, Nainggolan, F., Mahpil, M. (2017). Student's Awareness of Mistakes in Negotiation of Meaning. *UNILA Journal of English Teaching*, 6(1)
- Watanabe, Y., & Swain, M. (2008). Perception of Learner Proficiency: Its Impact on the Interaction Between An ESL Learner and Her Higher and Lower Proficiency Partners. *Language Awareness*, 17(2), 115–130. <https://doi.org/10.2167/la432.0>
- Yufrizal, H. (2015). Negotiation of Meaning and Language Acquisition by Indonesia EFL Learners. *TEFLIN Journal*, 12(1), 60–87. <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v12i1/60-87>
- Zhang, F., & Yin, P. (2009). A Study of Pronunciation Problems of English Learners in China. *Asian Social Science*, 5(6), 141–146. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v5n6p141>