LLT Journal, e-ISSN 2579-9533, p-ISSN 1410-7201, Vol. 26, No. 1, April 2023, pp. 54-68

LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching
http://e-journal.usd.ac.id/index.php/LLT
Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

AN ANALYSIS OF THE NEGOTIATION OF MEANING AND FORM IN NATURAL EFL CLASSROOMS: A CASE STUDY AMONG PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS

Paulina Chandrasari Kusuma[1], Christina Eli Indriyani[2], and *Tia Xenia[3]
[1,2,3]Unika Atma Jaya, Indonesia
paulina.cs@atmajaya.ac.id[1], christina.eli@atmajaya.ac.id[2],
and tia.xenia@atmajaya.ac.id[3]
*correspondence: tia.xenia@atmajaya.ac.id
https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.v26i1.4799
received 22 June 2022; accepted 7 March 2023

Abstract
The present competence of language learners influences the process, particularly in modifying the input to ensure the exact level of comprehensibility they can manage. It involves the negotiation of meaning (NfM) and form (NfF). Teachers need to pay attention to how frequently both processes occur in classroom interaction and whether the teachers use this situation to enhance students' language acquisition. Thus, this study aims to seek information concerning the negotiation of meaning and form in the natural classroom setting involving student teachers in a practicum program. To reach the objective of this study, two research questions will address: (1) Do negotiation of meaning and form take place in student-teacher-student interaction in a natural EFL classroom setting? (2) How do the student-teachers use negotiation of meaning and form strategies in the EFL classroom? Mixed method research will be employed by analyzing the utterances and conducting interviews. The analysis of the study reveals that firstly, NfM and NfF are two common occurrences in the student-teacher interaction in the natural EFL classroom under study; secondly, the strategies used by both NfM and NfF covered the negotiation processes with various moves and Long's (1996) types of signals embracing confirmation check, clarification request, and comprehension check in certain circumstances. Eventually, this study brings profound implications in two areas, namely the design of a teacher training curriculum and the teaching pedagogy.

Keywords: EFL, EFL student teacher, negotiation of form, negotiation of meaning

Introduction
Successful communication between interlocutors involves a process of negotiating meaning as a strategy to achieve mutual interchangeability. In Second Language Acquisition (SLA) theory, negotiation of meaning appears as a process when "two or more interlocutors identify and then attempt to resolve a communication breakdown" (Ellis, 2003, p. 346). In a classroom setting, "Negotiation of meaning is generally defined as conversational modifications or adjustments taking place in interactions when learners and their interlocutors experience difficulty in understanding messages" (Hartono, 2017). Thus,

negotiation of meaning as one of the communication skills takes an essential role in successful classroom interaction and L2 acquisition (Bitchener, 2004).

The present competence of the language learners influences the negotiation process, particularly in modifying the input to ensure the exact level of comprehensibility learners can manage. Employing the notion of comprehensible input, Long (1996) argues that input can be more comprehensible through the NfM process. The negotiation involves modification and restructuring of interaction, the listener's request for message clarification and confirmation; then the speaker may repeat, elaborate, or simplify the message (Pica, 1994; Long, 1996). About the process above, the existence of input and negotiation can be seen in classroom interaction. Hence, negotiation of meaning can be promoted in an English classroom when the teacher constructs an interactive learning environment with appropriate communication tasks (Lengluan, 2008).

Seeing that NfM and NfF are interrelated, teachers need to pay attention to how often both processes take place in classroom interaction and whether the teachers make use of this situation to empower students' language acquisition. The problem is sometimes teachers forget that the negotiation process in learning a second language (L2) is as necessary as learning the first language. Another thing that might be arguable is "teacher-student interaction does not provide as favorable an environment for negotiation of meaning and form as does student-student interaction" (Shim, 2007). Negotiation in L2 classrooms may be due to the lack of strategy of the teachers to build the interaction or lead the NfM and NfF processes.

Studies on NfM and NfF have been conducted massively, but most of them focused only either on NfM or NfF. Shim (2007) conducted an analysis of NfM between an English teacher and students in face-to-face interaction and computer-mediated communication interaction. Utterances indicating the speaker had problems in comprehension constituted the primary analysis. Another study conducted by Hwang (2010) researched NfF across L2 proficiency levels. This study looked at the employment of negotiation about form by a pair of advanced English L2 users engaged in collaborative composition tasks and compared their negotiation with that of a beginner English L2 pair. It can be seen that research on the negotiation of meaning and form is frequently detached. Also, those studies that have been conducted in negotiation about meaning or form contexts have rarely dealt with the teachers and their proficiency. The previous studies have rarely asked the more difficult question of whether the teacher's and learners' negotiation about both meaning and form is conducive to L2 learning and whether the teacher has qualified proficiency in exploring this area. Therefore, the present study is conducted to provide insights into these unexplored areas with innovation. Instead of experienced teachers, pre-service teachers, or student teachers (the two terms will be used interchangeably in this research) would be appointed as the subjects of the present study due to measuring their capacity as teacher candidates and capability in interaction with the students.

As discussed above, the recent study attempts to seek information concerning the negotiation of meaning and form in the natural classroom setting involving student teachers in a practicum program. In particular, this study focuses on trifold issues as follows:

1. Identifying the occurrences of negotiation of meaning and negotiation of form in the context of a natural EFL classroom with student teachers during their teaching practicum
2. Investigating the strategies implemented by student teachers to induce negotiation of meaning and form in classroom interaction.

The result of this study is expected to give benefits, to at least, three parties, namely EFL students, EFL student teachers, and teacher educators. EFL students are expected to get a clearer understanding of classroom interactions and to increase their involvement in activities generating NfM and NfF valuable for their language acquisition. Meanwhile, this research could help student teachers develop their teaching competence relevant to the acts of NfM and NfF, which are considered influential for students learning. Eventually, it might enlighten teacher educators on techniques for managing class interaction provision for student teachers in their preparation for becoming EFL teachers.

To become a well-trained language teacher, the pre-service teacher must be competent in the four areas of teaching namely exhibiting attitudes to promote learning and genuine human relationships, commanding information on the topic to be taught, managing teaching skills to encourage student learning better, and commanding theoretical knowledge of learning and human behavior (Afalla & Fabelico, 2020). The last deals with, among others, knowledge in the field of Second Language Acquisition which comprises concepts of input, output, and interaction. Input and output are required to push learners in the development of the language system and communicative purpose which leads to interaction. Interactions, in particular, are generally manifested in the form of negotiation of meaning and negotiation of form which are believed to contribute significantly towards second/foreign language acquisition and learning through offering mutual understanding and solutions to communication problems. Thus, mastery of such a notion among pre-service teachers is obligatory.

Negotiation of meaning

Negotiation of Meaning (NfM) indirectly contributes to learners' language acquisition because it is perceived as a prominent process of learners' awareness toward the target language and the developmental process of learners' language proficiencies (Foster&Ohta, 2005). During the negotiation process, the learners are provided with sufficient input which is the target language. The learners get the opportunity to make comprehensible input and modify the output by receiving messages and producing words. Krashen (1985) supports that language acquisition is gained when language learners can process language-containing input slightly above their current level of comprehending the language itself so that they can increase their language developmental level. This is in line with Fuente (2002) as cited in Hartono (2017) who argues that promoting language acquisition through negotiation is necessary since the learners try to understand structures or words beyond their current level of competence and eventually incorporate their L2 production. Furthermore, the process of NfM comprises four interrelated moves proposed by Doughty (1996), as cited in Nakahama, Tyler, and Lier's study (2001), namely trigger, signal, response, and reaction. A trigger is "an utterance or part of an utterance that is not understood" (Doughty, 1986, p. 48). It can be in a form of a

lexical item, phonetic error, language complexity, or task complexity. A lack of comprehension can be seen from a signal. It is identified with the confirmation check, comprehension check, or clarification request. Then, when the interlocutors try to follow up and repair the problematic utterances, it is mentioned as a response. It covers repetition, expansion, reformulation, or even the use of the first language (L1). The final process is a reaction in which it is a response to the repair like exclamation, non-verbal, or correction. Within the NfM, there are also possibilities of communication breakdown triggered by something incomprehensible in which the learners recognize an inadequate linguistic rule system (Mackey et al, 2000 & Lier et al, 2001).

Negotiation of form

As a part of communication, the negotiation of meaning is highly related to the Negotiation of Form (NfF). Long (1991) characterizes this term as "an instructional treatment that overtly draws students' attention to linguistic elements as they arise incidentally in lessons whose overriding focus is on meaning or communication" (pp. 45-46). Through NfF, students notice the utterances they produce and build their awareness when the interaction happens. To improve the accuracy of students' output, teachers can make use of four interactional moves proposed by Lyster and Ranta (1997); those are clarification requests, repetition of error, metalinguistic clues, and elicitation. Those interactional moves focus on form aiming for both accuracy and mutual comprehension (Lyster, 2002, p. 243).

For an in-depth exploration of the meaning and form of negotiation processes, the signal is specified in the instructional structure as the relevant parameter. The instructional structure of conversation (Long, 1983) includes three features as the strategies for negotiating meaning and form such as comprehension checks, clarification requests, and confirmation checks. Comprehension checks are made to establish whether the utterance(s) has been understood. This process is usually formed by tag questions, repetition, and any expressions to check comprehension. Confirmation checks are designed to ask for confirmation to ensure whether or not the preceding utterance(s) is understood or heard correctly. Last, clarification requests are used to clarify what is uttered. Eliciting clarification might be indicated by the expressions like "I don't understand," but not limited to WH-questions, yes/no questions, and tag questions.

Method

To reach the objectives, mixed-method research will be employed. Mixed-method research was adopted in this study since this study will look for the involvement of the participants in data collection and seek to build rapport and credibility with the individuals (Creswell, 2003). Quantitative research will be employed to answer the first research question aiming at seeking the identification of the occurrences of negotiation of meaning and negotiation of form. Meanwhile, the answers to the second and third research questions which deal with strategy investigation and pedagogical implications will be qualitative research.

The participants of this study are twenty student-teachers of the English Language Education Department at the Atma Jaya Catholic University of Indonesia. They had taken a Microteaching course and were equipped with pedagogical theories and skills. Passing this course, they were required to have an internship

program embedded in the Teaching Practicum course in several partnering schools in some areas of Jakarta. During their practicum, these student teachers are to conduct English lessons in previously assigned classes. For individual teaching reflection and performance evaluation, their teaching act is video recorded.

To answer the first and second research questions, the utterances of student-teacher interactions during the English course serve as the data gained from the transcribed teaching videos. The data are obtained from each participant's two teaching videos intentionally selected from their last two teaching performances (out of their eight videos). The selection of the last two videos is based on the supposition that student teachers' final performances may provide the best and near-real teaching proficiency they have developed through the practice feedback-reflection stages they have undergone during the practicum sessions.

The research instrument is a table covering the negotiation process taken from Doughty (1996) and three negotiation strategies proposed by Long (1983). The table consists of three columns. The first column is the negotiation process containing Trigger, Signal, Response, and Reaction. The second column is the utterances of the interactions containing the strategies such as confirmation check, clarification request, and comprehension check. The other one contains the number of occurrences.

The data are collected in six months. The videos are collected from the participants as a part of their report after they conducted the internship program. Subsequently, the videos are transcribed and analyzed. After the data are analyzed, the questionnaire will be distributed to all the participants. The data are directly gathered in the form of written responses. The utterances from the transcribed videos are classified based on the negotiation of meaning strategies and put into the table. The tally is used to see the occurrences. The frequency of the occurrences is counted based on the tally and converted into a percentage. Based on each strategy, the collected utterances will be analyzed to find out how the participants use the strategy. To analyze the questionnaire, the responses are categorized to see the challenges of each strategy.

Findings and Discussion

The occurrences of NFM & NFF

Responding to the first issue investigated in this research which inquires about the occurrence of negotiation of meaning (NfM) and negotiation of the form (NfF), the data show that in the context of the study, i.e EFL natural classrooms, NfM and NfF take place during the classroom interactions, involving student(s) and their in-training teacher. This, somehow, shows that the two phenomena may take place not only in deliberately set-up teaching contexts but also in normal classroom situations. Partly, this finding also helps answer a question of some researchers in the area of second language acquisition concerning the possibility of language interaction analysis in less controlled conditions which is out of the SLA research tradition (Foster, 1998).

From the transcription of the thirty-five (35) teaching recordings, there were identified seventy-three (73) circumstances of negotiation of classroom discourse. Table 1 below specifically displays the frequency of occurrence between the two. The difference in frequency is illustrated lucidly by the figures in the table. Negotiation of meaning outnumbers negotiation of form occurrences with 52

incidences or 71.23 % of the total discourse, whereas negotiation of form only reaches 21 incidences or approximately 28.77%. It means that students and the (pre-service) teachers in the classrooms engage in the interactions for the meaning of negotiation purpose more than in one(s) for form negotiation. Three arguments supporting the recent research findings embrace: firstly, negotiation of meaning is wider in its coverage of the area requiring negotiation or comprehensible input. In the present study, negotiation of meaning occurs when students encounter new vocabulary and when students ask for vocabulary meaning to reach a clear understanding of each other and/or mutual interchangeability. Secondly, negotiation of meaning results from teachers' instructions which are not considered comprehensive or which are indeed unclear. Thus, it yields negotiation and requests from the students to the teacher to settle the hurdles. The last argument may relate to the fact that the occurrence of negotiation of form is limited to the context of grammar teaching and learning or in other circumstances where students 'notice' certain unknown form(s) or grammatical item(s). The aforementioned assertions are in alignment with Pica (1987) and Richards and Schimidt (2002) who propound that negotiation of meaning will take place in a condition where a listener's signals to the speaker's message are not clear and followed by the speaker and listener's work on linguistic resolution over the impasse.

Table 1. The occurrences of negotiation types occurred in classroom discourse

Negotiation of Classroom Discourse	**Frequency**	**Percentage (%)**
Negotiation of Meaning	52	71.23
Negotiation of Form	21	28.77
Total	73	100

Table 2. The occurrences of Negotiation of Meaning (NfM)

Process	Signal							
	Confirm-ation	%	Clarifi-cation	%	Compre-hension	%	Total	%
T-S	1	6.67	2	9.09	11	73.33	14	26.92
T-S-Re	8	53.3	13	59.09	2	13.33	23	44.23
T-S-Re-Ra	4	26.67	6	27.27	2	13.33	12	23.08
T-S-Re-Re	2	13.33	1	4.55	0	0	3	5.77
Total	15	28.85	22	42.3	15	28.85	52	100

The quantity of NfM and NfF has also become the concern of this study because it makes the teachers realize how the interactions last and recognize the gap in students' language competencies. Table 2 presents the number of occurrences of NfM in the EFL classroom. It shows that all moves of the negotiation

process appeared in student-teacher interactions. The processes consist of Trigger (T), Signal (S), Response (Re), and Reaction (Ra). However, in some conditions, the process did not cover the interrelated moves which evoke curiosity if the target is achieved. The finding of the analysis shows that the most frequently used process in the interaction is TSRe at 44.23%. The other processes include T-S, T-S-Re-Ra, and T-S-Re-Re reaching much smaller occurrences. T-S, which was the second most frequently employed in student-teacher interaction, brought in 26.92 % of overall negotiation processes. This was followed by T-S-Re-Ra at 23.08%. Those processes appeared in all signals namely clarification request, confirmation check, and comprehension check. Different from the moves mentioned above, T-S-Re-Re was only found three times in the entire process that existed only in certain signals like confirmation checks and clarification requests.

In addition to the process of negotiation, it could be interpreted that in each process the utterances show different types of signals. From the utterances, clarification dominated by the T-S-Re process gained the most number of signals, at 42.3%. Meanwhile, confirmation and comprehension shared a similar number of frequencies of 28.85%. Eight (8) confirmation signals dominated T-S-Re processes and eleven (11) comprehension signals occurred in T-S. Interestingly, both confirmation and clarification were dominated by the T-S-Re process, whereas comprehension was dominated by T-S in which the process ended with the teacher's explanation without any response from the students. The teacher did not make sure whether the explanation was understood.

Table 3. The occurrences of Negotiation f Form (NfF)

Process	Signal							
	Con-firm-ation	%	Clarifi-cation	%	Compre-hension	%	Total	%
T-S	2	12.5	0		2	66.67	4	19.05
S	1	6.25	0		0	0	1	4.76
T-S-Re	6	37.5	2	100	0	0	8	38.1
T-S-Re-Ra	6	37.5	0		1	33.33	7	33.33
S-Re	1	6.25	0		0	0	1	4.76
Total	16	76.19	2	9.52	3	14.29	21	100

Concerning the occurrences of NfF, the study figures out the findings related to each process and signals in the utterances. The classroom teacher-student interactions produced five (5) types of moves covering T-S-Re, T-S-Re-Ra, T-S, S, and S-Re. The frequency of T-S-Re and T-S-Re-Ra was not significantly different. T-S-Re gained 38.1 % and 33.33%, respectively. It is evident from table 3 that T-S-Re and T-S-Re-Ra achieved far higher than the other three processes in which the quantity even did not reach 20% of all occurrences. T-S only reached 19.05%, while S and S-Re shared the same proportions at 4.76%. It can be seen from the table that

the interactions tend to be dominated by the processes that have complete moves or at least three moves. The other three lowest occurrences contained only one or two moves, and the interactions did not always start from Trigger.

As found in NfM, the negotiation process of form also covered the three types of signals: confirmation check, clarification request, and comprehension check. Among those signals, the confirmation check accounted for the most occurred negotiation process as the percentage was the highest at 76.19%. It was significantly different from the occurrences of the other two signals. The comprehension check and clarification request only appeared three times (14.29%) and twice (9.52%), making the gap among signals employed in the interactions widen significantly. The confirmation check took place in all processes, while the comprehension check only appeared in T-S and T-S-Re-Ra. The least frequency of signal showed that the clarification request belonged to T-S-Re.

The implementation of negotiation strategies

To answer the second research question of this recent study, the analysis of the data seeks to obtain information on the implementation of classroom negotiation discourses both for meaning and form purposes. The following sections subsequently discuss each type of negotiation in a more detailed way.

Negotiation of meaning in a language classroom situation refers to an occurrence where interlocutors, in this case, student(s) and or teacher, conduct interactional work to arrive at mutual understanding when there is a communication problem during the instructional activity. Inherent in the negotiation of meaning phase, are a pair of crucial elements, i.e. the process of NfM itself and the signal. This research data analysis reveals that both process and signal characterize the negotiation of meaning in the student teachers' EFL classes. It is further explored that in the process of their NfM, the majority of teachers and students in the study go through the trigger (T), signal (S), response (Re), and reaction (Ra) stages, which generally compose the NfM process. Interestingly, these four moves do not appear in a constant sequence and frequency, but there are variations in the order and the kind. A couple of examples of this 'irregularity' of sequence consist of T-S and T-S-Re (see the examples taken from the EFL class interactions below). Additionally, triggers that usually appear as an initial stage in NfM are not all initiated by the teachers, but occasionally by the students.

<u>*Example 1*</u>

Teacher: Based on this definition, *do you think that the photo and the caption should complement each other?* (T)
Student: Yes.
Teacher: And why do you think so?
Student: *Should what?* (S)
Teacher: Complement each other. Complement itu saling melengkapi. Why? (Re)

<u>*Example 2*</u>

Student: Saturday or Wednesday? (T)
Teacher: Saturday *itu*.
Student: Wednesday *itu apa*? (What is Wednesday?) (S)
Teacher: *gasps* *Lho?*

Example 1 shows that the process of NfM embodies three moves, i.e trigger (T), signal (S), and response (Re). The trigger produced by the teacher results in a student's signal for negotiation of meaning which is subsequently followed by a response from the teacher. Nevertheless, the teacher's response does not seem to generate any reactions from the students. Meanwhile, the situation illustrated by Example 2 demonstrates a briefer route of NfM, in which the process merely embraces a trigger produced by the students and a signal.

Similar to the process of negotiation in NfM, the data analysis demonstrates that the entire types of signal (clarification request, confirmation check, and comprehension check) mark the interaction for meaning negotiation with the dominance of the classification request category. The variety of signals that appeared in the interlocutors' speech denotes that the speakers take them as communication strategies to resolve a lack of understanding or communication problems. Moreover, they display that speech modification occurs during social interaction in EFL classroom contexts. This supports Doughty and Pica (1985) who claim that foreign or second language learners tend to employ different strategies in the negotiation of meaning during the interaction. The instances of clarification request, confirmation check, and comprehension check in the negotiation of meaning are as follows:

Clarification request examples
Example 3
T: For example, Henry, do you like using iPhone? And you answered me not only you like using iPhone, but you also like using Android. Do you get it?
S: *Repeat it again, miss.*

Example 4
T: This one is easy.
S: Orientation. *Apa bedanya sama yang atas?* (What's the difference with the above?)
T: Actually, these are two different facts. *Ini tanggal lahirnya, ini tempat lahirnya*. But those two are orientation

Confirmation check examples
Example 5
S: Want to show.
T: *Show what?*
S: His test

Example 6
T: You can act it out with words but without the word itself.
S: *Using the word?*
T: Expressing the word!

Comprehension check examples
Example 7
Students : Barely *itu kayak*…
Teacher : I barely earn enough.

Students : Minimum. *Pas pasan.*
Teacher : Barely *itu* almost not, *sama* kayak hardly. *Jadi* hardly *bukan dengan keras yah.* Hardly itu, hardly, barely *artinya* almost not. *Jadi kalo ada* I barely earn enough, *artinya* I almost do not earn enough. ...

Example 8
Student: Sir, *itu artinya apa?* I *nggak ngerti*. *Yang contohnya* "I either like cats or dogs".
Teacher: This is just an example kan. That means I will only like one of the two. *Jadi saya suka kalau nggak anjing, kucing. Antara anjing atau kucing*.

The investigation of the form negotiation strategies includes the process of negotiation and the signals used in the interactions since both are interrelated in achieving the targeted meaning. Based on the analysis of the utterances, it can be seen that the complete process covers the four moves; Trigger (T), Signal (S), Response (Re), and Reaction (Ra). An example of this process is as follows.

Example 9
Student : He had joined. (T)
Teacher : He had joined, he joins or he joined? (S)
Student : He joins. (Re)
Teacher : He joins the opera club. (Ra)

This finding is in line with Doughty's and Pica's (1986) proposal on the negotiation sequence. They, in this regard, incorporate a trigger, a signal, a response, and a reaction opportunity for the learners to process utterances in the foreign language which become more comprehensible. Nevertheless, not all interactions contained those four moves and were begun with Trigger. There were different sequences with incomplete moves that might exist in the negotiation. The following examples demonstrate those various sequences.

Example 10
Student : We can go camping. (T)
Teacher : We can go *ato* we could go? (S)
Student : We could go. (Re)

Example 11
Student : She did not give up. (T)
Teacher : She had not given up or She didn't give up. (S)

Example 12
Student : Zero conditional can use will, right? (S)
Teacher : Depends, whether it is a fact or not. (Re)

Example 13
Teacher : The iceberg or icebergs. (S)

As stated in section A, T-S-Re became the most dominant occurrence which mostly appeared when the students conveyed a sentence containing inappropriate tense and then the teacher tried to confirm or clarify it. The process can be seen in Example 10. The lack of this interaction was the teacher did not give reinforcement toward what students had responded. Thus, this situation evoked curiosity if the student's answer was already correct or not. Similarly, example 11 represents an incomplete process of negotiation. The difference between examples 10 and 11 was pointed out in the existence of Reaction following the Signal. The reaction was unavailable in example 11, so the interaction did not reach the ultimate goal which is understanding form. In this situation, there were neither correct answers nor further questions generated by the teacher and the students. These insights are likely perceived as a direct consequence of using optional information in natural circumstances (Palma, 2014) and students' different language competencies or socio-cultural backgrounds.

Observing the phenomena of how the negotiation is formed, it can be seen that the Signal move always took place in the interactions as the stage following Trigger or as the initial stage. It is proved in examples 9-13. For example, 9-11 Signal was preceded by Trigger which is considered a common negotiation process. On the contrary, examples 12-13 showed Signal came in the first place and ended with Response or remained nothing. Although it did not employ Trigger in the beginning, Signal in this situation appeared after several interruptions which made the Trigger and Signal not directly connected. Furthermore, the Signal might also be initiated by the student or teacher depending on the individual who needs clarification or confirmation of the targeted language features.

To operationalize signals, Long's (1983) confirmation check, clarification request, and comprehension check are discovered in this study. It was found that the participants, mostly student-teachers, used those three types of input modification as NfF strategies in performing the gap in students' comprehension of certain linguistic features. Moreover, the students benefited through this process in terms of making comprehensible input. Among those three strategies, the confirmation check was majority utilized by the teacher because of its existence in almost all types of formed processes. In contrast, Clarification Request was adopted only in certain types of processes and Comprehension Check as well. Clarification Request was found only in T-S-Re, while Comprehension Check was in T-S and T-S-Re-Ra. The confirmation check in NfF is illustrated in the following excerpts:

Example 14

Teacher : If it didn't rain the whole day, we…	
Students : We can go camping.	(T)
Teacher : We can go or we could go?	(S)
Students : We could go.	(Re)

Example 15

S: Oh! Jona and…	(T)
T: Both Jona and…	(S)
S: Both Jona and… Nico, they are boys.	(Re)
T: Both Jona and Nico are boys.	(Ra)

Both examples 14 and 15 have similarities with the initiator of the confirmation check. In example 14, the teacher raised a question to measure students' comprehension of the appropriately used grammar in the sentence. Meanwhile, in example 15, the teacher repeated the initial part of the sentence and then the conversational activity provided the students with opportunities to produce utterances by creating a sentence using suitable phrases. Interestingly, both examples show different styles on the confirmation check like question and repetition which were still acceptable. The two styles, therefore, benefited to trigger further communication and encourage students to talk (Masrizal, 2014).

Another type of Signal utilized in the NfF is clarification requests which were only found in the T-S-Re process. When the student mentioned a specific term like 'participle', the teacher asked for clarification about the meaning. However, the clarification was delivered in Indonesian which had not been obvious the teacher's intention to switch the language. Eventually, the conversation was ended by the student's response. The excerpt is presented below.

Example 16

Student : Par-ti-ci-ple. (T)
Teacher : *Apa itu?* (S)
Student : Verb three (Re)

Following the two previous Signals that occurred during the negotiation process, the comprehension check was revealed only in a few interactions; 2 were in the T-S process one was in the T-S-Re-Ra process. One of the comprehension check extracts is provided as follows.

Example 17

Student : Would took.. (T)
Teacher : Would take, would *ga boleh pake* took *lagi*. (S)
Would take our parents out more often. And what about number 2?

The conversation began by mentioning the phrase 'would took' which was considered a Trigger. The Trigger showed the student's incomprehension about morphological items so that the interlocutor, in this situation was the teacher, recognized it and then tried to fill the gap by giving the Signal of how the sentence should be constructed. Unfortunately, there were neither responses nor reactions following the conversation to express a better understanding of the discussed features.

The findings of the present study indicate that NfM and NfF appeared in natural EFL classroom discourse. Although it appears naturally, the process of negotiation meaning and form becomes an important indicator to pursue comprehensive communication in foreign language learning. Concerning the importance of NfM and NfF as communication strategies, two pedagogical implications are proposed. First, EFL student teachers are necessary to raise their awareness of the importance of employing NfM and NfF in classroom interaction to ensure comprehension which leads to foreign language acquisition. Second, it is best to design a teacher training curriculum that allows the teacher candidates to acquire and practice the techniques and strategies that generate the acts of NfM and

NfF. This is possible by integrating overtly the theories of NfM and NfF techniques/strategies and their implementation in several teaching subject courses, such as language teaching methodology, classroom-interaction as well as micro-teaching.

Conclusion

This study confirms that the natural classroom interactions generated the possibility for the interactants to negotiate in exchanging information without selecting certain activities or tasks. When engaged in the teaching-learning activities in the classroom, they included the use of Trigger (T), Signal (S), Response (Re), and Reaction (Ra) with various moves. Although those existed in the employed process of negotiating meaning and form, the utterances did not always adopt a complete move. For instance, T-S-Re, consisting only of trigger, signal, and ended in response, appeared to be the most used process in negotiating meaning and form. Interestingly, not only were the processes incomplete moves but in Negotiation of Form, they did not always start from Trigger. Inside the signal process, to achieve mutual interchangeability, the interactants employed the confirmation check, the clarification request, and the comprehension check to negotiate meaning and form. However, both negotiations shared the different most used signals. In negotiating to mean, both the students and the teacher mostly tended to ask for clarification, while in negotiating form, checking confirmation became the most frequently used.

The current research revealed that in natural classroom interactions, the process of negotiation appeared in certain circumstances. In the negotiation of meaning, the interactants tended to use strategies to make meaning comprehensible. Besides, the instructions given by the teacher were not clear became the circumstance where this negotiation strategy appeared. Another factor contributing to the occurrences of NfM has something to do with the student's language proficiency, specifically vocabulary mastery which might bring communication breakdowns. On the contrary, in the negotiation of form, this communication strategy was employed by the interactants when they were dealing with the accuracy and the precision of the language forms to make meaning and forms interrelated. Moreover, this strategy appeared the most when the teacher and the students dealt with sentence forms and certain tenses without interrupting the flow of communication.

The negotiation of meaning and form sequences appearing in the interactions shows the involvement of students and teachers in the conversations. The more the sequences appeared, the more the interactants were engaged in. This process of negotiation involves the modifications of output that result not only in mutual understanding but also in students' language acquisition in which they can modify their performances. Therefore, the student teachers must raise their awareness of the importance of employing NfM and NfF in classroom interactions and practice the techniques and strategies that generate NfM and NfF. The teaching subject courses must be able to equip the students with this awareness and the skills to trigger the negotiation to happen through language teaching methodology, classroom interaction, and micro-teaching. Since studies on NfM and NfF within a more natural setting are still small, this study suggests similar future research on

the fields, especially those which involve larger populations and more various activities.

References

Afalla, B. T., & Fabelico, F. L. (2020). Pre-service teachers' pedagogical competence and teaching efficiency. *Journal of Critical Reviews, 7*(11), 223-228.

Bitchener, J. (2004). The relationship between the negotiation of meaning and language learning: A longitudinal study. *Language Awareness, 13*(2), 81-95. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658410408667088

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and method approach*. California: Sage Publication, Inc.

Doughty, C., & Pica, T. (1986). "Information-gap" tasks: Do they facilitate second language acquisition? *TESOL Quarterly*, *20*(2), 305-326.

Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Foster, P. (1998). A classroom perspective on the negotiation of meaning. *Applied Linguistics, 19*(1), 1-23. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/19.1.1

Foster, P., & Ofta, A. S. (2005). Negotiation for meaning and peer assistance in second language classrooms. *Applied Linguistics, 26*(3), 402-430.

Hartono, R. (2017). A critical review of research on negotiation of meaning in second language learning. *Global Expert Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra, 6*(1), 1-7. http://dx.doi.org/10.36982/jge.v6i1.257

Hwang, J. (2010). Negotiation about form across L2 proficiency levels and its role in second language learning. *English Teaching*, *65*(2), 47-73.

Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. London: Longman.

Lengluan, N. (2008). *An analysis of conversational exchanges between grade 12 Thai students and native English speakers via a chat program: Strategies of negotiation for meanings*. Bangkok: Graduate School, Srinakharinwirot University.

Lier, L., Nakahama, Y., & Tyler, A. (2001). Negotiation of meaning in conversational and gap information activity: A comparative discourse analysis. *TESOL Quarterly, 35*(3), 377-405. https://doi.org/10.2307/3588028

Long, M. H. (1983). Native speaker/nonnative speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input. *Applied Linguistics, 4*(2), 126-41. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/4.2.126

Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W.C. Ritchie & T.K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition*, (pp. 413-468). New York: Academic Press. Lyster, R., & L. Ranta. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19*(1), 37-66. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034

Lyster, R. (2002). Negotiation in immersion teacher-student interaction. *International Journal of Educational Research, 37*(3-4), 237–253. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-0355(03)00003-X

Mackey, A., Gass, S., & McDonough, K. (2000). How do learners perceive interactional feedback? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 22*(4), 471–497.

Masrizal, M. (2014). The role of negotiation of meaning in L2 interactions: An analysis from perspective of Long's interaction hypothesis. *Studies in English Language and Education*, *1*(2), 96-105. https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v1i2.1829.

Nakahama, Y., Tyler, A., & Lier, L.V. (2001). Negotiation of meaning in conversational and information gap activities: A comparative discourse analysis. *TESOL Quarterly, 35*(3), 377-405.

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

Pica, T., & Doughty, C. (1985). Input and interaction in the communicative classroom: A comparison of teacher-fronted and group activities. In S. M. Gass & C.G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in the second language acquisition*. Rowley: Newbury House.

Pica, T. (1987). Second-language acquisition, social interaction, and the classroom. *Applied Linguistics*, *8*(1), 3-21. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/8.1.3

Pica, T. (1994). Research on negotiation: What does it reveal about second language learning conditions, processes, and outcomes? *Language Learning, 44*(3), 493-527. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1994.tb01115.x

Richard, J.C., & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics* (3rd ed.). Malaysia: Pearson Education Limited.

Shim, Y. (2007). Negotiation of meaning between an L2 teacher and students in face-to-face interaction and CMC. *English Teaching, 62*(3), 265-288.