CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A. Review of Related Literature

1. The Nature of Discourse Analysis

The terms 'discourse' and 'discourse analysis' have varieties of definitions. The definition of discourse itself really depends on the linguists who discuss about discourse. According to Rymes, discourse is 'language in use'.[1] This means that language deals both in forms and functions. In some linguistics books discourse is 'language beyond the sentence'. The definition of the term discourse as 'language beyond the sentence' similarly appears like 'language above the sentence' in other textbooks of linguistics. Arguably, that discourse is 'language beyond the sentence' or 'language above the sentence' is not appropriate to describe the term discourse. If discourse is only about the forms, organization, or structure of the language, it may ignore the social context and the functions of the language itself. For example, there is a word '*Ladies*' on the door of public lavatory. Can anyone understand even though this is just a word? What does this word mean? Even though this word '*Ladies*' is just one word, but it has a function where this word exists and people can understand it. It is obvious from the example that language has a

[1] Betsy Rymes, *Classroom Discourse Analysis: A tool For Critical Reflection* (Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 2008), 12.

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

form and a function. Thus, the meaning of discourse is close to 'language in use' than the others.

The term 'discourse' comes to a question what discourse analysis is. Here are some definitions related to discourse analysis. First, Brown and Yule discuss that analysis of discourse is 'the analysis of language in use' and an investigation of what language is used for.[2] They explain that discourse analysis cannot be restricted to the independent description of linguitic forms from the functions of the language. Second, McCharty defines discourse analysis as the study of relationship between the language and contexts in which it is used.[3] These two previous definitions have the same point that discourse analysis refers to the study of the language and its use. Then, Van Dijk states that discourse analysis is the form of language which refers to public speech or more commonly to spoken language.[4] Van Dijk makes a distinction that discourse analysis frequently deals with spoken language. In fact, discourse is language produced in oral and in written communication. While according to Steve Walsh, discourse analysis focuses on words and utterances above the level of sentence. Its main aim is to look at the ways in which words and phrases function in context as well.[5] It is clear that the

[2] Gillian Brown, & George Yule, *Discourse Analysis* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 1.
[3] Michael McCharty, *Discourse Analysis For Language Teacher* (Shanghai: Shanghai Education Press, 2002), 5.
[4] Teun van Dijk, *Discourse As Structure And Process* (London: SAGE Publications, 1997), 1.
[5] Steve Walsh, *Exploring Classroom Discourse: Language in Action* (pdf version) (New York: Routledge, 2011), 83.

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

analysis of discourse attempts to figure out the forms of the language and its context being used as natural data than in made up examples.

2. Types of Discourse

Based on the channel or medium used in discourse, there are two types of discourse: written discourse and spoken discourse.[6] Brown and Yule describe those types of discourse in the following.

a. **Written Discourse**: written discourse is one of types of discourse. It studies written texts such as essays, newspaper, magazines, and many others.

b. **Spoken Discourse**: Brown and Yule said that spoken discourse is verbal record of communication.[7] It studies conversations, dialogues, spoken monologues, and many others. Discourse analysts usually work with a tape-recording of an event, they then makes a written transcription.

3. The Nature of Classroom Discourse

Discourse is communication in general which is always found in any social interaction including in a classroom. Discourse occurred in a classroom is usually called as classroom discourse. It has the interaction between a teacher and students in a class, and vice versa. Here are some arguments about the term 'classroom discourse'. According to Nur Jannah, classroom discourse refers to the language which is used by a teacher and students to communicate

[6] Gillian Brown, & George Yule, *Discourse Analysis* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 14.
[7] Gillian Brown, & George Yule, *Discourse Analysis... ... ...*, 9.

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

in the classroom.[8] It is obvious that classroom discourse is where language takes place in a classroom. While Rymes identified that classroom discourse refers to 'language in use' in classroom context. It is also to understand how context and talk are influencing each other.[9] It means that the language is used to communicate in relation to lesson and communication in a classroom. According to Green cited in Rakhmawati as quoted by Jannah, classroom discourse is formed by two components. Those are social context and academic context.[10] Social context deals with the involvement of participants, and the process of interaction. Besides, academic context deals with the content of a lesson. To summarize, classroom discourse is the language used in the classroom or in the context of teaching.

Classroom discourse has many features. Walsh describes that one of the features is the structure of classroom discourse.[11] It is important to know the structures. First, it is common and predictable within classroom interaction. This exchange structure of classroom discourse enables us to understand the kinds of interaction in a classroom. Second, it is very frequently used by teachers to see the progress of interaction in teaching-

---

[8] Nur Jannah, Unpublished Thesis: "*An Analysis of Classroom Discourse in Speaking Class of English Department Students at University of Muhammadiyah Gresik"* (Surabaya: IAIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya Press, 2012), 12.
[9] Betsy Rymes, *Classroom Discourse Analysis: A tool For Critical Reflection* (Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 2008), 17.
[10] Nur Jannah, Unpublished Thesis: "*An Analysis of Classroom ... ...*, 12.
[11] Steve Walsh, *Exploring Classroom Discourse: Language in Action* (pdf version) (New York: Routledge, 2011), 17.

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

learning process. Last, it can be used to evaluate the teacher's role in classroom discourse as well. For example, a teacher frequently initiates the interaction first, and he/she evaluates the students' utterance. The structure of classroom discourse is beneficial for teachers to analyze their utterances in teaching.

The structure of classroom discourse typically has the pattern which is called as an exchange structure. Some writers and practitioners refer to 'IRF exchange structure'. The 'IRF' stands for Initiation, Response, and Feedback. This structure was first put forward by Sinclair and Coulthard.[12] 'Initiation' means that a teacher usually initiates the classroom discourse. It can be opening and closing the stage of lessons, eliciting (gathering information from students), or checking student's understanding about the lesson. 'Response' is defined as student's answers or teacher's questions. 'Feedback' means the evaluation or the way a teacher assesses students' response. This exchange structure typically occurs in teacher-learner interaction in classrooms all around the world.

There is the other features of classroom discourse stated by Walsh. There are four features in classroom discourse: control of interaction, speech modification, elicitation, and repair. Control of interaction means that there is a control from a teacher or students during interaction in a class, even though

[12] Steve Walsh, *Exploring Classroom Discourse: Language in Action* (pdf version) (New York: Routledge, 2011), 17.

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

the roles of teacher and students are not equal. A teacher more frequently controls the classroom interaction than students. The examples of this feature are managing the topic of communication and turn taking. Speech modification is that a teacher modifies the speech. Sometimes a teacher modifies the speech by increasing or decreasing the volume and tone. In addition, she/he also may simplify the vocabulary and grammar in speaking. Elicitation is a strategy done by teachers to ask students about their understanding of the content of lesson. Teachers may ask either display questions or referential questions. Repair, the last feature, is the way teachers deals with students' error. The errors can be the grammar, vocabulary, or the content.[13] These features usually happens in each classrooms by teachers, and they are rarely done by students.

4. The Language Functions

As the foundation of this research, this part reviews the functions of language namely the instrumental function, the regulatory function, the interactional function, the personal function, the heuristic function, the imaginative function, and the representational function. These functions are identified by Halliday.[14] The researcher uses this Halliday's theory to analyze

[13] Steve Walsh, *Exploring Classroom Discourse: Language in Action* (pdf version) (New York: Routledge, 2011), 3-9.

[14] Adrienne L. Herrel, & Michael Jordan, *Fifty Strategies for Teaching English Language Learners* (third edition) (Pearson Merril Prentrice Hall, 2008), 3-4. Malcolm Coulthard, *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis* (New Delhi: SAGE New Age International Publishers, 2006), 159-160. "Five Components of Effective Oral Language Instruction" *Professional Development Service for Teachers* (PDST) (http:// pdst.ie, accessed on March 11 2015 at 10.27 PM), 9-10.

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

the language functions of student teacher's utterances in PPL 1. The descriptions for each functions are explained in the following.

a. The instrumental function

Coulthard, Herrel, and Jordan quoting Halliday cited that instrumental function is used to ask one or students to do something.[15] In other words, a teacher uses this function of language as command to students to do something or to get things done. Kinds of utterances in the instrumental function are asking, requesting, and explaining.[16] The examples are "Hurry, get into your room!", "Do this task!", and "Open your book!".

b. The regulatory function

Coulthard, Herrel, and Jordan quoting Halliday cited that regulatory function is the language which aims to control one's behavior in general.[17] In a classroom a teacher uses this language function to control students' behavior, to make agreement, and to state the rules. There are some kinds of utterances in the regulatory function: setting task, managing, negotiating,

---

[15] Adrienne L. Herrel, & Michael Jordan, *Fifty Strategies for Teaching English Language Learners* (third edition) (Pearson Merril Prentrice Hall, 2008), 3. Malcolm Coulthard, *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis* (New Delhi: SAGE New Age International Publishers, 2006), 159. "Five Components of Effective Oral Language Instruction" *Professional Development Service for Teachers* (PDST) (http:// pdst.ie, accessed on March 11 2015 at 10.27 PM), 9.
[16] "Five Components of Effective Oral Language ... ..., 9.
[17] Adrienne L. Herrel, & Michael Jordan, *Fifty Strategies for* ... ..., 3. Malcolm Coulthard, *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis* ... ..., 160. "Five Components of Effective Oral ... ..., 9.

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

instructing, directing, and controlling.[18] Here are the examples "If you cheat, you will then be punished.", "Submit your assignment next week!", and "Don't be late!".

c. The interactional function

The interactional function is one of the language functions which commonly appears in communication. Coulthard, Herrel, and Jordan quoting Halliday cited that interactional function is used by a teacher to create interaction with students.[19] It is also used by students to interact with teacher and other students. The utterances categorized as the interactional function are initiating, sympathising, reconciling arguing, encouraging, and empathising.[20] Here are the examples of the utterances such as "Hi!", "How are you?", and "Good morning!".

d. The personal function

Coulthard, Herrel, and Jordan quoting Halliday cited that personal function is used in communication to express personal feelings, personal opinions, and personal arguments about a topic or an issue.[21] Kinds of utterances in the personal function are stating opinion, confronting,

---

[18] "Five Components of Effective Oral Language Instruction" *Professional Development Service for Teachers* (PDST) (http:// pdst.ie, accessed on March 11 2015 at 10.27 PM), 9.
[19] Adrienne L. Herrel, & Michael Jordan, *Fifty Strategies for Teaching English Language Learners* (third edition) (Pearson Merril Prentrice Hall, 2008), 3. Malcolm Coulthard, *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis* (New Delhi: SAGE New Age International Publishers, 2006), 160. "Five Components of Effective Oral Language... ... ..., 9.
[20] "Five Components of Effective Oral Language... ... ..., 9.
[21] Adrienne L. Herrel, & Michael Jordan, *Fifty Strategies for* ... ..., 3. Malcolm Coulthard, *An Introduction to Discourse* ... ..., 160. "Five Components of Effective Oral Language ... ..., 9.

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

expressing thoughts and feeling, and recounting experience.[22] These are the examples of the personal function such as "I agree with you.", "Yes, that's right.", and "I don't think so.".

e. The heuristic function

Coulthard, Herrel, and Jordan quoting Halliday cited that heuristic function is used frequently by both a teacher and students to get information about a topic of lesson.[23] Moreover, this function is usually used by students in form of questions which is needed an answer. The purpose of heuristic function for students is to learn, to discover, and to explore information or knowledge. There are some kinds of utterances in the heuristic function, for example interrogating, discussing, asking, querying, investigating, and clarifying.[24] The examples are "What do you mean?", and "Why does snow exist in Alasca?".

f. The imaginative function

Coulthard, Herrel, and Jordan quoting Halliday cited that imaginative or imaginary function is the language which is used to create story and words of imagination.[25] According to Halliday, the utterances

---

[22] "Five Components of Effective Oral Language Instruction" *Professional Development Service for Teachers* (PDST) (http:// pdst.ie, accessed on March 11 2015 at 10.27 PM), 9.
[23] Adrienne L. Herrel, & Michael Jordan, *Fifty Strategies for Teaching English Language Learners* (third edition) (Pearson Merril Prentrice Hall, 2008), 4. Malcolm Coulthard, *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis* (New Delhi: SAGE New Age International Publishers, 2006), 160. "Five Components of Effective Oral Language ... ..., 9.
[24] "Five Components of Effective Oral Language ... ..., 9.
[25] Adrienne L. Herrel, & Michael Jordan, *Fifty Strategies for* ... ..., 4. Malcolm Coulthard, *An Introduction to Discourse* ... ..., 160. "Five Components of Effective Oral Language ... ..., 9.

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

classified in imaginative function are storytelling, anticipating, predicting, imagining, playing, and experimenting.[26] This language function may appear when telling fairy tales, making poem, and many others.

g. The representational function

Coulthard, Herrel, and Jordan quoting Halliday cited that representational function is the function of language to communicate, to deliver, to report, and to explain information.[27] Kinds of utterances which are categorised as representational function are telling, lecturing, stating facts, sharing skills, commenting, imparting knowledge, and informing.[28] This language function is usually used by a teacher and sometimes used by students in the form of statements such as "*ate* is the past form of *eat*.", "Surabaya is the second metropolitan city in Indonesia.", and "Mr. Jusuf Kalla is the vice president of Indonesia.".

5. Recording and Transcribing Classroom Interaction

Researchers need ways to collect classroom data. Walsh describes that there are two principal ways to analyze classroom discourse.[29] They are recording and transcribing. Those points are commonly used by researchers in analyzing classroom discourse.

---

[26] "Five Components of Effective Oral Language Instruction" *Professional Development Service for Teachers* (PDST) (http:// pdst.ie, accessed on March 11 2015 at 10.27 PM), 9.
[27] Adrienne L. Herrel, & Michael Jordan, *Fifty Strategies for Teaching English Language Learners* (third edition) (Pearson Merril Prentrice Hall, 2008), 3. "Five Components of Effective ... ..., 10.
[28] "Five Components of Effective Oral Language ... ..., 10.
[29] Steve Walsh, *Exploring Classroom Discourse: Language in Action* (pdf version) (New York: Routledge, 2011), 67.

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

a. Recording

Walsh, discussed about classroom discourse, states that classrooms are places where there are a lot of situations happening at the same time. Thus it is very difficult to catch everything easily.[30] It means that it is quite hard to write quickly a lot of events in a classroom by a researcher, since he/she cannot pause the activities in a class. It is obvious that a researcher needs a 'tool' or media to record many situations occurring in a class accurately.

Walsh illustrates that there are four choices in recording classroom discourse. They are audio-recording, video-recording, observation, and narrative.[31]

1) Audio-recording

Audio-recording is the easiest ways to capture spoken interaction in classrooms. With modern technology, a researcher can choose any media which is suitable enough to record the classroom interaction. The emphasis of choosing audio-recordings is only to catch what the conversation is happening during the classroom interaction. The main problem associated with audio-recording is the background of 'noise'. It can be overcome by using more sophisticated media, and positioning some recording devices in some places.

[30] Steve Walsh, *Exploring Classroom Discourse: Language in Action* (pdf version) (New York: Routledge, 2011), 67.
[31] Steve Walsh, *Exploring Classroom ... ...*, 68.

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

2) Video-recording

Video-recording gives an additional advantage in which it provides not only audio data but also visual data. In this research, video-recording is chosen since it is more accurate than audio-recording. Moreover, it can be played several times if it is necessary.

3) Observation

Observation is one of techniques which is quite easy to record what is happening in a classroom. A researcher may need a pen or a pencil and a note. However, a researcher as an observer has to have ability to write everything objectively and accurately. The lack of doing obsevation for a researcher is he/she tends to write what they think rather than what it actually happens in a classroom. But this condition may be different if there are two observers. For instance, the observers A and B can discuss and complete their observations each other.

4) Narrative

A narrative approach needs an observer to record classroom observation as a descriptive text. The problem occuring of this technique is a researcher or an observer may not be able to write everything in a classroom quickly and accurately.

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

b. Transcription

When the process of recordings is done, the next step that has to be done by a researcher is transcription. Transcription means a researcher attempts to write the spoken discourse from recording into written text.

6. Discourse in Teaching

Discourse or communication is the part of human-life. Every day people tend to communicate with others including in classrooms. Discourse happened in classrooms or known as classrooms discourse is the key of teaching. Teaching is nothing without creating interactions between a teacher and students. Moreover, classroom discourse is the place where foreign language teachers can give the language input for students. In classrooms teachers tend to dominate the classroom interaction even though the learning process is designed as student-centered. Furthermore, teaching and learning process really depends on teachers. Therefore, understanding of classroom discourse and teacher talk is very crucial, since a teacher is the key in teaching. Walsh states that language teachers can improve teachers' professional practice by developing a closer understanding of classroom discourse and by focusing on the complex relationship between language, interaction, and learning.[32] Thus, the relationship between language, interaction, and learning is complex. By using language, teachers can succeed

[32] Steve Walsh, *Exploring Classroom Discourse: Language in Action* (pdf version) (New York: Routledge, 2011), 1.

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

to build interaction with their students. Then from the language and interaction, students learn something from teachers. The language, interaction, and learning are interchangeable.

B. Review of Previous Study

The researcher reads two previous thesis from Indonesian researchers who focus on the topic of discourse in particular classroom discourse. The first thesis is done by Ellisy Aisyah from University of Pendidikan Indonesia in 2011. The title is "Teacher's Strategy in Expanding Classroom Discourse in an English a Foreign Language Classroom". This study aims to discover a teacher's strategies in expanding classroom discourse. The objective is to investigate the types of teacher's strategies, the linguistic features, and the application of the principles of the expanded discourse in the classroom. It is clear that Aisyah reveals what strategies used by a teacher in extending classroom discourse.

The similarity Aisyah's research with this research is the object of the research. The difference is that Aisyah does not focus on the teacher's language and how it works in classroom. She just analyzes the teacher's strategies. However, this research deals with the student teacher's utterances or teacher talk especially the functions of language.

Then, Nur Jannah does the research about classroom discourse with the title "An Analysis of Classroom Discourse in Speaking Class of English

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

Department Students of University of Muhammadiyah Gresik". She writes about the structures of classroom discourse through student-student interaction.

There are two differences between Jannah's and this research. They are the topic and the object. She analyzes the structures of classroom discourse or organization of linguistic units which comprise acts, moves, exchanges, transaction, and lesson. Besides, she uses student-student interaction as the object of her research. In the other hand, the topic of this research is the functions of language in student teacher's utterances or teacher talk. Therefore, the researcher analyzes only on the teacher's utterances in communication.

The researcher finds two journals that discuss about classroom interaction between a teacher and students. First, a journal is presented by Biook Behnam and Yassamin Pouriran in 2009 from Islamic Azad University and Tabriz Branch Iran. The title is "Classroom Discourse: Analyzing Teacher/Learner Interactions in Iranian EFL Task-Based Classrooms". The writers attempt to reveal the types of questioning behavior and their interactive effects in EFL classes. The participants are in intermediate level. They record using video and audio-recorder, and also observe using non-participant observation.

Second, a journal is from a dissertation which has a title "A Discourse Analysis of Teacher-Student Classroom Interactions". It is written by Michael Andrew Shepherd from University of Southern California in 2010. Andrew does the researcher to find the role of classroom discourse in balancing teacher control over lesson content and student participation. Teacher-student classroom

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

interactions are observed using video-recorder. The finding of the result shows that teachers choose students who bid by raising their hands. Since the interaction is more likely student-initiated participation, teachers avoid choosing students who speak out of topic discussions. But, the teachers question students (who violate classroom rules) for clarification and ask them to correct perceived mistakes.

The similarity of these two journals with this research is the place of study that is in the classroom. However, the difference between the two journals above with this research is the theory. Those two journals discuss the kinds of classroom interaction between the teacher and students. But, this researcher deals with the language used by teachers.

On the other hand, there are some journals which are talking about teacher talk. First, a journal is written by Ma Xiao-yan in 2006 entitled "Teacher Talk and EFL in University Classrooms". The researcher is from Chongqing Normal University and Yangtse Normal University China. This journal discusses about how teacher talk (TT) affects foreign language learning (English classes) from a different perspective which is comparing to students' preferences towards the ideal teacher with the real TT.

Second, a journal comes from Ming Chuan University which has a title "Teacher Talk of Native and Non-Native English Teachers in EFL Classrooms". It is written by Hsin-Yin Lin in 2005. This journal is to examine the differences of teacher talk from native English teachers and non-native English teachers in

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

university classrooms. Besides, it is to analyze the linguistic proficiency factors that influence their talk.

Third, a journal is presented by Liu Yanfen and Zhao Yuqin entitled "A Study of Teacher Talk in Interactions in English Classes". It is from Harbin Institute of Technology in 2010. This journal is to investigate ways of teacher talk preferred by teachers and students. The writers use the structures of classroom discourse (IRF exchange structure) presented by Mehan, Sinclair, and Brazil. In addition, the writers analyze teacher-student interaction in the classrooms.

Fourth, it is a thesis entitled "The Effects of Teacher Talk on L2 Learners' Comprehension". It is written by Jenia Petkova Ivanova from University of Utah in 2011. This journal is to study about how teacher talk effects second language learner comprehension. It shows that teacher talk phonetic/phonological modifications impact to nonnative students. The patterns of result depend on many factors such level of learner proficiency, talker, and sentential context.

Fifth, a journal entitles "How well does teacher talk support incidental vocabulary acquisition?" It is written by Marlise Horst from Concordia University in Montreal Canada which is published in April 2010. This journal is to analyze that the method, communicative language teaching, can support second language students in acquiring words. The participants in Horst's research are from many different cultural backgrounds. The result reveals that teacher talk

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

applied in that method is inefficient to support learners acquiring the words. The main factor causing the problem is that the words used by the teacher are likely unfamiliar to learners.

Sixth, a journal which is from a dissertation entitles "The Effects of Teacher Talk on Students' Oral Productions" from Marta Santiago in 2010. This journal discusses about how teacher talk impacts students to speak. Since teachers usually use teacher talk to ask questions in a classroom, the writer investigates how the questions can encourage students to speak. The finding from this dissertation is the types of questions which influence teacher-student interaction.

Last, it is a journal entitled "Teacher Talk, Pedagogical Talk, and Classroom Activities: Another look". It is written by Rita Silver and Galyna Kogut in 2009. This journal is about how teacher talk works with activities that the teachers use during the lesson in Singapore English language classrooms at primary level.

Seven journals above discussed about teacher talk. The first similarity of those journals with this research is the broad topic of research, teacher talk. In this research, the researcher analyzes the teacher's utterances. The second similarity is the type of discourse analysis which focuses on spoken discourse. The difference between this research and the seven journals above is the theory used to analyze the teacher talk. The researcher does not take the theories which is used in all of the journals above, for instance the theories from many scholars

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

such Sinclair, Coulthard, Brazil, Mehan, Emanuelsson, Sahlstrom, and many others. On the other hand, the researcher takes the theory from linguistics discipline to discourse analysis where it is rarely used by other researches. The analysis of teacher talk is examined using Halliday's theory about the functions of language. Moreover, many researchers do not take this theory as basis because they tend to use the theory from discourse or classroom discourse as presented by Sinclair, Coulthard, Brazil, and Mehan. Hence, the researcher only focuses on analyzing the teacher talk from Halliday's theory.

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id