

NEGOTIATION OF MEANING IN THE ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSROOM INTERACTION

Martinus Lafu Salu⁴

ABSTRACT

Studi ini difokuskan pada negosiasi makna di dalam bahasa Inggris sebagai interaksi kelas bahasa asing. Dua pertanyaan penelitiannya adalah: 1) Tipe-tipe transaksi, pertukaran, perpindahan dan tindakan apakah yang terjadi pada negosiasi makna dalam bahasa Inggris sebagai sebuah Interaksi Kelas Bahasa Asing antara dosen dan mahasiswa? 2) Sampai pada tingkatan apakah dosen dan mahasiswa memerankan peranan di dalam proses negosiasi makna dalam bahasa Inggris sebagai sebuah Interaksi Kelas Bahasa Asing? Penelitian ini menggunakan metode kualitatif-deskriptif. Subjek studi ini adalah dosen dan mahasiswa semester enam pada Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris pada kelas Metodologi Penelitian. Analisis ini pada dasarnya didasarkan pada analisis wacana kelas yang diajukan oleh Sinclair dan Coulthard dengan sistem yang disebut: transaksi, pertukaran, perpindahan, dan tindakan. Hasil dari studi ini menunjukkan bahwa (a) tiga tipe transaksi pokok yang terjadi pada wacana kelas EFL adalah: 1) melaporkan transaksi sebanyak 44 kali (45,36%), 2) memunculkan transaksi sebanyak 35 kali (35,05 %), dan 3) mengarahkan transaksi sebanyak 19 kali (19,59 %). (b) Tipe-tipe pertukaran yang terjadi pada wacana kelas EFL meliputi 14 jenis pertukaran, yang terjadi sebanyak 128 kali, tetapi yang paling sering terjadi adalah membatasi (boundary), yaitu sebanyak 51 kali (39,84 %) dari keseluruhan kejadian pertukaran, sedangkan memperkuat (reinforce) dan menerima (accept) menempati posisi terendah, yaitu satu kali (0,78 %) dari keseluruhan kejadian pertukaran. (c) Tipe-tipe perpindahan yang terjadi pada wacana kelas EFL di dalam kelas Metode Penelitian adalah: 1) Perpindahan Awal (pembukaan) terjadi sebanyak 36 kali (37,5 %), 2) Perpindahan Respon (memberikan jawaban) terjadi sebanyak 34 kali (35,42 %), dan Perpindahan Umpan-balik (tindak lanjut) terjadi sebanyak 26 kali (27,08 %). (d) Pada tipe-tipe tindakan yang terjadi pada wacana kelas EFL, terdapat 22 jenis tindakan yang terjadi, sebanyak 1.106 kali, tetapi yang paling sering terjadi adalah yang membenarkan (acknowledge), yaitu sebanyak 238 kali (21,52 %) dari seluruh kejadian tindakan, sementara memeriksa (check) menempati posisi terendah yaitu 3 kali (0,27 %) dari seluruh kejadian tindakan. Peran dosen dan mahasiswa di dalam proses negosiasi makna antara lain: 1) proses ritual yang dilakukan oleh dosen, sebanyak 8 kali (53,33 %), proses ritual yang dilakukan oleh mahasiswa, sebanyak 7 kali (46,67 %); sementara ritual negosiasi yang dilakukan sebanyak 12 kali dibagi ke dalam Data I sebanyak 6 kali atau 50 % dan Data II sebanyak 6 kali atau 50 % pula. Diharapkan bahwa hasil dari studi ini akan memberikan informasi kepada para dosen bahasa Inggris di Indonesia sebagai konteks EFL mengenai beberapa strategi yang dapat digunakan untuk mengoptimalkan makna negosiasi antara dosen dan mahasiswa di dalam wacana kelas. Partisipasi mahasiswa di dalam wacana kelas EFL tergantung kepada bagaimana dosen menciptakan situasi, dengan menggunakan metode-metode yang tepat, karakteristik mahasiswa, serta alat-alat instruksi pilihan serta tidak didominasi oleh dosen.

Kata Kunci: Wacana Kelas, Negosiasi Makna, Interaksi Kelas, Bahasa Inggris sebagai Bahasa Asing, Metodologi Penelitian

⁴ Dosen S1 Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, FKIP, Universitas Timor

I. INTRODUCTION

Talking about of discourse analysis has played a vital role in the modern theory of linguistics. Until now it has drawn many investigations and discussions in the area of foreign language context. Classroom discourse analysis has been a major theme in much research like linguistic, applied linguistic and educational for some years now. In this area, classroom discourse deals with the communication between lecturer and students in foreign language classroom interaction setting.

Many experts studies focus on the classroom interactions which involve meaning negotiation, conversational interaction and classroom discourse in teaching and learning activity. Sometimes they did not realize the different of classroom interaction and classroom discourse. Those researchers are working within classroom discourse with a focus on the meaning negotiation between the learners and their interlocutors. Hartono (2003) in her classroom discourse research about native-non native teachers' negotiation rituals implementate of Sinclair and Coulthard Analysis. Her focus analysis just only one part of the five elements of Sinclair and Coulthard Analysis namely exchange especially the IRF patterns. Considering the importance of meaning negotiation in classroom discourse to facilitate foreign language learning, I believe that language lecturers and researchers still need to conduct more studies about classroom discourse.

The analysis of classroom discourse is a very important form which classroom process research has taken. The present study focuses on college English classroom discourse. Through a detailed description and analysis of the collected data by referring to Sinclair and Coulthard's classroom discourse analysis model, the problem of patterns of the classroom discourse is made clear and on the basis of which a few strategies for college English teachers are put forward by the researcher in order to improve college English teaching and learning.

The Discourse Analysis model (DA), also known as the *Birmingham model* or, at the level of exchange, the Initiation-Response-Follow-up structure (IFR), was developed by Sinclair and Coulthard from research concerning the structural description of discourse found in the classroom. Since its original description in 1975, it has evolved and expanded to allow the application of less structured discourse, through the works of Coulthard and Montgomery (1981), Sinclair and Brazil (1982), and Sinclair and Coulthard (1992).

Historically, the early implementation of Sinclair and Coulthard model is for the level children of first language. The next development of the model is to implementation for the second language situation. The resent research implement to the foreign language situation. It is very interested because from the early implementation model, Sinclair and Coulthard realize that the model could be developed in the other situation like foreign language situation, the larger classes or the university learners' level. The model itself helps the teacher and students for realize their activity in classroom setting how to make dynamic of classroom interaction. These some perspectives arise my curiosity to conduct a research.

Meaning negotiation is the one important strategy to overcome the classroom discourse problems. Classroom Discourse Analysis as the part of Discourse Analysis subject helps English lecturer and students in understanding how real people use real language, as opposed to studying artificially created sentences. It is therefore of immediate interest to English language lecturers because we need to consider how

people use language when we design materials, or when we engage learners in exercises and activities aimed at making them proficient users of their target language, or when we evaluate a piece of commercially published material before deciding to use it. Lack of promoting about teaching classroom discourse at university levels leads many students and lecturers to have not understanding the role of social interaction of a language teaching to help student success in their studies.

In this research, researcher want to know about 1) Pointing at of transaction, exchange, move and act that occur in foreign language lecturer - students' meaning negotiation in the English as a Foreign Language Classroom Intraction; and 2) Finding out how the lecturer and students play roles in the process of meaning negotiation in the English as a Foreign Language Classroom Intraction.

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A. Meaning Negotiation of English as a Foreign Language and it is Application in Classroom Discourse

Meaning negotiation can help accomplish a great deal for second language acquisition by enabling learners modify their own output, and by providing opportunities for them to access second language form and meaning. Cclassrooms interaction can help monitor students by interacting with their teacher and communicating their immediate problems through interaction with their teachers of their peers. Interaction in the class time is important because students can take these opportunities to develop their language ability. Moreover, students have opportunities to speak as the real life situation in classroom setting and they can exchange their ideas and negotiate their meaning of speech.

Classroom discourse analysis helps us in understanding how real people real use real language as opposed to studying artificially created sentences. It is therefore of immediate interest to language teachers because we need to consider how people use language when we design teaching materials, or when we engage learners in exercises and activities aimed at making them proficiency users of target language, or when we evaluate a piece commercially published material before deciding to use it (McCarthy, 2002).

Walsh (2006) in his book 'Investigating Classroom Discourse' shows that there are three kinds of approaches to investigating L2 classroom interaction namely: *interaction analysis approaches*, *discourse analysis approaches* and *conversational analysis*. Further, Wallace (1978) shows that observation instruments are divided according to whether they are *system-based* or *ad hoc*. There are some models of system-based namely: Bellack *et al.* (1966), Flanders (1970), Moskowitz (1971), Frohlich *et al.* (1985), Spada and Fröhlich (1995). There are one kind of ad hoc system namely, SETT model.

Perhaps the earliest and most well- known proponents of a DA approach to classroom interaction are *Sinclair and Coulthard (1975)* who, following a structural-functional linguistic route to analysis, compiled a list of 22 speech acts representing the verbal behaviors of both teachers and students participating in primary classroom communication. The outcome is the development of a descriptive system incorporating a discourse hierarchy: *Lesson, Transaction, Exchange, Move and Act*. These models would be analysis more comprehensive in this study.

Based on the main topic of the study, as a researcher I would like to applicate the study using Sinclair & Coulthard model (Coulthard, 1992:1-34). This research has

been very much text-based. We began with very few preconceptions and the descriptive system has grown and been modified to cope with problems thrown up by the data. The system we have produced is hierarchical and our method of presentation is closely modelled on Halliday's 'Categories of a theory of grammar'. All the terms used, *structure, system, rank, level, delicacy, realization, marked, unmarked*, are Halliday's.

B. The Review of Previous Studies

There are some studies it related for this study namely: Nunn (2001), Hsiao (2005), Yu (2009), Sampson (2008), Bannik & Dam (2007), Jia (2005), Atkins (2001), White (2003), Saikko (2007) and Hartono (2005). Yu (2009) in his research entitled **An Analysis of College English Classroom Discourse** has studied a Chinese college English classroom of non English major at Qingdao University of Science and Technology about college English classroom discourse and to provide information for improving teaching and learning in college English classroom. In sum, Sinclair and Coulthard's model can be applied to college English classroom discourse analysis in that there were quite a lot patterns found agreeing with their model although there also existed some discrepancy. The patterns of discourse in college English classroom were that: teacher-initiated exchange dominated; "IRF" patterns did exist and accounted for the most proportion of all the discourse patterns.

Nunn (2001) in his study entitled **Language Learning Across Boundaries – Negotiating Classroom Rituals** stated that when opposed to communicative language teaching, teacher-fronted classroom discourse is sometimes devalued, represented as a rigid and ritualistic process of eliciting pre-planned responses. The analysis of a data sample of twelve teacher-fronted language lessons revealed highly repetitive structuring in the flow of discourse, frequent verbatim repetition in the collective reconstruction of texts, and restrictive turn-taking norms. However these ritual features of discourse need to be considered alongside the essential negotiation which takes place during the continuous process of adjustment and re-adjustment between participants.

White (2003) in his study entitled **'The Application of Sinclair and Coulthard's 'IRF' to a Classroom: Analysis and Discussion'** found that Sinclair and Coulthard define a teacher uniform as an exchange where the teacher contributes facts, opinions, ideas and a new information to the pupil. Most difficulties in fitting the data to the IFR categories can be attributed to two related factors namely small class size and a relaxed perception of teacher/student roles. Despite difficulties in application, discourse analysis of these types has many benefits to teachers wanting a better understanding of classroom discourse.

Meanwhile, Hartono (2005) in her research entitled **Native-non-Native Teacher Negotiation Rituals in the Introductory Parts of Speaking Classes: A Report** pay special attention to see how negotiation ritual element of one part of five elements of Sinclair and Coulthard is exchanges with the special part of IRF pattern. She realizes that the exchange structure is often criticized as a rigid and ritualistic patterns. This study highlights the role of teachers in providing context for the students. The context will encourage negotiation meaning among the classroom discourse participants. Although the IRF pattern helps to keep the discourse run

smoothly, the communication between the teacher and the students is often unnatural. Within the foreign language setting like in Indonesia, English teachers have to be skillful and creative to create and provide a context for their language class. The context must be the one which can encourage students to speak in the target language.

Based on the previous studies by researchers not more specific study about the all elements from five elements by Sinclair and Coulthard system could be implement in the classroom discourse. The more studies of meaning negotiation rituals as a part of exchange element run by researcher especially just for the IRF/IRE context. It has the lack study of the application of Sinclair and Coulthard system of college English classroom discourse. Based on the fact, as a researcher I would like to further explore of the application of Sinclair and Coulthard system of outstanding classroom discourse analysis.

C. Theoretical Framework

There are three basic theories should be discussed as a grounded theory with related this study namely:

1. Hallidays' rank scale description of grammar

The original Sinclair-Coulthard system of analysis is based on Halliday's (1961) rank scale description of grammar (Willis in Coulthard, 1992:112). The ranks in the model are *lesson; transaction, exchange; move* and *act*, and these are related to one another in a 'consists of' relationship. A lesson is made up of a series of transactions, which in turn is made up of a number of exchanges. Exchanges are made up of moves, which in turn are made up of acts.

The new paradigm in post modern English Grammar developed Functional Grammar run by Halliday. The one indicator to this statement is speedily in implement of discourse analysis in linguistic analysis. This phenomenon is a spirit of classroom discourse analysis in teaching learning activity. According to Halliday, basic concepts for the study of language has raised a number of theoretical issues, as can be seen from the variety of technical terms that had to be used. We have referred to language (i) as text and as system, (ii) as sound, as writing and as wording, (iii) as structure – configurations of parts and (iv) as resource – choices among alternatives. These are some of the different guises in which a language presents itself when we start to explore its grammar in functional terms: that is, from the standpoint of how it creates and expresses meaning (Halliday, 2004:19).

2. Austin theory of Speech Act

The other basis theory is speech act theory by Austin. All of the issues in the general theory of language used, speech act theory has probably aroused the widest interest. As showed by Coulthard (1994), originally Sinclair pays more interesting of his study based on description of grammar by Halliday and speech act by Austin. Psychologists have suggested that the acquisition of the concepts underlying speech acts may be a prerequisite for the acquisition of language in general, while linguists have seen the notions of speech acts theory as variously applicable to problems in syntax, second language learning and elsewhere. From a linguistic perspective, the original discourse analysis work was motivated by a wish to make a description of spoken interaction, using the insights of the philosopher J.L. Austin (1962).

3. Vygotsky theory of The Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD)

The work of Vygotsky, a social psychologist, highlights the role of social interaction in learning and development. This study will also investigate how the teachers provide the context for language learning and how the teacher takes important roles in the process of meaning negotiation. In fact, teacher's presence is a must to create contexts which will facilitate meaning negotiation and language learning. In other words, teacher's presence will help the students improve their target language. This based on the theory proposed by Vygotsky: the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). Vygotsky defines it as 'the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers.

Vygotsk's views on learning and development in children differ markedly from those of Piaget, for whom learning and mental development is independent processes. According to Piaget (1979), learning does not affect the course of development since maturation precedes learning. In this framework, the learner must be cognitively and developmentally ready to handle certain learning tasks. In Vygotsky's (1978) view, however, learning precedes and contributes to maturation, and the learner's language performance with others exceeds what the learner is able to do with the language without assistance. The learner bring two levels of development to the learning task: an actual developmental level, representing what the learner can do, and a potential developmental level, representing what the learner should be able to do in the future. Through interaction with others, the learner progresses for the "actual developmental level" to the "potential developmental level." In this process, the potential development level of the learner's interaction with others and the expansion of cognitive abilities.

The three basic theories discussed above inspire Sinclair and Coulthard make of theory building and have closely related to the substance of the study. These theories become a grounded theory to make more exploration and deep analysis in classroom discourse analysis.

Halliday (1961) developed a description of grammar based on a rank scale. This theory has been used by Sinclair and Coulthard to create a model for spoken discourse analysis. Speech act theory proposed by Austin offered a functional theory of meaning. The study will also investigate how the teacher provides the context for language learning and how the teacher takes important roles in the process of meaning negotiation. To maximize the quality of classroom discourse, teacher' presence in the class becomes very important. Teacher' presence is a must to create contexts which will facilitate meaning negotiation and language learning.

III. METHODOLOGY

A. Research Design

Research design as an important point to conduct a research. Research is systematic investigation to answer a problem. This study belongs to *descriptive qualitative method* and included *discourse analysis approach*. I had apply descriptive qualitative approach to analyze English foreign language lecturer and students' meaning negotiation rituals of classroom discourse in the research methodology classroom of the fifth semester students of English Study Program of Timor

University. The analysis model is basically based on classroom discourse analysis which is proposed by Sinclair and Coulthard as revised it in Coulthard (1992).

B. Subject of the study

The subject of the study is the fifth semester students and lecturer of Research Methodology Subject of English Study Program of Timor University in the academic year of 2012/2013. On the basis of the characteristics and availability of the data needed, this study applied a *purposive sampling* technique. Based on the sample of the study I determined which class is chooses. So, from the four parallel classes of the fifth semester students, I would like determined two classes to conduct research.

C. Instrument of Data Collection

In this study, instrument is defined as a technique used to get the data needed. To get the data needed, it applies two kinds of instruments. *Firstly*, it used observation technique. Through this technique, the researcher have opportunities to observe the lecturer of the research methodology subject and the fifth semester students as will become subject of the study. The observation do in this study aims at finding which classes adjust to conduct this research. The observation will do two weeks. Based on the result of the observation, the researcher determines which classroom is chosen. *Secondly*, using a video-tape recording (VTR) to record the classroom discourse during the classroom interaction between lecturer and students. The result of the classroom discourse become of the data transcription as a requirement will be further analyzed based on Sinclair and Coulthard system will focus on *transaction, exchange, move* and *act* as proposed by Sinclair and Coulthard.

D. Techniques of Data Collection

For the conducting of my research, I had joint some procedures to collect the data needed namely: *First*; Before the researcher conduct the research, I had ask permission from the Rector, Dean, Head of the English Study Program of Timor University and lecturer of research methodology subject for conducting the study. *Second*; After getting the permission and legality on the some administration procedures, the researcher recorded the classroom interaction that happened during the teaching learning activity in the research methodology subject. *Third*; During the process of recording, the researcher observes and makes notes of what the lecturer and students do during the interaction. The notes include how lecturer prepares the setting of the classroom or activities which the lecturer and students do during the classroom learning – teaching process. *Fourth*; The recorded data is played several times and transcribed. The transcription is also accompanied with the notes made by the researcher.

E. Data Analysis

The analysis of the data in this study is conducted in the following steps:

1. Transcribing

Transcribing is a process of representing the talk or speech event in written form. The teaching and learning process on the classroom is transcribed carefully in accordance with flow of talk. Then the transcript becomes the writer's required data for further analysis.

2. Codification

After the transcript is completely done, the data is used to make the analysis of four ranks of Sinclair & Coulthard system in classroom discourse analysis, namely: *transaction, exchanges, move* and *act*. And then, the available transcript is codified or labelled to facilitate the researcher in identifying the characteristics of interaction take place in the teaching learning process between the lecturer and students in the Research Methodology subject of the fifth semester students of Timor University.

3. Categorizing

The purpose of categorizing the data is to facilitate the tabulation of the data. In this study, the data is classified into four elements of Sinclair and Coulthard system covers: transaction, exchanges, move and act; and categorize them based on their frequency of occurrences.

4. Tabulation

Based on the classification above, the data were expressed in the form of table. This is make things simple, but meaningful and comprehensibly represented. The result was put in a table to see the distribution of lecturer and students' transaction, exchanges, moves and acts, and their participation in the classroom discourse.

5. Interpretation

The results of the analysis above were interpreted to answer the research questions which were presented in statement of the problem in chapter one. The interpretation of the data analysis is also discussed clarify some findings and see whether the types of interaction between English lecturer and students contains positive values to improve teaching and learning process at English Study Program of Timor University. Based on the results of the analysis above, the data are expressed quantitatively in the form of table to facilitate the description and discussion.

IV. DISCUSSION

This section presents a discussion on how the types of transactions, exchanges, moves and acts are used and their structure as well as the samples taken from the body of language in the classroom discourse between lecturer and students in the fifth semester students of English Study Program of Timor University during the English classroom process.

Much previous research has been done in EFL classroom discourse analysis which implemented by Sinclair and Coulthard system, but none of them could not pay more attention of transaction element. As we know that transactions normally begin with a preliminary exchange and end with a final exchange. Within these boundaries a series of medial exchanges occur. Although we have identified eleven types of medial exchanges, we cannot yet specify in detail how they ordered within transactions. We can specify that the first medial exchange in a transaction will normally be selected from the three major teacher-initiated free types – Inform, Direct and Elicit.

Table 6b. The finding/result text of EFL classroom discourse between lecturer and students (transactions).

Transaction Type	Frequency	Percentage
Informing	44	45.36
Directing	19	19.59
Eliciting	34	35.05
T o t a l	97	100 %

The data shows that the top rank transaction types occurred is informing, that is 44 times (45.36 %) of the total transaction occurrence, after the informing is eliciting with 34 times (35.05%), while directing occupied the lowest rank that is 19 times (19.59 %) of the total transaction occurrence. Informing is top rank because in the classroom discourse it has most frequencies than another. From each types of transaction, especially informing, boundary is the highest level with 19 times or 19.59 %. From the eliciting transaction, L-Elicit is the highest level with 12 times or 12.37 %. From the directing transaction, Boundary is the highest level with 6 times or 6.18 %.

The table 7 shows the all types of exchange occurred in the classroom discourse between lecturer and students in the sixth semester students of English Study Program of Timor University during the English classroom process. The exchange types copying the top rank or the most frequencies occurred is boundary, that is 51 times (39.84 %) of the total exchange occurrence, while reinforce and accept occupied the lowest rank that is 1 times (0.78 %) of the total exchange occurrence. Boundary is top rank because in the classroom discourse it has most frequencies than another.

There exists two types of exchanges, Boundary and Teaching. *Boundary exchanges* mark an end or a beginning to a stage of the lesson, and can be implemented either with a *framing move* or a *focusing move*. Typical framing and focusing moves are indicated by *acts* such as ‘wel’, ‘good’, ‘okay’, in addition to an extended pause, and/or comments by the teacher which summarize the preceding or following discourse. *Teaching exchanges* concern the actual progression of the lesson, and depending on the teacher’s intent, can be actualized through informing, directing, eliciting or checking. There are eleven subcategories of teaching exchanges. Six are *free exchanges* and are defined by their function and by the type of *head act* in the initiating move. Whether the teacher or student initiates the exchange also affects categorization. The five remaining exchanges are *bound exchanges*, in that they normally contain no initiation and thus are bound to the previous exchange’s function in some way.

Table 8. The finding/result of the Move Types Occurred in the EFL classroom discourse between lecturer and students.

Move Types	Structure of Moves	Frequency	Percentage
Initiation (I) (opening)	(S) (Pre-h) h (post-h) (select)	36	37.5
Response (R) (answering)	(Pre-h) h (post-h)	34	35.42

Feedback (F) (follow-up)	(Pre-h) h (post-h)	26	27.08
T o t a l		96	100 %

Table 8 above shows that initiation have occupies the top rank. It occurred 36 times (37.5 %) while feedback move occupies the lowest rank. It occurred 26 times (27.08 %) of the total move occurrence because in the classroom discourse the initiation (opening) has the big percentage than another. Teaching exchanges consist of initiation moves, response move and follow-up moves. This three-move structure of an exchange (IRF) is commonly cited.

From the 22 types of act in the Sinclair and Coulthard system, there are 1.106 acts occurring in the research of classroom discourse between lecturer and students in the fifth semester students of English Study Program of Timor University during the English classroom process. The act types of the top rank or the most frequencies occurred is acknowledgement, that is 238 times (21.52 %) of the total acts occurrence.

Example:

L: The first chance to the back group. *(d)*

S: Yah, ... *(ack)*

L: Who is the leader? *(d)*

Acknowledge, a verbal or non verbal signal which confirms that the students is listening and understanding. Acknowledge is also an optional part of the response to a directive, when it serves to let the lecturer know that the students has heard. As we know that acknowledge realized by 'yes', 'OK', 'cor', 'mm', 'wow', 'yah' and a certain non-verbal gestures and expressions. Its function is simply to show that the initiation has been understood, and, if the head was a directive, that the student intends to react. In the normal classroom interaction, sometimes lecturer or students using acknowledge as filler, and become one strategy to maximize the communication. From this research, acknowledge used by lecturer to maximize the context of situation.

While check occupied the lowest rank that is 3 times (0.27 %) of the total acts occurrence. In the check realized by a closed class of polar questions concerned with being 'finished' or 'ready', having 'problems' or 'difficulties' being able to 'see' or 'hear'. They are 'real' questions, in that for once the lecturer doesn't know the answer. The function of checks is to enable the lecturer to ascertain whether there are any problems preventing the successful of the lesson.

The types of ritual of classroom discourse between the lecturer and students are depicted in the following table:

Table 10. The finding/result of the Ritual types occurred in the EFL classroom discourse between lecturer and students.

Ritual of EFL Classroom Discourse	Frequency	Percentage
Lecturer	8	53.33
Students	7	46.67
T o t a l	15	100 %

Table 10 above shows that lecturer have occupies the top rank. It occurred 8 times (53.33 %) while students occupies the lowest rank. It occurred 7 times (46.67 %) of the total ritual occurrence because in the classroom discourse the lecturer has the big percentage than students.

Meaning negotiation ritual of classroom discourse between the lecturer and students in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context, actually an attempt to know how meaning negotiation element is captured by the elements of classroom discourse: the Initiation, Response and Feedback. The three exchange structure is often criticized as a rigid and ritualistic pattern. Some of us as a researcher are worried that if the students do not get enough opportunities to develop an effective communicative learning within the rigid pattern happens during the classroom interaction. Yu (2009:157) is her studied saw the the role of teachers in providing context for the students. The context will encourage meaning negotiation among the classroom discourse participation.

The types of meaning negotiation of classroom discourse between the lecturer and students are depicted in the following table:

Table 11. The finding/result of the Meaning Negotiation types occurred in the EFL classroom discourse between lecturer and students.

Meaning Negotiation of EFL Classroom Discourse	Frequency	Percentage
Data I	6	50
Data II	6	50
T o t a l	12	100 %

Based on the research it shows that lecturer have occupies the top rank. It occurred 8 times (53.33 %). While students occupies the lowest rank. It occurred 7 times (46.67 %) of the total ritual occurrence. It is shown that not more significant of the IRF exchange between the EFL lecturer and students in classroom discourse. As in previous study of Yu (2009:156) stated that IRF still dominate the classroom exchange pattern but meaning negotiation is a solution to this problem. The commonly of IRF pattern from occurred by the lecturer or students.

The previous study shown that classroom discourse interaction which involve the meaning negotiation between EFL learners are also important for the production of comprehensible output (Shehadeh in Hartono, 2005:70). Meaning negotiation are important not only because they provide EFL learners with an opportunity to receive input, which they have made comprehensible through negotiation, but also because these interaction EFL learners with opportunities that enable them to modify their speech so that the output is more comprehensible. From the table of the meaning negotiation shows that lecturer and students have the same occurrences in EFL classroom discourse , that is 6 times (50 %) of the data I and 6 times (50 %) also in data II. It is an indicated that meaning negotiation need by the lecturer or students in the classroom discourse activities to maximize the quality of the language learning and teaching.

Many previous studies about classroom discourse are based on the theory proposed by Sinclair and Coulthard (Jia:2005; Yu:2009; Bannik & Dam:2007; Samson:2008; Hsiao:2005; Nunn:2001; Andrew:2001 & 2003; Saikko:2007;

Hartono:2005) which is recognized as three-part structure of exchange : Initiation (I), Response (R) and Feedback (F). Traditionally, the discourse between lecturer and students follows the L-S-L pattern (Lecturer-Students-Lecturer). The L-S-L pattern occurs when a lecturer asks a question, a student answers, and the lecturer gives feedback. This pattern is then repeated again and again during the class session. Sinclair and Coulthard categorizes this pattern as IRF (Initiation, Respond, Feedback). This pattern is mostly found in English as a Foreign Language (EFL).

This condition prove by Nunn (2001) that in era of communicative language teaching (CLT), the three-part exchange structure which is also recognized as teacher-fronted discourse is often considered devalued. It is represented as a rigid and ritualistic process of eliciting preplanned responses. The teacher-fronted classroom discourse which is represented as a predominantly three-part structure seems to have negative characterization. Learner's opportunities to develop their communicative competence are limited and bounded under the three-part exchange structure. However, along those rituals, there are some interesting phenomena of negotiating shared meaning which take place during the continuous process of adjustment and readjustment between the participants. I believe that lecturer will take a significant role in the negotiation process because teaching a language is not simply a process of linguistic knowledge transmission. It is more an attempt to negotiate shared meanings and understanding between the learners and their interlocutor.

Humor as a powerful strategy in classroom discourse using by lecturer to maximize students participation in context of English as a Foreign Language (EFL). As prove by Saikko (2007:65) stated that students in a foreign language classroom do not probably know much of the language they are studying, and that with youger learners the types of questions they might ask is limited by their lack of intellectual maturity in general and their lack of metalinguistic knowledge.

V. CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis of the EFL classroom discourse in the research methodology classroom between the lecturer and the fifth semester students of English Study Program of Timor University, the researcher would like to conclude the results of the findings to answer the statement of the problems as follows; The three major types of transactions that occurred in the EFL classroom discourse in the researech methodology classroom are: (a) informing transaction occurred 44 times (45.36 %), (b) eliciting transaction occurred 34 times (35.05 %), and directing transaction occurred 19 times (19.59 %). The types of exchanges, that occurred in the EFL classroom discourse, there are 14 kind of exchanges which occurred in 128 times, but the top rank or the most frequencies occurred is boundary, that is 51 times (39.84 %) of the total exchange occurrence, while reinforce and accept occupied the lowest rank that is 1 times (0.78 %) of the total exchange occurrence. The types of move that occurred in the EFL classroom discourse in the researech methodology classroom are: (a) Initiation (opening) move occurred 36 times (37.5 %), (b) Response (answering) move occurred 34 times (35.42 %), and feedback (follow-up) move occurred 26 times (27.08 %). The types of acts that occurred in the EFL classroom discourse, there are 22 kind of acts which occurred in 1.106 times, but the top rank or the most frequencies occurred is acknowledge, that is 238 times (21.52 %) of the total

acts occurrence, while check is the lowest rank that is 3 times (0.27 %) of the total acts occurrence.

The lecturer and students roles in the process of meaning negotiation rituals are: (a) ritual process occurred by the lecturer 8 times (53.33 %), ritual process occurred by the students 7 times (46.67 %); while meaning negotiation ritual occurred 12 times divided in Data I 6 times or 50 % and in Data II 6 times or 50 % too.

VI. SUGGESTIONS

Hopefully, the results of this study will provide information to English language lecturers especially in Indonesia as Foreign Language context about some strategies. They can also be used by the lecturers to optimize negotiation meaning between the lecturer and students in the classroom discourse. Lecturer-students' meaning negotiation in the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) of Research Methodology Classroom effected by some factors like lecturer, students, materials, methods and environment, so in the classroom discourse lecturer should be adjust with characteristics from these factors above. Students participation in the EFL classroom discourse it depends on the lecturer how to create the situation, using exactly methods, characteristics of students, choosing materials of instruction and not dominated by the lecturer.

In the classroom discourse, it is better that should be a ballance between the lecturer talks and students talks. It is better that classroom interaction follows the typical pattern of IRF model. Actually Sinclair and Coulthard system analysis is a reflective model, so this model could be apply by the lecturer of EFL at university level to maximize the quality of classroom discourse activity. For the future researcher; its suggested to apply this model to other subjects beside research methodology subject because this subject as a prerequisite for the students before finished their study, not as based on talent or interest of students. So, it should be better for EFL university level could be apply Sinclair and Coulthard system for English for Spesific Purpose (ESP) context.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Atkins, Andrew. 2001. Sinclair and Coulthard's 'IRF' model in a one-to-one Classroom: An Analysis; July 2001, www.ccsenet.org/journal.html; Accessed October 13th 2010.
- Bannink, Anne, & Dam, Jet van. 2007. A Dynamic Discourse Approach to Classroom Research. *Linguistics and Education Journals*, www.elsevier.com/located/linged; Accessed October 13th 2010.
- Broughton, Geoffrey, Christopher Brumfit, Roger Flavell, Peter Hill & Anita Pincas. 2003. *Teaching English as a Foreign Language (2nd ed.)*. London: Routledge.
- Coulthard, Malcolm (Ed.). 1992. *Advanced in Spoken Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Cazden, C. B. 2001. *Classroom Discourse: The Language of Teaching and Learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Christie, Frances. 2002. *Classroom Discourse Analysis: A Fuctional Perspective*. London: Continuum.
- Halliday, M.A.K. 2004. *An Introduction to Functional English Grammar*. London: Arnold.

- Hsiao, Cheng-hua. 2005. Teacher-Student Communicative Patterns in an English Language Class-Examination of Classroom Discourse; www.ccsenet.org/journal.html; Accessed October 13th 2010.
- Hartono, Heni. 2005. Native Non-Native Teacher Negotiation in the Introductory Part Speaking Classes Research Projects. *Journal Penelitian Kependidikan, Tahun I, Nomor 1, April 2005*, Program Pascasarjana Universitas Negeri Semarang.
- Jia, Aiwu. 2005. Feedback in the IRF Discourse Model in Foreign Language Classroom; Sino-US English Teaching Journal, July 2005, Volume 2, No.7 (Serial No. 19) www.ccsenet.org/journal.html; Accessed October 13th 2010.
- Maxom, Michelle. 2009. *Teaching English as a Foreign Language for Dummies*. England: Wiley.
- Nunan, David. 1992. *Research Methods in Language Learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Nunn, Roger. 2001. Language Learning Across Boundaries-Negotiating Classroom Rituals. *TESL-EL Journals*, Vol. 5, No. 2, September 2001; www.ccsenet.org/journal.html; Accessed October 13th 2010.
- Sampson, Peter. 2008. Using Discourse Analysis to Prepare Learners for Overseas University Study. *The Asian ESP Journals*, Vol. 4, Issue 1, April 2008; www.ccsenet.org/journal.html; Accessed October 13th 2010.
- Saikko, Virve. 2007. *Different Student-Strategies fir Interactional Power in the IRF Pattern in an EFL Classroom*. Unpublished Thesis, University of Jyväskylä; www.ccsenet.org/journal.html; Accessed October 13th 2010.
- Wallace, Michael J. 1991. *Training Foreign Language Teachers: A Reflective Approaches*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- White, Andrew. 2003. The Application of Sinclair and Coulthard's IRF Structure to a Classroom Lesson: An Analysis and Discussion. May 2003; www.ccsenet.org/journal.html; Accessed October 13th 2010.
- Walsh, Steve. 2006. *Investigating Classroom Discourse*. 2006. London: Routledge
- Yu, Weihua. 2009. An Analysis of College English Classroom Discourse. *Asian Social Science Journals*, Vol. 5, No. 7, July 2009; www.ccsenet.org/journal.html; Accessed October 13th 2010.