

## **The Use of Communication Strategies among Indonesian Young Learners of English in Early Total Immersion Program**

**Djoko Sutopo**

Semarang State University (Unnes) Central Java Indonesia  
Kampus Sekaran Gunungpati Semarang, Indonesia

**Steffie Mega Mahardhika**

Post-graduate Program Semarang State University (Unnes) Central Java Indonesia  
Kampus Bendan Ngisor Semarang, Indonesia

### **Abstract**

This study aims at describing how Indonesian young learners of English act in responding to the interlocutor's move to keep a conversation going. The research questions are (i) what speech functions are involved in the kindergarten students' conversation; and (ii) what communication strategies are used by the learners? The participants of the research are kindergarten students of *Mondial School* of the Academic Year of 2015. The study uses descriptive qualitative research. The section of analysis is move(s). The learners' speech is recorded, transcribed and identified to figure out what speech functions are involved in the conversation. The data are then analyzed and interpreted to reveal what communication strategies are used by the learners. The findings suggest that the learners use communication strategies involving four major speech function choices: opening, continuing, react responding, and react rejoinder moves. The learners produce initiation and react-responding the most. Opening in the form of demanding information and react responding in the form of replying answer moves are mostly realized through declarative clauses. Regardless the incongruent or congruent of mood types, it proves that they are able to sustain the conversation. The learners use three basic types of communication strategy: interpersonal negotiation, logico-semantic negotiation, and "channeling" negotiation. It is reasonable to argue that their conversation is natural. The conversation is also meaningful because the children are involved in the process of exchange. It is recommended that total immersion program can be applied in Indonesia as it provides precious opportunities for learners to speak.

*Key words:* communication strategies, move(s), negotiation of meanings, speech functions, text

**Cite as:** Sutopo, D. , & Mahardhika, S.M. (2016) The Use of Communication Strategies among Indonesian Young Learners of English in Early Total Immersion Program. *Arab World English Journal*, 7 (3). DOI:<https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol7no3.16>

## Introduction

Being able to speak English is a dream come true for most Indonesian learners of English. Unfortunately, English has been considered as foreign language in Indonesia where English is taught as a school subject that makes it difficult for the learners to have access to spoken English outside the classroom. Kirkpatrick (2008) states that English is the second language of educated urban elites and the first foreign language taught at schools in Indonesia but with limited success. Equipping learners to carry out ordinary conversation in English is therefore a challenge to be faced by English teachers in Indonesia in order that learners are able to negotiate meanings. English teachers need to know what to teach so that learners are able to negotiate meanings. This study is aimed at describing (i) what speech functions are involved in the kindergarten students' conversation; and (ii) what communication strategies are used by the learners. Communication strategies here refers to the one which enables learners to keep a conversation going by relating the learners' contribution to what has been said previously by the other interactant(s). This study focuses on investigating communication strategies at the discourse semantic level.

## Literature Review

A study conducted by Nguoi & Ahmad (2015, p.175-190) aims at exploring Limited English Language Proficiency (LEP) learners' meaning negotiation in communicative tasks. It is found that meaning negotiation can be a potential platform to facilitate language development among learners, particularly through clarification requests which can create the linguistic urgency to push LEP learners to expand their inter-language. This study implies that meaning negotiation strategies is an issue needs to be addressed further. The present study is similar in concern but distinct in the way that it focuses on young learners and that the method used is discourse-semantic-oriented.

Edward (2009: 5) argues that the way teachers view young children tends to be influenced by early childhood education. Teachers' beliefs and values are in turn influenced by these views. The present study addresses the issue of early childhood education, particularly their language acquisition. She states:

Early childhood education tends to influence the way teachers view young children, including the way young children learn and grow. These views in turn influence teachers' beliefs and values about how they can best meet young children's needs within an educational context (Edward, 2009: 5).

According to Rod Ellis (2006: 31) an attempt to explain L2 acquisition including the systematic development of the learner's language is the central issue of the study of learning foreign language. A mental system of L2 knowledge which is often referred to as inter-language is reflected in systematic development of learners' language. The present study is concerned with the issue of children's inter-language particularly their communication strategies to sustain a conversation.

Ortega (2009:2) argues that within a biological window of four to six year of age children acquiring their first language complete the feat. However, different L2 learners may begin learning the new language range widely. The subjects of the present study are the children who

are exposed to English when they are two years old. It is likely that English is the first language they learn and speak. He states:

Children acquiring their first language complete the feat within a biological window of four to six years of age. By contrast, the ages of which different L2 learners may begin learning the new language range widely (Ortega, 2009:2)

Cremin (2009:1) remarks that teaching and learning English is developing children's competence and building positive attitudes of learning. Ignoring children's affective or creative development as language learners is therefore considered the poorest performance of teaching and learning the language. The present study is an endeavor to portray the process of teaching and learning English which is assumed to focus on developing children's competence and building positive attitude of learning. Cremin states:

Teaching and learning English is, at its richest, an energizing, purposeful and imaginatively vital experience for all involved, developing youngsters' competence, confidence and creativity as well as building positive attitudes to learning. At its poorest, English teaching and learning can be a dry, didactic experience, focused on the instruction of assessable skills, and paying little attention to children's affective or creative development as language learners and language users (Cremin, 2009:1)

Anderson & Anderson (2003:1) state that a world of words is where we live. One is regarded to create a piece of text when he puts these words together to communicate a meaning. One constructs a text when he speaks and writes to communicate a message. The present study deals with how children are creating and constructing a spoken text.

Thornbury (2005: 6) points out that wherever we are texts are present. One among the significant units of language is text. The present study focuses on the text created by the children as a significant unit of language. He states:

We live in a world of text and we are surrounded by text: in our homes, in the streets, at work and at school. From an aesthetic, social or educational perspective it is the text which is the significant unit of language. (Thornbury 2005:6).

Halliday (2004:3) suggests that the term "text" refers to any instance of language, in spoken or written form, which is meaningful to the interlocutors. One can focus on the text either as an object or an instrument to find something. He states:

The term 'text' refers to any instance of language, in any medium, that makes sense to someone who knows the language Text is a rich, many-faceted phenomenon that 'means' in many different ways. We can distinguish two main angles of vision: focus on the text as an object in its own right; two, focus on the text as an instrument for finding out about something else (Halliday, 2004:3)

Celce-Murcia, et. al (2000, p.9) argues that in order to manage old and new information the speakers need to control turn-taking system. It is a feature of discourse in conversation. The present study describes how the turn-taking system of the children's interaction is at work. She states:

In conversation, in addition to managing new and old information in a coherent way, the interlocutors also have to take stock of and constantly monitor each other to control the

turn-taking system of the target language in question since this is another feature of discourse in oral interaction (Celce-Murcia, et. al., 2000, p. 9)

Although a turn is the most obvious unit of discourse it cannot be used to analyze speech functions of a conversation, since one turn may consist of more than one move. One move represents one speech function. Halliday (in Eggins & Slade, 1997.p.185) points out that the discourse patterns of speech function are expressed through moves. In other words, a move is a discourse unit. It can be defined that a move is a discourse unit through which a speech function is expressed.

As discourse units, the moves are expressed in language through clauses (Eggins & Slade, 1997: p.185). However, clauses are not discourse units. They are grammatical units. A clause is grammatical unit (which can be in the form of a sentence, a phrase or a word) through which a discourse unit (such as a move) is realized in language. A move and a clause are distinct units; a move is a discourse unit whereas a clause is a grammatical unit. Moves in a conversation (spoken discourse) are classified into four major categories: (1) Opening moves; (2) Continue sustaining moves; (3) Responding react sustaining moves; (4) Rejoinder react sustaining moves (Eggins & Slade, 1997: p.192)

Interpersonal negotiation occurs when the speakers are negotiating their feeling and attitudes. Eggins & Slade (1997, p.74) claim that interpersonal negotiation occurs when the speakers are negotiating the mood element in the clause. The mood elements, which are subject and finite make the interpersonal negotiation possible. Meanwhile, *Logico-semantic* negotiation occurs when the speakers are negotiating message or news. The speakers are negotiating the residue element in the clause. The residue elements, which are predicator, complement, and adjunct make the logico-semantic negotiation possible. The presence of complement in dialog enables the speakers to do the logico-semantic negotiation.

### **Method of Research**

The objective of this study is to describe how Indonesian young learners of English at *Mondial School* act in responding to the interlocutor's move to keep the conversation going regardless the length of the exchange and what types of negotiation of meanings they demonstrate and prefer. This study uses a descriptive qualitative research. In enhancing the qualitative analysis in this study the quantity of the data are used as a means. The data are interpreted by drawing heavily on words to explain conclusions by using descriptive qualitative research. Conversation's transcriptions of kindergarten students of *Mondial School* in Semarang in the Academic Year of 2015 are used as the data of this research. One semester observation is conducted to take the data. The young learners' activities in some classes of Language, Mathematics and Dramatic Play are recorded to obtain the data. While the young learners are playing and having break time are also recorded.

The data collecting is conducted through a number of steps including exploring students' activities at school by observation; using audio and video recording as well as note-taking to obtain data; selecting and reducing the video recordings to get appropriate ones for the study; conducting video transcription into written form; and carrying out transcription documentation to be analyzed. Transcription key by Eggins & Slade (1997, p.2) is applied in transcribing the data.

A systemic functional perspective to see authentic discourse data is applied in this study as the type of analysis proposed.

Communication strategies at the discourse semantic level are the focus of the investigation in this study. It means that what has been said previously by other interactant(s) to be related to the learners' contribution to enable a conversation keep going are the communication strategies the author searches for.

The section of analysis of this study is move(s) considering that negotiation of meanings here refers to analysis on the relation between moves and speech function which indicates the function of the move(s). It is therefore the transcription of the learners' conversation is divided into move(s) to be analyzed further using speech function network of conversation proposed by Eggins & Slade (1997: 192).

Identifying turn-taking, identifying moves and clauses, and applying speech function classes to every move are the points of analyzing speech function network of conversation in this study. In order to produce descriptive qualitative analysis, the result of identification is interpreted.

Through the system of mood, analysis is conducted to figure out the types of negotiation of meanings of the data. The definition of mood elements (subject and finite), residue (predicator and complement), the adjunct (mood adjunct, circumstantial adjunct, and comment adjunct) belongs to the system of mood in this study. In analyzing the types of negotiation of meanings, this study focuses on moves.

This study adopted two types of analysis. First is the analysis based on speech function network of conversation as proposed by Eggins & Slades (1997); Second is the analysis based on the types of negotiation of meanings. The transcription is initially divided into moves. Using the Arabic numbers: 1, 2, 3 etc. each turn is numbered. One turn can commonly have more than one move. Greek numbers: i, ii, iii, etc. are used to label each clause. A speech function is assigned for each move once the transcripiont is divided into moves. Since it cannot be done in isolation the researcher needs to look at the relationship to prior moves. Quantifying all moves made by the speakers is carried out following the analysis on speech function. The pattern of relationship can be revealed into the words.

The type of negotiation of meanings demonstrated in the conversation is then analyzed by focusing on moves of the speakers and considering the system of mood covering the definition of mood elements (subject and finite), the residue (predicator and complement) and the adjunct (mood adjunct, circumstantial adjunct, and comment adjunct).

### **Research Findings**

A number of tables are used to present the result of the study including speech function column, type of negotiation of meanings, turn/move, discourse which is broken down into speakers, clauses, text, and mood choices. The negotiation of meanings and speech function coded in conversation among kindergarten students of *Mondial School* of the Academic Year of 2015 is presented in Appendix 1. The discussion following the presentation of the result of

analysis is presented in tables and their interpretation. Related literature is matched with the findings.

**Table 1: Summary of Meaning Choices Found in the Data**

Type of meaning	Speakers														Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	17
<b>INTERPERSONAL</b>															
<b>Declarative</b>															
Full	1	2	17	1	11	0	1	0	35	0	1	0	0	1	<b>70(41.67%)</b>
Elliptical	1	1	7	0	4	1	2	5	8	2	5	2	1	0	<b>39(23.21 %)</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>109(64.88%) out of 168 moves</b>
<b>Polar interrogative</b>															
Full	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	<b>7(0.47 %)</b>
Elliptical	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>2(0.11 %)</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9(0.58%) out of 168 moves</b>
<b>WH-interrogative (Logico-semantic)</b>															
Full	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>5 (0.30 %)</b>
Elliptical	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0 (0 %)</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5 (0.30 %) out of 168 moves</b>
<b>Imperative</b>															
Full	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	<b>5 (0.30 %)</b>
Elliptical	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0 (0%)</b>



<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5 (0.29%)</b>
<b>Minor clause</b>															
Minor clause	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>1 (0.6%)</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1(0.6%) out of 168 moves</b>
<b>LOGICAL</b>															
<b>Expansion</b>															
Elaboration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0(0%)
Extension	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2(0.12%)
Enhancement	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3(0.18%)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5(0.30%) out of 168 moves</b>
<b>Projection</b>															
Verbal	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2(0.12%)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2(0.12%) out of 168 moves</b>

Three different analysis including speech function analysis, the meaning recapitulation analysis and the types of negotiation of meanings are presented as the research findings of this study (see Appendix 2).

There are 14 speakers in six excerpts produce speech functions choices. This study focuses mainly on 14 students' production out of 15 speakers of which the other one is the teacher. Considering that it is useful to show the overall patterns of the data, regardless it is used or not by any of the speakers, all speech functions classes in speech function network are shown.

Feature by feature involving dominant and incidental participants, number of turns, number of moves and clauses, and categories of moves produced by the speakers are presented as the speech function analysis. The meaning choices produced by 14 speakers in six excerpts is summarized and presented in Table 1. Despite the fact that the speakers involve 14 students and one teacher, this study focuses mainly on the students' speech production. The meaning recapitulation analysis is presented section by section based on the types of meaning namely interpersonal and logical meanings.

The data show that interpersonal meanings seem to be the biggest number of types of meaning found in the data demonstrated in Table 1. Out of 168 moves this type of meaning emerge 124 times in the frequency of occurrence. It means 73.80% in figure whereas logical meaning occur seven times (or about 4.17%).

Full declaratives seem to dominate the occurrence of mood types. Out of 124 moves, full declaratives emerge 70 times (or about 56.45%) whereas elliptical declaratives emerge 39 times (or about 31.45%). Either full or elliptical, most speakers produce declaratives but I seems to dominate it by producing 35 declaratives out of 70 (or 50 %) whereas elliptical declaratives emerge eight times (or about 20.51%) out of 39 declaratives. Contrastively, C produces 17 full declaratives (or about 24.28%) out of 70 declaratives and seven elliptical declaratives (or about 17.94) out of 39 declaratives. Meanwhile, E produces 11 full declaratives (or about 15.71%) out of 70 declaratives and four elliptical declaratives (or about 10.25%) out of 39 declaratives.

Most speakers use full and elliptical interrogatives in the conversation. Full polar interrogatives, however, is the most frequently used by the speakers. The speakers use full polar interrogatives seven times (or about 0.41%) and elliptical interrogatives two times (or about 0.11%) out of 168 moves. Full polar interrogatives are equally used by C, E and I that is two times respectively. In contrast E produces elliptical polar interrogatives two times whereas H produces it once. C and I are the second most of producing elliptical polar interrogatives, that is two times respectively. In a casual conversation among close friends or family members polar interrogatives are common to use. When one intends to initiate an exchange he typically uses polar interrogative by requesting information from others.

The full WH-interrogatives are used by the speakers 23 times (or about 13.69%). Meanwhile elliptical WH-interrogatives are used by speakers four times (or about 2.38%). Full WH-interrogatives typically demand an active initiatory role of a speaker and are typically used to bring out additional circumstantial information. The speaker typically gets to initiate exchanges by demanding information more often than others.

Imperative mood types are used by the speakers five times out of 168 moves (or about 0.30%). All imperative mood types are in the form of full imperatives that is five times (or 0.30%). Demanding someone to do something is the function of imperative mood type. Imperatives, however, are usually used to negotiate action directly in casual conversation in the case of the function to encode advice.

Minor clauses typically function as prelude to negotiation in casual conversation. To the prior interaction it positions the speaker as a compliant support. Few speakers produce this mood types. The data show that minor clauses are used once out of 168 (or about 0.6%).

Logical meanings as another type of meanings emerge five times including extension two times (or 0.12%) and enhancement three times (0.18%). Meanwhile, projections emerge two times (or 25%). The expansion type is represented by extension two times (or about 0.12 %) whereas verbal is once (or about 0.6 %) produced by speaker 1.



**Table 2: Frequency of Negotiation of Meanings Occurrence**

<b>Types of Negotiation of Meanings</b>	<b>Occurrence</b>
Interpersonal Negotiation	<b>118 (86.76%)</b>
Logico-semantic Negotiation	<b>18 (13.23%)</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>136</b>

Table 2 indicates that interpersonal negotiation is dominantly used in the conversation. It has significant difference. Interpersonal negotiation occur 118 times (or about 86.76%) whereas logical negotiation occur 18 times (or about 13.23%).

The data show that in the conversation the children exchange commodity namely information or goods and service. They take roles associated with exchange relation, either giving or demanding. According to Halliday in Eggins & Slade (1997, p.180) a conversation is regarded meaningful if there is a process of exchange. Definitely, the children in the conversation are involved in the process of exchange. It is reasonable to argue that the children's conversation is meaningful.

The data show that the speakers in the conversation produce almost all of the speech function choices in spite of different proportion. They produce opening, continuing, react responding and react rejoinder moves. Initiating by demanding information seems to be preferred by the young learners. They realize it with declarative mood types. Responding the initiation by providing information seems to be also preferred by the children. They realize it with either full declaratives or elliptical declaratives. In other words, negotiation takes place as evidenced by reactions or feedback in the conversation.

The learners in this study are found to make use of most of the strategies but the realizations of these, in detail, often prove to be problematic. The difficulties that hindered the learners have something to do with speech function choices of open-attend: continue-monitor-prolong-elaborate, develop-elaborate, develop-extent, develop-enhance, prolong-extent, prolong-enhance, register, engage, reply-supporting-affirm, reply-confronting-non-comply, reply-confronting-disavow, reply-confronting-decline, reply-confronting-withhold, react-joinder track-clarify, react-joinder track-check, react-joinder probe, react-joinder repair, react-joinder acquiesce, react-joinder challenge-detach, react-joinder rebound, react-joinder challenge-counter, react-joinder act-rechallenge. In terms of meaning choice, the learners find it difficult to realize logico-semantic negotiation in elliptical WH-interrogative (logico-semantic) and elliptical imperatives.

## **Discussion**

Referring to the fact that the children are able to produce most of the mood types without difficulty except local grammatical errors it is reasonable to argue that the children have

definitely achieved significant syntactic development. They do not find it difficult to ask questions, give commands, report real events and create imaginary stories. As Goh (2004, p.86) remarks, syntactic development is a gradual process and involves learning at different levels. It means the learners have developed the aspect of form of phrases, sentence types and overall sentence complexity.

In such an early age the children have acquired both interpersonal and logico-semantic negotiation in total immersion context. It was evidenced, however, that the children prefer to use interpersonal negotiation rather than logico-semantic ones. Table 2 indicates that out of 136 moves 118 moves are realized in the form of interpersonal negotiation.

The learners also enhance their expression considerably by using back-channeling expressions. Channeling devices such as 'right', 'yeah', 'I see' are demonstrated by the speakers F, L, J and K respectively in their conversation.

Regardless the length of the exchange the children are able to respond to the interlocutor's move to keep the conversation going. To some extends they are capable to create spoken texts without the help of the elder speakers. They can participate in the conversation independently.

Sufficient exposure of language use has been possessed by the children. They have acquired the moods in the form of declaratives, interrogatives, imperatives and minor clauses. The children chose the mood elements of the clause properly which consists of Subject and Finite. Grammatically, they have managed to convey negotiation of feelings and attitudes. Additionally, they are able to realize the negotiations of information or context by choosing to negotiate residue elements such as predicator, complement and adjunct.

The data show that in early total immersion program the children use the language naturally in spoken interaction. They negotiate meanings about what they think is going on in their world, how they feel about it, and how they feel about people they interact with in the conversation. The children's ability in negotiating meanings develops well in immersion context. The children get sufficient exposure in language use. In other words, immersion program could provide precious opportunities for the teachers and children to use the language naturally in spoken interactions. It is reasonable to argue that early total immersion is an effective way of developing communicative competence and foreign language proficiency in Indonesian context. It is in accordance with the objectives of communicative language teaching as pointed out by Richards (2006, p.2) that sets its goal the teaching of communicative competence that is knowing how to use language, knowing how to vary our message, knowing how to produce and understand different types of text and knowing how to maintain communication.

## Conclusion

In the context of early total immersion program applied by *Mondial School* the conversation of kindergarten children involves four major speech functions: opening, continuing, react responding, and react rejoinder moves. Apart from producing initiation and react-responding, they produce opening in the form of demanding information and react responding in the form of replying answer moves which are mostly realized through declarative clauses.

Additionally, they produce opening in the form of demanding information and react responding in the form of replying answer moves which are mostly realized through declarative clauses.

The data show that the learners' communication strategies involve all types of negotiation namely interpersonal negotiation and logico-semantic negotiation as well as "channeling." It is, therefore, reasonable to argue that their conversation is natural. Precious opportunities to use English naturally in spoken interactions could be provided by the structured early total immersion program. In other words, in Indonesian context, this program is effective in developing communicative competence of the learners.

#### **About the Authors:**

**Dr. Djoko Sutopo**, MSi. Lecturer of English Department Faculty of Language and Arts, Semarang State University. Doctor of English Education (Unnes)

**Steffie Mega Mahardhika**, MA., MPd. Post-graduate Student of English Education Studies Semarang State University. Graduate of School of Education (Master of Arts - Ohio State Univ.)

#### **References**

- Anderson, M. & Anderson, K. (2003). *Text Types in English*. Macmillan Education Australia PTY Ltd. Sydney.
- Celce-Murcia, M. and Olshtain, E. (2000). *Discourse and Context in Language Teaching. A Guide for Language Teachers*. Cambridge University Press. New York.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (2007). *Rethinking the Role of Communicative Competence in Language Teaching in Intercultural Language Use and Language Learning*, Eva Alcón Soler and Maria Pilar Safont Jordà (Eds). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Cremin, T. (2009) *Teaching English Creatively*. Routledge 270 Madison Avenue, New York.
- Edward, S. (2009). *Early Childhood Education and Care*. Pademelon Press. New South Wales.
- Eggins, S. (1994). *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. London: Pinter Publishers.
- Eggins, S. & Slade, D. (1997). *Analyzing Casual Conversation*. London: Pinter Cassell.
- Goh, C. & Silver, R.E. (2004). *Language Acquisition and Development*. Singapore: Longman.
- Halliday, M.A.K. & Matthiessen, C. (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. Arnold, HodderHeadline Group, New York.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2008). *English as the Official Working Language of the ASEAN: Features and Strategies*. In *English Today* 94, Vol. 24, No. 2 (June 2008) Cambridge University Press.
- Martin, J.R. and Rose, D. (2004). *Working with Discourse: Meaning Beyond the Clause*. Continuum. London. New York.
- Nguoi, C. C. L. & Ahmad, A.A.A. (2015). *Meaning Negotiation of ELP Learners in Communication Tasks*. 3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature. The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies. Vol 21, No 3 (2015)  
<http://ejournals.ukm.my/3l/article/view/9346/3438>. Retrieved on March 1<sup>st</sup>, 2016.

Ortega, L. (2009). *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Hodder Education, Hachette UK Company, London.

Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum Development in Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Thornbury, S. (2005). *Beyond the Sentence. Introducing discourse analysis*. Macmillan Publisher Limited. Bangkok.

**APPENDICES**

**Appendix A. Negotiation of Meanings and Speech Function Coded in Conversation among Kindergarten Students of Mondial School of the Academic Year of 2015**

Speech function	Type of negotiation	Turn/ Move	Discourse	Mood choices	
				Interpersonal	Logical
				5	6
<b>Data 1</b>					
O:I:demand:info	Logico-semantic	1	Gaby : (i) What do you want?	WH:intro:full	
			(ii) Mango or strawberry?	WH:intro:ellip	
Rs:s:answer	Interpersonal	2	Hady : (i) I want orange juice	Decla:full	
O:I:give:opinion		3	Kenny : (i) Hey you should be vegetable seller.	Decla:full	
O:I:demand:info	Logico-semantic	4	Randy : (i) What is this?	WH:intro:full	
Rs:s:answer		5	Gany : (i) This is crab.	Decla:full	
O:I:give:opinion	Interpersonal	6/a	Randy : (i) I want this.	Decla:full	
O:I:demand:info		6/b	(ii) How much is this?	WH:intro:full	
Rs:s:answer		7	Gany : (i) One thousand.	Decla:ellip	
<b>Data 2</b>					
Rs:s:acknowledge		8	Kiki : (i) I see	Decla:ellip	
Rs:s:comply		9	Ainy : (i) One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight.	Decla:ellip	
Rs: register	Interpersonal	NV1	Trey : NV1 (Raising hand)	NV	
Rs:s: answer		10	Faris : (i) Four.	Decla:ellip	
Rs:s:answer		11	Berline : (i) Eight.	Decla:ellip	
Rs:s: answer		12	Rafi : (i) Seven.	Decla:ellip	

Rs: register		NV2	Kenny : NV2 (Selecting the letter A)	NV	
Rs: s: answer		13/a	Kenny : (i) A to apple.	Decla:ellip	
C:P: Extend	Logico-semantic	13/b	(ii) How about this?	WH:intro:full	
Rs: register		NV3	Faris : NV3 (Selecting the picture of cat)	NV	
Rs: register		14	Faris : (i) Cat	Decla:ellip	
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Data 3</b>					
Rs: register	Interpersonal	NV4	Faris : NV4 (Collecting materials for the game)	NV	
O:I:give: fact		15/a	Faris : (i) I already make one		Expansion:
		15/b	(ii) Now I take this one.		Extension
		15/c	(iii) I get so many in my spoon.		Expansion:
		15/d	(iv) Now I do this again.		Extension
O:I:demand:service		15/e	(v) Just do it so fast.	Impera:full	
O:I:demand:service		15/f	(vi) You play with your partner.	Impera:full	
O:I:give: fact		15/g	(vii) I already make four..		Expansion:
C:P: Extend		15/h	(viii) I have many than you.		enhance
C:Append:extended		15/i	(ix) I help you, okay?	Polar:intro:elip	
Rs:register		NV5	Gany : NV5 (Shaking head)	NV	
R:joinder:refuse		16	Gany : (i) No, you done a lot.	Decla:full	
O:I:give: fact		17	Faris : (i) Oh, I got some here.	Decla:full	
O:I:give: fact		18	Gany : (i) I make a sand castle.	Decla:full	
O:I:give: fact		19/a	Faris : (i) We are make a sand castle.	Decla:full	
C:P: Extend		19/b	(ii) I can make it many than you now.	Decla:full	

O:I: demand: goods		20/a	Gany : (i) I want this.	Decla:full	
C: P: enhance		20/b	(ii) I just have one.		Expansion: enhance
O:I:give:opinion		21	Faris : (i) So, you can get the other.		
Rs:register		NV6	Gany : NV6 (Nodding head)	NV	
O:I:give opinion	Logico-semantic	22	Gany : (i) That's for me.	Decla:full	
O:I:give:fact	Interpersonal	23/a	Faris : (i) I will help you.	Decla:full	
Rj: s: track: confirm	Logico-semantic	23/b	(ii) But one by one.	Decla:ellip	
	Interpersonal	23/c	(iii) We cannot make it all of them.	Decla:full	
		23/d	(iv) Just make it one by one..	Impera:full	
		23/e	(v) I make an ice cream.	Decla:full	
O:I:give: fact		23/f	(vi) I just make like this.	Decla:full	
O:I:demand:info		24/a	Gany : (i) Are you said Kiki?	Polar:intro:full	
Rs:non-comply		24/b	(ii) I am not Kiki.	Decla:full	
O:I:give: fact		25/a	Faris : (i) I will help you.		Expansion: enhance
Rj: s: track: confirm		25/b	(ii) So you can do faster.		
O:I:give: fact		25/c	(iii) You need extra power.	Decla:full	
O:I:demand:service		25/d	(iv) Put it here.	Impera:full	
O:I:give: fact		25/e	(v) I will put it all of them.	Decla:full	
			(vi) I just need one minute later.	Decla:full	
Rj: s: track: confirm	Logico-semantic	25/f	(vii) One more.	Decla:ellip	
O:I:give: fact		26/a	Gany : (i) This s my cup.	Decla:full	
C: P: enhance	Interpersonal	26/b	(ii) Don't take it.	Impera:full	
Rj: s: track: confirm		26/c	(iii) Promise?	Polar:intro:elip	
<b>Data 4</b>					



O:I: demand: info		27/a	Gany : (i) Do you have a robot at home?	Polar:intro:full	
Rj: s: track: clarify	Logico-semantic	27/b	(ii) How many do you have?	WH:intro:full	
O:I:demand: info		27/c	(iii) So, the robot is...?	WH:intro:ellip	
Rs: s: answer	Interpersonal	28	Faris : (i) My robot has a long ears.	Decla:full	
Rj: resolve		29	Faris : (i) Yes.	Decla:ellip	
O:I:give: fact		30/a	Gany : (i) My brother has a robot.	Decla:full	
C:Prolong: elaborate	Logico-semantic	30/b	(ii) It is transformer.	Decla:full	
O:I: demand: service		30/c	(ii) Cross your legs.	Impera:full	
O:I: demand: info	Logico-semantic	30/d	(iii) How many of you?	WH:intro:full	
Rj: s: track: confirm		30/e	(iv) One, two, three, four, five.	Decla:ellip	
O:give: fact	Interpersonal	30/f	(v) I have four groups.	Decla:full	
O:I: demand: service		30/g	(vi) I want you to make a robot.	WH:intro:full	
O:I:demand: info	Logico-semantic	31/a	Faris : (i) Where is the animal.	WH:intro:full	
O:I: give fact	Interpersonal	31/b	(ii) I need this shape.	Decla:full	
		31/c	(iii) I get so many.	Decla:ellip	
		31/d	(iv) I need it.	Decla:full	
O:I: give: info	Logico-semantic	31/e	(v) This is your hand	Decla:full	
<b>Data 5</b>					
Rs: s: agree		32	Kekey : (i) Yeah.	Decla:ellip	
Rs: register		33	Bernie : (i) Good morning.	Minor	
Rs: s: answer		34/a	Ainy : (i) I'm fine.	Decla:full	
Rs: register		34/b	(ii) Thank you.	Minor	
Rj: unresolved	Interpersonal	NV7	Ainy : NV7 (Shrugging shoulders)	NV	

Rs: s: answer	Logico-semantic	35	Trey : (i) Friday.	Decla:ellip	
Rs: s: agree	Interpersonal	36	Berline : (i) Yeah.	Decla:ellip	
Rs: s: comply	Interpersonal	NV8	Kenny : NV8 (Raising hand)	NV	
Rs: s: answer	Logico-semantic	37	Kenny : (i) Eleven.	Decla:ellip	
Rj: c: unresolved	Interpersonal	NV9	Berlina : NV9 (Shrugging shoulders)	NV	
Rs: s: answer	Logico-semantic	38	Rafi : (i) Ten.	Decla:ellip	
Rs:s: comply	Logico-semantic	39	Keny : (i) Today is Friday.	Decla:full	
Rs:s: comply		40	Hady : (i) It is a sunny day.	Decla:full	
Rs:s: comply		41	Gaby : (i) It is ten August two thousand and twelve.	Decla:full	
Rs:s: acknowledge	Logico-semantic	42	Rafi : (i) One two three four five six seven eight nine ten.	Decla:ellip	
O:I:demand: info	Interpersonal	43	Kenny : (i) Are you okay?	Polar:intro:full	
Rs: s: answer		44	Rafi : (i) Yeah.	Decla:ellip	
O:I:give:info		45	Kenny : (i) Miss, done.	Decla:ellip	
O:I:demand:service		46	Hady : (i) Press it.	Impera:full	
O:I:give:opinion	Logico-semantic	47/a	Kenny : (i) That is so big.	Decla:full	
O:I:give:info	Interpersonal	47/b	(ii) Like this.	Decla:ellip	
O:I:give opinion		47/c	: (iii) Wow, that broken.	Decla:ellip	
O:I:demand:info	Logico-semantic	47/d	: (iv) Where is the eyes?	WH:intro:full	
<b>Data 6</b>					
Rs:register		48	Berlina : (i) Good morning, teacher.	Minor	
Rs:register		49/a	Kenny : (i) I'm fine.	Decla:full	
Rs:register		49/b	(ii) Thank you.	Minor	

O:I:demand:info		NV10	Kenny : NV10 (Shrugging shoulders)	NV	
Rs:s:answer	Logico-semantic	50	Hady : (I ) Wednesday.	Decla:ellip	
Rj: c: resolved		NV11	Kekey : NV11 (Raising hand)	NV	
Rs:s:answer	Logico-semantic	51	Kekey : (i) W-e-d-n-e-s-d-a-y.	Decla:ellip	
Rj:c:resolve	Logico-semantic	52/a	Rafi : (i) T-o-d-a-y.	Decla:ellip	
O:I:demand:info	Logico-semantic	52/b	(ii)Is it a cloudy day?	Decla:full	
Rs:s:disagree	Interpersonal	53/a	Gany : (i) No.	Decla:ellip	
Rj:c:resolve	Logico-semantic	53/b	(ii) It's a sunny day.	Decla:full	
Rs:s:answer		54	Gaby : (i) Eight.	Decla:ellip	
Rs:s:answer		55	Trey : (i) August.	Decla;ellip	
Rj:c:resolve	Interpersonal	NV12	Ainy : NV12 (Raising hand)	NV	
Rj:c:resolve	Logico-semantic	56	Ainy : (i) Eight August two thousand twelve.	Decla:ellip	
Rj:c:resolve	Interpersonal	NV13	Bernie : NV13 (Raising hand)	NV	
Rj:c:resolve	Logico-semantic	57	Bernie : (i) 'H'	Decla:ellip	
Rj:c:resolve		NV14	Faris : NV14 (Raising hand)	NV	
Rj:c:resolve	Logico-semantic	58/a	Faris : (i) Room.	Decla:ellip	
Rj: s: track: confirm		58/b	(ii) Living room.	Decla:ellip	
Rs:s:answer		59/a	Gany : (i) Chair, table, sofa	Decla:ellip	
C:append:enhance	Interpersonal	59/b	(ii) Do you see bed in living room?	Polar:intro:full	
R:c:contradict		60/a	Trey : (i) No.	Decla:ellip	
R:j:track: resolve	Logico-semantic	60/b	(ii) TV, telephone	Decla:ellip	
R:d:elaborate		61	Rafi : (i) Stove, pan, frying pan	Decla:ellip	
<b>Data 7</b>					
R:r:engage		62/a	Kenny : (i) Kenneth, I am with you, okay?	Decla:full	

R:j: track: clarify		62/b	(ii) I want with Kenneth.	Decla:full	
O:I:give:opinion	Logico-semantic	63	Faris : (i) This my King and this is the master.	Decla:full	
C: a: enhance		64	Kenny : (i) Rafi, Rafi with me	Decla:ellip	
C:p: elaborate	Interpersonal	65/a	Faris : (i) I need some more like this.	Decla:full	
C: p: enhance		65/b	(ii) Aha, I need that.	Decla:full	
O:I:demand:service	Logico-semantic	66	Gany : (i) One more time.	Decla:ellip	
O:I:give:fact	Interpersonal	67	Kenny : (i) I want the square one.	Decla:full	
O:I:give:fact		68/a	Faris : (i) I get it	Decla:full	
C:pr:enhance	Logico-semantic	68/b	(ii)This is here	Decla:full	
O:I:demand:info	Interpersonal	69	Gany : (i) What should I do?	WH:intro:full	
O:I:give:info	Logico-semantic	70/a	Faris : (i) This is for the kingdom	Decla:full	
C:pr:enhance		70/b	(ii) It is not living room.	Decla:full	
O:I:give:info		71	Kenny : (i) This is only one.	Decla:full	
O:I:give:fact		72/a	Faris : (i) This is my king.	Decla:full	
C:pr:enhance	Interpersonal	72/b	(ii) I have a king here.	Decla"full	
O:I:give:info	Logico-semantic	73	Kenny : (i) One more this.	Decla:full	
O:I:give:opinion	Interpersonal	74	Faris : (i) I think we don't need this.	Decla:full	
O:I:demand:info	Logico-semantic	75	Gany : (i) Like this?	Polar:ellip	
R:s:acknowledge	Logico-semantic	76/a	Faris : (i) All of this is my animals.	Decla:full	
C:pr:elaborate		76/b	(ii) This is the master of the kingdom.	Decla:full	
O:I:give:fact	Interpersonal	77	Rafi : (i) I have this for you, Kenny.	Decla:full	
O:I:give:opinion	Logico-semantic	78/a	Kenny : (i) The beautiful one.		Projection:
C:pr:enhance	Interpersonal	78/b	(ii) I say the beautiful one.		Verbal
O:I:give:opinion	Logico-semantic	78/c	(iii) That's so many.	Decla:full	

C:pr:enhance	Interpersonal	78/d	(iv) It should be living room.	Decla:full	
O:I:give:opinion		78/e	(v) You don't make living room.	Decla:full	
O:I:give:fact		78/f	(vi) Kenny don't want to listen me.	Decla:full	
C:app:enhance		78/g	(vii) It is for me and you, okay?	Polar:intro:full	
O:I:give:fact		79/a	Faris : (i) I need this.	Decla:full	
C:pr:extend		79/b	(ii) And this is already done.	Decla:full	
O:I:demand:info		80	Gany : (i) Do you have another animal?	Polar:intro:full	
O:I:give:fact	Logico-semantic	81/a	Faris : (i) All the animal in my house.	Decla:full	
C:pr:elaborate	Interpersonal	81/b	(ii) I have many dinosaurous, lion, dog and tiger.	Decla:full	
O:I:give:opinion		81/c	(iii) It must be full.	Decla:full	
C:pr:extend	Logico-semantic	81/d	(iv) This here, for here, and then here.	Decla:ellip	
R:r:register	Interpersonal	82/a	Gany : (i) Thank you.	Minor	
R:r:dev:elaborate		82/b	: (ii) I need it.	Decla:full	
O:I:give:fact	Logico-semantic	83	Kenny : (i) Oh, it's my house.	Decla:full	
O:I:demand:info		84/a	Trey : (i) Where's your house?	WH:intro:full	
C:pr:elaborate	Interpersonal	84/b	: (ii) Did you tidy up?	Polar:intro:full	
R:s:acknowledge		85	Hady : (i) Yes.	Decla:ellip	
O:I:demand:info		86	Faris : (i) We tidy up?	Polar:intro:elip	
R:c:contradict		NV15	Kenny : NV15 (shaking head)	NV	
R:c:disagree		87	Kenny : (i) Not yet.	Decla:ellip	
O:I:give:fact	Logico-semantic	88/a	Faris : (i) This helicopter is mine.	Decla:full	
O:I:give:info	Interpersonal	88/b	(ii) I want to make the biggest living room.	Decla:full	
C:pr:elaborate		88/c	(iii) I want to make again.	Decla:full	
O:I:demand:ser		88/d	(iv) Can you give me one more?	Polar:intro:full	

vice					
O:I:give:info		89	Kenny : (i) I want to make again.	Decla:full	
O:I:give:info		90/a	Faris : (i) I have very big house.	Decla:full	
O:I:demand:info		90/b	(ii) Did you take my blocks?	Polar:intro:full	
R:c:contradict		NV16	Kenny : NV16 (Shaking head)	NV	
R:c:contradict		91	Kenny : (i) No, don't take it.	Decla:full	
C:pr:extend		92	Faris : (i) I need this.	Decla:full	
O:I:give:fact	Logico-semantic	93	Kenny : (i) This is mine.	Decla:full	
O:I:give:opinion	Interpersonal	94	Rafi : (i) It's easy, right?	Polar:intro:full	
C:pr:elaborate		95/a	Faris : (i) Right. We get this, this to get this.	Decla:full	
C:pr:extend		95/b	(ii) We gonna make the airplane	Decla:full	
O:I:give:fact		96	Kenneth : (i) It's falling down!	Decla:full	
R:s:register		97	Kenny : (i) Oh hate you.	Declare:full	
R:c:contradict		NV17	Faris : NV17 (Shaking head)	NV	
R:c:contradict		98	Faris : (i) I don't want to tidy up.	Declare:full	

**Appendix B: Summary of Speech Function Choices Found in the Data**

No	Speech Function	Speakers														Total
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
	Number of turns	3	5	19	2	16	1	1	3	5	27	3	8	1	3	<b>98</b>
	Number of moves	4	5	30	2	24	1	1	4	7	65	3	8	1	3	<b>168</b>
	Non-Verbal	0	0	4	0	2	0	2	1	4	1	0	1	1	0	<b>17</b>
	Number of Clauses	4	5	30	2	24	1	1	4	7	65	3	8	1	3	<b>170</b>



<b>1</b>	<b>Open</b>															
	<b>Attend</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 (0%)
	<b>Open: Initiative</b>															
	O:I:Demand Info	1	0	6	1	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	13 (12.92%)	
	O:I:Demand Service	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3(1.76%)	
	O:I:give: opinion	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	8 (4.60%)	
	O:I:give: fact	0	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	5	0	1	0	0	13 (12.92%)	
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b> <b>37</b> <b>(22.7%)</b> <b>out of 168</b> <b>moves</b>	
<b>2</b>	<b>Continue</b>															
	Monitor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0(0%)
	Prolong: elaborate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0(0%)
	Prolong: extend	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3(1.76%)
	Prolong: enhance	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3(1.76%)
	Append: elaborate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	5(2.84%)
	Append: extend	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3(1.76%)
	Append: enhance	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3(1.76%)
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b> <b>17</b> <b>(9.88%)</b> <b>out of 168</b> <b>moves</b>	
<b>3</b>	<b>React:</b>															

	<b>responding</b>														
	Register	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1 (0.58%)
	Engage	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1 (0.58%)
	Develop: elaborate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 (0%)
	Develop: Extend	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 (0%)
	Develop: enhance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 (0%)
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b> <b>(1.76%)</b> <b>out of 168</b> <b>moves</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Reply: supporting</b>														
	Agree	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3 (1.76%)
	Answer	1	2	2	0	1	0	1	3	2	2	3	3	0	3 (1.76%)
	Accept	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 (0%)
	Comply	1	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5 (2.84%)
	Acknowledge	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	4 (2.24 %)
	Affirm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 (0%)
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>21</b> <b>(9.17%)</b> <b>out of 168</b> <b>Moves</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Reply; confronting</b>														

	Contradict	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	7(3.6%)
	Non-comply	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 (0%)
	Disavow	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 (0%)
	Disagree	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1(0.56%)
	Decline	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 (0%)
	Withhold	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 (0%)
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8(4.6%) out of 168 moves</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>React: joinder</b>														
	Track: clarify	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1(0.56%)
	Track: confirm	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	8(4.6%)
	Track: check	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 (0%)
	Track: probe	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 (0%)
	Track: resolve	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	2	6(3.52%)
	Track: repair	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 (0%)
	Track: acquiesce	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 (0%)
	Challenge: detach	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 (0%)
	Challenge: rebound	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 (0%)
	Challenge: counter	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 (0%)
	Act: unresolved	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1(0.56%)
	Act: refuse	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1(0.56%)
	Act: rechallenge	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 (0%)
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>17(9.88%) out of 168 moves</b>