

THE STRUCTURE OF CLASSROOM INTERACTION PRODUCED IN SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL ENGLISH CLASSES

Hamzah

English Department of FBS UNP
hamzahhs@yahoo.com

Abstract

This paper discusses the structure of the interaction in pedagogical discourse produced by participants in English classes at senior high schools. The source of data consisted of twenty lesson's transcript regarded as complete interaction stating from opening to closing. The analysis was based on Sinclair and Coulthard model looking interaction as a hierarchical units in which the higher level units consist of the lower level units. The findings reveals that the structure of the lesson consisted of opening, topic discussion and closing. The opening unit consisted of greeting and topic introduction and exchanges relating to motivating students and the introduction of the lesson outline were not found. The transactional units were not strategically wrapped, preliminary exchanges were usually available but the terminal exchanges were mostly absent. It might lead to a believe that the teacher develop the transaction's flow as if it were a face to face and personal interaction. The exchange units were dominated by eliciting moves showing the characteristics of traditional classroom where the teacher dominated the class. The move units were dominated by head acts and less than five percent elaborated with prehead acts or posthead acts and the selection act were not used by the teacher to enhanced the student's learning. The closing units consisted of few summary and greeting. In conclusion the structure of the classroom interaction studied are closer to traditional classroom as compared to thinking classroom.

Key words: classroom discourse, interaction, structure of the interaction, teacher talk

A. INTRODUCTION

The structure of classroom discourse (hereinafter pedagogic discourse) is a type of text produced by teachers and students in the classroom. This discourse is different from the discourse by other institutions because of the particularities in the activities and social roles of each participant involved in the interaction. The role of the teacher, for example, will affect the structure of the resulting interaction. Teachers dominant interaction will result in a different structure than the teachers who delegate greater authority to their students. Similarly, the class with active students generates different discourse structures compared to the class with passive students. Through discourse analysis, contextual aspects that underlie the formation of discourse can be traced back as well as the generic structure of a text, the stages are used and passed to the communicative goals can be achieved (Martin, 1992). Thus, the structure of pedagogic discourse interaction gives a space to understand to what extent the teachers have applied the concepts of the ideal learning in the classroom.

In the learning process, more time spent talking and listening. As the mainstream media learning, speaking plays a very important. Verbal interaction in the classroom not only mediate the learning process but also will mediate the culture as a whole. Alexander (2004) states that speaking is needed to develop the potential of the brain, while Nystrand (1997) is to see that the quality of pedagogic discourse will determine the climate that is conducive to learning.

Some scholars have examined the relationship between language and learning process. Vigostcky (1978), for example, look at the importance of the role of verbal interaction in bridging between the actual developmental level to the level of potential development through problem solving is done with the help or collaboration with adults. Such scholars use the term learning in the zone of proximal development. Wells (1999) adds that that the process of learning in the zone of proximal development depends on social interaction which in this case involves interaction with the media bersemuka speech. Halliday (1976) look at the role of language in the classroom of the aspects of social function where the language is created and interpreted. Speech used by teachers in the classroom have different levels of effectiveness to student learning. Bames (1992) distinguish two types of functions speech teacher in the classroom. The first function is a function presentational more inclined towards the interests of the teacher to check the students' understanding of the material that has been studied. The second function is a function eksplorasional that allows students to express their main ideas, hear other students respond to the main ideas and arrange them in different patterns of information.

This study uses conversation analysis model developed by Sinclair and Coulthard (1992). Sinclair and Coulthard states that discourse should be analyzed separately from the grammar and phonology. Therefore they develop a ranking scale models where the meeting into the top ranks of the conversation in the classroom, followed sequentially by the transaction, exchange, move, and speech acts.

The basic structure is the interaction and exchange move. Move is the speech unit comprising at least one head acts and can be coupled with some accompanying speech act. For example, move asks consists of speech acts "to get information (inquiry)" which can be preceded by selection and starter, and may be terminated by the speech act comments (comment). Fourth the speech act is a unity, and that the head of the speech act in that move is a question of speech acts. In one chance to speak, the speaker can produce one or several move that can be initiated in response to another participant or a new initiation that requires a response from the other participants.

Exchange is the smallest unit of interaction is where participants negotiate meaning through the exchange of messages between one speaker with another speaker. The structure consists of elements exchange move initiation, response, and feedback. In exchange asked, the structure consists of several move, that is the question-answer-feedback. For example, ask exchange can have a structure consisting of several move, namely questions, answers, and thank you.

Sack (1971) emphasizes the importance of the next position in the pair side by side. He said that the second position is a generic place where the speaker does not include information other than that associated with the speech contained in the first position. Schegloff (1977) formulates the relationship between the first three and the second in the pair side by side. First, if the first part is spoken by a participant, the second part is expected also to be spoken by the other participants. Secondly, if the second part is pronounced, the participants hope that the second part is relevant to the first part. Third, if the second part is not as pronounced then the event has significance and a conclusion can be drawn from the absence of the second part. In other words, Schegloff agree that the absence of the second part also a response to the first part.

From the point of view of the speaker, the next position offers a location to find a listener speech analysis, ie to see if the response is anticipated *terkuatkan*. From the point of view of the listener, the next position offers the opportunity to demonstrate an understanding of the aspects of the previous discussion that the speech will be given by the audience response. Thus, the next position is an important location to establish intersubjectivity - each subsequent position to give a place for listeners weeks to show understanding, including the understanding of the problematic and in need of repair at the third position (Schegloff, 1992).

Pomeranz (1984) found a preferred choice for second place in pairs side by side. More desirable option is in accordance with the expectations of the previous speaker. For example, when someone is invited to a party, then the preferred option for the second position is the acceptance of the invitation. Obviously, the less preferred option at the second position is a rejection.

There is a significant relationship between the choice and structure of the moves used by the second speaker. Levinson (1983) states that if the person who responds want to convey the information desired by the speaker in the first position then he will use a simpler structure. However, if the information to be presented is the least preferred option by the speaker in the first position, the structure would be more complicated will be used.

The three-part sequence called exchange. Sinclair (1980) defines exchange as linguistic units into units and associated minimum interaction with the basic structure, and the organizational structure of speech exchange become essential. Berry (1981) adds that exchange-lah, not a sentence, which became a top limit both semantic units and syntactic units. Seen from the point of exchange of information, Coulthard and Brazil (1981) states that exchange is associated with one unit being negotiated as well as information relating to the work done during the negotiations to produce exchange structure of a general nature. They also identify the characteristics exchange. First, the structure on which to base exchange predictable. Secondly, there is an increase in the ellipsis in line with the progress of the interaction. Third, the structure consists of initiation exchange coupled with other measures that are likely to put an end to the information that was introduced at the initiation stage.

Stubbs (1984) identifies elements exchange which consists of several parts. The first part is the initiation that has the possibility open (open-ended), then followed by a response that is bound to the initiation and rate of closure has increased. Any contribution of speech that serves to complement the proposition is assumed to be part of the same exchange. The same is suggested by Sinclair (1980) with the restriction that the utterances in the exchange show compliance responses and if it does not show any compliance response it can be interpreted as signifying the start of a new exchange.

In addition to the reality of other utterances embedding between the couple, Martin (1992: 71) propose another finding of the existence of move tracking (tracking moves) which serves to clarify the experiential meaning intended by the speaker.

Complete Exchange usually consists of initiation and response, and often followed by a reversal. Coulthard in Stubbs (1984) makes the formulation exchange structure as $I \rightarrow R \leftarrow (F)$. This formula means that I (initiation) the initial position and the arrows indicate that the presence of the first to predict the emergence of R (response), but the presence of F (reversal) after R is unpredictable so that its nature is a choice not a requirement. Another element that might appear in one exchange is R / I. R / I is an element that appears at the

center position after I. In addition to functioning as a response to the I, R / I predict the emergence of R thereafter so that the formulation that appears is the IR / IR (F).

Response to the initiation can be categorized as canonical or Insertion. Stubbs (1984) states that the canonical response is a response to the expectations of the previous speaker, while the response is questioned Insertion comfortable presuppositions or conditions of the previous speaker's speech delivered, or questioning certain lexical items of natural speech.

Coulthard (1975) in Stubbs (1984) found that exchange structure formed in the discourse of teaching in different classes based on the function of the exchange. When the teacher asks questions which expect a verbal response, the structure is formed exchange IR B. This means that the third part of the complete structure. By the time the teacher gives the command to be done, the structure formed is IR (F). Initiation in the form of non-verbal commands to get a response in the form of activity. In this command exchange feedback is not mandatory but is optional. Teachers sometimes give feedback but unpredictable occurrences. In exchange which serves to provide information, the structure formed is I (R). At the time of the creation exchange teachers lecturing and students quietly listened. Sometimes there is no response from the students, but the response was not a necessity and unpredictable occurrences. Exchange checking by the teacher produces IR structure (F). Initiation of teachers requires a response from the students, but the feedback from the teacher is not merupakan necessity and can not be predicted. From the above findings it appears that the function of decisive exchange forms that may arise.

Exchange can be grouped into two main categories. First, exchange who have organizational functions. There are two types of exchange which includes such categories. First, exchange frame called framer, namely exchange which has a function to show the limiting discourse. Exchange this type usually consists of one element only. Exchange second type consists of three organizational categories exchange - organizing, penyapaan and calls. The three types exchange has two mandatory elements, namely the I R. Organizing functions for structuring conversations. Exchange penyapaan serves to greet at the beginning or during excused himself. This relates to the conventional procedure depends on the culture of speakers on how to implement it. English speakers use certain expressions, such as hi, hello, good morning to penyapa at the beginning of the meeting, and at the end of the meeting or to take leave to use the expression, like bye bye, good bye, so long, Have a nice day. Exchange exchange calls are used to involve other participants in the conversation by pulling his attention by calling names or other designations.

The second category is exchange which has a conversational function, namely transactional exchange that have meaning in the form of exchange of information, goods or services. Exchange are included in this category are classified on exchange free and bound. Free Exchange is exchange question, penginformasian, and commands. Which includes exchange exchange whose existence is bound depends on the previous exchange. Exchange are included in this group are exchange clarification, repetition, and restart.

Exchange question serves to ask for information, decision or approval. exchange structure consists of I (R / I) R (Fn). I realized through the move asking, R move through the provision of information, and F through the move to demonstrate understanding. (R / I) and (Fn) are not a necessity and can not be predicted those occurrences in exchange question.

Information exchange serves to provide information to the hearer. The structure formed from this exchange are I (R/I) R (Fn). Initiation is realized in the provision of information and R is a move shows understanding. The appearance of (R/I) and (Fn) are not a necessity and cannot be predicted.

Command exchange functions to ask someone else to do something for the benefit of the speakers. This is the first structure exchange is R (Fn). The Initiation (I) is realized in directive move and R in the action move or demonstrate understanding and F through the move to demonstrate understanding. However, the presence of F is not a necessity and cannot be predicted.

Clarification exchange is a kind of questions exchange that functions to ask for clarification about the previous speaker's utterance. The structure is Ib (R / I) R (Fn). Ib is realized through question move and inform R through the information move and F through demonstrate understanding move.

Repetition exchange is bound to ask for repetition which serves utterance of the previous speaker. Exchange structure is Ib (R / I) R (Fn). Ib realized through the move to ask and R and F through the move to demonstrate understanding.

Restart exchange is bound question exchange which serves to indicate that informed move still needed. This exchange following a period of silence in the hearer. Restart exchange shaped structure Ib (R / I) R (Fn). Ib realized through the move to ask and inform R and F through the move to demonstrate understanding.

In addition, move is a structure that facilitate the realization of the speech act conveyed by each speaker in a speech tum. Thus, the elements of the move is the speech act. Francis and Hunston (1992) identified eight move function. The eight functions are grouped into two main categories. Three moves are included in the category of organizational and five moves included in the transactional category.

Move that included in the category of organizational are framing, greeting and response. Move which has a function to mark the limits in conversation called as framing. Framing move has a structure consisting of an optional element -signal - and the element must exist, namely the head act. Meanwhile, seven other measures have optional elements - signal, pre-head and post-head - with compulsory elements, the head act. Accost move is a move that serves to start or end the conversation. This move contains the head acts greeting to start a conversation or greeting cover to end the conversation. Move response serves to give an indication of willingness to engage in conversation. If accost move consists of meta-statement or cover and move the selected answer is silent then it is classified into organization exchange.

Transactional category exchange is a questions move, informed, designation understanding, commands, and actions. Question move serves to request information from the hearer. Information requested may include factual information, yes or no option, agreement, clarification or repetition. Inform move has a function to offer information or give answers to a question move. Informative move can occupy a place in the first position and the position at inform exchange I / R or R on question exchange. Demonstrate move understanding follow up serves to provide positive or negative for the previous speaker's utterance. Command move is used to ask for the goods or services of the hearer. Action move is an action in response to the demand for goods or services of the previous speaker. Such actions may be as expected by the requester or deviate from what is expected by the requester.

Dealing with constituents in the move, the model above was expanded with a new level called speech acts which have the function of a class as an element of the move. Speech acts in there that serves as a move pre head, head acts and post head. Butler (1993) introduced pre head two categories, namely: the opening speech acts (starter) and introduction (Preface). Opener speech act is an attempt to direct the listener's attention to some areas to facilitate response to head acts that will be spoken. Meanwhile, the introduction is defined as giving a sign to remind topics, interruptions or personal view of what is to come. Move which consists of pre-head, head acts and pascaint shown in the following example:

Pre-head (introduction): Tentang minuman yang anda tanyakan tadi

Head act (Directives): Saya minta Beer ya

Post head (comments): hari semakin larut nih

Post head also grouped into two types, comments and prompt. Butler (1993) defines as the comments that appear after the speech informative or directive speech act that serves to expand, provide justification or additional information on the previous informative speech acts. Prompt is defined as speech that serves to strengthen the directive or elicitation earlier.

In addition to the expansion of the constituent move, structure interaction also extended upwards by combining several exchanges that discuss the topic into one that is called by the transaction level. Transaction structure consists of exchange P M (M₂ ... M_n) T. (P) Preliminary and T (terminal) is the exchange that have organizational functions. M medial (M₂ ... M_n) are exchanges that exist between preliminary and terminal and is conversational.

In conversation element of M is a compulsory element in the transaction structure and elements of P and T is optional elements. Usually one transaction consists of several M. element of P and T is realized in the form of exchanges which includes organizational categories, such as: Boundary, structuring, greetings, or opening and closing. In face to face conversation, the element P in the structure of the transaction can be replaced by the use of intonation. High key is often used to introduce new the topics and low key to closing the topic.

The highest level in the rank structure is the level of conversation or interaction. According to Francis and Hunston (1992), this level does not have a structural representation in the conversation. The interaction can be seen from the sequence of the topics discussed in one period of the conversation and the combination of the overall transactions.

This paper is aimed at discovering the structure of pedagogic discourse interaction and its significance to the teaching of English in senior high school. Questions will be answered "what does the structure of classroom interactions produced in the classroom at the level of interaction, transaction, exchange, move and speech act look like?"

B. METHODOLOGY

This research is conducted using conversational analysis method developed by Birmingham School. This research used corpus of pedagogic discourse that consists of twenty texts obtained from twenty English lessons starting from the beginning until the end of the lesson. Data analysis was conducted starting from making the written transcripts from the audio record, identifying exchanges through the relationship between or among several moves that forms an exchange. Then, the identification of transaction unit carried out by observing the relation of several exchanges discussing one topic and the emergence of transaction unit's border. Further, patterns that appear in every unit level and the distribution are also identified. Finally, the

construction of interaction's structure of pedagogic discourse produced in the English learning classroom is conducted.

C. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

1. The Structure of Exchanges

This research uses the theory derived from Birmingham School in analyzing the data. The exchange consists of three parts – Initiation, Response, and Feedback. Perceived from the component that form them, the exchange found in the data can be categorized generally as the exchange that consists of one, two, or three components.

The analysis of the units in the rank exchange will be grouped in the basis of their function and the ratio of each categories

Table 1: The exchange's functional ratio found in learning process's discourse

No	Exchange	Frequency	Percentage
1	Question	1216	84
2	directing	202	13,5
3	Informing	37	2,5
	Total	1455	100

Table 5.1 shows the ratio of the function of the exchange found in the structure of pedagogic discourse in English learning process. Eliciting exchanges that functions to demand information dominate the interaction between teacher and students (84%). Questions used by the teacher in the classroom is usually dominated by confirmation questions where the answer has already known by the teacher. Exchange that functions as directive is in the second rank (13.5%). Meanwhile, the exchange that has informative function is at the lowest position (2.5%).

That lowest proportion of informing exchanges arises big question. First, as the initiator of the exchange, the teacher tends to set the informing moves after feedback or before the eliciting move or directive moves so that the move responded by the students is that of eliciting or directive moves. Thus, though the informing moves exist, the moves that become the counterpart of the students' response is the eliciting or directive moves. Second, there is a high probability of the effect of cultural factor in this structure of exchange. Just like children who do not interrupt their parents' discussion, the students are not expected to respond or comment the teacher's informing moves.

Table 2: The Types of Eliciting exchanges

No	Exchange type	Total	% x Eliciting exchange	% x Exchange's total
	I	28	2,3	1,927
	IR	457	38	31,45
	IRF	584	48	40,19
	I R/I R	30	2,5	2,065
	I R/I R/I R	23	1,9	1,583
	I R/I R/I R/I R	20	1,6	1,376
	I R/I R F	9	0,7	0,619
	I R/I R/I R F	8	0,7	0,551
	I R/I R/I R/I R F	2	0,2	0,138
	I Ib R	3	0,2	0,206
	I R Ib R	19	1,6	1,308
	I Ib R F	22	1,8	1,514
	I R Ib R F	11	0,9	0,757
	Total	1216	100	84,0

Eliciting exchange is the one that is dominant in the interaction's structure. Table 5.2 indicates that exchange with the two moves (IR) and the three moves (IRF) are at the top rank with each proportion are 38% and 48%. It proves that the teacher still set his/herself as the only source of information in the classroom. Therefore, the students have to follow the sequence of the interaction developed by teacher. Other variation of that eliciting

exchange type are Initiation I/R R dan Initiation IbR where the emergence's proportion are 6% and 1,6%. Those emergences are small compared to other types. Initiation I/R R variant appears if teacher's initiation is responded which then needs teacher's further response. Meanwhile, Initiation Ib R appears if the teacher initiates question and is not immediately responded by the students so that the teacher needs to do repetition both through verbatim or paraphrasing the question so that it will be easy to be understood by the students. Other possibly emergence's pattern is that when the teacher wants the students to make sure whether other students also have the same response so that the variation becomes Initiation R Ib R. Immediate questions' paraphrasing without wait time is not legally considered as Ib. The last, I pattern designates that teacher asks question, but the question is not repeated or continued even though the wait time is given. The question immediately answered by teacher is not included to this category for rhetorical question is considered as part of informative move.

Extract 10 : Eliciting exchange that has I R component move

1. T : blackcat...the story about blackcat is one about text, it is about superstition. In narrative text I explain to you before, ibuk jelaskan kemaren narative has generic structure.
2. What is the generic structure in naratif .Who can tell me the generic structure of narative? (I)
3. S: Orientation (R)
-
4. T: Next two (I)
5. S: Complication (R)
-
6. T: Next three (I)
7. S: Resolution (R)
-
8. T: Number four (I)
9. S: Re orientation (R)
-
10. T: What is the orientation (I)
11. S: Pendahuluan (R)
-
12. T: What is the pendahuluan. What is pendahuluan in english? (I)
13. S: Introduction (R)
14. T: Introduction. (F)
-

In the extract 10, it is obviously seen in move 2 that teacher begins the transaction unit with question's move about the generic structure of narrative text. Then, it is responded by a student by stating one of the components or the first component of narrative text in move 3, so that it yields I R structure. In the next exchange 4-5, 6-7, 8-9, and 10-11 IR exchange is also generated. Meanwhile, 12-13-14 exchanges form IRF structure's type. From the extract above, it is clearly seen that IR structure is formed when the teacher tries to check students' memory or knowledge about the topic that has been studied using chained of questions.

Extract 11: Eliciting exchange that has I R F component

1. T : Jadi expression of congratulation itu kapan kita ucapkan? (I)
2. Ss : Sesuatu yang bahagia. (R)
3. T : Aaaa.... Sesuatu yang bahagia..something make us happy. (F)
-
4. Something make us sad, apa? (I)
5. S1 : Sympathy. (R)
6. T : Sympathy ok good (F)
-
7. Dara....ok next. Next picture please.....oooo....this one...look at the picture. And try to analyze it. (I)
8. S2 : The third picture congratulates wedding party. (R)
9. T : The third picture? Oooo ok congratulate to the her wedding party. (F)
-

Extract 11 indicates several instances of exchange structure that consists of IRF component. Exchange 1-3 for an instance where the teacher asks about the time to say congratulation that is responded by the student shown in the move2. Student's answer which is regarded as the correct one is then repeated by the

teacher in order to make it clearly heard by the entire students in the classroom. The same thing is also happened in exchanges 4-6. The teacher gives feedback in the form of repetition followed by confirmation 'very good'. As for the exchange 7-9, feedback's move the teacher gave is started with the answer from the student and responded with 'okey', and continued by repeating the correct answer. Therefore, feedback's move that the teacher gave can be in the form of confirmation that the student's answer is correct and also student's answer repetition. This proves that teacher still uses confirmative question; question used to check information the students have already known and usually the answer has already known by the teacher too. In fact, the recent learning process more emphasizes on the use of informative question where the teacher tries to dig information which is more original or nature from the students' mind. For an example, the exchange 1-3 can be followed by further informative question such as, "Have you ever achieved something or happiness that makes others congratulate you?". "Can you give example of how the people's expression in congratulate you?". Those questions need students' original answers that may not be predicted by the teacher.

Extract 12: Eliciting exchange that has I R/I R (F) component's move
Example 1

-
1. T: Have you ever heard (uhm) about discussion text? Udah pernah dengar apa itu discussion text? Kalau diskusi bahasa Indonesianya apa? (I)
 2. S: Berkompromi (R/I)
 3. T: Berkompromi? Dalam diskusi apa yang kamu lakukan misalnya? (R/I)
 4. S: Musyawarah (R/I)
 5. T: Musyawarah? (R/I)
 6. S: Memberikan argumen (R)
 7. T: Okay, betul. Memberikan argumen atau (uhm) opinion about something. (F)
-

Extract 12 Example 1 shows how the teacher's efforts in guiding the students to the correct answer using the question guide. If the students can immediately answer correctly as in move 6, then the structure formed is IR. With the teacher's speech that directs the students to the correct answer, then formed I R/I R/I R/I R/I R F structure.

Example 2

-
1. T : Ketika tense present continuous. What is the pattern for active? (I)
 2. Ss : subject.. (R/I)
 3. T : subject plus be. Be nya apa? (R/I)
 4. Ss : is.. (R/I)
 5. T : verb nya continuous.. (R/I)
 6. Ss : verb -ing.. (R)
 7. T : verb -ing karena sedang, plus time signal (F)
-

In example 2 above, the teacher makes the initiation moves in the form of questions about the pattern of the active sentence for the present continuous tense. Obviously, this move expects a response answer in subject + be + verb-ing + time signal pattern. If the students respond as expected, then the exchange structure formed is IR. However, the students cannot give a complete answer all at once. Therefore, the teacher makes an effort to guide the students to arrive at the expected answer by using the question guide. In move 3 the teacher asked subject plus be, what be? In move 5 the verb is continuous and plus time signal in move 7. The exchange above has I R/I R/I R/I R/I R F structure. What is interesting from the exchange above is that the students do not produce a complete answer and the teacher does not try to ask the student to repeat the pattern formula in detail in the next exchange.

Extract 13: the example of question exchange that has move element I Ib R (F)

-
1. G : How many persons in the picture, miftah? (I)
 2. M : Aaaaa (R)
 3. G : How many? (Ib)
 4. M : Eight. (R)
 5. G : There are eight? Let's counts it one two three four five six seven. Ok seven. (F)

The IR Ib R (F) exchange appears when the teacher tries to repeat the question either verbally or with paraphrase. In extract 13, the teacher asks a question to one of the students and that student cannot directly answer the question. The teacher in move 3 repeats the question. On the second attempt the student can answer, but the answer is wrong so that the teacher tries to help the student with conformative questions followed by counting people in the picture one by one. The teacher repeats the question, in this context, not because the students do not understand what the teacher means because the question is simple. Repetition move performed by the teacher may have a strategic goal to focus the students and the entire class on the activity of counting the number of people present in the picture.

The Command Exchange

The command exchange is the type of exchange which is also found in the pedagogic discourse. This exchange arises when teacher tries to give instruction to students either something related to classroom management or assignment related to the topic being studied. In the collected data it appears that the command exchange ranked second after the question exchange with much lower proportions.

Table 3: Types of command exchange

No	Type	Total	% of exchange command	% of total exchange
1	IR	177	87,63	12,18
2	I R/I R	23	11,39	1,58
	Total	202	100	14,04

Table 5.3 shows that the interaction structure of the command exchange consists of only two variations, namely IR and I R / I R. Basically, the command exchange in the pedagogic discourse consists of two moves - initiation and response. Variation that arises is the IR / IR / IR with a very low proportion. I R / IR arises if students ask for an explanation of the command given by the teacher. IRF exchange should appear when the teacher gives feedback on students' willingness to perform the command. The Disappearance of IRF exchange for command in the class may be related to the type of institutional discourse that gives teacher the authority to give command to their students so that the teacher does not give feedback on the students' willingness to do so. I R / I R / I R exchange type arises when students try to ask the tasks that are less clear to the teacher.

Extract 16 command exchange IR type

Extract 17 command exchange I R/I R/I R

 G : OK. Silakan jawab sekarang waktu lima belas menit!
 S : Di LKS, Pak?
 G : Ya di LKS boleh, di exercise book, di buku latihan juga bisa.
 S : [Students are doing their exercises]

 Extract 18 command exchange I R/I R/I R type

 G : then you change into passive..
 Ss : apa soalnya tadi maam?
 G : Pemerintah membangun jembatan Siti Nurbaya beberapa tahun yang lalu..
 Ss : (menjawab soal)

In extracts 17 and 18, teacher provides instruction to the students to do something relating to the topic. In extract 17, the teacher asks the students to answer a number of questions shown through a slide projector. However, the students feel doubtful about the place where they should do it so that the exchange is expanded because of the students' questions about it. In extract 18 what problematic for the students is a task of changing passive form that will be done, causing one of the students asks the teacher to repeat the sentence that will be changed into passive form so IR / IR / IR type formed.

2. Informing exchange

Informing exchange includes the smallest proportion exchange in the pedagogic discourse. This happens because of two things. First, students do not respond to the informing move done by the teacher that may be caused by students' habitude of not interrupting when the more respected person is speaking. The second reason is the fact that teacher always puts informing move after feedback and or before questions. So that what becomes the initiation move in exchange is not informing but others such as question or command.

Table 4: Informing exchange type presented in the table

No	Type Exchange	Total	% of Informing exchange	% of total exchange
1	IRF	29	78,37	1,996
2	I R/I R	8	21,62	0,275
	Total	37	100	2,271

Example

G : Misalnya pasang foto Aufa yang cantik tu ya tiba-tiba diubah sama orang jahat misalnya siapa namanya itu gak ngerti saya.

S: Mr. X

G: Ya Mr. X bisa berubah jadi wanita yang lain tidak punya baju dan kemudian Aufa menjadi stres karena semua orang menjudje dia. Akhirnya dia suicide melompat dari lantai 3 gedung ini.

Example 2

G: Langsung kita lanjut ke (eh) positive side berikutnya through facebook someone can fiind some friends dengan teman lama tu bertemu lagi, bisa berkomunikasi ya and then some users use facebook to advertise bisa mengiklankan tas ya da baju kemudian bisa kue (uhm) handphone juga. Next, there are some people design product attractively and sale it in facebook tapi terkadang beda (I)

S : Ya beda dengan yang kita harapkan Miss (R/I)

G : Iya, jangan membeli melalui online itu, kurang baik ya (0.1) kadang-kadang bisa tertipu (R)

There are several possibilities that make informing exchange less: 1. the habitude of not giving comments or interruption when parents are speaking. 2. the placement of informing in the beginning or in the middle of the tum which normally closed with question or directive speech acts. Thus the exchange that arises is question or directive exchanges.

2. Structure of the moves

This section discusses about the move structure that make up exchange. At the tiered structure conversational interaction is the fourth level. The move consists of several speech acts with one head. The head of the speech act is an element that must exist on the move, while the other elements are optional. The complete structure of a move would look like: (Selection) (pre-head) head (post-head). Selection is giving an opportunity to speak to particular participant by calling his or her name. Pre-head is a speech act that precedes the presence of speech act head that will be delivered by the speaker, while the post-head is a speech act that is delivered after the head.

The structure of the move used by teachers in general are described in the following table:

Table 5 Interaction structure in the move rank

No	Types of Moves	Frequency	percentage
1	Head acts	1331	91,6
2	Selection + head acts	48	3,3
3	Head acts + Selection	22	1,5
4	Pre head act + head act	52	3,6
	Total	1453	100

Table 5 shows the presence of the move structure in the pedagogical discourse. The most dominant structures found in the pedagogical discourse were head act only (91.6%). This means that when the teacher asks question to the students, the teacher directs question to the whole class, and whoever can give a response to this question may respond. The weakness of a question which is consist of only a head is teacher can not control and divide a chance to speak among the students. This can lead to a false perception from the teacher who felt her class went well because it always gets a response that the response is most likely only from a few people. The selection-head and head-selection structure indicate that teacher will point-out which students is going to respond. Selection+head act (3.3%) indicates that the teacher select which students who will respond first and then utter the head acts of that move. In contrast, the structure of the head+selection move shows that the the teacher utter the head of the speech act and address it to all participants that makes all participants prepare themselves to respond, after that the teacher selected one student to respond. The advantages of the head-selection structure is the possibility of all participants mentally active to respond and they are also ready to evaluate the response given by other participants. Thus, when the teacher asked for their assessment regarding the response of their friend, they will be able to do so. However, the data of this study indicate the use of speech act of selection is very low. The findings also showed a very low proportion of the use of pre-head and post-head. This may be due to fact that the head of speech acts has only required a low level cognitive process. Consequently, the additional background information is not required by the students before giving their response.

Example: Move consisting of Head of speech acts

-
1. G : Are you familiar with these pictures?
(using the pictures from the slide as a prompt)
2. Ss : Yesssssss...
-
3. G : so, what's the picture about?
4. Ss : Drugs
5. G : Yes, the picture is about drugs.
-
6. Can you tell me one by one the name of.. the kind of drugs.
The picture number 1?
7. Ss : Shabu-shabu
-
8. G : Number 2?
9. Ss : Mariyuana.
10. G : Number 2 is mariyuana.
-
11. Number 3?
12. S : Morphin
-

Extract 5. shows that teachers make some of the questions that is directed to the class not to the individual. Thus, the opportunity to respond is open for each student. In move 1, 3 and 6 the teacher do the questioning by using only a head act and on this opportunity teacher is using a complete sentence, whereas in move 8 and 11 teacher uses a sentence with the omission of certain parts.

The move consisting of the head acts and the selection usually occurs in the questioning. The appearance of the speech act of selection shows how teacher manage the classroom by distributing of opportunities among students to answer questions. The question speech acts that are not accompanied by a selection indicate that the teacher directs question to the whole class and each student has a chance to answer. The pattern of the question move, which is mention before, has some disadvantages. Firstly, the distribution of opportunities to answer is unequal because usually a few students who are active will always grab the chance to answer so that the answer will always be given by a small number of students in the class. Second, the teacher cannot monitor the overall class understanding. Third, some teachers feel the class has follow the lessons well with the answers to all questions offered, however the question only answered by some of the best student. Fourth, students who are not active or do not follow the lessons well will feel comfortable in the classroom because they are not challenged to answer the question.

The example above shows each move consists of a speech act

Example: move consists of Selection+ Head act

G : so now, there is a forest fire...Yudi, do you think why did it happen?
 S : The people cut the trees randomly...
 G : Yeah...the people cut the trees randomly...

T : How about number two? Group four, why do you think the speaker express the curiosity? What does curiosity means? Apa makna dari curiosity?
 Ss4 : (Talk in group)
 G : Hello group four? Siapa yang mau menyampaikan?
 S1 : Panji.. panji..

The Example of move consists of head act + selection

G : Have nya di ganti dengan had. Ok yang lain? Any comment? Future possible....Eka Puji.
 E : Dia future possible kok were?
 G : Nah itu dia..that's the real dia future possible.
 Dia dalam main clausenya itu apa? Kalimatnya dalam bentuk...
 S : Present.
 G : Present,

The use of head acts followed by selection provide opportunities for individual students to respond. The speech act that is commonly used in traditional classes are head act followed by selection. This allows all students to think of an appropriate response before the teacher pointed to one of the students to give a response. thus, all students are cognitively active because they cannot predict who will be appointed by the teacher to give a response. Meanwhile, the selection move pattern before speech acts enables student who is not selected feel comfortable and do not have to think of the expected response. Generally, this pattern is used by teachers to challenge students who may not be paying attention or when the teacher wants to give special opportunities for certain students to respond.

Example Move consists of Pre head + head act

T : I hope you are as students and intelligence people, you must avoid drugs. Don't try to get closer.
 Jangan pernah mendekati atau mencoba drugs ya.
 S : Enak tapi mam.
 G : Enak katanya, tapi dampaknya jadi kecanduan.

Di surat kabar juga ibu-ibu RT detangkap karena mengkonsumsi narkoba. Ada baca benita nya?
 Ss : Tidaaaaaaaak..

In the example above there are two speech acts - the directive speech act on the first exchange and question speech act on the second exchange. Directive speech act is preceded by a pre that functions as an introduction and then followed by post-head which functions as a prompt to strengthen the directive. Meanwhile the question speech act on exchange preceded post-head that functions as a starter to recall the topic being discussed.

C. CONCLUSIONS

The findings of this study show that the interaction at the exchange level dominated by the majority of teachers with question exchange and very little proportion for informative exchange. The informative move by teacher placed after feedback move or before a question move or directive. This indicates that English teacher tend to use the traditional learning process that puts the teacher as a source of information and has not put forward a learning process that emphasizes students' ability to think. At the move level, the use of head act is very dominant and only five percent of moves are using the other elements that are pre-head, post-head and selection. In fact, the use of speech act of selection is a good strategy for the class management associated with the distribution of response given to the teacher. Thus, it is expected that there are efforts which can raise the awareness of teacher toward the structure of pedagogic discourse interaction that can boost the effectiveness and efficiency of learning.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, J. 2004. *Toward Dialogic Teaching: Rethinking Classroom Talk*. Cambridge: Dialogos
- Alwasilah, a.C.. 2002. *Pokoknya kualitatif: dasar-dasar Merancang dan Melakukan Penelitian Kualitatif*. Jakarta: Pustaka Jaya
- Aman, Idris dan Rosniah Mustaffa. 2006. Classroom Discourse of Malay Language Lesson: A Critical Analysis. *Jurnal e-bangi*. Vol1/1
- Barnes, D. 1992. The Role of Talk in Learning in K. Norman(1992). *Thinking Voices: The Work of National Oracy project*. London: Hodder&Stoughton
- Brazil, D. 1981. Discourse analysis as linguistics: A response to Hammerley. Dalam French, P. dan M. MacLure (editor). *Adult-child conversation*. London: Croom Helm.
- Burton, D. 1981. Analysing spoken discourse. Dalam Coulthard, M. Dan M. Montgomery (editor). *Studies in discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Butler, C. S. 1993. Communicative function and semantics. Dalam Halliday, M. A. K. Dan R. P. Fawcett (Editor). *New development in systemic linguistics*. London: Batsford.
- Cockayne. 2010. Reducing Teacher Talk Time and Improving the Quality of Teacher Talk: A Classroom Research Project. Birmingham university (Unpublished Paper)
- Coulthard, M. 1985. *An introduction to discourse analysis*. London: Longman
- Coulthard, M. 1992. *Advances in spoken discourse analysis*. London: Routledge
- Coulthard, M. dan D. Brazil. 1981. Exchange structure. Dalam Coulthard, M. dan M. Montgomery (editor). *Studies in discourse analysis*. London: Routledge&Kegan
- Coulthard, M & M. Montgomery. 1981. *Studies in discourse analysis*. London: Routledge
- Cutting, J. 2002. *Pragmatics and discourse: A resource book for students*. London: Routledge.
- De Boor, M. 2009. Discourse Analysis of Peer Scaffolding and Language development. Birmingham University (Unpublished Paper)
- Fracis, G. dan S. Hunston. 1992. Analysing Everyday Conversation in M. Coulthard (1992) *Advances in spoken Discourse Analysis*. London: routledge
- Halliday, M.A.K.. 1976. *Exploration in the Function of Language*. London: Blackwell
- Hamzah. 2007. Simplifikasi Bahasa yang Ditujukan kepada Jenjang Kelas yang Berbeda oleh Guru Bahasa Inggris. *Jurnal Bahasa dan Seni*. Vol 8/1
- 2008. Penggunaan Kode Bahasa Oleh Guru Dalam Pengajaran Bahasa Inggris di Sekolah Menengah Atas. *Lingua Didaktika*. Vol. 2/3
- 2010. Analisis Struktur Pertanyaan pada Register yang Digunakan oleh Guru Pelajaran Bahasa Inggris SMA. *Kalamistics*. Vol2/1
- Martin, J. R.. 1992. *English text: System and structure*. Philadelphia: John Benjamin.
- Nystrand, M. 1997. Dialogic Instruction: when Recitation Become Conversation in M. Nystrand et all (1997). *Opening Dialogue: Understanding the Dynamics of Language and Learning in the English Classroom*. New York; Teacher College
- Pomerantz, A.. 1984. Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. Dalam Atkinson, J. M. Dan J. Heritage (editor). *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Raine, P.. 2010. An application of the Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) Method of discourse analysis. [Http://www.cels.bham.ac.uk/resources/essays/raine_sinc-coul.pdf](http://www.cels.bham.ac.uk/resources/essays/raine_sinc-coul.pdf)
- Rashidi, Nasser dan sahar Naderi. 2012. The effect of Gender on the Patterns of Classroom Interaction. *Education*. Vol. 3 / 2
- Sacks. H.. 1984. Notes on methodology. Dalam J.M. Atkinson dan J. Heritage (Ed), *Structures of social action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sacks, H.. 1971. *Lecture notes*. School of social science. University of California at Irvine.
- Sanders, R. E. 1983. Tools for cohering discourse and their strategic utilization: Markers of structural connections and meaning relations. Dalam Craig, R. T. Dan K. Tracy (editor). *Conversational coherence: Form, structure and strategy*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publication
- Schegloff, E.. 1992. The last site for intersubjectivity. *American sociological review*.
- Schegloff, E. & H. Sacks. 1973. Opening up closings. *Semiotica*. Vol. 8/4.
- Schegloff, E. dkk.. 1977. the preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*. Vol. 53/3.
- Shomoossi, N.. 2004. The effect of Teachers' Questioning Behavior on EFL Classroom Interaction: a Classroom Research Study. *Reading Matrix*. Vol14/2
- Sinclair, J.. 1980. Discourse in relation to language structure and semiotics. Dalam Greenbaum, S. dkk. *Studies in English linguistics for Randolph Quirk*. London: Longman.
- Sinclair, J. & M. Coulthard. 1975. *Towards analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*.

- Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stenstrom, A. 1994. *An introduction to spoken interaction*. London: Longman.
- Vygotsky, L.S.. 1978. *Mind in Society: the Development of Higher Psychological Process*. Cambridge: Harvard University
- Wells, G.. 1999. *Dialogue inquiry: Towards a Sociocultural Practice and Theory of Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University
- Woodward-Kron, R dan Louisa Remedios. 2007. Classroom Discourse in Problem Based Learning Classrooms in the Health Sciences. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*. Vol 30/1