JELE

Journal ofEnglish Languageand Education

Editorial Board

PREFACE

We proudly present the *Journal of English Language and Education (JELE) Vol.1, No.2* whichis presented for practitioners and researchers in accomodating their findings of research. By sharing the idea through this journal, it is expected that issues dealing with the English language and teaching can be overcome as it can be a reference to conduct a new research in the future.

This journal comprises seven articles concerning on linguistics and English language teaching. They are categorized into discourse analysis, syllabus design and techniques to teach English that aim to improve the quality of Englishlearning.

We would like to thank to the contributors who have already participated in sharing the ideas towards the content of this journal. We would like also to express our sincere thanks to all members of editorial board who have worked hand in hand in creating this journal. We hope that this fine collection of articles will be beneficial and valuable to stimulate a further research.

Yogyakarta, December 2015
Editor

TABLE OF CONTENT
Vol.1 No.2, December 2015

The Realization of Interpersonal Negotiation in the Conversation

Elysa Hartati
English Education Department, Faculty of Teachers Training and Education,
Mercu Buana University of Yogyakarta
Email: hartatielysa@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study aimed toinvestigate how the students of English Department of the State University of Semarang realize interpersonal negotiation in their conversation and find out what kinds of problems that emerge when the students have an interpersonal negotiation in their conversation.In analyzing the data, the descriptive qualitative approach was employed with small quantification was made to support the analysis. Besides, the choices of mood, modality, speech roles as well as clause category were applied to analyze the data.The research findings showed that from the observation towards 10 (ten) students done by practicing the conversation in pairs, there were only 3 (three) pairs that could realize the interpersonal negotiation in their conversation. Most of students used declarative mood types (56.6%) more in their conversation. It indicated that they wanted to initiate the exchanges by giving information more often. The modality that they used most was probability modalization (41.2%). With high and medium categories of probability, the students expressed their idea of the situation given.Though the students produced declarative mood more in their conversation, it did not directly indicate that they could realize interpersonal negotiation well. Most of the declaratives produced was more maintaining the information exchange. The giving speech roles of the clauses produced by the students sometimes were inappropriate with the topic being discussed. It made the conversation inconvenient. Even though the use of modalization and modulation to express interpersonal negotiation was not problematic, they did not use it optimally; only 17 clauses out of 143 clauses made use of them.

Keywords : realization, interpersonal negotiation, conversation

INTRODUCTION

The most distinctive human characteristic is the ability to use a language. With it people can communicate to each other, sharing their ideas, solving their problems, expressing their feeling, etc. As a human of society, people need to communicate with lots of people in a day period. Even they do not know each others; they can communicate by having a conversation.

Conversation is the product of speaking skill which is like the other skills that is more complicated than it seems at first and involves more than just pronouncing words. Conversation in English, especially, makes some problems in practicing itparticularly to

the country which uses English as a foreign languge, like Indonesia. Beside we have to pay attention to the means of vocabularies, pronunciation, and the situations where the conversation takes place, we also have to think about the purpose when we speak to others. In other words, we can say that language itself has purposes when we use it to communicate to each other in a conversation.

We may speak with a specific goal in mind to achieve, such as finding out bus departure or arrival times, or inviting friends to dinner, or reserving a flight to Sydney, but we may also speak just to have a chat with someone with no particular goal in mind. That is what so called language is interpersonal as well as transactional (Berendt, 1981 in Murata, 2002).

As a language is transactional and interpersonal, the negotiation of language becomes a part that should be considered when having a conversation. They are two kinds of negotiation; interpersonal negotiation and transactional negotiation. Both negotiations can influence the purpose of the conversation which then differ it

becomes two types. Brown (2001: 273) states there are two types of conversation. They are transactional conversation and interpersonal one. The purpose of transactional conversation is to convey or exchange specific information. Moreover, the purpose of interpersonal conversation is more maintaining social relationships than transmittingfacts and information. Actually both of them are important in having conversation but they must be balanced in their purpose of communication. It will be easy if we onlystudy transactional conversation because it is often learned in classroom learning process, started from elementary school, junior high school, senior high school up to university level. But then, in interpersonal exchanges, oral production can bepragmatically complex with the need to speak in a casual register and use colloquial language, ellipsis, slang, humor, and other sociolinguistic conventions. Hence, the research is conducted to know 1) how the students of English Department realize interpersonal negotiation in their conversation and 2) what kinds of problems that emerge

when the students have an interpersonal negotiation in their conversation. It is conducted in the English Department of the State University of Semarangbecause the students have known a lot about English so that it makes easier to conduct the research and to analyze the data obtained.

The Essence of Interpersonal Communication

Interpersonal communication is a communication which aims to maintain the relationship between the speaker and listener. It is in line with what it is stated by *Depdiknas* (2004: 78) that interpersonal dialogue is conversation to make relationship. Relationship is something that is closed to human being. It is how people relate to each other in a society by interaction which is delivered through a language. Celce-Murcia, 2001 in Astuti (2009: 7) states that interpersonal language is "social-types" talk, it is more person oriented than message oriented. The features of interpersonal language are those of identifying with the other person's concerns, being nice to the other person, and maintaining and

respecting "face". This is how people can function the language they use for the sake of keeping personal relationship so that it will not hurt the persons involved in the conversation.

Furthermore, there is a definition which sees interpersonal conversation from its process. West (2006: 16) states that interpersonal communication is the process of message transaction between people to create and sustain shared meaning. There are three critical components embedded in this definition: process, message transaction, and shared meaning.

A process means that it is an ongoing, unending vibrant activity that is always changing. A message exchange means that the transaction of verbal and nonverbal messages is being sent simultaneously between two people. Messages, both verbal and nonverbal, are the vehicles we use to interact with others. Then, meaning is the central to the definition of interpersonal communication because meaning is what people extract from a

message.

Besides, Verderber, 2007 in Edwards (2007) also defines that interpersonal communication is the process through which people create and manage their relationships, exercising mutual responsibility in creating meaning. In other words, when people communicate with others, it is not only meaning they share but the way they share it is also considered more in other that it will not threaten others' face.

From the definitions above, interpersonal communication can be defined as communication which happens in an ongoing process that is unpredictable either the beginning or ending where two people or more are sharing and creating their meaning in the purpose of making relationships or social purposes.Interpersonal conversation has the purpose of maintaining social relationships (Brown, 2004: 142). It is more than just exchanging information. It is more complex than that. A casual register and use of colloquial language, ellipsis, slang, humor, and other sociolinguistic conventions are neededto make the interpersonal conversation.

The Realization Of Interpersonal Negotiation in The Conversation

The realization of interpersonal negotiation in the conversation can be analyzed through the use of mood, modality and speech roles of the speaker.

Mood

Mood structure can reflect the relationship between speaker and listener. Mood analysis is adopted to capture different social roles and role relationships among the participants involved in the talks (Eggins and Slade, 1997: 90). There are two indicators of power exercises: mood types and evaluative feedback. Participant who has more various mood types will be considered more powerful than the participant with less various types. It is refered to patterns of clause type, such as interrogative, imperative and declarative. These patterns have to do with the presence and configuration of certain negotiable elements of clause structure. Meanwhile, evaluative feedback is realized through minor clause (Eggins & Slade, 1997: 94). Lexicalized minor clause is the minor clause of fully lexical item, which operates in other

structures in the language: e.g. *Right, Exactly, Good Grief, Bloody hell, OK, Fine,* and *Great*.

Modality

The analysis of modality is actually a continuation of the analysis of mood. Hartono, 2004 as quoted by Nurjanah (2006: 28) also argues that relevant cognitive functions determining modal expressions are interpersonal power relation and the expectation of the agents involved in a speech situation. For example, when somebody says I must go now, she indicates that the listener has some power over her, and that the listener expects her to stay, but there is some other stronger power that forces her to leave.

There are two kinds of modality. Halliday (1994: 356) categorizes it into modalization and modulation. Modalization is a way of tempering the categorical nature of the information we exchange. Modulation is a way of tempering the directives with which we seek to act upon each other. Modalization tempers of the message with reference to degrees of frequency or probability, while the modulation is the qualification of the

message with reference to degrees of obligation, inclination and probability.

Speech Roles

Analyzing speech roles is done to see dialogue from discourse point of view. This tells us how while enacting social roles, participants are constantly negotiating relationships of solidarity and intimacy. Speech role analysis, together with grammar/ mood analysis, will contribute to the understanding of how participants enact their interpersonal differences, and therefore, how power is negotiated through talk (Eggins & Slade 1997: 179).

The speech role analysis is adopted to further elaborate control over turn taking; that power can also be exercised by controlling topics. Fairclough (1989: 636) states that the topic or topics of an interaction may be determined and controlled by the more powerful participant.

There are two kinds of speech roles. Wignell (1994: 22) divides them into giving and demanding. Giving means invite to receive whereas demanding means invite to give. The commodity of role itself can be goods and services or information. It can be

seen in the table below.

Table 1. Speech roles and commodities in interaction

SPEECH ROLE	COMMODITY EXCHANGED	
	Information	**Goods and services**
Giving	Statement	Offer
Demanding	Question	command

(Halliday in Eggins, 1994: 151)

From the combinations of speech role which are delivered by the speaker above, of course as the addressee has some discretion to respond to the role either positive or negative utterance. If it is an offer, the addressee can accept or reject it. If it is a statement, the addressee can acknowledge or contradict it. If it is a command, the addressee can undertake or refuse it. Afterwards, if it is a question, the addressee can answer or disclaim it. All of them can be analyzed to see the speaker roles to their power relations in the conversation. It is summarized in the table below.

Table 2. Speech role pairs

Initiating speech role	Responding speech role	
	Positive	**Negative**
offer	Accept	Reject
Statement	acknowledge	Contradict
Command	Undertake	Refuse
Question	Answer	Disclaim

METHODS

The descriptive qualitative approach wasapplied in conducting this research. The data of this study were the transcripts of the conversation recordings that the students had done. The conversation was done by ten students of EnglishDepartment on fifth semester. It was recorded by using recorder and handy cam.Then, the conversation was trancribed and analyzed into documentary sheets. Those sheets contained the clauses, analysis of mood, modality,speech roles, and clause category.Finally, the data were identified and interpreted.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Conversation Analysis 1

Table 3. The Summary of Mood Choices in Conversation 1

Mood (clause type)	S-1	S-2
Number of clauses	13	17
Declarative	5	7
Polar interrogative	-	3
Wh interrogative	2	3
Imperative	2	1
Minor	4	3
Modalization		
probability		
high		2 (incongruent, subjective
median		explicit and modal finite)
low		
Modulation		
inclination		
high		
median		1 (modal finite)
low		
Total no. of modalities	-	3

From the table, it could be seen the number of clauses produced by S-1 and S-2. In this conversation, S-2 spoke a lot than S-1. It meant that S-2 was dominant in the interaction. All speakers produced high number of declaratives and S-2's number washigher than S-1's. This assumed that S-2 got to initiate exchanges by giving information more often than S-1.

S-1 did not produce any polar interrogative while S-2 produced 3 (three) polar interrogatives. It meant that S-1 was only providing information or responding the questions from S-2.

S-2's wh interrogative was more than S-1. This was her way to initiate the topic. Even S-2 changed the topic in this conversation twice which made it inconvenient because it might indicate that S-2 could not negotiate well the topic beingdiscussed so she changed the topic. It could be seen in the turn 3 and 9.

Next, S-1's imperative was more than S-2's. It indicated her way to enact some authority because she

had been demanded by S-2 continuously.

The minor clause produced by S-1 was more than S-2. It indicated her non initiating role in the interaction. Her position was more compliant than S-2. However, from the total major clause produced by the speakers compared with minor clause produced, the margin was too far. It indicated that the speakers in having conversation ignored the use of minor clauses which characterized the

interpersonal negotiation which was more encoding interaction not exchanging information.

From the point of modality, S-1 did not produce it at all. While S-2 produced two probabilities which were high categorized. It indicated that she was very sure when producing those clauses. S-2 also used one inclination with medium category that meant she was not too willing when she told it to S-1.

Conversation Analysis 2

Table 4. The Summary of Mood Choices in Conversation 2

Mood (clause type)	S-3	S-4
Number of clauses	11	8
Declarative	2	3
Polar interrogative	2	1
Wh interrogative	2	-
Imperative	1	1
Minor	4	3
Modalization probability		
high		1 (incongruent, subjective explicit)
median		1 (incongruent, subjective explicit)
low		
Modulation obligation		
high		
median		1 (modal finite)
low		
Total no. of modalities	**-**	**3**

The number of clauses produced by S-3was more than S-4. It

indicated that S-3 was dominant in the interaction. Because of his dominance,

he initiated the topic by producing polar interrogative, wh interrogative and imperative. S-3 produced polar interrogative twice in this conversation. However, those polar

Turn	Clause
9	And do you *really* not make this room …mmm look so bad and..
11	Are you *really*?

By using the interrogative and imperative, S-3 had changed the topic twice. It could be seen in turn 5 and 9. Thus, it made the conversation inconvenient because the topic was always changed by S-3 as he could not negotiate the previous topic proposed by S-4 well

However, the S-4's declarative was more than S-3's. It indicated that he was giving information morethan demanding responses. It could be known from the total of the other mood types. He never produced wh interrogative and imperative. Only one polar interrogative he produced. And it was used to make sure his argument towards S-3.Although S-3 seemed to have the authority in this conversation because of so many interrogatives or imperatives produced, actually it was not him who held it but S-4 did. It was because of his modalization and modality used to respond the S-3. S-4

interrogatives were used to get S-4's truth because he always used the word "really" in his clause to make him sure, for example.

used two kinds of probality with high and medium category to make the S-3 sure, as well as an obligation with median category when he ordered S-3 to remember what happened with their room previously.

The minor clause produced by S-3 was more than S-4. It indicated his non initiating role in the interaction. Though the margin between the major clause and minor clause was not many, it still meant that the speakers in having conversation did not pay to the use of minor clauses as one of interpersonal negotiation characteristics.

Conversation Analysis 3

The number of clausesproduced by both speakers was thesame. It meant that both of them were dominant each other in the interaction. S-5's declarative mood type was more than S-6's.

Table 5. The Summary of Mood Choices in Conversation 3

Mood(clause type)	S-5	S-6
Number of clauses	14	14
Declarative	9	6
Polar interrogative	-	-
Wh interrogative	-	3
Imperative	3	1
Minor	2	5
Modalization		
usuality		
high		
median		
low		1 (mood adjunct)
Modulation		
obligation		
high		
median	1 (modal finite)	
low		
capability		1 (modal finite)
Total no. of modalities	**1**	**2**

It indicated that S-5 got to negotiate exchanges by giving information more often than S-6. There was no polar interrogative produced by the speakers.

S-5 did not produce any wh interrogative while S-6 produced 3 (three) wh interrogatives. S-6 took role as an initiator here. Although she became the initiator of the interaction, she never changed the topic. It made the conversation convenient because she could negotiate the topic being discussed well.

However, from the total number of imperative produced by S-5, it was more than S-6. This was the

way S-5 enacted some authority than S-6. Therefore, the authority of both speakers could be said balanced.

S-6 used high proportion of minor clauses, indicating her supportive and providing feedback. But then, in this conversation the use of minor clause was still few if compared with the total major clause produced. It could be concluded that the speakers still ignored the use of minor clauses which characterized the interpersonal negotiation in their conversation.

From the modality point of view, S-5 only produced one obligation with median category in

order that S-6 trusted him, whereas S-6 produced two kinds of modality there. Therewere usuality with low

category and capability realized in the form of modal finite.

Conversation Analysis 4

Table 6. The Summary of Mood Choices in Conversation 4

Mood(clause type)	S-7	S-8
Number of clauses	12	11
Declarative	5	4
Polar interrogative	1	2
Wh interrogative	1	2
Imperative	1	1
Minor	4	2
Modalization		
probability		
high	1 (incongruent,	
median	subjective explicit)	
low	1 (incongruent,	
	subjective explicit)	
	1 (modal finite)	
Modulation		
Capability		2 (modal finite)
Total no. of modalities	**3**	**2**

From Table 6, it could be seen the number of clauses produced by S-7 and S-8. In this conversation, S-8 spoke a lot than S-7 with few margin. It meant that both of them were dominant in the interaction.

All speakers produced high number of declaratives and S-7's number was higher than S-8's. This assumed that S-7 got to negotiate exchanges by giving information more often than S-8.

S-8 produced polar and wh interrogatives more than S-7. This was S-8's way to initiate the topics while S-7 was only providing information or responding the questions from S-8. Both of the speakers also produced imperative mood type with the same number. That made them demandto each other.

The minor clause produced by S-7 was more than S-8. It indicated her non initiating role in the interaction. Her position was more compliant than the S-8. However,

from the total major clause produced by the speakers compared with minor clause produced, the margin was quite far. It indicated that the speakers in having conversation ignored the use of minor clauses which characterized the interpersonal negotiation which was more interactive if compared with transactional negotiation that enabled to use written language more.

From the point of modality, S-7 produced three kinds of probability with all different categories; high, median, and low. It meant that sometimes she was very sure with her opinion and sometimes she was not. S-8 produced two capabilities which were realized through modal finite; could and can. It showed her curiosity towards something which happened.

Conversation Analysis 5

Table 7. The Summary of Mood Choices in Conversation 5

Mood(clause type)	S-9	S-10
Number of clauses	27	16
Declarative	15	4
Polar interrogative	-	1
Wh interrogative	1	1
Imperative	4	6
Minor	7	4
Modalization		
usuality		
high	1 (mood adjunct)	
median		
low		
Modulation		
obligation		
high	1 (modal finite)	1 (modal finite)
median		
low		
Total no. of modalities	**2**	**1**

The number of clauses produced by S-9 was higher than S-10. It indicated that S-9 was dominant in the interaction. S-9's declarative was also more than S-10's. It indicated that

she was more giving information than demanding responses. It could be known from the total of the other mood types. She never produced polar interrogative while S-10 produced it

once. It was said in order to get S-9's attention.

Both of the speakers produced wh interrogatives with the same number. It indicated that they wanted to initiate the topic each other. Finally they made exchanging topics in this conversation which could be seen in turn 11 and 12. Too often in exchanging topic was not good in the conversation because it would make the conversation inconvenient. The topic would change whenever the speaker could not negotiate the topic being discussed. It would not make the conversation flow well.In this conversation, S-10 produced imperatives more than S-9. It was used as the effort to enact the authority of interaction.

S-9 produced two kinds of modality in this conversation. They were one probability with high category and one obligation with high category. It showed the certainty of the speaker when delivering those clauses. S-10 only produced one obligation with high category. It also showed her strength when producing it. The minor clause produced by S-9was more than S-10. It indicated her non initiating role in the interaction.

Her position was more compliant than the S-8. However, the margin between the total of major clause and minor clause was too many. It still meant that the speaker in having conversation still did not consider the use of minor clauses as one of the interpersonal negotiation characteristics.

Interpersonal Negotiation Analysis

By seeing the distribution of speech roles in the coding sheet, it could be known whether in the conversations, the speaker could realize interpersonal negotiation or not. It could be indicated by the distribution of giving speech roles and its responses rather than demanding and its responses.

Conversation 1

Among 15 (fifteen) turns that the speakers produced, there were four turns realizing interpersonal negotiation. See Table 8.

All of the clauses above were in giving speech roles with its responses.It indicated that speakersdid interpersonal negotiationbecause there was no demanding and answering showed in the above clauses.They spoke like having a chat in

communication. When S-1 said *I feel fine in every condition,* S-2 responded it directly without any demanding from S-1 by saying *You will be nice,*

like giving compliment, then it came back to the topic discussed by stating the second clause; *Jill it must be you who'd everything.*

Table 8. Interpersonal negotiation analysis 1

Turn no.	Speaker	Clause no.	Clause	Speech roles
8	S-1	ii	I feel fine in every condition	giving
9	S-2	i	You will be nice.	acknowledging
		ii	Jill it must be you who'd everything	giving
11	S-2	i	Hey…you are the only one who stay in this room while I'm going out	giving
12	S-1	i	But I have no idea about this.	contradicting

The interpersonal negotiation also could be realized in turns 11 and 12. When S-2 stated her ideas that S-1 was only one in the room while she was going out, S-2 then responded it that she had no idea about it. It was only giving and responding in those clauses, no demanding speech role there.

Conversation 2

There was no interpersonal negotiation realized in this conversation. Most of the speech roles were demanding and answering. The speakers produced 12 (twelve) turns,

but all of them were transactional. S-3 always gave some questions to S-4 then S-4 answered them. It happened continuously.

Conversation 3

Only 9 (nine) turns were produced in this conversation. Among 9 (nine) turns that the speakers produced, there were 4 (four) turns realizing interpersonal negotiation. It was indicated from the speech roles they contributed.

Those clauses below showed that both of the speakers stated their arguments about the messy room doer.

Table 9. Interpersonal negotiation analysis 2

Turn no.	Speaker	Clause no.	Clause	Speech roles
4	S-5	ii	I did nothing.	giving
5	S-6	i	I don't believe you.	contradicting
		ii	You are the one in the room.	giving
6	S-5	i	No.	contradicting
		ii	You should believe me.	giving
		iii	I did nothing.	giving
		iv	It was so messy when I came in.	giving
		v	You just leave them all messy when you go.	giving
7	S-6	i	No.	contradicting
		ii	Foreknown, I never left it messy.	giving

They did self defense each other. It ran smoothly like having a chat because there was no demanding and answering there. They only gave their statement then responded by the opponent and so on. The interpersonal negotiation could be known here by the speech roles produced; therewere giving and its responses.

Conversation 4

As like conversation 2, therewas no interpersonal negotiationrealized in this conversation. Most of the speech roles were demanding and answering. The speakers produced 15 (fifteen) turns, but all of them were transactional. S-8 always gave some questions to S-7 then S-7 answered them and vice versa. However, S-8 gave more questionsthan S-7 did. It indicated that the conversation tended to be a transactional negotiation.

Conversation 5

Among 26 (twenty six) turns produced by the speakers, there were only 6 (six) turns realizing interpersonal negotiation.It could beshown in the table below. From the table, it could be seen that turns 13 to 16 showed both of the speakers gave their opinions about the messy room. S-9 always showed her passiveness to S-10 towards the room while S-10

contradicted   S-9's   statements.

Table 10. Interpersonal negotiation analysis 3

Turn no.	Speaker	Clause no.	Clause	Speech roles
13	S-10	ii	I leave this room with the with the clean situation.	Giving
14	S-9	i	So, it's your duty to clean up our room.	Giving
		ii	I don't care.	Giving
		iii	I just wanna sleep, okay.	Giving
15	S-10	i	I didn't did it.	Contradicting
16	S-9	i	You did it.	Contradicting
		ii	It's your place when you ehhh…when you were sleeping last night, the right, right?	Giving
		iii	Oh I don't care.	Giving
25	S-10	I	I don't want to do it.	Refusing
26	S-9	I	You know because this is my our room.	Giving
		Ii	It is not just my room	Giving

From the table, it could be seen that turns 13 to 16 showed both of the speakers gave their opinions about the messy room. S-9 always showed her passiveness to S-10 towards the room while S-10 contradicted S-9's statements. But finally, they could resolve it which was showed by the statements from S-9 in turn 26. It was only giving and responding in those clauses, no demanding speech role there. That was why the interpersonal negotiation occured.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

From the observation of 10 (ten) students done by practicing the conversation in pairs, there were only 3 (three) pairs which could realize the interpersonal negotiation in their conversation seen from the speech roles that they produced; those are giving speech role and its responses. Most of students used declarative mood types (56.6 %) more in their

conversation. It indicated that they wanted to initiate the exchanges by giving information more often. The modality that they used most was probability modalization (41.2 %). With high and medium categories of probability, the students expressed their idea of the situation given.Though the students produced declarative mood more in their conversation, it did not directly indicate that they could realize interpersonal negotiation well. Most of the declaratives produced was more maintaining the information exchange. In other words, the declaratives produced as the giving speech roles were the responses from the demanding speech roles proposed by another speaker previously. The giving speech roles of the clauses produced by the students sometimes were inappropriate with the topic being discussed. It made the conversation inconvenient when the speakers produced them too often because it would influence the exchanging topic being discussed. It happened in conversation 5 in turns 11 and 15. The students also tended to produce major clauses (73.4 %) which indicated that the minor clauses which

characterized the interpersonal negotiation were ignored. Even though the use of modalization and modulation to express interpersonal negotiation was not problematic, they did not use it optimally; only 17 clauses out of 143 clauses made use of them.

In general, the following suggestionsareaddressed to the readers especially those who frequently speak English as their foreign language that the use of interpersonal negotiation in the conversation is a great importance for them to practice speaking English fluently and communicatively. Employing interpersonal negotiation when performing a conversation will be helpful for students. Therefore, the practice of interpersonal negotiation should be explored more in the English subject such as speaking class in a college.To produce a good speech needs a long process. Students need to be trained, practiced, and placed in a circumstance that they have the sense of real communication.At last, the realization of interpersonal negotiation in the conversation as discussed in this paper is also requiredto create good communication skill reflected in the speech we make.

REFERENCES

Astuti, Heri Budi. 2009. *The Problems of the Implementation of Teaching Transactional/Interpersonal Dialogue Based on School Based Curriculum (KTSP) (The Case Study of Junior High School Teachers in Teaching 2008/2009 Seventh Students in Semarang).* Unpublished Final Project State University of Semarang.

Brown, H.D. 2001. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy* (2nded.). New York. Pearson Education, Inc.

---. 2004. *Language Assessment: Priciples and Classroom Practices.* New York: Pearson Education, Inc.

Depdiknas. 2004. *Kurikulum 2004: Standar Kompetensi Mata Pelajaran Bahasa Inggris Sekolah Menengah Pertama dan Madrasah Tsanawiyah.* Jakarta: Depdiknas.

Edwards, Chad. 2007. *Theories and Principles of Interpersonal Communication.* Unpublished Teaching Module. Online at http://homepages.wmich

Presented at Nagoya University of Foreign Studies. Online at http://www.jalt-publications.org/tlt/articles/2002/12/murata. [accessed 3/5/10]

Nurjanah, Ela. 2006. *Power Relation in Casual Conversation Occurring in Internet Online*

edu/~cedwards/Teachingmodules/modules/Interpersonal%202.pdf. [accessed 17/5/10]

Eggins, Suzanne and Diana Slade. 1997. *Analyzing Casual Conversation.* London: Casell.

Eggins, Suzanne. 1994.*AnIntroduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics.* London : Pinter Publisher

Fairclough, Norman. 1989. *Language and Power.* New York: Longman.

Galvin, Kathleen and Wilkinson, C.A. 2006. *The Communication Process: Impersonal and Interpersonal.* Unpublished Paper. Online at http://www.roxbury.net/image/pdfs/mc4ch1sample.pdf. [accessed 3/5/10]

Halliday, M.A.K. 1994. *An Introduction of Functional Grammar.* London: Edward Arnold.

Murata, Yasumi Gee. 2002. *"How Do I Respond?": A Survey of Interpersonal Aspects of English in Japanese High School Oral English Textbooks.* Unpublished Paper

Chatting. Unpublished Final Project State University of Semarang.

West, Richard and Lynn H. Turner. 2006. *Understanding Interpersonal Communication: Making Choices in Changing Times.* California: Wadsworth Publishing.

Wignell, Peter and Linda Gerot. 1994. *Making Sense of Functional* *Grammar*. Sydney: Gerd Stabler.