SPEECH FUNCTIONS USED IN CLASSROOM INTERACTION OF THE ELEVENTH GRADE STUDENTS AT MA NURUL IKHWAN KONSESI

*Tri Ardiansyah

**Dr. Meisuri, M.A.

ABSTRACT

This study aimed at describing the use of speech functions and investigating the reasons of using the most dominant speech functions in classroom interaction at MA Nurul Ikhwan Konsesi. The objectives of this study were to indicate the types of speech function in the teacher-student classroom interaction and to describe the pattern of speech function realized in the teacher-student classroom interaction. The method used in this research was descriptive qualitative research. The data were collected by observing, recording the utterances of teacher and eleventh-grade students at MA Nurul Ikhwan Konsesi. The data were analyzed based on Systemic Functional Linguistics theory. There were 198 utterances produced as the total number consisting of 55 (28.80%) statement, 80 (42.39%) questions, 10 (5.44%) commands, 3 (0.54%) offer, 37 (19.02%) answers, 8 (3,27) disclaimers, and 3 (0.54%) acknowledgement. The teacher produced 150 (77.17%) utterances and students produced 48 (22.83%) utterances. The result showed that the question was the dominant type of speech functions used by the teacher, and the answer was the dominant type of speech function responses used by the students.

Keywords: Speech Functions, Classroom Interaction, Mood System.

---

*Graduate Status

** Lecturer Status

INTRODUCTION

A. Background of Study

Language is one of the important things for people around the world because a language is used as a means of communication in their community. A language is created so that people are able to fulfill their necessities as social individualities. Without language, people in community cannot cooperate in their activity. Wardaugh (1977 : 7) says that language is basically a means of both oral and written communication. Without language, people in community cannot cooperate in their activity. Language allows human to say things to each other and express their communication needs.

The language used by the teacher in the classroom interaction is commonly known as teacher talk. It can be said as magical thing because it can probably change everything in the classroom interaction. Some experts do not only define what language is but also they account for its importance and impact upon the teaching and learning process.

In Indonesia, survey on sixty-two junior and senior high school teachers in west Java, Banten and DKI revealed that most of the teachers rate their students' participation as very low and low (Suherdi, 2009). Suherdi explains it is because students tend to be low confidence and lack of independence in organizing their learning. Another research shows that in EFL classroom, teachers spend 70% to 80% class time talking (Yuliati, 2013). From these researches, the evidences indicate the teacher's ability to provide an interactive language classroom through his communicative language is very important. Substantially, the use of an appropriate function of clause in a certain situation do determines the acceptance of the message that wants to be delivered.

When the teachers talk in the classroom, they adopt the role of speech functions in any situation of classroom interaction to deliver their functional instruction in a certain situation. They use statement while lecturing in declarative mood, imperative mood as the realization of command in directing students or

interrogative mood in demanding information from the students. But, sometimes, there are situation in which speech function is not congruently realized.

As explained previously, statement is congruently used to give information and realized in a declarative mood. It could probably make confusion and create ambiguity among the students in getting the information comprehensively when information is metaphorically delivered.

Based on the elaboration above, the writer was interested in analyzing speech functions used in classroom interaction, while focusing on the analysis of spoken language. It is regarding Systemic Functional Linguistics analysis on Mood types of interpersonal metafunction which is concerned with the analysis of communicative functions what Halliday refers to as speech function (Eggins, 2004).

REVIEW OF LITERATURE
A. Theoritical Framework

This chapter presents the review of literature related to the basic theories and foundation of the research.

1. Systemis Functional Linguistics

Halliday (1994) developed an approach to linguistics which performs language as a basic of constructing human being's experiences called as Systemic Functional Linguistics. According to Liu (2014:1238), Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) provides a social perspective to language study and regards language as a social semiotic resource. It describes how the language is used by people in accomplishing human's daily social life. SFL views the study of language as a set of social and cultural context to attain meaning in the use of daily language interaction. It examines how language is performed in a different context and how that kind of language is structured by people in expressing their purposes or their meanings.

2. Metafunction

Halliday (1970) states that the context of situation is arranged in three categories: field, tenor and mode. Corresponding to that, Halliday analyzes language into three broad metafunction: ideational, interpersonal and textual metafunctions. Each of three metafunctions is about different aspect of the world concerned with a different mode of meaning of clauses. Based on the SFL perspective, language has three main metafunctions which will be described as follows:

a. Ideational function is the concern function of language (Halliday, 2007:183). It is realized in Transitivity and serves to represent situation and events in the world and the entities, action and process involved. It is in the ideational function that the text producer embodies in language their experience of the phenomena of the real world (Halliday, 1973:106).

b. The textual function of language is an enabling one (Halliday and Matthiessen, 1999:7). It is in the textual function that ideational and interpersonal meaning are actualized (Halliday, 2007:184).

c. Interpersonal meaning is the meaning which expresses a speaker's attitudes and judgments. These are meaning for acting upon and with others. Meaning is realized in wordings through what is called MOOD and modality (Gerot and Wignell, 1994:13).Language is used not only to construe the speaker's experience. It is also used to indicate, establish, or maintain the social relationship between people. This function enables people to participate in building a communicative interaction among others. It includes forms of address, speech function and mood.

3. Interpersonal Function

Interpersonal meanings are meanings which express a speaker's attitudes and judgments (Gerot and Wignell 1994: 13). These are meanings for acting upon and with others. Meanings are realized in wordings through what is called mood and

modality. Meanings of this kind are most centrally influenced by the tenor of discourse. Interpersonal meanings construing tenor are realized lexicogrammatically by the system of mood and modality with the mood element further analyzed into subject and finite. This metafunction is about the social world, especially the relationship between speaker and listener, and concerns with the clause as exchanges.

4. Metaphor

Aaron (2003:50) defines that the word metaphor is derived from Greek word *metaphora* meaning 'transfer,carry out'. It is a derivation from meta meaning 'over, across', and pherein meaning 'to carry'. Metaphor is two things of an implicit comparison in which two unlike objects are compared with factual, the first is original meaning and the seconds is describing of metaphor, So that metaphor is beautiful to studying because they got a lot of benefits, metaphor can analyze something in the world.

Thus Aristotle states metaphor such as *phora and epiphoraas* that the word can borrowed from an order other of language. Metaphor is pervasive kind of figure of speech not only in literary work but also in everyday life. Metaphor is to describe of terms something which compare each other so it can be comparison between of two differentness but they are had the characteristics to important it.

5. Speech Functions

Halliday (1994:30) states that speech functions are action or performance done by language users such as: asking, commanding, and answering in order to fulfill the intention of the speakers and listeners. Speech function is used as the medium exchange of their experiences. It is more oriented to functional interpretation,

specifically Systemic Functional Linguistics. It means that all the utterances involved the four types in speech functions (statement, question, offer, and command). The speech functions of clauses are much determined by the speech roles and the commodity exchanged. Halliday states that there are two types of specific role, they are giving and demanding. The commodity exchange can be either goods and services or information

As in addition to Saragih's statement (2014:37), it is obviously clear that nobody can live harmoniously in the society without the acts of giving and asking or demanding for something in interactions. Either the speaker is giving something to the listener or he is demanding something from him. The speaker is not only doing something by himself, but he or she is also requiring something of the listener.

a. **Types of Speech Functions**

The most fundamental types of speech role which lie behind all the more specific type that we may eventually be able to recognize are just two: (i) giving and (ii) demanding. Either, the speaker is giving something to the listener (a piece of information, for example) or he is demanding something from him. Even these elementary categories already involve complex notions: giving means inviting to receive and demanding means inviting to give.

b. **The Initiations and Responses of Speech Function**

The four speech functions are initiated by the speaker or addresser. In real interaction, the listener or addressee responds to the speech functions produced by the speaker or addresser. In other words, a speech function of a speaker or addresser is responded by the listener or addressee.

The three elements of role, commodity and orientation are set up in a system network to derive eight speech functions as specified. Saragih (2014:23) states that the system network specifies that the role may be either that of giving or demanding, the commodity may be either information or goods and services and the orientation

may be initiating or responding. When the three elements are intersected, eight speech functions are derived as summarized.

6. Realization of Speech Function in Mood System

Halliday (1994) states that the relation between the semantics and the grammar is one of realization: the wording 'realizes', or encodes the meaning. The wording, in turn, is realized is a symbolic one. It is not possible to point to each symbol as an isolate and ask what it means; the meaning is encoded in the grammar both of them cannot separate each other in the sentence.

In relation from that statement, there is another theory about semantics and grammar which call speech function as discourse semantics and mood as lexicogrammar. The four speech functions (statement, question, offer and command) find their realization in mood which is an aspect on interpersonal function at the level of lexicogrammar. The representation of speech function 'statement' is realized by 'declarative', 'question' is realized by 'interrogative' and 'command' is realized by 'imperative'. However, the speech function of 'offer' does not have an unmarked representation of mood. It is realized by any one of the four speech functions. The unmarked realization of the speech functions are realized in mood.

7. Classroom Interaction

For foreign language learners, classroom is the main place where they are frequently exposed to the target language (Xiao-yan, 2006:5). Meanwhile, interaction generally defines as a way of learning something and developing the language skills in particular. In the language teaching, interaction becomes a strategy that takes place in the classroom and requires the participation of the participants. According to Brown (2001:165), classroom interaction is the collaborative exchange of thoughts, feelings, or ideas between two or more people, resulting in a reciprocal effect on each other which takes place in the classroom. Thus, classroom interaction concerns with the existence of communicative interaction raised by both the teacher and students, and among all students in the classroom.

a. Participants in Classroom Interaction

Dagarin (2004:129) categorized some interactions conducted by the participants in the classroom. These are the most frequent ways of organizing classroom interaction, depending on who communicates with whom:

1). Teacher – learners

2) Teacher – learner/a group of learners

3) Learner – learner

4) Learners – learners

b. The Aspects of Classroom Interaction

1) Teacher Talk

2) Student Talk

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research was conducted by applying descriptive qualitative design. Descriptive qualitative design was chosen in order to explore and understand the social phenomenon (Creswell, 2009). Besides, this study was also focused on the students' and teacher's talk and the interaction between them in teaching learning process.

Because the study would relate to the activity of teaching and learning process in the classroom, the report of the writer applied in a form of case study since it explored in-depth activity in one or more individual explained by Creswell (2009)

The data in this research was the interaction between teacher to student(s) and student(s) to teacher during teaching and learning process. The data were in the form of the utterances used by the teacher and students.

This study would carry out at the second grade students of MA Nurul Ikhwan. The participants of this study are 26 students and the English teacher who took a speaking class. It was selected purposively based on the availability of time and teacher's suggestion.

The data was collected by passive participant observation and audio video recorder as a tool to collect the data during the teaching process.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

A. Data

The data in this research was the interaction between teacher to student(s) and student(s) to teacher during teaching and learning process. The data were in the form of the utterances used by the teacher and students.

This study would carry out at the second grade students of MA Nurul Ikhwan. The participants of this study are 26 students and the English teacher who took a speaking class. It was selected purposively based on the availability of time and teacher's suggestion.

B. Findings

Based on the data analysis, the researcher found out some findings as follows:

1. During the teaching and learning process done at MA Nurul Ikhwan Konsesi, there are 198 utterances as the total number of speech function. The teacher produced 150 utterances and students produced 48 utterances. The teacher produced all types of speech function in form initiating statement 55 (28.80%), question 80 (42.39%), command 12 (5.44%), and offer 3 (0.54%). The most dominant type of speech function used by the teacher among all the utterances is question 80 (42.39.%). Students produced three types of speech function response in form responding answer 37 (19.02%), disclaimer 8 (3.27%), and

acknowledgment 3 (0.54%). The most dominant type of speech function response used by the students among all the utterances is answer 37 (19.02%).

2. The pattern of speech function realized in teacher-student interaction was opening by giving a statement as the information about the topic that is a conditional sentence, what the conditional sentence is, how to use conditional sentence and so on. Then it is followed by asking a question, and closing with a demanding command to invite the students to do something, for example, the teacher commands the student to make the example of a conditional sentence. In addition, there are four types of speech function response found in classroom interaction performed by the students in responding the teacher, they are answer as the dominant types, then it is followed by disclaimer, and acknowledgment.

C. Discussion

After analyzing the data and getting the findings, there are some points which considered as the important ones to be discussed.

In determining the types of speech functions occurred in the English speaking classroom of the second grade students at MA Nurul Ikhwan Konsesi, the writer found that there were only seven types of speech functions namely statement, question, command, offer, answer, acknowledgement. Not all of the types of speech functions stated by Eggins (2004: 146) occurred in the English speaking classroom.

In term of the most dominant one, question realized by interogative was found as the most used speech functions.. It was caused by the majority of initiating statements and questions were dominated by teacher. This might become a problem because she didn't let the students to use their potential in arguing opinion or raising an individual thinking. The main focus is getting the learners to perform well on state-mandated tests rather than catering to students' need (Lynch, 2010). The student's lack of participation was also supported by Huba and Freed (2000). They stated that the culture of teacher's dominance classroom will not lead the students to think aloud or interact.

V. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

A. Conclusion

Based on the findings as presented in previous chapter, conclusions are drawn as the following based, it is concluded:

1. Teaching and learning process done by observing the teaching learning process at MA Nurul Ikhwan Konsesi, grade eleven A as the sample of research. The researcher found there are 198 utterances as the total number of speech function, in which the teacher produced 150 (77.17%) utterances and students produced 48 (22.83%) utterances. The teacher produced all the types of speech function, they are statement 55 (28.80%), question 80 (42.39%) command (5.44%), an offer 3 (0.54%). The most dominant type of speech function used by the teacher among all the utterances is question with 80 (42.39%) utterances in form of initiating. Meanwhile, the students produce four types of speech function response and the most dominant type of speech function response used by the students is answer with 37 (19.02%) utterances in the form of responding.

2. The pattern of speech function realized in teacher-student classroom interaction is good. It can be seen that the teacher used all the types of speech function in the classroom and have some responses from the students. From all the types of speech function question is the dominant used by the teacher.

   Question given by the teacher aims to invite the student to talk and express their idea related to the topic being discussed that is conditional sentences. It happened because the students tend to keep silent when the teacher asked something related to the topic being discussed that is a conditional sentence. . The students only gave a short answer like "Yes, Miss" in responding to the teacher's question and frequently keep silent. The students also have an opinion that they just receive what the teacher presented to the student, and some of the students do not want to express their ability to speak English because it will be ashamed if they make mistake in speaking. Therefore, to encourage the students

to speak up, the teacher asks more questions during the classroom activity because through asking and answering activity, it will make the interaction in the classroom be better.

B. Suggestion

Based on the conclusion previously stated, there are some suggestions for further researcher. Since this research is focused on analyzing English speaking classroom in the perspective of speech functions and their realization in mood systems, thus the writer suggested to:

1. Teacher

It is suggested to the teacher who teaches English, in teaching process to have a good teaching method to make the students become interested to speak up or to response to the teacher, for example, making games with the aim that English is fun and the teacher also should know the main problem of the student.

2. Student

For the students learning English, they should improve their ability in responding to the teacher in the class to make the interaction in their classroom during teaching and learning process becomes better by having more initiating to the questions, avoiding from being ashamed of making mistake in speaking, being a critical student in receiving the knowledge, especially when they do not understand what the teacher expalined.

3. Researcher

It is suggested to other researchers to conduct varied research in other classroom interaction sessions, for instance in reading comprehension with the other kinds of text, in writing speaking, or listening which is considered important in improving the students' abilities and ways in learning English as well as improving the teachers' performance in the teaching process.

REFERENCES

Arrifuddin, M and Sofwan, A. 2015. *Speech Functions And Grammatical Patterns Realization In Conversation In The English Textbook*. Journal: Lembaran Ilmu Kependidikan. 44(1): 1-6.

Brown, H. D. 2001. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. Second Edition. New York: Addison Wesley Longman.

Creswell, J. W. 2009. *Design Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches. Third Edition.*USA: Sage.

Eggins, S. and Slade, D. 1997. Analyzing Casual Conversation. London and Washington: Cassel.

Eggins, S. 2004. An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics. 2nd Edition.

New York; London: Continuum.

Fauzi, S. 2013. Mood and Speech Function Realizations of Rights and Responsibilities in "Twitter's Terms of Service". Semarang: Universitas Dian Nuswantoro.

Fikri, et al. 2014. "*Mood Structure Analysis of Teacher Talk in EFL Classroom: A discourse Study Based on Systematic Functional Linguistic Theory*". Ejournal Program pascasarjana Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris. Vol 2 Tahun 2014.

Gerot&Wignell. 1994. *Making Sense of Functional Grammar: An Introductory Workbook*. New South Wales: Antipodean Educational Enterprises.

Halliday, M. A. K. 1994. *An Introduction of Systemic Functional Linguistics.* London: Printer.

Indari, A. 2011. *Realization of Speech Function in Mood in Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono's (SBY) Speeches.* A Thesis. English Applied Linguistics Study Program. Medan: Postgraduate Program, State University of Medan. Unpublished.

Komar, S. & Mozetic, U. 2004. *Classroom Interaction and Communication Strategies in Learning English as a Foreign Language..* Ljubljana: Birografika Bori.

Littlewood, W. 1981. *Communicative Language Teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Markee, N. & Kasper, G. 2004. *Classroom Talks: An Introduction. The Modern Language Journal.* 88(4). 491-500.

Martin, J. R. 1992. *English Text: System and Structure.* USA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Morley, G. David. 2000. *Syntax in Functional Grammar.* New York: Continuum.

Pujiastuti. 2013 *Classroom Interaction An Analysis of Teacher Talk and Student Talk in English Young Learners'(EYL)*", (English Education Study Program of Indonesia University of Education, 2013

Saragih, A. 2016.*Discourse Analysis.* Medan: UniversitasNegeri Medan.

Suherdi, D. 2009. *Classroom Discourse Analysis: A Semiotic Approach.* Bandung: Celtics.

Supika, A. 2017. *The Realization Of Speech Function In English Classroom Interaction Based On Systemic Functional Linguistics Theory* A Thesis. English And Literature Department Program. Medan: State University of Medan. Published.

Tsui, A. B. M. 1995. *Introduction Classroom Interaction.*London: Penguin.

Tuan and Nhu. 2010. *Theoretical Review on Oral Interaction in EFL Classroom.* Canada. (Vol, 4 No:1)

Wardaugh, Donald. 1997. *Introduction to Linguistics*. New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.

Widiyatmoko, Arif. 2013. *A Study of Classroom Interaction in Microteaching Class Conducting in English: The Case at Fifth Year of Science Education Study Program of Semarang State University.* (Vol.1 No:3).

Yanfen, L. & Yuqin, Z. 2010. *A Study of Teacher Talk in Interactions in English Classes.* Harbin Institute of Technology: Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics (Bimonthly). Apr. 2010. Vol.33 No.2.

Yuliati. 2013. *Interpersonal Meaning Negotiation in the Teacher-Student Verbal Interaction.* The International Journal of Social Sciences. May 2013. Vol.11 No.1.

Zohrabi, Mohammad, et al. 2012. *Teacher-centered and/or Student-centered Learning: English Language in Iran.* Canadian Center of Science and Education. August 2012. Vol. 2 No. 3.