

TRANSLINGUAL NEGOTIATION STRATEGIES USED BY ENGLISH STUDENTS TO BUILD CLASSROOM INTERACTION IN A TRANSLATION CLASS

Veni Roza

Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, Fakultas Tarbiyah dan Ilmu Keguruan (FTIK),
Institut Agama Islam Negeri (IAIN) Bukittinggi
Jl. Raya Gurun Aur Kubang Putih, Bukittinggi, Sumatera Barat, Indonesia
veniroz_501@yahoo.com

Received: 05th January 2019/**Revised:** 07th February 2019/**Accepted:** 13th February 2019

How to Cite: Roza, V. (2019). Translingual negotiation strategies used by English students to build classroom interaction in higher education: A case study in translation class. *Lingua Cultura*, 13(1), 21-29.
<https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v13i1.5214>

ABSTRACT

This research aimed at revealing what kind of translingual strategies that were practiced by the sixth-semester students to build interaction in the translation class. This qualitative research conducted through observing students' interaction in translation class (using English, bahasa Indonesia, and Minangkabau languages). The researcher finds that four macro strategies proposed by Canagarajah (2013): envoicing, recontextualization, interactional, and entextualization strategies are consciously used by students during communication. Envoicing strategies are used by way of word coinage, foreignization, as well as code switching and code mixing dominantly by students while asking and clarifying information. Recontextualization strategies are done through the use of the feature of linguistic form such formulaic Islamic greeting in Arabic preceding the talk. Interactional strategies used are confirmation check, check, clarification request, and recast. Interestingly more competent students use simplification in communication, and less competent speakers use leveling as entextualization strategies. The use of these strategies in speaking helps students (as speakers) to establish classroom interaction.

Keywords: translingual negotiation strategies, classroom interaction, higher education

INTRODUCTION

It is believed that using English within a global context and merging it with speakers' own languages and values will open up various negotiation strategies. These strategies help speakers decode other unique varieties of English and construct new norms which mean that people can use various local languages in global context together with English. It is called by Canagarajah (2013) with multilingual or translingual.

Translingual Practice (TP) goes with post-structuralism perspectives which have been mentioned in several works of literature, such as Canagarajah (2013), Widiyanto (2016), De Costa et al. (2017), Chen (2017), and Fang (2017). In this paradigm, merging one language into English is very acceptable. Monolingual orientation in traditional classroom literacy at many social and educational institutions today, including in Indonesia, is something to be altered. People can communicate across language boundaries about local content and others' culture. However, people are caged in the belief that they should

speak in standardized English like the native. As a result, the teachers and the students as non-native speakers avoid having language contact (afraid of making mistakes) due to the lack of English vocabulary and grammar. The anxiety in the EFL context due to the lack of linguistic competence happens across ages, genders, and grades (Aydin et al., 2017). In short, people will not speak or cannot deploy languages they cope with when they must produce a common language with shared norms.

Considering this fact, Canagarajah (2013) and his proponents propose a TP approach in language learning with the emphasis on active interaction within social rather than cognitive process. The TP offers a way of thinking about letting people expressing their repertoires about something they want to share. The employment of the first language (language interference) in current communication media like social media, in one side, increases sustainable professional development (Alberth et al., 2018) while eventually produce code meshing and other multilingual interaction. Most importantly, the users can speak in languages in order to negotiate the meaning in appropriate ways (knowing

when and how to say what to whom) (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2013).

Canagarajah (2013) has really opened others' minds that in the past they are shaped, educated under and embraced traditional paradigm in teaching English like Grammar Translation Method, Audio-Lingual Method, and so forth in monolingual approach and traditional multilingual one. In a structural point of view, English lecture as a teacher-centered approach and other product-oriented (cognitive domain) dominate the teaching practice in this research. However, translingual practice theories offer a new concept that it is a process-oriented that focuses on interaction and negotiation. It is also open to differences as a component of the ongoing process of meaning-making. In other words, there is no problem when students do communication breakdown like committing errors since every single feature appeared. It has the meaning which is contrary to the structural point of view with accuracy as the foci.

Some of researches have explored the notion of translingual practice coined by Canagarajah with different dependent variables. Widiyanto (2016) has investigated interconnection between translingual negotiation strategies and translingual identities. His research provides clear insight for authors in term of four domains of translingual: personal, social, contextual, and textual domains with the negotiation strategies of envoicing, interactional, recontextualization, and entextualization respectively. De Costa et al. (2017) have investigated translinguaging of prospect and possibilities. He gains its application beyond the communicative product in wider pedagogical contexts. Sugiharto (2015) has analyzed translingualism in action, rendering the impossible-possible. He has found that translinguaging occurs both at lexical and morpho-syntactical levels connected to identities, cultures, and traditions. Next, Lamsal (2014) has analyzed tension between the monolingualist views toward their actual engagement in real literacy practices and Zheng (2013) has studied the complexity of professional lives of international teaching assistants in American University. All of them have discussed the theories and practices of translingual practice by Canagarajah (2013) in a different setting and dependent variables.

Furthermore, translingual practice in higher education seems to be a potential phenomenon to be researched. For this research, translingual practice is conducted at a Translation class where students and lecturers use English, Indonesian, and Minangkabau languages during communication in the classroom. The interaction happens in the classroom among students and also between students and teacher since the researcher applied discussion technique in the subject of English-Indonesian Translation.

During the classroom discussion, students present the theories of translation by giving examples, and then students interact in the session of question and answer. The problems appeared are that some good students tease presenters who delivered their paper in mixing of English, Indonesian, and Minangkabau languages. Students perceive that performing in their mother tongue is inferior and that they must always practice their English in the classroom. As a result, students who get involved in the discussion are brave ones to speak. Another problem is a direct error correction done by the teacher and or other students while presenters performed. This hinders communication fluency. The other is that students as a presenter have applied translingual negotiation strategies to build heat discussion during; however they deploy these less maximally. Based

on these phenomena, the researcher realizes that teachers do not need to interrupt students' talking time. Teachers need to clarify that merging students' own languages in English in order to carry out the paper is not wrong. It is better for the teacher to give feedback after students have done it.

Theoretically, Canagarajah (2013) has coined the translingual negotiation strategies which focus on the process of how these strategies create new values and meanings for existing words or the construction of new indexicals. The speakers negotiate meaning to co-construct situated new norms and achieve sharedness through their negotiation strategies. For instance, before the discussion, the presenters open it by using Islamic greeting in Arabic, *Assalamu'alaikum wa rahmatullahi wabarakaatuh*, Thanks to Allah, Peace be Upon Him to the Prophet Muhammad, and introduce themselves using Indonesian English, "We are from group one" instead of "We are the first group". It is a translingual practice that is deployed by interlocutors unconsciously in reality.

Canagarajah (2013) formulated the strategies that facilitate communicative success through the analysis of an interaction between multilingual students in English. It is proposed four macro translingual negotiation strategies. These strategies will be employed by translingual in a language contact zone, in this case, interaction during the Translation subject discussion. The four macro strategies are envoicing, recontextualization, interaction, and entextualization. These address the central constructs in any act of communication that is personal, contextual, social, and textual dimension respectively (in Teague, 2017).

Envoicing strategies shape the extent and nature of hybridity, as a consideration of voice plays a critical role in appropriating mobile semiotic resources in one's text and talk. In other words, envoicing determines what voices are appropriate in the contact zone. The recontextualization strategies frame the text or talk to facilitate and alter the footing to prepare the ground for appropriate negotiation. In other words, reconceptualization helps students make meaning in spaces with diverse and often incongruent semiotic affordances. The interactional strategies are adopted to negotiate and manage meaning-making activity. These strategies govern how interlocutors communicate with one another and are characterized by reciprocity. Moreover, the entextualization strategies configure codes in the temporal and spatial dimension of the text/talk to facilitate and respond to these negotiations. They ground communicative acts in particular spatiotemporal contexts.

Based on these fours, each strategy addresses a different aspect of the communication act, but they cannot be separated from each other. Since Canagarajah do not elaborate on these four macro strategies in detail so that the researcher adopts micro strategies by Canagarajah (2013) and Widiyanto (2016). These strategies are as shown in Table 1.

Based on Table 1, there are 26 micro negotiation strategies proposed by Widiyanto (2016). These strategies are categorized into seven micro envoicing negotiation strategies, six micro recontextualization negotiation strategies, nine micro interactional strategies, and four micro entextualization negotiation strategies.

Moreover, Moeller (2014) has added three more components which help students negotiate the diverse Englishes in the global contact zone. They are language awareness, rhetorical sensitivity, and negotiation strategies. For the last part, he mentions strategies of confirmation check, repetition, and clarification requests to repair potential

Table 1 Translingual Negotiation Strategies

No	Envoicing strategies	Recontextualization strategies	Interactional strategies	Entextualization strategies
1.	Approximation, e.g. "plate" instead "bowl"	Managing topic, "Asking age,..."	Confirmation check, e.g. "You said..."	Simplification, using lower speech rate.
2.	Word coinage, e.g. handicapped toilet	Contextualization cues, "Saying greeting"	Clarification request, e.g. "What do you mean?"	Segmentation, shortening utterances into segment.
3.	Foreignization, e.g. "kans" for "chance"	Accommodation	Comprehension check, "Do you know?"	Regularization, Foregrounding explicit forms.
4.	Code switching/ code mixing, e.g. "summa cum laude"	Using safe talk, hiding the fact to preserve interlocutor dignity.	Recast, "She sick" → "Oh she is sick"	Leveling, "He eat" instead "He eats".
5.	Code meshing "It ain't enough"	Crossing, using language variety that belongs to other group.	Self-reformulation/ correction, "I go ..i went.."	
6.	Rhetorical tendency, e.g. using humor	Creating a third space, save talk with topic to agree"	Self-representation, "I don't know the material..."	
7.	Gendered expressions, e.g. high involvement for women		Appeal for assistance, "What is the name? made of meat..."	
8.			Mime, using visual illustration	
9.			Let it pass, "ignoring small mistake"	

communicative breakdowns due to norm differences. There are also two unique strategies 'let it pass' and 'make it normal' (Firth, 2009). 'Let it pass' means interlocutors wait patiently for more clues for words or features they do not understand, thus temporarily ignoring the trouble source. 'Make it normal' means the interlocutors may treat as shared a lexical or grammatical feature that may not be normative for native speakers. They will achieve communicative success through features that they thus make normal for their situated interaction. Those strategies involve three key-words collaboration, patience, and solidarity. Based on these theoretical reviews, the researcher goes with the combined concepts of Canagarajah (2013) and Widiyanto (2016) in analyzing translingual negotiation strategies used by students during classroom discussion.

METHODS

The method used in the research is descriptive qualitative. To collect the data, the researcher observes, records, and takes notes the translation class discussion for seven meetings in the class of the sixth semester translingual students (using English, Indonesian, and Minangkabau languages) and the other half by doing the exercise of translation. There are seven topics of translation discussed in the classroom which is held in group presentation and discussion. During this process, negotiation strategies appear when presenters try to explain translation theories and some examples related to them and in the session of question and answer. After doing a theoretical review for half of the semester, students practice of translation from English texts into Indonesian. The data which become the focus of the research are oral interaction between presenters and audience during classroom discussion. Meanwhile, the role of teacher or lecturer in the class is to monitor the process of delivering messages by each participant of the

groups.

Furthermore, the data of the research are taken from the classroom interaction in English Education Department at higher education where English is used as media of communication. However, students are also let to use Bahasa Indonesia, Minangkabau, and other local languages which are positively perceived in supporting teaching and learning process (Alsied, 2018). There are three parallel classes taught by two non-native teachers. The class which provided data for this research is class 6C (33 students) that is taught by a non-native teacher (not author's class). The non-native teacher according to Costa et al. (2017) is considered a proficient teacher (not bad) as long as having teacher quality like the length of experience, teaching qualifications, personal traits, motivation, love of children, and so forth. Moreover, that teacher fulfills these criteria.

In the class, the students are divided into 13 groups by considering that the three meetings are for introduction, mid, and final tests. Each group consists of three members (moderator, presenter, and secretary) of seven groups and two students from six groups. As mentioned before, the researcher collects the information from seven groups (for the half semester) that do the presentation in front of the class (speaking); the other half is doing exercises or practicing translation project (writing). Thus, contact zone means in this research is oral interaction which occurs among interlocutors, student-student interaction during the discussion of Translation class for a half semester.

To analyze the data, the researcher refers to Miles and Huberman's interactive model, namely data collection, data condensation or reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing and verification (in Ngulube, 2015). These activities are carried out interactively and endlessly until the researcher gets saturated data. During data collection of recording students' presentation, the researcher has anticipated data condensation (useless ones) and data display. To reduce data, the researcher has interaction with data display and

conclusion drawing and reciprocally. When displaying the data, she refers to data reduction again, and when drawing the conclusion, the researcher comes back to data display and data collection until she gets the flooded answers related to negotiation strategies used by translingual students.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Based on the data analysis, the finding reveals that students deploy four macro negotiation strategies when explicating the concepts and examples in translation class. They keep using English as they can as a medium of communication and sometimes alter their languages with Indonesian and local language as needed in order to deliver the message. The researcher finds the negotiation strategies applied by interlocutors during classroom interaction

are through; (1) deploying envoicing strategies of word coinage, foreignization, code-switching, and code mixing.; (2) employing recontextualization strategies by the use of the feature of linguistic form like saying a formulaic Islamic greeting in Arabic before speaking; (3) using interactional strategies through confirmation check, clarification request, and recast; (4) applying entextualization strategies by using simplification in communication by more competent students and leveling by less competent speakers.

The first is the envoicing strategy which is to voice one's thoughts so that other people can listen and comprehend one's idea. Voice as self-representation of the speaker exhibits his personality. The researcher finds the students do envoicing negotiation strategies in these following utterances that stated in Table 2.

Based on the interaction depicted in Table 2, it exhibits negotiation envoicing strategies. Students are

Table 2 Finding of Envoicing Strategies

No	Strategies	Speaker	Context	Finding
1.	Word coinage	The first group (Gusti, Dila and Rahmi)	Presenting the word equivalence when translating from English into Indonesian. Presenter gives example in English: "Breadwinner" is for " Pencari nafkah " in Bahasa.	" Pencari nafkah " "ricewinner" instead of "breadwinner"
		Alfu:	Why do the Western call breadwinner <i>ya</i> for pen-cari nafkah ?	
		Gusti:	May be, because they eat bread as their staple food.	
		Melanie:	May we call "ricewinner" for Bapak kita ?	
2.	Foreignization	The second group (Resi, Gustina, Zahra)	Discussing kinds of meaning; one of them is referential meaning. It refers to word or concept which one can perceive. Presenter provides some Indonesian fruits in English version: durian, rambutan, apple, avocado, cherry, melon, papaya, pear, and strawberry .	Using English words "durian, rambutan, apple, avocado, cherry, melon, papaya, pear and strawberry" instead of Indonesian fruits
		Bestiara:	Are you sure? ...eat durian, rambutan, apple,	"durian, rambutan, apel, pokat, ceri, melon, pepaya, pir dan stroberi"
		Resi:	Yes, I ever...durian, rambutan, apple...	
		Lika:	Avocado, cherry, melon, papaya, pear, and strawberry.	
3.	Code mixing/ code switching	The second group (Resi, Gustina, Zahra)	Talking about expressive meaning that it cannot be judged true or false because it reflects speaker feeling. Presenter gives example about evolution of bamboo in Indonesia which symbolizes human life. Bamboo evolution reflects human life process toward flawless stage. Start from Rebung as baby bamboo (nice to eat). We grow in youth a kid like buluh, talang, and aur . Finally we become strong bamboo that is batang or batuang in Minangkabau language. The higher our position and status, the more challenging and the more virtuous.	Bamboo has many varieties " rebung (rabuang) : baby bamboo, buluh (buluah) , aur (aqa) , eru, talang : young bamboo batang (batuang) : bamboo in general which can be only translated into "bamboo".
		Emil:	Why bamboo so philosophical for Minangkabau? Ehm....Why is so ?	
		Resi:	It grows well in our mother land and gives economy value in all aspect of human life. Right?	
		Melisa:	Yes, agree. Even we live in Gurun Aur . We name it. We use it for food, for handicraft, even for housing.	
		Emil:	So that is why just bamboo because only we have it here. Not in England.	

enthusiastic in taking their part during the discussion. Even though they interact in Indonesian and Minang-English, the class atmosphere is so lively and warm. Everybody is brave to speak without thinking of mistake. They apply their own repertoires which maybe native speakers do not understand. 'Rice winner' is coined from 'breadwinner' to indicate that his father works hard as a breadwinner. Moreover, then, the use of English fruits for Indonesian since they do not know the word equivalence in Indonesian, namely foreignization as it is in line with Putrawan's (2018) research that cultural terms are partially foreignized and partially domesticated into the target language. They also deploy code-mixing and code-switching as well when telling a variation of bamboo in English.

Moreover, Kirkpatrick in Widiyanto (2016) has argued that three aspects of languages; communication, identity, and culture. Applying envoicing strategies is a way of exposing the aspect of identity. The structuralist proponent is keen on finding out students' errors and tries to reveal that the errors lead to misunderstanding among the interlocutors. The idea of this fossilized error has been influenced by the monolingual paradigm that argues that language norms are fixed so that students must accept the norms as they are. In contrast, the structuralist opponent, the post-structuralist like Translingual Practice (TP) has a completely different perspective that considers errors as a process of learning and symptom of development. It will not lead to fossilization because mistakes can be eliminated as students learn and practice by merging their own languages into English and

constructing new norms (Canagarajah, 2013).

Based on the finding, students are not influenced by the paradigm 'must correct' in speaking as suggested by a monolingual perspective. They encourage themselves employing translingual negotiation strategies to deliver their ideas even though repertoire they used do not meet the standard form of English. For instance, Zahra uses the strategy of code switching when she is stuck because of not knowing the term in English. If it is viewed from the structuralist approach which applies 'English only', Zahra action is discouraged and rejected. This principle will eventually make students less confident to speak, even just keep silent because of the lack of vocabulary and grammar. The monolingual perspective does not support envoicing negotiation strategies which violate the norms of Standard English. In contrast, Zahra's deed is something common committed in building the conversation by mixing code about local wisdom (Harjanti et al., 2018).

The second is recontextualization strategies which deal with the social aspect that interlocutors are engaged in meaning negotiation so that they can understand each other. In other words, users can speak in languages in appropriate ways (knowing when and how to say what to whom) because knowing the context or framing the talk in order to create save atmosphere. The researcher finds two micro strategies in these recontextualization strategies that can be seen in Table 3.

Based on Table 3, the researcher finds that students deployed two micro strategies, namely managing the topic

Table 3 Finding of Recontextualization Strategies

No	Strategies	Speaker	Context	Finding
1.	Managing the topic	The third group (Ade, Sari, Popi)	They discuss the topic of evoked meaning. It arises from register variation. Register is a variety of language than users considers appropriate to a specific condition. Register arises from filed of discourse, tenor and mode. After that, the presenter gives example. Taking part in a football match, register used will be dealing with that.	Framing: the talk about 'football match' and also Talking about 'wedding party' in Minangkabau culture.
		Arif:	Sometimes talking about football makes <i>rusuh</i> . Many people fight talking about club they support went home earlier.	
		Ade:	Yes, Arif, you have given us the answer. Club, lost, win are the register of football. It impossible for us to talk about wedding party when the field is discussing football.	
			Argentina, Messy, Portugal, Ronaldo.	
		Siti:	Yes...you alrait.	
		Ade:	Arif maybe the way they support the team is <i>lebay</i> and make others offended. So people angry.	
		Melanie:	What about changing topic. After playing football, the football player is having a wedding party.	
		Siti:	(Laughing)	
		Melanie:	If talking about weeding party in Minang culture, what register appear, ya?	
		Gusti:	I have ever been in a traditional party. We sit on the floor and served some foods like <i>rendang</i> and <i>gulai rebung</i> .	
		Ade:	Food, bridegroom, bride,	
		Yeni:	Ms, I was asked by the host to eat <i>parabuang</i> after I ate.	
		Gusti:	What is parabuang actually?	
		Sari:	As far as I know, <i>parabuang</i> is dessert. Ehm,... It is part of the roof. <i>Parabuang</i> indicates "closing". It is to complete the phase of eating so everybody is full.	
		Gusti:	Perfect!	

Table 3 Finding of Recontextualization Strategies (Continued)

No	Strategies	Speaker	Context	Finding
2.	Contextualization	Group 1 (Gusti, Dila, Rahmi), Group 2 (Resi, Gustina, Zahra), Group 3 (Ade, Sari, Popi), Group 4 (Novia, Melisa, Timang) Group 5 (Suci, Lika, Emil) Group 6 (Lisa, Indri, Melani), Group 7 (Melisa, Yeni, Putri)	Starting the discussion of each topic by greeting using feature of linguistic form of a formulaic Islamic greeting in Arabic. <i>Assalamu 'alaikumwarahmatullahiwabarakaatuh</i> , Thanks to Allah, Peace be Upon Him to Prophet Muhammad and so forth) and introduced themselves using Indonesian English "We are from group one" instead of "We are the first group".	Saying a formulaic Islamic greeting in Arabic. <i>Assalamu 'alai kumwarahmat ullahiwabarak aatuh</i> , Thanks to Allah, Peace be Upon Him to Prophet Muhammad and so forth)

by framing the talk/text and alter the footing to prepare the ground for appropriate negotiation and contextualization by saying Islamic greeting to open discussion. As mentioned in theory, each strategy is related to each other. When talking about recontextualization strategies, other strategies adhere to them. For the first strategy, many students are participating in discussing a football match. They can speak smoothly about the topic they are familiar with and having background knowledge on it. Names of club, famous football players, winner and loser are terms related to the frame. They also produce repertoires which some friends do not know about it like *parabuang*. Sari as a less active student, when knowing what *parabuang* is, wants to express her idea. That *parabuang* is part of the roof to close the meets between two roofs to avoid water drop. Why dessert is related to part of a house is to indicate a complete job, full if eating.

That idea is in line with Widiyanto's (2016) research that why a non-native English speaker (NNES) mechanic with mediocre English competence can better understand a car manual written in English than a fluent English speaker who does not know about mechanics. That is because she/he knows the context of the manual based on his/her background knowledge. The manual is framed in a certain structure, such giving pictures to show where certain bolts are or pictorial steps of opening certain compartment so that anyone who is familiar with the car quickly understands how to do the thing. The same things happen in a conversation where interlocutors use their recontextualization strategies so that they can understand each other better because they have background knowledge.

Moreover, in the second micro strategy, almost all group presenters start their speaking by saying a formulaic Islamic greeting in Arabic like *Assalamu 'alaikumwarahmatullahiwabarakaatuh*, Thanks to Allah, Peace be Upon Him to Prophet Muhammad and so forth, and introduced themselves using Indonesian English, such as, "We are from group one", "We are the second group", and so forth. Since they study in an Islamic institution, it is common for them to always start any event by greeting and using Islamic preamble.

The third is interactional strategies. They deal with social aspect that interlocutors are engaged in meaning negotiation so that they can understand each other. It can be categorized as reciprocal strategies (resist others' coercion) and collaborative strategies (interested in agreement and

harmony). The finding reveals three micro strategies used by students are confirmation check, clarification, and recast. It can be seen in Table 4.

Based on Table 4, Ade confirms interlocutor's idea about 'dress the chicken' and 'dress the baby'. She feels strange with the expression and thinks how to dress a chicken. Meanwhile, Popi clarifies Novia's answer on meaning 'dress the chicken' versus 'dress the baby'. Another strategy applied is recast done by Suci and Alfu. She repeats Indri's statement by revising the errors, and Alfu revises Emil's error. In general, students who do not understand, they push themselves to deploy their interactional strategies to engage in negotiating meaning together with other class members especially those who have better competence in English so that they get something from the lesson. That finding is in line with Widiyanto (2016) that students deploy pragmatic strategies such as a confirmation check to allow meaning negotiation among them. The sentences of 'do you know what I mean?' or 'do you get it?' are used to make sure that interlocutors understand.

The fourth is entextualization strategies that aim at revealing how speakers (writers) to manage their productive processes by exploiting the spatiotemporal dimensions of the text and orientating us to the trajectory of meaning-encoding practices in contact zone encounters (Canagarajah, 2013). The researcher finds two micro strategies enacted by the discussor, namely simplification, and leveling. It can be seen in Table 5.

Based on Table 5, Alfu, as a good speaker, can present his idea smoothly. He simplifies his speech by lowering the speech rate to minimize pauses. He explains the use of address terms in different situations by choosing simple word slowly. In contrast, Ade as less competent one speaks in fillers, 'umm' because of her limitation vocabulary and grammar. The second minor strategy is that errors of grammar committed by students during speaking as the application of negotiation strategies. These errors do not hinder students from interacting and communicating with their friends in the classroom. It makes them able to create solidarity and model intercultural sensitivity (Kulavuz-Onal & Vasquezkula, 2018). Different from the structuralist point of view, all errors are problems and should be eliminated. It makes students afraid of getting involved in the conversation and voicing their ideas.

The way students negotiate the meaning and make the audience understand what they communicate is a

Table 4 Finding of Interactional Strategies

No	Strategies	Speaker	Context	Finding
		The fourth group (Novia, Melisa, Timang)	Presenter presents the topic about collocation of lexical items. Collocation is concerned with how words go together. Knowing which words go together is important to understand meaning of a text and translate well. The presenter give example of English collocation: 'dress the chicken' vs 'dress the baby'.	"What do you mean" is used confirmation of interlocutor's statement.
1.	Confirmation check	Ade: Novia:	What do you mean? I give you examples of collocation. Word dress can collocate with chicken, baby...	
2.	Clarification	Popi: Novia: Dila: Timang: Alfu: Novia: Popi:	You said dress the chicken? Chicken has a dress? The meaning is contrast. Dress the baby is putting the clothes on, <i>memasang baju bayi</i> but dress the chicken involves taking the feathers off, <i>menguliti ayam</i> . Ade has given us example of English collocation. I ever heard. Fire . Is it collocation too? Fire? You mention Api? I know expression in the movie "You are fired!" I also have some. The hunter fired his gun. The book fired my imagination. The man fired his stove. Yes, they are collocations. They have different meaning, depend on word which follow... <i>membakar, bersemangat, terbakar, menembak, dipecat</i> . Ok. I get it.	Clarification is used to clarify statements uttered by someone. E.g. "You said..." "You mention..."
3.	Recast	The fifth group (Suci, Lika, Emil) Indri: Suci: Indri: Suci: Emil: Alfu:	They discuss grammatical equivalence of source and target languages. There are five categories: number, person, gender, tense and aspect, and voice. English recognizes all these grammatical categories which should be considered when doing translation. The presenter gives example: Telling past experience in the last long vacation. Lika and I went to Sirandah Island. The trip took six hours. Arrived there, we saw many people. The view was so beautiful. I also go to island...I am forget. near Sirandah. Oo good. You also went to Island ,....Sirandah, Indri? You forgot it? Are you sure going there? Yes, no..., eh yes I went to Pasumpahan, another island. Oh I see... Different from both of you, I didn't go anywhere. I helped my brother make homework of handicraft. Emil was excellent. He helped her brother do the homework. Right?	Interlocutor does recast to correct error of her friend. e.g. I go → you went I am forget → you forgot

Table 5 Finding of Entextualization Strategies

No	Strategies	Speaker	Context	Finding
1.	Simplification	Group 7 (Alfu, Sesmita and Fatimah) Ade: Alfu: Melanie: All students:	Presenter presents about the lexical items and situational context. The situation in which words are used is crucial. Particular word that is chosen will depend on situation. Speaker-addressee relationship, age, sex, and educational level influence our lexical items in doing translation. Presenter gives example of using address term. Prof, Sir, Mr. Umm, in seminar like proposal and thesis seminar, we call umm...Prof. Ritonga, umm outside we call him..Bapak..in market maybe... ummm...Mr. Rahman. The same person will be addressed differently. In formal situation, Prof. Dr. Rahman Ritonga. Even added Bapak Prof. In less formal Bapak, Sir or maybe Mr. Ustadz....Bapak ustadz in masjid. well. She is my father. Shocked!	Address term in different setting, <i>Prof Smith, Mr: John, Sir</i> abroad. In Indonesia <i>Bapak Prof, Prof, Pak Rahman, Ustadz, even father</i>

Table 5 Finding of Entextualization Strategies (Continued)

No	Strategies	Speaker	Context	Finding
2.	Leveling	Taken from presentation previously: Emil: Ade: Melanie: Gusti: Novia:	Various topics: Why bamboo so philosophical for Minangkabau? Well Arif, you have given us the answer. It impossible for us to talk about wedding party when the field is discussing football. Arif maybe the way they support the team is lebay and make others offended. So people angry . We sit on the floor and served some foods like rendang gulairebung. ... They have different meaning, depend on word which follow	Missing be in every nominal sentences. Missing be in passive voice. We served with rendang, gulairebung. Error in using verb suffix. e.g. We presentation. Error in subject-verb agreement. e.g. word follow Error in using plural marker.

breakthrough grasped by the teacher during class discussion. As it is suggested by the coiner (Canagarajah, 2013) that English proficiency should focus on language awareness rather than grammatical correctness in a single variety, strategies of negotiation rather than mastery of product-oriented rules, and pragmatics rather than linguistics competence as cited in Chen (2017).

Teacher as the facilitator in the classroom needs to encourage students and raise their awareness to use some various strategies to speak and learn a language (Alfian, 2018). Classroom discussion keeps running as long as students take parts and interact in their own repertoires to negotiate meaning by applying some strategies as expressed previously.

CONCLUSIONS

Students have participated actively during discussion even though they produce some semiotic resources which are not congruent with the norms of Standard English. Students have negotiated message they want to share by applying some strategies. In envoicing strategies, they express their ideas by coining new word form, using foreignization in the Indonesian language, and altering their speech to mother tongue when they do not know the words equivalences in English. In recontextualization strategies, they manage their topic by choosing a topic which produces safe talk like a football match and a wedding party. Students also give cues ranging from the prosodic, paralinguistic, lexical and larger discourse by saying a formulaic Islamic greeting in Arabic before opening the discussion. In interactional strategies, students use confirmation check, clarification and recast. In entextualization strategies, the good competence students in English speak in lower speech rate to avoid pauses using fillers. They simplify their speech. Meanwhile, less competent students do some errors in using verbs and be.

In short, it can be concluded that these four strategies actually cannot be separated from each other because one uses one micro strategy, another one follows. Above all, the conclusion is letting students expressing in their own repertoires about something without judging the correctness. Negotiating the meaning is more important than saying a single correct sentence. Since this research conducted in the classroom only, the data gotten are limited to the semi-contextualized situation. Furthermore, this

research can be a basis for the next research that elaborates the translingual negotiation strategies in a real context of the daily conversation.

REFERENCES

- Alberth, Mursalin., Siani., Suardikan, I. K., Ino, L. (2018). Social media as a conduit for teacher professional development in the digital era: Myths, promises or realities? *TEFLIN Journal*, 29(2), 293–306. <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v29i2/293-306> 1.
- Alfian, A. (2018). Proficiency level and language learning strategy choice of Islamic University learners in Indonesia. *TEFLIN Journal*, 29(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v29i1/1-18>.
- Alsied, S. M. (2018). An investigation of the use of the first language in Libyan EFL classrooms. *TEFLIN Journal*, 29(2), 155–176. <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v29i2/155-176>.
- Aydin, S., Harputlu, L., Çelik, Ş. S., Uştuk, Ö., & Güzel, S. (2017). Age, gender, and grade effect on foreign language anxiety among children. *TEFLIN Journal*, 28(2), 133–154. <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v28i2/133-154>.
- Canagarajah, S. (2013). *Translingual practice global: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. London: Routledge.
- Chen, X. (2017). Translingual practices in the first-year international students' English academic writing. *IN TESOL Journal*, 14(1), 25-50.
- De Costa, P. I., Wang, X., Singh, J. G., Fraiberg, S., Milu, S., & Canagarajah, S. (2017). Pedagogizing translingual practice: Prospects and possibilities Introduction: Situating Translingual Practice in the Classroom. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 51(4), 464–472.
- Fang, F. (2017). English as a lingua franca: Implications for pedagogy and assessment. *TEFLIN Journal*, 28(1), 57–70. <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v28i1/57-70>.
- Firth, A. (2009). The lingua franca factor. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 2(6), 147–170.
- Harjanti, M., Sumardjo., Lubis, D., Suhandi, N. (2018).

- Code-mixing in online discussion forum among progressive farmer: Revealing Sundanese culture wisdom in Agriculture community. *Lingua Cultura*, 12(3), 247–252. <https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v12i3.4175>.
- Kulavuz-Onal, D., & Vasquez, C. (2018). Thanks, shokran, gracias: Translingual practices in a Facebook group. *Language Learning & Technology*, 22(1), 240–256.
- Lamsal, T. R. (2014). *Globalizing literacies and identities: Translingual and transcultural literacy practices of Bhutanese refugees in the U.S* (Master's Thesis/ Doctoral Dissertation). Louisville, Kentucky: University of Louisville.
- Larsen-Freeman, D., & Anderson, M. (2013). *Techniques and principles in language teaching* (3rd Ed.). UK: Oxford University Press. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(01\)00006-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(01)00006-9).
- Moeller, L. (2014). *Students' rhetorical strategies in translingual encounters on campus* (Master's Thesis). Michigan: Michigan Technological University.
- Ngulube, P. (2015). Qualitative data analysis and interpretation: Systematic search for meaning. In E. R. Mathipa & M. T. Gumbo (Eds.), *Addressing Research Challenges: Making Headway for Developing Research* (pp. 131–157. Nordwyk: Mosala-Masedi Publishers & Booksellers. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.1375.7608>.
- Putrawan, G. E. (2018). Foreignization and domestication of Indonesian cultural terms in the novel "Gadis Pantai" translated into English. *Lingua Cultura*, 12(3), 309–315. <https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v12i3.4233>.
- Sugiharto, S. (2015). Translingualism in action: Rendering the impossible possible. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 12(2), 125–154.
- Teague, W. S. (2017). *Toward a translingual orientation to writing instruction at a hispanic-serving institution*. Texas: Texas State University.
- Widiyanto, Y, N. (2016). *The interconnectedness between translingual negotiation strategies and translingual identities: A qualitative study of an intensive English program in Gorontalo - Indonesia* (Dissertation). Ohio: The Ohio State University.
- Zheng, X. (2013). *Translingual identity-as-pedagogy: The identity construction and practices of international teaching assistants (ITAs) of English in the college composition classroom*. Washington DC: University of Washington.