

The Implementation of Communication Strategies to Exchange and Negotiate Meanings in a Simulation of Job Interview

Steffie Mega Mahardhika¹, Dwi Rukmini¹, Abdurrachman Faridi¹ & Januarius Mujiyanto¹

¹ Postgraduate Program in English Education, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Correspondence: Steffie Mega Mahardhika, Doctor Candidate, Postgraduate Program in English Education, Universitas Negeri Semarang Jl. Kelud Raya 111 Semarang 50237 Indonesia. E-mail: steffiemahardhika@gmail.com

Received: April 12, 2019 Accepted: May 28, 2019 Online Published: July 3, 2019

doi:10.5539/ijel.v9n4p241 URL: <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v9n4p241>

Abstract

Students of English as a foreign language find it difficult to initiate a talk and exchange meanings in an interaction. They find it hard to break the iceberg and act by asking, commanding and answering to make the speakers or listeners' intention fulfilled. As such they do not have medium to exchange experiences. The present study aims to explain the way meanings are negotiated and exchanged in the implementation of communication strategies in a simulation of a job interview. The subjects of this qualitative study are students of Indonesian Vocational College. The object of the study is the students' utterances in the interview. Functional semantic reinterpretation of turn-constructive units of conversation analysis is implemented to explain how the students exchange and negotiate meanings. The findings suggest that the realization of exchange and negotiation of meanings is influenced by moves assigned to speech functions classes and the types of meanings implemented in the act of production and comprehension of the whole communication. The subjects of the present study can be categorized into productive speakers. The students negotiate feelings and attitudes more than that of the content of the proposition.

Keywords: communication strategies, exchange of meanings, negotiation of meanings, move(s)

1. Introduction

Contrary to what might have been assumed language policy in Indonesia is not consistent in the case of time allotment given to English subject in secondary and senior high schools which tends to be less and less than before. English which had been once introduced in primary school level is no longer a compulsory one today. It is arguable that such a language policy has given a negative impact on the English language competence of the higher level education graduates, particularly vocational ones of which the class time allotment is minimum. However, based on the observations on how the students' enthusiasm in expressing feelings and thoughts in English it is reasonable to argue that they are potential to develop their language acquisition.

It is likely that the students need knowledge of communication strategies and how to use them. The framework should be pedagogically oriented and most relevant to communicative language use. In other words, we need communication strategies as verbal plans by the speakers to overcome problems in the planning and execution stages of reaching a communicative goal. It is also regarded as a means of keeping the communication channel open in the face of communication difficulties and playing for time to think and to make speech plans.

Recent years have seen researches on communication strategies implemented in ESL/EFL classroom interaction (see e.g., Thompson, 2017; Fitriati et al., 2017; Septianingsih & Warsono, 2017). Studies on whether communication strategies can be taught to learners of EFL have been carried out (see e.g., Saedi & Farschi, 2015; Ya-ni, 2007; Maleki, 2010). Studies on the role of meaning negotiation in L2 interaction have been the concern of researches (see e.g., Masrizal, 2014; Nakahama, 2012). Interests on how teachers and learners use communication strategies in the university classroom have been the focus of researchers (see e.g., Al-Shboul & Huwari, 2016; Eftekhari, 2011; Ghasani & Sofwan, 2017).

Based on the issues addressed above, the study dedicated to the exchange and negotiation of meanings in communication strategies is lacking. Thus, this justifies the present study's investigation on the implementation of communication strategies to exchange and negotiate meanings. The present study investigates students' use of

communication strategies to answer the following research questions:

- 1) How do the students exchange meanings in their implementation of communication strategies?
- 2) How do the students negotiate meanings in their implementation of communication strategies?

2. Literature Review

Tarone (1977) and Faerch and Kasper's (1983) defined communication strategies as conscious strategies used by a speaker to overcome communication problems that take place when linguistic resources are insufficient to express his feelings and thoughts. Considering these definitions, it is reasonable to argue that communication strategies can be understood as conscious plans to overcome the communication crisis.

Canale (1983) pointed out that communication strategies involve an attempt to enhance the effectiveness of communication. Deliberately slow and soft speech for rhetorical effect is an instance for it. Canale's concept is contributive to understand the notion of communication strategies. This definition is broader than the restriction of communication strategies to problem-solving only.

In a study on interlanguage communication strategies in sustained casual conversation Agustin (1997) concluded that communication strategies can be defined as systematic moves in negotiating meanings to sustain interactions. Agustin's study is insightful and challenging. It implies that the unit of analysis to address the issues of communication strategies in sustaining conversation should be move(s) instead of clause(s). It matches Halliday's theory (in Eggins & Slade, 1997, p. 185) which suggests that discourse patterns of speech function are expressed through moves whereas grammatical patterns of mood are expressed through clauses.

According to Eggins (1990, p. 290) negotiation of meanings refers to an interaction between speakers. When a speaker reacts to the previous move (which can be realized by a clause), s/he negotiates the previous move(s). This implies a structural relationship between the negotiating act and the negotiated one. Eggins' perspective is helpful to conduct research on the issue of meaning negotiation.

Meanwhile, Halliday (1994, p. 39) suggests that exchange of meanings is an act of giving and receiving content or proposition of message, expression of attitudes and judgments, and how to get a text characterizing coherence. It is argued that whenever someone uses language to interact, one of the things they are doing is establishing a relationship: between the person speaking now and the person who will probably speak next. Halliday's theory is inspiring in exploring issues on the exchange of meanings.

Eggins and Slade (1997) pointed out that as move is a discourse unit to which a speech function is assigned, a technique of discourse analysis as an analytic tool is needed to find out what language can be used as a means of realizing a range of different functions. In this way, how meanings are negotiated and exchanged can be explained. Eggins and Slade proposal of an analytic tool is significant for researchers to realize their concerns on discourse analysis.

Furthermore, Eggins and Slade (1997) remarked that a move is closely related to the organization of turn-taking in conversation. The move is a 'functional-semantic re-interpretation of the turn-constructive unit'. The end of a move signals a possible turn transfer and the new turn taken at this point cannot be regarded as an interruption. The assignment of speech functions depends not only on the constituent structure of the move itself but on the relation between the current move and prior moves. Eggins and Slade's elaboration on the nature of moves is useful to carry out research on communication strategies.

2.1 Empirical Studies

Recent years have seen researches on communication strategies implemented in ESL/EFL classroom interaction (see e.g., Thompson, 2017; Fitriati et al., 2017; Septianingsih & Warsono, 2017; Fitriati et al., 2016). Thompson's study focuses on strategic planning in developing speaking whereas Fitriati's study is concerned with the implementation of the strategies which is similar to the issues addressed by Septianingsih and Warsono. The most prominent findings worth considering for future research is that unlike high achievers who use all sorts of strategies, the low achievers use social strategies and cognitive strategies. It is the lecturers who tend to use directive speech acts whereas students use questions only when they did not understand something. These studies provide important information for researchers who deal with EFL classroom interaction.

Researches on whether communication strategies can be taught to learners of EFL have been carried out (see e.g., Ya-ni, 2007; Maleki, 2010). The study conducted by Ya-ni is concerned with the nature of communicative competence as well as English speaking environment in line with the training of communication strategies. Maleki's study has something to do with a bottom-up approach. It is worth considering for future research that story-telling can be used to effectively measure the speech production of high school students. It suggests that an

English-speaking environment and highlighting communicative competence is contributive to the effort of training communication strategies. These studies inspire further research on the way communication strategies are taught in EFL classes.

Interests on how teachers and learners use communication strategies in the university classroom have been the focus of researchers (see e.g., Al-Shboul & Huwari, 2016; Eftekhari, 2011; Ghasani & Sofwan, 2017). The study conducted by Al-Shboul and Huwari suggests that the manifestation of triggered code-switching in ESP context is greater in terms of frequency. Ghasani and Sofwan's study shows the high use of entertain of engagement, appreciation of attitude, and focus of graduation in the contest. These studies are contributive in understanding communication strategies used in classroom universities.

Investigation on the role of meaning negotiation in L2 interaction has been the concern of researches (see e.g., Masrizal, 2014; Nakahama, 2012; Saeedi, 2013). These studies explore the potential of negotiation of meanings in developing the interlanguage of the learners. The study conducted by Masrizal suggests that meaning negotiation in particular clarification requests can facilitate learners with limited English proficiency to develop their language. Nakahama's study indicates that negotiation of meaning in conversational interaction has the potential to offer substantial learning opportunities at multiple levels of interaction. Saeedi's study points out that students made progress and learned of English during practices as a result of the implementation of negotiation of meaning. Overall, these studies see the significance of meaning negotiation in providing learners opportunities to make progress and develop their language proficiency.

3. Methods

The present study is a qualitative descriptive explanatory research in nature. By qualitative research, it means that it involves looking in-depth at non-numerical data. It is a systemic rigorous investigation of situation or problem in order to generate new knowledge or validate existing knowledge. It deals with phenomena that are difficult or impossible to quantify mathematically, such as meanings and symbols; it involves content analysis. It includes patient interviews and a detailed case study. It is primarily exploratory research used to gain an understanding of underlying reasons, opinions, and motivations.

3.1 Subject of the Study

The subject of the present study is the students of Indonesian Vocational College. This college offers a number of study programs including D-III Study Program of English. The interview is conducted in English for such jobs like translator and hotel receptionist as well as administrative assistant/office position. The present study takes twenty sixth-semester students of Study Program of English of Indonesian Vocational College in the academic year of 2016/2017 as the subject of the study for a reason that the students are able to speak English.

3.2 Object of the Study

The object of the present study is utterances produced by the participants of the research that is the speech production of the students of Indonesian Vocational College. The utterances are gained from the interaction during a simulation of a job interview. It means the interviewees' utterances are the object of the study. In other words, the object of the study is spoken texts as a result of the interview.

3.3 Method of Collecting Data

The data expected from this method of collecting data includes dominant and incidental participants, number of turns, number of moves and clauses, and categories of moves produced by the speakers. The moves include opening moves, sustaining moves, reacting moves, supporting moves, confronting moves, and rejoinder moves.

The person-to-person format is used in collecting data. The interview is a highly structured style, in which questions are determined before the interview. The interviewer asked the same questions to all the participants, but the order of the questions, the exact wording, and the type of follow-up questions may vary considerably. The use of a digital recorder is the method of recording interview data because it has the obvious advantage of preserving the entire verbal part of the interview for later analysis. Taking notes during the interview is another method conducted in the present study.

3.4 Method of Analyzing Data

Transcription of the recorded data is the next step to carry out. Initially, the recorded data are transcribed based on a turn. Functional semantic reinterpretation is then conducted to produce transcription based on moves. The transcription-based on moves is used as the basis to conduct analysis and interpretation of the data. In other words, two stages of transcription are conducted in the present study. The first is transcription based on turns, and the second is transcription based on moves.

To explain how the students exchange meaning in implementing communication strategies in the simulation of a job interview, feature by feature involving dominant and incidental participants, number of turns, number of moves and clauses, and categories of moves produced by the speakers are analyzed. The moves include opening moves, sustaining moves, reacting moves, supporting moves, confronting moves, and rejoinder moves.

To explain how meanings are negotiated in the implementation of communication strategies in a simulation of job interview analysis is conducted by describing and analyzing the communication strategy distribution. It includes analyses of speech function, interpersonal strategies, logical-semantic strategies, and channeling strategies.

4. Findings and Discussions

The objective of this study is to analyze the simulation of a job interview to explain the ways meanings are exchanged and negotiated. How the meanings are exchanged is explained by presenting the result of speech function analysis. Whereas the ways meanings are negotiated is explained by presenting the result of analysis on how meanings are chosen by speakers in an interaction.

4.1 Speech Functions Analysis

Referring to Eggins and Slade's (1997) theory, how the meanings are exchanged can be explained by analyzing the speech functions the speakers have chosen in an interaction. Table 1 demonstrates the speech function choices produced by 20 speakers. The speakers include 20 students and one lecturer, but the focus of this study is mainly on the students' speech production. The frequency of turns produced by the speakers is 200 times. The frequency of moves produced by the speakers is 363 times. Meanwhile, the frequency of clauses produced by the speakers is 534 times. Table 1 demonstrates the speech function choices produced by the speakers.

Table 1. Choices of speech function in summary

No	Speech Function	Speakers																				Total	
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22		
	Number of Turn	10	12	13	10	10	10	12	10	9	6	11	9	12	18	10	9	10	12	16	8	200	
	Number of Moves	12	25	11	14	9	25	18	10	20	16	16	22	12	10	27	28	10	22	29	10	363	
	Number of Clauses	20	22	16	16	30	23	15	30	20	47	25	13	17	41	45	13	10	18	60	10	534	
1	Open																						
	Attend	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Open: Initiative																						
	O.I. Demand	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	info																						
	O.I. Demand	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	service																						
	O.I. Demand	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	opinion																						
	O.I. Demand	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
fact																							
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
2	Continue																						
	Monitor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
	Prolong:	4	8	2	3	4	7	4	18	5	13	5	4	4	18	20	7	8	9	8	1	140	
	elaborate																						
	Prolong: extend	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	10	
	Prolong:	1	1	0	0	1	4	2	2	6	18	2	1	0	0	3	0	2	3	4		49	
	enhance																						
	Append:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	elaborate																						
	Append:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Extend																							
Append:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
enhance																							
TOTAL	5	9	2	3	6	11	6	21	11	32	8	5	5	19	22	10	8	11	13	6	200		
3	React:																						
	responding																						
	Register	0	3	0	3	1	0	3	0	0	0	1	4	1	1	2	6	3	1	1	3	34	
Engage	0	1	1	2	0	1	1	2	1	0	1	1	3	1	0	1	0	1	0	2	20		

	Develop:	4	8	2	3	4	7	4	8	5	13	5	4	10	12	20	7	11	2	9	1	152
	elaborate																					
	Develop: extend	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	1	0	0	1	1	10
	Develop:	1	0	0	1	2	1	2	2	2	20	5	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	45
	enhance																					
	TOTAL	4	13	2	8	13	9	5	14	5	40	14	6	9	21	29	15	18	4	15	4	261
4	Reply:																					
	supporting																					
	Agree	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Answer	5	13	10	10	17	11	11	17	10	37	21	10	9	67	32	8	15	13	20	10	305
	Accept	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	3
	Comply	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	27
	Acknowledge	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Affirm	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
	TOTAL	8	15	11	11	18	12	12	18	12	38	27	11	10	68	33	9	18	15	22	11	341
5	Reply:																					
	Confronting																					
	Contradict	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	6
	Non-comply	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	7
	Disavow	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5
	Disagree	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	6
	Declare	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	Withhold	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	12
	TOTAL	7	2	0	0	0	5	1	2	3	2	1	0	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	5	38
6	React:																					
	Rejoinder																					
	Track:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
	Clarify																					
	Track: confirm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	Track:	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
	Check																					
	Track:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	Probe																					
	Track:	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	1	0	12
	Resolve																					
	Track:	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	3	2	0	3	0	0	4	0	3	0	5	0	0	24
	Repair																					
	Track:	2	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	13
	acquiesce																					
	Challenge:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
	detach																					
	Challenge:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	rebound																					
	Challenge:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	counter																					
	Act: unresolved	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Act:	3	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	10
	Refute																					
	Act: rechallenge	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	TOTAL	8	5	0	0	6	1	3	3	10	0	6	3	2	0	7	0	5	3	5	1	62

The students' production above indicates that they are productive speakers as a result of dialogs that occurred to exchange information. It is in line with Halliday's (1984, p.11) concept which suggests that two variables are involved when dialogue takes place as an exchange process. They are the exchange of commodity and information.

4.1.1 Opening Moves

Table 1 shows that speaker I produced one opening move. He is the only speaker out of the total 20 learners who made it happen. The evidence of using an opening move by the learner in the simulation of job interview appears in the following example:

RC: (i) Mmm ... (ii) I will make it simple.

(iii) Can I make it?

IR: Okay. Tell me about your responsibility at this hotel?

In this example, RC initiated a sequence of a talk by asking IR whether he can make simple the issue on his progress in the hotel industry. This opening move belongs to initiating move because it actually gets that interaction underway as IR responded to it by saying ‘Okay’. It indicates a claim to a degree of control over the interaction.

4.1.2 Continuing Moves

As the data in Table 1 show, four out of seven subclasses of continuing moves are found although in an unequal portion. Speaker J continues most frequently with 32 out of 200 moves. A great varying number of continuing moves are produced by the rest of the speakers. Those who produce less than 22 continuing moves out of the total 200 moves are of seven speakers. While those who produce less than ten out of 200 moves are of 12 speakers. The most frequent type of continuing moves produced is in the form of prolong-elaborating moves. It comes up about 140 moves out of 200 moves (or about 70 %).

The evidence of the use of continuing moves by the students in the simulation of job interview appears in the following examples:

- (1) IR: Tell me about your responsibility at this hotel
AN: (i) I think (ii) hotel will give good service (iii) **so** the customers feel comfort with our service.
- (2) IR: Which qualities do you boost that will help you progress in the hotel industry?
AN: (i) I believe (ii) my communication skills are my strength (iii) **because** I have a strength about that (iv) I have an ability in communication in English.

In the first example, causal and consequence structural relation between the continued (*I think the hotel will give good service*) and the continuing moves (*the customers feel comfortable*) is established by ND by making use of the conjunction ‘so’. Meanwhile, the second example suggests that the continued (*I believe my communication skills are my strength*) and the continuing moves (*I have a strength about that I have an ability in communication in English*) are connected by using the conjunction ‘because’.

The findings echo Eggins and Slade’s (1997) theory that the speakers in such a context prefer to continue a talk by providing more information as an additional contribution. These categories refer to the fact that frequently we need to say what we want to say in more than one move.

4.1.3 React Responding Moves

As the data show, speaker J is dominant by producing the biggest number of react-responding moves. Speaker J produces 40 out of 261 react-responding moves. The second frequent responding moves are produced by speaker O who responds 29 times. Meanwhile, N responds 21 times. In fact, Table 1 shows that all speakers produce the responding moves proportionally in different number; either supporting or confronting. The type of responding moves produced by the speakers is mostly elaborating answer moves.

The evidence of the use of react-responding moves by the students in the simulation of job interview appears in the following example:

- IR: Why do you want this job?
FT: (i) Because to be a translator is fun (ii) because we can translate (iii) and we can inform the other language to another language (iv) and we can inform, (v) maybe there is important information from the other country to our country then (vi) and then we can have because of that.

This example shows that FT started his [rationalizing] strategy in providing a reason why he wanted the job by pointing out that to be a translator is fun. In his effort to give stronger reasons FT argued that he can translate and inform (a text) in one language to another and that he can get important information as a result of the translation.

The findings indicate that the students tend to negotiate propositions set up by the prior speaker by responding to it. As respondents, they accept being positioned to negotiate interlocutor’s proposition. It is likely that the students have made an attempt to sustain interaction. It matches the theory proposed by Canale (1983) who pointed out that communication strategies involve an attempt to “enhance” the effectiveness of communication.

4.1.4 Reply Supporting Moves

Table 1 indicates that all the speakers produce most of the sub-category of reply supporting moves. Answer reply supporting moves are the biggest number of the moves produced by the speakers. There is 305 answer supporting moves out of 341 reply supporting moves produced by the speakers. Speaker N is the most productive one who produces 68 answer supporting moves out of 341 reply supporting moves.

The evidence of the use of reply supporting moves by the students in the simulation of job interview appears in the following example:

IR: We expect managers to work more than 8 hours a day.

Do you have a problem with that?

SK: (i) No. (ii) I think is no problem (iii) I have 12 until 16 hours.

In this example, SK replies positively the interviewer's question whether he has a problem with working more than eight hours a day. He supported it by stating that he has no problem and that he has 12 until 16 hours a day.

The findings imply the speakers' willingness to accept the propositions or proposal of the other speaker. Alignment is created for the initiator and supporter. Such a relationship indicates dependence and subordination of both the supporter and the initiator. In this way, they could sustain a conversation. It conforms to the theory suggested by Tarone (1977) that communication strategies can be understood as conscious plans to overcome communicative problems

4.1.5 Reply Confronting Moves

Although it is in a small number of occurrences the speakers produce reply confronting moves. Withhold reply confronting moves are the most frequently produced by the speakers with 12 moves out of 38 reply confronting moves. The number of contradict and non-comply reply confronting moves is equally produced by the speakers with nine moves take place respectively. It is followed by disagree-confronting moves with five moves appear in the data. The smallest number of moves produced by the speakers is disavow-reply confronting moves.

The evidence of the use of reply-confronting moves by the students in the simulation of job interview appears in the following example:

(1) IR: Tell me about your responsibility at this hotel?

RC: (i) No. (ii) I don't have an idea

(2) IR: We are ready to make an offer.

Are you ready to accept today?

SK: (i) No. (ii) But I think (iii) I can call you later maybe tomorrow.

In Example (1) RC was unable to provide information demanded by the interviewer concerning with the responsibility at the hotel. By replying the prior move with negative elliptical declarative RC tends to avoid negotiating differences. It matches Eggins and Slade's (1997, p. 206) theory which suggests that the speakers and the interviewer are dependent on each other. In Example (2) SK was capable to provide a negative response to question as a negation of proposition and to deny acknowledgment of information as an expression of disclaiming knowledge. He responded 'No' to IR's question whether he was ready to accept the offer then. He added information that he would call IR later.

The findings indicate dependency between the speakers and the interviewer. However, it has no implication on the deference or alignment of supporting replies. The interviewer offers positioning and a form of non-compliance is encoded by the speakers. Any exchange is closed off by the speakers and they tend to avoid negotiating every difference. In this way, the students succeeded in overcoming a crisis. It is in accordance with the theory put forward by Faerch and Kasper's (1983) who defined communication strategies as conscious communication strategies used by an individual to overcome the communication problems that take place when the available linguistic resources fail to realize a speaker's feelings and thoughts.

4.1.6 React Rejoinder Moves

The data indicate that the speakers produce react rejoinder moves. The biggest number of the moves is in the form of track repair react-rejoinder moves. The speakers produce 24 track repair moves out of the total 62 react-rejoinder moves. The second biggest number of react rejoinder moves is produced in the form of track acquiesce moves. They appear 13 times out of the total 62 react rejoinder moves in the simulation of a job interview.

The evidence of the use of react-rejoinder moves by the students in the simulation of job interview appears in the following example:

IR: When have you been most satisfied in your career?

FT: (i) I think (ii) there is no satisfaction about my career

(iii) because human always needs more and more.

In the example, FT queried the proposition of the previous move made by the interviewer who assumed that a man can be satisfied in his career. FT is of the opinion that there is no satisfaction in his career. He added that human always needs things more and more.

The findings imply that the speakers do not tend to complete negotiation of a proposition. Instead, they prefer to interrupt the talk and postpone as well as abort or suspend the previous sequence of speech function. In their words, with these rejoinders, the speakers either demand more details or offer an explanation as an alternative. In this way, the students could sustain the interaction. It matches the perspective proposed by Agustin (1997) who defined communication strategies as systematic moves in negotiating meanings to sustain interactions.

4.2 Ways of Negotiating Meaning

The second objective of the present study is analyzing the simulation of a job interview to explain the ways the participants negotiate meanings. Referring to Eggins and Slade (1997) the ways participants negotiate meanings can be explained by analyzing the meanings chosen by speakers in an interaction. Accordingly, meaning choices produced by the learners in the simulation of a job interview are analyzed.

Table 2 demonstrates the summary of meaning choices which are produced by 20 speakers in the interview. It indicates that the highest occurrence of mood types is in the form of full declarative. There are 269 times of full declarative out of 347 and 78 elliptical declarative out of 347 emerge in the data. All the speakers produce declarative either full or elliptical ones or just one type of them. However, speaker J shares speaker O who produces the biggest number of clauses with 25 full declarative out of the total 269 clauses. The smallest number of clauses is produced equally by A, G, and R with 8 full declarative clauses out of 269 clauses.

The evidence of using full declarative clauses by the students in the simulation of a job interview is as follows:

IR: How do you define hospitality?

ST: (i) Hospitality is smiling to people, polite, humble and nice to people.

In the example, ST tried to define hospitality by describing it as a behavior to be polite, humble, and nice to people. He also includes the act of smiling to people as an indicator of hospitality. In this way, he got more value for his turn by making full comments on the definition of hospitality rather than elliptical ones. Referring to Eggins' (1994, p. 20) concept it means that unlike the choice "interrogative" which has the elements of Subject and Finite in the opposite order, the speakers in "declarative" tend to realize the choice by the sequence of elements involving Subjects followed by Finite and Predicator.

Almost all of the speakers produce elliptical declarative clauses. The biggest number of the elliptical declarative clauses is produced by speaker H with 10 clauses out of the total 78 clauses. Speaker J follows the record with 8 elliptical declarative clauses out of the total 78 clauses. The smallest number of the elliptical declarative clause is produced equally by speaker M and N with one clause out of 78 clauses.

Table 2. Choices of meaning in summary

Types of Meaning 1	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	Total
	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	
INTERPERSONAL																					
Declarative																					
Full	8	13	10	10	13	10	8	16	10	25	15	11	9	24	25	18	15	8	14	11	269
Elliptical	2	2	3	3	4	6	2	10	7	8	5	4	1	1	5	4	2	4	3	2	78
TOTAL	10	15	13	13	17	16	10	26	17	33	20	15	10	25	30	22	17	12	17	13	347
Polar interrogative																					
Full	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Elliptical	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
WH-Interrogative																					
Full	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Elliptical	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Imperative																					
Full	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Elliptical	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Minor Clause																					
Minor clause	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LOGICAL																					
Expansion																					
Elaboration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	3	1	0	0	7	1	4	0	0	0	3	22
Extension	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	2	0	3	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	15
Enhancement	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	2	2	11	4	0	0	2	3	3	0	3	2	4	45
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	3	2	12	5	0	2	7	3	6	0	2	1	4	82

The evidence of the use of elliptical declarative clauses by the learners in the simulation of job interview appears in the following example:

IR: Which qualities do you boast that will help you progress in the hotel industry?

ST: (i) Discipline, on time, work hard.

In the example, ST tried to express his opinion on the qualities he boasts that will help him progress in the hotel industry by using ellipsis. He abandoned subject for the word 'discipline' and 'on time', and 'working hard'. He also did not use finite for the word 'discipline' and 'on time'. Referring to Eggins' (1994, p. 21) perspective it means that all the speakers produce declarative clauses although in the form of elliptical ones. Their choice of the grammatical system is expressed through the presence and order of particular grammatical elements. This structure eventually gets realized as words.

Apart from interpersonal meaning, the data show that the speakers produce clauses in the form of logical meaning. All of the sub-categories of expansion in the logical meaning is addressed by the speakers. In elaboration sub-category, N produces seven times out of the total 22 clauses. Speaker P produces the subcategory four times out of the total 22 elaboration clauses. Meanwhile, speaker J produces the clause three times out of the total 22 clauses. In Extension and enhancement sub-category the speakers produced 15 times and 45 times respectively. Speakers H, M, and P share an equal number of production with three times out of 15 extension clauses. Whereas speaker J is dominant with 11 times out of 45 enhancement clauses.

The evidence of using clauses in the form of logical meaning by the learners in the simulation of job interview appears in the following example:

IR: Why do you want this job?

FT: (i) Because to be a translator is fun (ii) **because** we can translate (iii) and we can inform the other language to another language (iv) and we can inform, (v) maybe there is important information from the other country to our country (vi) and **then** we can have a relationship because of that.

In the example, FT tried to use enhancing conjunction 'because' and 'then' to link sentences '...to be a translator...' and 'we can translate and inform ...' In this way, FT is able to enhance on a prior's move by

providing a temporal and causal qualification.

Following Eggins and Slade's (1997) perspective, negotiating the experiential meanings can mean that the interlocutor clarifies, justifies, adds or even questions the propositional content of the previous move(s). In this case, conjunctions such as 'and, but, so' and other markers are very important in determining the speech function status of the move. For example:

Grace: For your high school, was it at Madiun?

Rudi: (i) Uh... (ii) my high school was at Malang.

In this example what is put under scrutiny is not the mood ('it was') but the circumstantial element (place) where Rudi did his high school.

Logical relations in a dialogue are expressed by continuatives (*well* and *now*), cohesive conjunctions (*therefore*, *so*, *then*), etc. Conjunctions express the logical meanings of elaboration, extension, and enhancement (see Eggins, 1994; Halliday, 1985; 1994). The logical relations can be explicitly marked by the use of conjunctions, but sometimes the logical relations are left implicit, not using any linking resources available in the grammar. Negotiating propositional meanings seems to be less favored by the students. Negotiating propositional or the ideational meaning means that the structural relations between a strategy and the previous one(s) are that of the elaboration, extension, enhancement, and projection. While most types of meanings emerge, elliptical polar interrogative, full and elliptical interrogative, full and elliptical imperatives, and minor clause are not found in the data. Further investigation is required to reveal the reason why they are absent.

5. Conclusions and Suggestions

It is concluded that moves assigned to speech functions classes influence the way meanings are exchanged, and the realization of the way meanings are negotiated is influenced by the types of meaning implemented in the act of production and comprehension of the whole communication. In terms of exchange of meanings, apart from moves to initiate a sequence of talk, the learners implemented continuing moves, responding moves, reply supporting moves, reply confronting moves, and react rejoinder moves. Prolong-elaborating moves are mostly produced in continuing moves. It means that the speakers prefer to continue by providing more information as an additional contribution. It indicates the fact that frequently we need to say what we want to say in more than one move.

The learners negotiate interpersonal meanings more than that of logical meanings in the interaction. Almost all of the speakers produce elliptical declarative clauses. The speakers in the interaction typically tend to express their feelings and thoughts in short clauses and abandon unnecessary ones. Apart from interpersonal meaning, the speakers produce clauses in the form of logical meaning. The speakers' use conjunctions in explaining, sequencing, comparing, and adding to interconnect between these processes and the logical meanings can link figures in sequence.

In parallel to the tendency of learners of English as a foreign language to produce logical meanings more than that of interpersonal meanings in casual conversation (see Agustin, 1997), the present study indicates that the speakers tend to produce interpersonal meanings more than that of logical meanings in pragmatic conversation.

Considering the communication problems, it is suggested that learners of English as a foreign language are encouraged to use opening moves. Consistent exposure of the way to ask questions to initiate a talk is recommended. Once a conversation is going on they need to be motivated to sustain it by implementing opening moves, sustaining moves, reacting moves, supporting moves, confronting moves, and rejoinder moves. Negotiation of both interpersonal and logical meanings needs to be kept in balanced.

References

- Agustin, I. R. A. (1997). *Interlanguage Communication Strategies in Sustained Casual Conversation*. Unpublished Doctor's thesis, Macquarie University, Sydney.
- Al-Shboul, Y., & Huwari, I. F. (2016). Congratulation Strategies of Jordanian EFL Postgraduate Students. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v6i1.2664>
- Bataineh, R. F., Al-Bzour, W. K., & Baniabdelrahman, A. A. (2017). On the Teachability of Communication Strategies to Jordanian EFL Beginners: Exploration and Reflection. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching*, 4(3), 213–227. Retrieved from <http://iojet.org/index.php/IOJET/article/view/154/167>
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching

- and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1–47. Association for Applied Linguistics (AAAL), Long Beach, CA. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/1.1.1>
- Eftekhari, M., & Rukmini, D. (2011). Psycholinguistic code switching in Iranian university classroom context. *The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, 1(1). Retrieved from <http://www.jltl.org/index.php/jltl/article/view/13>
- Eggs, S., & Slade, D. (1997). *Analysing Casual Conversation*. London: Cassell.
- Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. (1983). Plans and Strategies in foreign language communication In Faerch & Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication* (pp. 20–60). London: Longman.
- Fitriati, W., Isfara, G. A. V., & Trisanti, N. (2017). Teachers Questioning Strategies to Elicit Students Verbal Responses in EFL Classes as a Secondary School. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 5(2). <https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v5i2.537>
- Ghasani, B. I., & Sofwan, A. (2017). Appraisal and Speech Structure of Contestants' Speeches in Speech Contest of ESA WEEK Competition. *English Education Journal*, 7(2). Retrieved from <https://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/eej/article/view/15738>
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press Inc.
- Maleki, A. (2010). Techniques to Teach Communication Strategies. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1(5), 640–646. Finland: Academy Publisher Manufactured. <https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.1.5.640-646>
- Nakahama, Y., Andrea, T., & Leo, v. L. (2012). Negotiation of Meaning in Conversational and Information Gap Activities: A Comparative Discourse Analysis. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35(3), 377–405. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588028>
- Syafiq, N. S., & Saleh, M. (2012). Humor English Teaching Material for Improving Students' Speaking Skill with High and Low Learning Motivation. *English Education Journal*, 7(1). Retrieved from <https://journal.unnes.ac.id/nju/index.php/LC/article/view/2431>
- Thompson, C. (2017). How do Teachers View Strategic Planning as Contributing to the Development of Speaking in EFL Classes? *Journal of Second Language Teaching & Research*. Retrieved from <http://pops.uclan.ac.uk/index.php/jsltr/article/view/27>
- Ya-ni Z. (2007). Communication Strategies and Foreign Language Learning. *US-China Foreign Language*, 5(4). ISSN1539-8080, USA 43.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author, with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).