

Negotiated Interaction to promote EFL Learners in the Learning of Vocabulary

Nur Subari¹

¹(Master of English Education Study Program, Lampung University, Indonesia)

Abstract. *Studies on negotiated interaction in Vocabulary acquisition which involved the learners with the different aged have been well documented. However, the study on negotiated interaction with similar aged has still not become widespread in Vocabulary Learning. The current study is about the negotiated interaction in two way tasks effect to the students Vocabulary Learning and the group of input and interaction task should be compared with the task input material. So, the design of this research was control pretest and posttest design on which utilized control and experiment group and the sample of the research were 40 students from two classes, 20 students as the control group and 20 students as the experiment group. The finding of this research show that the students of experiment group do much better to learn the vocabulary than the students in the control group due the students in the experiment group were able to negotiate if they lack of proficiency in the Language. As negotiated interaction has proved successful in enabling students to learn vocabulary items, such the task with input and interaction should be encouraged in the classroom.*

Keyword. *Negotiated interaction, Control Group Pretest and posttest design and Vocabulary Learning.*

Date of Submission: 26-01-2021

Date of acceptance: 11-02-2021

I. Introduction

Numerous Studies on Negotiated interaction in the Vocabulary Acquisition which involved the learners with different aged have been well conducted. However, studies on Negotiated interaction in the Vocabulary learning which involved the learners with the similar age are very seldom. A many studies related to this issue, a study by Oliver (1998) conducted a study to examine whether children have the same ability with adults in negotiation for meaning so the strategies for negotiation were similar. The study by Oliver (2002) which examined the conversational interaction between children in different age (aged 8 to 12 years old) that they involved in two communicative tasks. A similar study by Zhao and Bitchener (2007) also investigated that negotiated interaction in the vocabulary acquisition which involved mainly adults and children of varied L1 backgrounds. So, Lee Luan and Sappathy (2011) had made his mind by conducting his own study on Negotiated interaction which involved mainly Child-Child between ten and eleven years of age with the similar background of L1, Those previous studies had been conducted for the ESL Learners. Yet, for the EFL Learners, Lazaro-Ibarrola & Azpilicueta-Martínez(2014) which investigated negotiation of meaning for EFL Children between seven to eight years in learning Vocabularies. It seems to be in need to include the similar aged and level in the negotiated interaction for Vocabularies Learning. Due to the Children and adult will have different rate in the negotiated interaction although they have the same strategies and the most striking difference is that children use fewer comprehension checks (Oliver, 2009). Moreover, children tend to focus on constructing their own meaning, and less on facilitating their partners' construction of meaning" (Oliver, 1998: 379). Ellis (1985) also elaborated that adult tend to employ more questions and request for clarification than child interlocutors.

For the sake of what the importants of vocabularies are in Language, it have been well explained by Aysan and Karim (2014) Focused that Vocabulary is the most basic and fundamental element in Foreign Language learning above all. Krashen (1989) and Nation (1990) who believe that learning language needs learning it's Vocabulary. Then, Lee Luan and Sappathy (2011, p. 6) maintain that "structures and functions of the language alone cannot be used for comprehension and communication". Richards and Rodgers (2001, p. 132) refers to vocabulary as lexis and words so words combination. Huang, Huang, Huang and Lin (2012, p. 273) elaborated that Vocabulary is one essential element for learning four language skills. However, there is no an ample time for learners to learn some vocabularies with their own freinds in the classroom and sometimes, the students also are given a task of Vocabularies to be completed and memorized individually without any highly interacted with their own classmate to learn and practice it together due to the Language should be practiced and communicated, it seems in accordance with Setiyadi et, al (2018) stated that the role of teacher is likely to be teaching communication via Language, not teaching language via communication.

To overcome the problems, Negotiated interaction is expected to be utilized in Learning Vocabularies for EFL Learners which allows them to practice in the target Language above all when there is little opportunity

for the learners to do this outside classroom situations due to negotiation of meaning helps students notice gaps in their language which enables them to work towards mutual understanding (Varonis & Gass, 1985; Pica, Young & Doughty, 1987)

II. Literature Review

2.1. Input and Interactional Hypotheses.

Long (1996) pointed out that both input and interaction as two major players in the language Acquisition. Input according to Coder (1967) is not what is heard and read by the learners to take in but rather than what actually goes in, making it heard or read as "input" and what is taken as "intake". The Input hypothesis developed by Krashen (1985), states that learners acquire language in only one way and that is by understanding messages or receiving input that is slightly above their current level of understanding. Receiving the input as the important process in acquiring of the language due to it needs highly comprehensible about it. It is in accordance with what had been assumed by Pica (1994) Input needs to be made comprehensible before learners can internalize the rules, forms and features. In order to get the highly comprehensible, modified interaction between participants in an interlocution is very necessary was necessary in providing comprehensible input to the language learner (Luan and Sappathy, 2015). This is known as the interaction hypotheses, when native speakers or non-native speakers make modification during the conversation. According to Long (1996) the modifications are made by native or non-native speakers during the conversation is to serve the comprehensible input to the learners. Additionally, Luan and Sappathy (2015) elaborated that the learners are facilitated to obtain the comprehensible input in the term of positive and negative feedback on their problematic utterances using the feedback provided during interactions. Therefore, Negotiation Sequences have the potential in providing the learners with the opportunities to access the acceptable and unacceptable of linguistic data (Bitchener, 2003). Bitchener (2003) also elaborated that two-way information gap task and a decision making task have the effect on long-term retention of vocabulary items (concrete noun, abstract noun and adjective). Accordingly, Blake (2000), two-way tasks bring about further negotiation of meaning than other task types, and this characteristic is due to their convergent nature. In addition, two-way tasks possess significant features such as more confirmation checks, comprehension checks, and clarification requests made in learning contexts.

Furthermore, Negotiation of meaning plays as the most important role in the considering the comprehensible input. The term negotiation here refers to the modification and restructuring of interaction between interlocutors when they experience comprehension difficulties (Pica, 1994, p. 494). The features of negotiation in this case include the listener's request for message clarification and confirmation; the speaker may then repeat, elaborate, or simplify the original message (Pica, 1994; Long, 1996).

Therefore, for the sake of negotiated interaction implementation to promote EFL Vocabulary Learning, the researcher attempts the research question as below:

1. Is there a significant difference between the pretest of the group with input material only and the group with input and interaction?
2. Does the group with the input material and interaction promote students Vocabulary learning better than the group with input material only?

III. Methodology

This study was the Control group pretest-posttest design which data was gathered using pretest and posttest for both control and experiment group. To answer the first research question, Independent sample test was undertaken to compare the score of pretest between the control and experiment group. To answer the second research, Paired sample t. test was undertaken to compare the score of pretest and posttest in each groups and the Independent sample T-Test was undertaken to compare the score of posttest between the control and experiment group.

3.1. Participants.

Eleven grade students of MAN I Metro Boarding school were the population of this study. The sample for the study were Twenty students were taken from eleven science five students as the experiment group and twenty students of eleven Social four students as the control group. These students were taken purposively from the both two classes of Control and experiment group.

3.2. Procedures.

On Day 1, all 40 participants sat for a pretest involving 15 vocabulary items on 'Things in the Kitchen'. On the second day, all 40 participants were taught these vocabulary items through an input only task where the words were embedded in a comprehension passage. The teacher used translations and pictures to get meaning across.

On the 3rd day, students in the experimental group were involved in a two-way interactive task, whereas the learners have to complete task interactively by using the strategies of Negotiation of meaning in

constructing the word meaning and afterward the participant. After receiving instructions from the researchers on how to carry out the task, the students who are paired proceeded to show the Vocabulary words and one another to show the picture related to the meaning of Vocabulary. In this process, the learners are expected to utilize the negotiation strategy when the students lack of the knowledge.

3.3. Data Analysis

The collected data were recorded in SPSS 23 Version. To know the different score of pretest between control and experiment group independent sample T-Test was used to analyze it and to know the different score of pretest and posttest in each group paired sample T. Test was undertaken to analyze it. And to know the different score between the posttest of control and experiment group, independent sample T-Test was undertaken to analyze it.

3.4. Instrument

In this study, the researcher used test as the instrument for collecting the data, the kinds of test are

1. Pretest, this activity was done to make sure that the target words in the experiment were unknown for all students.
2. Posttest, used to know about students score both control and experiment group after treatment.

IV. Findings and Discussions

4.1. Findings and Discussions

A total of two sets of scores were gathered. They comprised a pretest and posttest after the treatment and the comparison scores pretest and posttest of the control and experiment group were highlighted here to know about the significant influence to the improvement of vocabulary in each group afterward the posttest of each group would be compared. Data was analyzed using Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 23. Descriptive statistics were obtained by conducting a the pretest to know the scores of both the control and experimental group to determine equality of variances. The results of the test are summarized in Tables 1 and 2 below.

Table 1 The Mean Description Table of the Pre-Test

		Group Statistics			
Groups		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
1.	control group	25	57.6000	3.57071	.71414
2.	Experimental Group	25	57.8000	2.91548	.58310

Table 2: Independent samples test for pretest of control and experiment group

Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
1. control group	1.055	.309	-.217	48	.829	-.20000	.92195	-2.05371	1.65371
Equal variances not assumed			-.217	46.154	.829	-.20000	.92195	-2.05563	1.65563

Based on Tables 1 and 2, the p-value from the Levene's test for equality of variances is 0.829. This means that equality of variances can be assumed where Pretest scores can be said to be similar. It can be concluded from the results above that the subjects shared the same level of vocabulary. Thus, the two groups were deemed comparable prior to treatment.

Comparison of Pretest and posttest score in the Control and Experiment group

To find out if there was a difference between the vocabulary Pretest and posttest scores of the group with input and interaction (two way tasks) and the group with input only materials (one way task), an analysis of t-test for paired samples was used to analyze the mean scores of the pre-test and the posttest obtained by the control group and the experimental group. The table 3 and 4 is the result of different scores for pretest and posttest of control group.

**Table 3, Descriptive summary of control group of pretest and posttest score
Paired Samples Statistics**

	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1 Pretest Control Group	57.6000	25	3.57071	.71414
Posttest Control group	60.6000	25	3.00000	.60000

**Table 4, Paired sample T-test for pretest and posttest of control group
Paired Samples Test**

	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Pair 1 Pretest Cont Group - Posttest Cont group	-3.00000	2.88675	.57735	-4.19159	-1.80841	-5.196	24	.000

Tables 3 and 4 show the evidence that there is a significant increase in the score of the posttest for the control group in comparison to the pretest score. The p-value for the control group is 0.000. For the pretest of control group, the mean gain score was 57.6 and the posttest mean score was 60,6 it can be concluded that there is the different scores between pretest and posttest of control group after giving the treatment by the task with input material only, whereas the posttest score significantly increase. The evidence in the table showed that the tasks with input material only namely one way tasks is effective to promote students Vocabulary learning. However, tasks with input material only without any interaction had not given much influence yet to the vocabulary learning improvement due to the learners to complete the tasks individually. Yet, the learners are offered the change to produce more modified output by giving the input material only. It is in line with Iwashita (2001) indicates that one-way tasks offer chances which bring about producing more modified output than two-way tasks.

**Table 5, Descriptive summary of Experiment group for pretest and posttest score
Paired Samples Statistics**

	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1 Pretest exp Group	57.8000	25	2.91548	.58310
Posttest exp group	70.2000	25	3.05505	.61101

**Table 6, Paired sample T-test for pretest and posttest of Experiment group
Paired Samples Test**

	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Pair 1 Pretest exp Group - Posttest exp group	1.24000E1	3.26599	.65320	-13.74813	-11.05187	-18.984	24	.000

From the table 5 and 6 showed us the evidence that p-value for the experiment group in comparing the pretest and posttest is 0.000 that means that there is significant different between pretest and posttest score of experiment group, whereas the score of pretest is 57.8 and the score of posttest is 70,2. Therefore, it can be concluded that by giving the task with the interaction between students namely two way tasks could Promote students Vocabulary learning more effective than the group with only input the material. The result improvement of students vocabulary be so, due to the tasks in the experiment treatment offers the learners to share information each other as a study of Ellis (2003), Izumi and Izumi (2004), and Mackey (2012) pointed out that a two-way task teaching method has the participants in any learning activity share information with the aim of fulfilling goal which is the completion of the task. Therefore, by sharing information each learners will add slightly comprehensible input for each learners.

Comparison the posttest scores of the Control and Experiment group

To find out if there was a difference between the vocabulary posttest scores of the group with input and interaction (two way tasks) and the group with input only materials (one way task), an analysis of Independent sample T-test was used to analyze the mean scores of the posttest between control and experiment group.

**Table 7, Descriptive summary of different posttest scores of Control and experiment group
Group Statistics**

Vocabulary Learning	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Score 1. Control Group	25	60.6000	3.00000	.60000
2. Experiment Group	25	70.2000	3.05505	.61101

**Table 8, Independent samples test control and experiment group posttest score.
Independent Samples Test**

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means							
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
								Lower	Upper	
Score Equal variances assumed	.094	.761	-11.210	48	.000	-9.60000	.85635	-11.32180	-7.87820	
Equal variances not assumed			-11.210	47.984	.000	-9.60000	.85635	-11.32182	-7.87818	

Regarding to the table 7 and 8, it is indicated that there was significant different score between the posttest of control and experiment, whereas the P-value was 0.000 that means the score of control and experiment group to be compared significantly. The control group obtained the score 60,6 and the experiment group obtained the score 70,2, so it can be concluded statistically that the Experiment group had done much better than the control group, whereas the result is in line with The results study of Gass & Torres,(2005); Ellis et al (1994) conducted on negotiated interaction for the acquisition of vocabulary. In the experiment group the learners are given the tasks to negotiated in order to build the interaction between learners to confirm and disconfirm hypothesis if the learners lack of knowledge. Yet, in the control group on which the tasks input material only will affect to the learners were not able to confirm and disconfirm the tasks it is in accordance with what had been claimed by Gass and Torres (2005) that subjecting learners to interaction with materials only may not enable the learners to confirm or disconfirm hypothesis if there is a lack of knowledge.

Furthermore, in the process of receiving comprehensible input by the task with input material and interaction namely two way task, learners will encounter many difficulties due their own lower knowledge proficiency and they need a feedback from one another in order to comprehend the meaning accurately. Therefore, as clarified by Khodareza (2016) as cited in Blake (2000) that two-way tasks bring about further negotiation of meaning than other task types, and this characteristic is due to their convergent nature. In addition, two-way tasks possess significant features such as more confirmation checks, comprehension checks, and clarification requests made in learning contexts.

Supporting the result above, there were several examples of negotiation of meaning strategies utilized by the students in the negotiated interaction by using two way tasks:

Example of Clarification request and Confirmation Check.

- Student A : Showed some Vocabulary to the students B in order to be answered by showing the appropriate picture.
- Student A : Showed the word “ Electric kettle”
- Student B : Showed the picture about “ Kettle “ only
- Student A : No
- Student B : **So, what the meaning of “ Electrical kettle” ?**(Ask the clarification)
- Student A : Electrical kettle means the tool that used by people to make the water in short time and simple one without any fire and the other (**Giving Clarification**)
- Student B : Think of it and searched the appropriate picture and showed it so He/ She said “ **is this (the picture of electrical kettle) electrical kettle? (doing some confirmation check)**
- Student A : yes, great

V. Conclusion

Based on the result and discussion above, it can be concluded that the learners in both the control and experiment group have the same capabilities in language above in Vocabulary mastery. The learners Vocabulary mastery improves for both of the groups after the treatment by the input material only for the control group and the input material and interaction for the experimental group. However, the group which input the material with the interaction had done much better in the improvement than the group with input the material only. Due to the learners are given much time to share information each other in order to get slightly comprehensible input and confirm and disconfirm if they lack of the knowledge in the group of the input material and interaction. Even, the learners with input material only are offered the change to produce more modified output of the utterance. However, what negotiation strategies were utilized by the students was not elaborated in this article. Therefore, for the further research is expected to elaborate about what kind of negotiation strategies were utilized by the students in the interaction and whether the learners which in the similar age have the same strategies or not.

References.

- [1]. Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language teaching and learning*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- [2]. Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. New York : Oxford University Press.
- [3]. Ellis, R., Tanaka, Y., & Yamazaki, A. (1994). Classroom interaction, comprehension, and the acquisition of L2 word meanings. *Language Learning*, 44, 449-491.
- [4]. Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learners' errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 5, 161-170.
- [5]. Gass, S. M., & Torres, M. J. A. (2005). Attention when?: An investigation of the ordering effect of input and interaction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 27(1), 1- 31.
- [6]. Huang, M. Y., Huang, M. Y., Huang, H. S., & Lin, T.Y. (2012). A Ubiquitous English Vocabulary Learning System: Evidence of Active/passive Attitudes vs. Usefulness/ease-of-use. *Computers and Education*. 58, 273-282
- [7]. Izumi, Y., & Izumi, S. (2004). Investigating the effects of oral output on the learning of relative clauses in English: Issues in the psycholinguistic requirements for effective output tasks. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 60(5), 587-609.
- [8]. Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: issues and implications*. London: Longman.
- [9]. Krashen, S. D. (1989). We Acquire Vocabulary and Spelling by Reading: Edition Evidence for the Input Hypothesis. *The Modern Language Journal*. 73, 440-464.
- [10]. Karim, S & Aysan N. (2014) The Effect of Linguistic Context on EFL Vocabulary Learning. *GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies*. Volume 14(3)
- [11]. Lazaro-Ibarrola & Azpilicueta-Martínez(2014). Investigating negotiation of meaning in EFL children with very low levels of proficiency. *International Journal of English Studies*.
- [12]. Lee Luan, N., & Sappathy, M. S. (2011). L2 Vocabulary Acquisition: The Impact of Negotiated Interaction. *GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies*. 11(2), 5-20.
- [13]. Long, M. H. (1996). *Input, interaction and second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [14]. Mackey, A. (2012). *Input, interaction and corrective feedback in L2 classrooms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [15]. Nation, I. S. P. (1990). *Teaching and Learning Vocabulary*. New York: Newbury House.
- [16]. Nation, I. S. P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- [17]. Oliver, R. (1998). Negotiation of meaning in child interaction. *The Modern Language Journal* 82, 372-386.
- [18]. Oliver, R. (2002). The patterns of negotiation for meaning in child interactions. *The Modern Language Journal*, 86(1), 97-111.
- [19]. Oliver, R. (2009). How young is too young? Investigating negotiation of meaning and corrective feedback in children aged five to seven years. In A. Mackey & C. Polio (Eds.), *Multiple Perspectives on Interaction: Second Language Interaction Research in Honour of Sue M. Gass* (pp. 135–156). New York: Routledge.
- [20]. Pica, T., Young, R. & C. Doughty. (1987). The impact of interaction on comprehension. *TESOL Quarterly* 21, 737–758.
- [21]. Richards, C. J., & Rodgers, S. T. (2001). *Approaches and Method in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [22]. Sadeghi, Karim & Nobakht, Aysan. (2014). The Effect Of Linguistic Context On EFL Vocabulary Learning. *GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies*. 14(3), 65.
- [22]. Setiyadi, Ag Bambang, Sukirlan, Muhammad & Mahpul (2018). *Teaching Language Skills : Preparing Materials and selecting Technique*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.
- [23]. Varonis, E. M., & Gass, S. M. (1985). Non-native/non-native conversations: A model for negotiation of meaning. *Applied Linguistics*, 6(1), 71-90.
- [24]. Zhao, S. Y. & Bitchener, J. (2007). Incidental focus on form in teacher-learner and learner-learner interactions. *System* 35, 431-447.

Nur Subari. "Negotiated Interaction to promote EFL Learners in the Learning of Vocabulary." *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME)*, 11(1), (2021): pp. 13-19.