

STUDENTS' PERSPECTIVES IN THE CLASSROOM DISCOURSE ANALYSIS (CRITICIZING LECTURE'S POLITENESS IN TEACHING ACTIVITIES)

Kokok Dj Purwanto¹, Wawan Gunawan², Syihabuddin³

¹Department Of English Education, Universitas Indraprasta PGRI

^{2,3}School Of Postgraduates Studies, Linguistics S3, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia

¹kokokdjokopurwanto1386@gmail.com, ²wagoen@upi.edu, ³syihabuddin@upi.edu

Abstrak

Wacana seringkali dipahami sebagai konstituen terbesar dan terlengkap dari struktur bahasa, oleh karenanya secara struktural maknanya, wacana merupakan bagian dari rangkaian komponen bahasa. Wacana didefinisikan dan ditilik dari berbagai sudut pandang yang berbeda, mulai dari yang berorientasi sangat kebahasaan hingga politis. Perspektif ini sudah dianalisa fungsinya sebagai ekspresi ideologi, kekuasaan, dominasi, ketidaksetaraan, dan praanggapan (Van Dijk, 1998). Dalam Ilmu Bahasa, wacana juga telah dipandang dari beragam perspektif mengacu kepada jenis fungsi sosial bahasa yang lainnya seperti wacana berita koran, wacana iklan, wacana kelas, serta wacana konsultasi kesehatan (Fairclough, 1992:3). Penelitian ini terfokus pada tindak kesopanan dosen, tindak tutur, dan kerjasama dosen dengan mahasiswa di dalam kelas. Tujuan penelitian adalah untuk mengetahui seberapa sering dosen menggunakan ujaran positive maupun negative dalam proses perkuliahan. Hal ini akan memunculkan pertanyaan-pertanyaan tentang penelitian serta cara bagaimana dominasi kekuasaan melalui praktik diskursif terlihat serta pelaksanaannya di dalam kelas dan aktifitas perkuliahan. Data diambil dari sesi kelas Y6H semester 6 Universitas Indraprasta. Data sample diambil dari satu kelas yang sama dengan jumlah mahasiswa tiga puluh lima dan sepuluh dosen yang diambil secara random. Metode dalam penelitian ini adalah deskripsi kualitatif berdasarkan transkripsi model Sinclair dan Coulthard (1975), tindak tuturan J.L Austin, Roger Searle, dan pragmatik George Yule. Semua data dalam bentuk deskripsi yang merepresentasikan aktifitas belajar mengajar (perkuliahan-red) pada analisis kritis wacana kelas.

Kata Kunci: Wacana, Perspektif; Kesopanan; Tuturan; Analisis Wacana Kelas.

Abstract

Discourse is frequently understood as the largest and most complete unit of language structure, structurally, it means that discourse is part of a series of language components. It is defined and viewed from many different perspectives, ranging from a very linguistic-oriented to a political-one. This perspective discourse has been analyzed for its role in expressing ideologies, power, dominance, inequality, and bias (Van Dijk, 1998). In Linguistics, discourse has also been viewed from different perspectives, referring to other types of languages used in various sorts of social situation such as newspaper discourse, advertising discourse, classroom discourse, and the discourse of medical consultation (Fairclough, 1992:3). This study focuses on lecturer's politeness, speech acts and cooperative principles in the classroom. It will also bring to a broad band of disciplined questioning of the ways in which power works through the discursive practices and performances in schooling and lecturing. And the aims of this research is to find out how most lectures using positive or negative utterances in teaching students in the classroom interaction. The research method applied in this study is a descriptive qualitative approach based on the

transcription among models of classroom discourse- the Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) model, performative utterances from J.L Austin, Roger Searle, and pragmatics from George Yule was selected as a sign post of this classroom on discourse analysis. All the data were analyzed in the form of a description. The data taken from class Y6H 6th semester randomly from the students' perspectives on lectures at Universitas Indraprasta PGRI. The sample data taken from a single class with thirty-five (35) college students and ten (10) lecturers randomly. As the result of this study, observing classes, finding out some information from students, then applying the use of interaction- scheme undoubtedly results in a much better understanding of classroom aims and events, particularly in terms of lecturer talking and behaving to the students and classroom activities.

Keywords: Discourse; Students' Perspectives; Critical Classroom Discourse Analysis.



Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)

INTRODUCTION

Classroom Discourse is a discourse related to the talk, between teachers or lecturers and students. The nature of discourse as stated by Fairclough (1992:3) and many other discourse theorists is not easy to define because it has been viewed from many different conflicting and overlapping perspectives, ranging from a very linguistic-oriented to socio-political one. Thus, some tools of study are needed to figure out what kind of classroom discourse conducted by lecturers in the teaching –learning process (Lecturing-red). For that reason, why Classroom Discourse has become a central study in the main target of the learning process. Its perspectives can be focused on discussing, negotiating, and meaning through spoken interaction in the classroom- lecturing discourse between lecturers and students as learning agents.

The previous studies, taken from International Journal of Advanced Research and Publications ISSN: 2456-9992 Volume 5 Issue 3 March 2022 'Classroom Discourse Analysis' by Mitiku Teshome Abeti, PhD Candidate at Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia, his analysis shows that teacher was dominating the class, and students were not fully participating in the classroom. The class was teacher dominated, there was no room for the students to begin or initiate the conversation or a chance to respond teacher's talk. Another previous study taken from Journal of Art, Humanity and Social Study 'Analysis of Speech Acts Used By EFL Teachers In Class Interaction: A Case Study at High School Bosowa Makassar' by Asmaul Husna, Asfah Rahman and Amirullah Abduh Universitas Negeri Makassar. The results of their research revealed (1) there were five types of speech acts, specifically for illocutionary acts that were used by the English teachers in classroom interaction namely assertive, directive, commissive, expressive and declarative apparently had particular functions. The most frequently used illocutionary assertive was 41% while the least frequently used illocutionary was commissive, about 4%. (2) the thirty-one student's students from grade two in this research provided positive responses towards the teachers' speech acts in the classroom interaction.

Ever since then, discourse can be developed along with the emergence of various studies that link language to the social dimensions of society, including the variations in language used in society, including classroom discourse or individuals' interaction between lecturers and students in the classroom. A language may be used for innumerable

purposes and all known languages are capable of serving at least three functions; to pass on information, to glean information and to issue commands.

Defining discourse and classroom discourse will help us to understand each nature of them in applying for the functions. Understanding discourse in language studies cannot be separated from the study of discourse about social problems. If we assume that the language used by a society reflects the social dynamics of that society, then discourse becomes part of the dynamics or represents the presence of that society as well. Therefore, language in this context becomes an instrument for creating discourse that develops in society. Discourse develops along with the emergence of various studies that link language to the social dimensions of society, including the variations in language used in society. This development emerged in the 1970s (Van Dijk, 1983:1, Heracleous, 2006: 1). Thus, then the experts carried out various pragmatic studies of language in various contexts, so that various scientific disciplines were born according to the respective intersections.

Discourse develops along with the emergence of various studies that link language to the social dimensions of society, including the variations in language used in society. The awareness of the importance of discourse in the world of language education has existed for approximately 30 years, but only recently has discourse analysis entered the mainstream in language education in schools and universities in Europe and America (Stern, 1992: 18). The shift in the language teaching paradigm towards language teaching that prepares students to have competencies in order to participate in modern society, this is what Stern (1992:15) calls the literacy approach. The literacy approach is the basis for discourse learning in schools, considering that texts are the foundation for the growth of literacy.

In the context of discourse analysis, specifically discourse in structural understanding, it is divided into spoken and written discourse. In oral discourse, the theory of speech acts, conversation and non- verbals is presented, while in written discourse the theory of cohesion, coherence and text structure is presented. As we know that teaching is the main task of an educator (a teacher, a lecturer, an instructor and so on). Creative Educators will always create ideas in designing new learning systems which enable students to achieve their goals. They use a classroom as a means to study and explore themselves get knowledge and become better persons in the real life. By applying kind of methods and learning models in the classroom, a teacher hopes that he will be able to explore materials maximally to his students, and vice versa for the students. Therefore, Classroom Discourse Analysis is an interdisciplinary method in the study of discourse that is used to examine language as a social practice such as description, narration, exposition, and argumentation.

Schiffrin in her approach to discourse (1994) discusses and compares some of the different approach to linguistic analysis of discourse ie speech acts theory, interactional sociolinguistics, and ethnography of communication, pragmatics, conversation analysis, and variation analysis. In the early writing, in fact the writer would like to spot on the utterances of the lecturer to find out politeness in the classroom discourse, however it had already been represented by other discourse theorists. In this case, the research study will remain focusing on the lecture activities, how the lecturer delivers his subject course and how he behaves and speaks in the classroom discourse.

Oral discourse analysis in structural understanding can be applied by using speech acts theory, conversation, cooperative principles and politeness. The theories are often used in analysing dialogue- discourse, oral discourse in pragmatic science. In this regard,

discourse analysis can use this theory because the language data is the same namely spoken language or dialogue discourse. Discourse analysis emphasises how the form of speech and meaning are formed, so that communication can run well, whereas pragmatics emphasises more on the function of language in achieving successful communication.

Unequal power relationship between teachers and students in the classroom does not mean ignoring politeness or etiquettes between them in classroom interaction. Compared from the previous studies, the research gap shows slightly differences in the subjects of the research within teachers and lectures, students and college students in communication, talks without considering how languages delivered to other especially what kinds of languages convey to other in activity atmosphere, interaction and learning experiences that the students achieve in the lecturing class. That is becoming the writer's scope of the research for the present time of study.

RESEARCH METHOD

The ranges among discourse, language in use and communication in the classroom atmosphere have become the concern of this research to find out the relation between discourse and politeness, politeness and speech acts also teachers- lecturers and students. The research method applied in this study is a descriptive qualitative approach related to the transcription among models of classroom discourse- the Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) model, Austin (Cunning, 2002: 16; Brown and Yule, 1996: 231; Anshori, 2017: 48). Speech acts are divided into locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary, etc. This model was developed to describe lecturers and students' talking in such based-on hierarchy of an oral discourse unit. It assumes that the classroom/ lecture- discourse 'follows a fairly typical and predictable structure, comprising three parts: a teacher- lecturer Initiation, a student Response, and a lecture Feedback, commonly known as IRF, IRE: Initiation, Response, and Evaluation. IRE is preferred by some writers and practitioners to reflect the fact that, most of the time; lecturers feedback is an evaluation of a student's contribution. The sample datas were taken from class Y6H, sixth (6) semester, lecturers with thirty-five students in the classroom. Lecturers are constantly assessing the correctness of an utterance and giving feedback to learners. Another theory of this research study is Politeness as a fundamental thing for the humans in establishing good relationship (Malekian, 2016). The research used the theory in order to know how teacher-lecture played his role in using languages in classroom discourse, to find out the students' responses and their positive- negative feedback in the classroom interaction.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

To obtain good results in analysing dialogue discourse, it was necessary to study and understand theories related to spoken discourse, especially speech theory, speech acts, conversational theory, cooperative principles and politeness. And this below is about Semantic- Pragmatic Orientation of Speech Theories:

Table 1.1: Speech Theories Orientation

Semantic- Pragmatic- Orientation				
Speech Theory	Speech Acts	Conversation	Cooperative	Politeness
1. Assalamualaikum.. Good Evening All...		✓		✓
2. Today is Friday 3 May, 2024...	✓			
3. And we'll be conducting online lectures ... today from 18.30-20.00		✓	✓	
4. It's nice to see you all...	✓			✓
5. We'll do this learning- All together...	✓		✓	
6. And you can do the rest by yourselves at home!	✓	✓	✓	
7. You must complete this by Tuesday...	✓			

Of the ten lecturers, only two lecturers were more sensitive to politeness. As viewed some texts of dialogues below:

Lecture: Selamat Malam semua!

Good Evening class!

Students: Selamat Malam pak!

Good Evening sir!

Lecture: Kita lanjutkan materi bahasan malam ini..

Let's continue our discussion material for this evening about...

From the discourse texts above, shown that a lecture prefers expressing speech acts, conversation, and doing cooperative principles to showing politeness.

The theory of speech acts, conversation, the principle of cooperation and the theory of politeness are often used in analysing dialogue discourse or oral discourse in the realm of pragmatic science. In this regard, discourse analysis can use these theories because the language data used is the same, spoken language or dialogue discourse. As shown at table 1.1 taken from samples of lecturers at Indraprasta University PGRI session class Y6H semester 6 majoring English Education Study Programme with thirty-five (35) college students and ten (10) lecturers randomly. Most of the lecturers preferred applying speeches, dialogues and cooperative principles to applying politeness.

The depth of analysis was determined by the desired analytical achievement. If the analytical achievement was only showing structures, grammatical contents (linguistics) then the device only included the elements that form the texts. As mentioning earlier, the study of speech acts is actually the main study of pragmatics. The study of speech acts can be seen from its type, the relationship that is built and the level of politeness. Speech acts are divided into locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary. Look at the tabel 1.2 below, analysis of types of speech acts where language data and resources will be shown as an explanation of performative utterances by J.L Austin:

Table 1.2: Types Of Speech Acts

Language Data and Sources			
Utterances	Locutionary	Illocutionary	Perlocutionary
1. Today we'll make a presentation...	-	✓	✓
2. Classes start as scheduled...	✓	-	-
3. We'll study online via zoom...	-	✓	✓
4. Before lectures start, I'll take – attendance first...	-	✓	✓
5. If I'm on camp, you have also to be oncamp...	-	✓	✓

Explanation:

- ✓ Showing the sign of performative action
- Showing non- performative action

Speech and dialogue discourse can be classified into the three types of speech above. This analysis is useful for determining which utterances are frequently used by a lecturers. Discourse analysis places more emphasis on how speech forms and meanings are formed, so that communication can take place well. As we see at table 1.2 about speech acts analysis, showing that most of the lecturers express more illocutionary and perlocutionary acts than locutionary acts. Of the ten lecturers, only one lecturer was eager to express locutionary acts. It's a good sign for representing other lecturers at the same study programme. The following dialogues are making us clear to define which performative utterances frequently come up:

Lecture: Baiklah, sebelum perkuliahan dimulai, saya akan mengabsen kehadiran..

Alright, before starting lectures, I'll take your attendance list first...

Students: Siap, saya hadir pak!

Ok I'm here sir!

The lecture said, that was an act performed in saying something, as contrasted with a locutionary act (Austin, 1984). Another real instance of an illocutionary act that affected an action or perlocutionary act as someone says, 'is there any sugar?' at the afternoon tea table, the illocutionary act was a request; please give me some sugar, eventhough the locutionary act (the literal sentence) was to ask a question about the presence of sugar.

Another speech acts in cooperative principles point to cooperation in communication. These were obtained through speakers attempting to be truthful, informative, clear and relevant. In linguistics, the cooperation principles refered to the fact that participants in a conversation cooperate with each other to create successful communication. The cooperative principles was introduced by Paul Grice in 1975 and based on the assumption that participants in a conversation cooperate with each other, in this case a lecturer with students or a student with his colleague students. There are four types of a maxim in cooperative principles that can create effective and cooperative communication. These are the maxims of quantity, quality, relation and manner as follow below.

Table 1.3: Cooperative Principles Analysis

Language and Source Data				
Maxims Of	Quantity	Quality	Relation	Manner
1.Ok, is today's presentation getting ready?	✓			
2.While waiting for the group In charge of the presentation, Please share the PPT...		✓		
3.Tomorrow, we meet face to face...		✓		✓
4.Last semester's grades were quite good...			✓	
5.The dean went with the chancellor to usual place...				

Speech act studies are also conducted by looking at the cooperation principles or relationships that are built between participants in oral communication. According to Grice (Cutting, 2002: 34), this type of speech act can be divided into maxims of quantity, maxims of quality, maxims of relation and maxims of manner. The maxim of quantity is a maxim whose answer does not indicate certainty or truth, the maxim of quality shows an answer that is definite and in accordance with the statement or question, the maxim of relation shows an answer that depends on the speaker's interpretation, while the maxim of manner is an answer that does not directly lead to the statement. Some following dialogues will explain which maxims suit the situation in the classroom:

Lecturer: Saya tidak melihat Isabel malam ini, ada yang tau?

I'm not seeing Isabel; do you know where she is?

Student Y: Saya tidak tau pasti pak, tidak ada pemberitahuan

I'm not sure sir, there's no confirmation from her tonight.

From the above conversation, the maxim quantity does not indicate certainty or truth.

Let's take a look at another maxim:

Lecturer: Kita akan bertemu di lab besok menjelang pukul 10 pagi ya...

We'll meet in the lab tomorrow by 10 am...

Students: Baik pak, di Ranco!

Ok sir, di Ranco!

The maxim of quality showed an answer that was definite and in accordance with the question or statement.

Here's the maxim relation that showed an answer depending on the speaker's interpretation, as the following dialogues:

Lecturer: Di mana Andi tidak kelihatan hari ini? Ada yang tau?

Where is Andi now? Anybody knows?

Students: Biasa pak, membantu ibunya berdagang tiap Sabtu malam.

As usual, he helps his mother every Saturday night sir.

The last type of maxim is manner. The answering did not directly lead to the statement or texts.

Lecturer: Setelah saya koreksi hasil ujiannya, nilai rata-ratanya cukup bagus...

The average scored results of this class are excellent.

Students: Yang paling tinggi berapa pak?!

Who is getting the highest score?!

Lecture: Yang penting tidak mengecewakan.

The important thing is not to disappoint.

In this last section, Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) provided useful basis for discourse analysis after they had exemplified, they cited an example drawn from the Sinclair's model as shown below:

Lecture: Does anyone know about this theory of performative utterances?

Students: Do you mean the theory of J.L Austin or Roger Searle, sir?

Lecturer: Both of them

Using the criteria of predicting /predicted nature for contribution, they argued that the students' (S) contribution in the example is to be included to the fourth element of exchange structure (?) as shown in the following matrix:

	Predicting	Predicted
1. Initiation	Yes	No
2. Response	No	Yes
3. Follow- Up	No	No
4. ?	Yes	Yes

Such kind of contribution was not uncommon in normal discourse. In fact, in Sinclair and Coulthard's texts, they were significant in number. As shown in the chart, Sinclair and Coulthard treated them as replies. Thus, belonged to answering/ response moves in the matrix. When asking some questions, a lecturer had to consider what types of questions should be given to students in order to obtain an explanation, not just by answering yes or no.

CONCLUSION

Commonly, the classroom discourse was enough analyzed based on Sinclair and Coulthard model, however detecting politeness and attitudes that is another thing to conduct this study using other theorists such as J.L Austin, Roger Searle, and pragmatics by George Yule, also William Leech in the purpose of finding out utterances, politeness, cooperative principles in critical classroom discourse analysis (CCDA). Thus, from this discourse analysis, words in utterance- speech acts theory, and Leech's politeness, it can be concluded that such way when lecture talks more, and students wait everything from that lecture could bring an impact both positive and negative results- it depends on the contents of material speeches delivering to the students in the classroom discourse.

There are many ways to analyse dialogue/spoken discourse. In addition to what the author has explained, discourse can also be done using conversational cohesion and coherence. Coherence can be seen from the theme or content of the conversation depicted from one sentence to another, while cohesion elements can be seen from various

grammatical and lexical elements. The rests of the related- interesting theme, hopefully we can discuss them in another article with a better writing style.

REFERENCES

- McCarthy, M. (1991) *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sinclair, J., and Brazil, D. (1982) *Teacher Talk*. Oxford University Press.
- Sinclair, J. & Coulthard, R.M. (1975). *Toward an Analysis of Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1999). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. United Kingdom: Longman.
- Van Dijk, A.T. (1997). *Discourse as Structure and Process of Discourse Studies. A Multidisciplinary Introduction, Volume 1*, SAGE Publication, London.
- Nunan, D. (2003). *Practical English Language Teaching*. New York: McGraw Hill Inc.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principle Of Pragmatic*. London: Longman Group.
- Austin, J.L. (1984). *How To Do Things with Words*. Oxford University Press.
- Brown, G. And Yule, G. (1996). *Analisis Wacana (Terjemahan)* Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Heryanto, A. (1996). *Bahasa dan Kuasa (Latif dan Ibrahim, ed)*. Bandung: Mizan.
- Anshori, D.S. (2017). *Analisis Wacana (Teori, Aplikasi, dan Pembelajaran)*. Bandung: UPI Press.
- Suherdi, D. (2010). *Classroom Discourse Analysis (A Systemiotic Approach)*. Bandung: Celtics Press.
- Heracleous, L. (2006). *Discourse, Interpretation, Organization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yule, G. (2005). *The Study Of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.