

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The theories from several literatures concerning the research questions have been reviewed to support this study. Then the review is provided in this chapter.

2. 1. Classroom Interaction

From Ellis (cited in Tuan and Nhu, 2011) classroom interaction is defined as any exchanges in the classroom, including the authentic communication or the written one. In addition, Brown (1994 cited in Tuan and Nhu, 2010) also points out the purpose of the ‘communicative competence’ in the classroom communication is more than just to ‘negotiate’ meaning, but also to transfer the idea from the teacher to the students, students to the teacher and among all participants of the classroom interaction.

Classroom interaction is an authentic context of interaction (Knop, 1985). Through which students experience exchanging information and facing real interlocutors. In EFL classroom, classroom interaction facilitates students to use the target language in a real context of communication. Moreover, teacher can provide opportunity for students to use the target language in classroom interaction by doing so in the interaction (Knop, 1985), such as in giving instructions to the students.

There are two types of interaction constituting in the classroom interaction. They are the non-verbal and the verbal interactions. The non-verbal one deals with

any behavioral responses (Tuan and Nhu, 2010: 30), like nodding, hand rising, and body gestures. Meanwhile the verbal interaction is the kind of interaction that involving written and oral form. The written interaction is related to expressing ideas through written words, document, etc. Otherwise, the oral interaction is the interaction style where students and teacher interact among each other by speaking activities (Tuan and Nhu, 2010: 30).

2.1.1. Classroom Oral Interaction

Classroom oral interaction includes all speaking activities involving the teacher and the students in the classroom. In EFL classroom, those activities are assumed to be a meaningful way in promoting students' oral proficiency of the target language, as reviewed from Knop (1985), then may affect the outcome of the learning process (Frymer, 2005). As reviewed from Tuan and Nhu (2010: 30), Rivers points out classroom oral interaction facilitates students to use the target language meaningfully and purposefully.

2.1.2. Students' Participation in Classroom Oral Interaction

Oral interaction is not a one-way activity in its process. Teacher and students play an important role on their own way. Teacher is considered as the one who give the most elicitation in the interaction. Then students can response it in some ways, for instance, by giving answers. Both of them, then, can give feedback on each other's participation.

As suggested by Christie (2002), “students would have greater opportunity to initiate and take the talk where they willed it”. Therefore, students can play various roles in the classroom oral interaction as long as they have opportunity to play those roles. Meanwhile, the teacher is assumed to be the one who can provides the opportunities for the students by giving elicitation in many ways

2. 2. Interpersonal Functions in Classroom Oral Interaction

The theories about the interpersonal functions was developed by M.AK Halliday (2004: 106) and also provided in Eggins (2004: 141). Halliday explains that the interpersonal function belong to the metafunctions of language. The interpersonal functions in classroom oral interaction deal with the interactive or communicative functions done the interactants of the interaction referring to the teacher and students.

The functions they do are then classified according to the interpersonal moves, the initiating role and the commodity being exchanged by the interactants. In relation to the IRF pattern of classroom oral interaction, the interpersonal moves reflects the role of the teacher and students in initiating, giving responses, and providing follow-up on the others’ responses.

2.2.1. Interpersonal Moves

A move in a ‘dialogic interaction’ corresponds to the complementary roles of the interaction that is the initiating role who starts the dialogue then requires the

other interactant to take role too, the responding role. Hence, the moves in the classroom oral interaction cover the initiation, the response, and the follow up.

Therefore, IRF pattern is used in determining the moves done by the teacher and students in the classroom oral interaction.

2.2.1.1.IRF Pattern of Classroom Oral Interaction

In some sources, the use of the term between IRF (initiation, response, and follow-up) and IRE (initiation, response, and evaluation) have been argued. From Halliday's theory of 'clause as exchange', Mehan (1979 in Christie 2002) described the IRE as "the basic unit of classroom interaction" (Hall, 2003). It is defined as "a three-sequential" of exchange involving teacher in eliciting the information (I), then students give responses (R), after that teacher as the expert of the interaction evaluates/gives feedback on students' participation (E). Meanwhile, Sinclair and Coulthard propose another model of the structure of Moves, "the so-called Initiation, Response and Feedback move (Christie, 2002)

Hall (2003) argued that the IRE has disadvantages on the application of the term 'Evaluation' since it can, ideally, be done by the teacher as the 'expert' in the interaction, then none of students' participations can be categorized as the 'evaluation'. Hence, 'follow-up' is suitable to use to label the feedback, from the teacher or even the students, on students' responses. The follow-up can function to give reinforcements and re-initiate by asking another questions. Meanwhile, the students themselves are potential in providing feedback on other students' participation by, for example, summing up, arguing, etc. It implies that students

have the same right with the other participants of classroom oral interaction in giving initiation, response, and follow up.

Furthermore, Christie (2002) also suggests that the IRF pattern of classroom oral interaction is useful to “look at the nature of meanings in construction, the relative roles and responsibilities of teachers and students at the time of constructing those meanings”. Hence, the IRF pattern is preferred to use in this study to use in analyzing the speech functions of students’ interpersonal moves in the classroom oral interaction.

2.2.2. Commodity of Exchange

The commodity of exchange deals with what is being exchanged. As reviewed in Halliday (2004) and Fairclough (1992), the verbal commodity is classified as information, while the non-verbal is categorized as goods-&-services. The commodity being exchanged in the English classroom oral interaction cannot be predicted whether the most dominant one is the information or action.

Therefore, the exchange of information can be found by the interpersonal functions done by the teacher and the students involving the following functions: ‘statement’, ‘acknowledgement’, ‘contradiction’, ‘question’, ‘answer’, and ‘disclaimer’. Meanwhile, the rest functions are done to exchange actions or goods-&-services.

2.2.3. Initiating Roles in Exchange

There are two initiating roles in the exchange, categorized into Giving and Demanding. To illustrate, Halliday explains "...giving means 'inviting to receive', and demanding means 'inviting to give'.". Students' initiating role in the classroom oral interaction can be done by both the teacher and students. It depends on the functions they do in the interaction. Therefore, to avoid repetition, the initiating roles reflected in the interpersonal functions have been reviewed and elaborated on the previous points.

In short, Halliday (2004: 108) sums up and illustrated the speech role in exchange in the following table:

Initiating Role	Commodity	Initiation	Response	
			Expected	Discretionary
give	goods-&-services	offer shall I give you this teapot?	acceptance yes, please, do!	rejection no, thanks!
demand		command give me the teapot!	undertaking here you are	refusal I won't
give	information	statement he's giving her the teapot.	acknowledgement is he?	contradiction no, he isn't
demand		question what is he giving her?	answer a teapot	disclaimer I don't know

Table 2.1. Speech Functions and Responses (Halliday, 2004: 108)

Therefore, considering the interpersonal moves, the commodity being exchanged, and the initiating roles, the interpersonal functions in the oral interaction are then categorized into several types of functions. The primary

functions include 'offer', 'question', 'statement', and 'command'. Then those functions are likely responded with other functions. To elaborate, by reviewing the Halliday's speech functions, the followings are the interpersonal functions done in the classroom oral interaction consisting of:

- **Offer**

An offer is defined as the initiating move in interaction and purposed to invite the other interactants to receive the goods-&-services. Therefore, this function is ideally responded with the expected move called 'acceptance'; or the unexpected move called 'rejection'.

- **Question**

It is defined as the initiating move and is functioned to invite the other interactants to response with 'answer' and 'disclaimer'. Question, answer, and disclaimer are the interpersonal functions likely to do by both the teacher and students in the classroom oral interaction. Ideally, a question is given by the teacher to elicit students' participation in giving responses. Otherwise, a question is also used by students to get more information from the teacher or the other students.

- **Statement**

A statement is the interpersonal function to give information to the other interactants. This function is, frequently, done by the teacher in explaining things then responded by the students with 'acknowledgment', a function

reflecting the agreement with the statement. However, students are also potential to give a statement during the interaction to express their opinions or even suggestions. However, a statement can also be responded by the other interactants with another contradictive opinion, called ‘contradiction’.

- **Command**

In the same way with a question, a command is the interpersonal function frequently done in the classroom oral interaction and, ideally, done by the teacher. The teacher does this function to get the students to do the instructions given. Then, if the students do the action demanded, then their interpersonal function in responding a command is called ‘undertaking’. However, students can unexpectedly refuse to do the command, therefore it is called ‘refusal’.

Regarding to the students interpersonal moves in the practice of classroom oral interaction, the students’ interpersonal functions which can be classified into initiation moves are ‘offer’, ‘statement’, ‘question’, ‘command’. Then the most typical moves by students, the response move, can be reflected by ‘answer’, or ‘disclaimer’, ‘undertaking’ or ‘refusal’, ‘acknowledgement’ or ‘contradiction’, and ‘acceptance’ or ‘rejection’. Meanwhile, the follow-up move is ideally done by the students when they, as discussed in the previous point, give feedback on the others’ participation.

In addition, reviewing Malinowski theory on the phatic communication (in González et al, 2011), there are some phatic expressions used in the classroom as means of the interpersonal functions done by the teacher and students. Those

phatic expressions refer to the small talks in the interactions. Instead of exchanging the information, phatic communication is aimed at developing relationship between the interactants (González et al, 2011). Hence, those expressions that are not purposed for information exchange will be categorized as phatic communication. In English classroom oral interaction, phatic communication can be found, such as, when the teacher and students used some fixed expressions in greeting each other before the lesson starts and before the class is dismissed.

2. 3.Experiential Functions in Classroom Oral Interaction

Referring to the theories on Halliday's the experiential functions (Halliday,2004; Eggins 2004; Harthayan, 2010), the experiential functions deal with humans' experience reflected in language then classified into six process types representing different experiences. There process types are material, mental, verbal, existential, relational, and behavioral.

In relation to the classroom oral interaction, the process types of the experiential functions are reflected by the interpersonal expressions used by the teacher and students in doing their interpersonal functions. Meanwhile, the meaning conveyed in the interpersonal expressions used in the classroom interaction is very rich. Therefore, it is rarely to find all of the process types mentioned above represented at once through the clauses used in classroom oral interaction. There are some process types likely to occur, but it depends on the content of the interaction itself.

The following points are the review on the Halliday's process types reflected by the interpersonal expressions used in classroom oral interaction.

2.3.1. Material Process

The material process is the process of doing. It deals with the physical activities: happening, changing, creating, doing, and acting. The properties of material process are actor, goal, recipient, client, and initiator/agent, and range, which function as the participants of the clause and represented by, typically, the nominal group. Actor and goal are directly involved in the process. Actor is the doer, used in transitive and intransitive material clauses.

Meanwhile, the material process in the interpersonal expressions is, ideally, represented by instructions or command demanding someone to do an action. It is also used by the classroom participant in expressing or sharing their experience in doing something. However, the material process probably occurring in students utterances is not that complex. 'Actor' and 'goal' are the potentially participants involved in students' utterances during the oral interaction.

2.3.2. Mental Process

Mental process or the process of sensing has a participant experiencing the mental activities called a 'senser'. The 'senser' is always a human and conscious being. The other participant of this process is 'phenomenon', something sensed (thought, felt, wanted, or perceived) by the 'senser'. This kind of process is ideally used by the teacher and students in the beginning of stating their opinions, even in arguing others' statement.

2.3.3. Behavioral Process

Behavioral process is the combination of the inner (psychological) reaction, which is, then, expressed by outer (physiological) reaction. Therefore, behavioral process is the process between the material and the mental (Halliday, 2004). In practice, the behavioral process is reflected by the interpersonal expressions used in expressing the physical and mental action at the same time.

2.3.4. Verbal Process

Verbal process is the process of saying or verbalizing the experience. The process involves a participant called a Sayer who functions as speaker in the process of saying. The ‘sayer’ is, ideally, accompanied by a ‘verbiage’ that is the quote or reported speech by the sayer. Another potential participant involved in the process is a ‘receiver’, who is the addressee of the quote or reported speech.

In the classroom oral interaction, the verbal process is reflected by the expressions used by the classroom participants in thanking or asking for apology to someone, and quoting or reporting someone’s quotes or statements.

2.3.5. Relational Process

Furthermore, the classroom oral interaction is, typically, a discussion containing the process of relating some items to their identities or attributes. Therefore, the relational process is the process type that is likely to occur during the classroom oral interaction. This process is distinguished into two main types

of relational process, process of characterizing called the attributive; and process of identifying. Each type is, then, categorized into intensive, possessive, and circumstantial relational process.

Relational Process	Attributive	Intensive	
		Possessive	Circumstance as participant
			Circumstance as process
		Circumstantial	Circumstance as attribute
			Circumstance as process
	Identifying	Intensive	
		Possessive	Circumstance as participant
			Circumstance as process
		Circumstantial	Circumstance as participant
			Circumstance as process

Table 2.2. Relational Process

The participants involved in the process of identifying are ‘identified’ and ‘identifier’. Meanwhile, ‘carrier’ is characterized by its ‘attribute’ in attributive process.

2.3.6. Existential Process

Existential process is also known as the process of existing or the process representing something that exists or happens (Halliday, 2004: 256). It can be recognize from the occurrence of the word ‘There’ as, typically, the subject of the clause used in the interpersonal expressions. In the classroom oral interaction, this

process can be reflected by the expressions used to show the existence of event happening in the classroom.

2.4. Classroom Discourse Analysis

Brown (2000) explains “conversations are excellent examples of the interactive and interpersonal nature of communications...” (p.255). Likewise, Chrisrie (2000) explains “the principal resource available to teachers and students with which to achieve educational goals is language”. It implies that the classroom conversation or classroom talk occurring in an EFL class can be used to observe, beside the learning activities and its influence to the learning outcomes, the nature of the classroom oral interaction which involves the teacher and students as its participants, also called ‘interactants’.

Furthermore, it has brought the linguists’ interest to conduct studies on the classroom language and become one of various areas of discourse analysis, called classroom discourse analysis. Rather than improving the educational practices, classroom discourse analysis is aimed at understanding more about the nature of the classroom talk. However, as suggested by Christie (2002), the report of the research also provides “a section reflecting on some possible applications of their findings, including educational application.” Therefore, the findings of the classroom discourse analysis present the information how the language is used by the teacher and students in the classroom interaction and how it can be useful for pedagogical practices.

Reviewing from Young (2008), there are many approaches that can be used in conducting the studies on the classroom discourse analysis. Firstly, the ethnography approach where the observer becomes the parts of the classroom interaction (in some cases, the observer participates as the teacher, co-tutor, or even the students). Secondly, there is the conversational analysis which focuses primarily on the social life in the classroom interaction rather than the language, but “limits the analysis on the talk itself” (Young, 2008).

The last is micro-ethnography which almost similar to the first approach, except the use of audio/video recordings of the interaction and the transcription of the talk as another way to deal with the classroom interaction without getting involved as a participant. Therefore, the last approach was likely to be adopted in this study on classroom discourse analysis focusing on the students’ participation in English classroom oral interaction.