

## **CHAPTER II**

### **REVIEW OF RELATED THEORY**

This chapter provides some related theories that need to be reviewed in order to know the related theory.

#### **2.1. Discourse Analysis**

The general discussion of this research is about discourse. Discourse means what people say and write. Specifically to what people say or write for many reason and their particular reason will play a large part in deciding just what sort of saying and writing they choose to study by Antaki (2008:2). Discourse is not only saying or writing in particular reason but also knowledge about the language, then according to Paltridge (2006:2) discourse analysis focuses on the knowledge which is about language of the word, clause, phrase and sentence in order for successful communication. Furthermore, discourse analysis also consider of two ways. First, the use of language presents different views of the world. Second, different understanding. It examines both spoken and written texts. But in this research, it focuses on the spoken discourse, and exactly in the classroom discourse analysis.

It is argued that discourse analysis is the one of study about language. According to Carthy (1991: 5) that discourse analysis is concerned with the study of the relationship between language and the contexts in which it is used. It grew out of work in different disciplines in the 1960s and early 1970s, including linguistics, semiotics, psychology, anthropology and sociology.

The four core features of any discourse analysis which considered by Antaki (2008:5) are these:

1. The talk or text is to be naturally found (in the sense of not invented, as it might be in psycholinguistics, pragmatics or linguistic philosophy; some analysts admit interview data into this natural category, while others do not);
2. The words are to be understood in their co-text at least, and their more distant context if doing so can be defended;
3. The analyst is to be sensitive to the words' non-literal meaning or force;

4. The analyst is to reveal the social actions and consequences achieved by the words' use as enjoyed by those responsible for the words, and suffered by their addressees, or the world at large.

### **2. 1. 1 Context**

Cazden in Walsh (2006:6) stated that some of the features of the classroom context They are: teachers control the topic of discussion; teachers control who may participate and when; students take their cues from teachers; role relationships between teachers and learners are unequal; teachers are responsible for managing the interaction which occurs; teachers talk more. And also (ibid: 16) “Contexts are constructed through the *talk-in-interaction* in relation to specific institutional goals and the unfolding pedagogic goals of a lesson”. Furthermore, Dey (2001: 3) stated that context is about any information that can be used to characterize the situation of an entity. Then, an entity means a person, place, or object that is considered relevant to the interaction between a user and an application, including the user and applications themselves. And (Ibid: 4) stated “A system is context-aware if it uses context to provide relevant information and/or services to the user, where relevancy depends on the user’s task”.

Furthermore, Hymes (2010: 4) said “Speakers of a language in particular communities are able to communicate with each other in a manner which is not only correct but also appropriate to the sociocultural context”.He also offers a theoretical basis for language study that accounts for both linguistic variation from individual to individual and relative linguistic coherence across the social realm, while also offering a methodological heuristic for investigating communication, often represented in terms of the SPEAKING mnemonic. Also (Ibid: 7-8) stated about explanation of SPEAKING as below:

(S) Setting including the time and place, physical aspects of the situation such as arrangement of furniture in the classroom; (P) participant identity including personal characteristics such as age and sex, social status, relationship with each other; (E) ends including the purpose of the event itself as well as the individual goals of the participants; (A) act, sequence or how speech acts are organized within a speech event and what topic/s are addressed; (K) key or the tone and

manner in which something is said or written; (I) instrumentalities or the linguistic code i.e. language, dialect, variety and channel i.e. speech or writing; (N) norm or the standard socio-cultural rules of interaction and interpretation; and (G) genre or type of event such as lecture, poem, letter.

## **2.2 Classroom Discourse**

If specifically to the classroom discourse, then Walsh (2006:7) said “classroom discourse is dominated by question and answer routines, with teachers asking most of the questions as one of the principal ways in which they control the discourse”. And according to Cazden (2001:2) that the study of classroom discourse is kind of linguistics which applied the study of situated language use in one of social setting.

Several features of educational institutions make central communication based on Cazden (2001:2) as bellow:

1. Spoken language is the medium by which much teaching takes place and in which students demonstrate to teachers much of what they have learned.
2. Classroom are among the most crowded of human environments. Few adults spend as many hours per day in such crowded conditions. Then the teacher as one person in the classroom is responsible for controlling all the talk that occurs while class is officially in session controlling not just negatively as a traffic officer does to avoid collisions, but also positively, to enhance the purposes of education.
3. Spoken discourse is an important part of the identities of all the participants. And the schools are the first large institution to which children come from their families and home neighborhoods, and in which they are expected to participate individually and publicly.

### **2.2.1 IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback)**

Hale (2011:38) stated that the description of the IRF (or sometimes the IRE where E stands for *evaluation*). They are teacher's *initiation*, a student's *response*, and the teacher's *feedback*. The teacher prepare to ask questions that he or she already knows the answers to and, as the authority figure, has the power to select themselves (self-select) and select individual students (other-select) during the exchanges. And also IRF is seen largely as a means for teachers to reward students for saying what teachers want to hear, and students come to rely on the third part of the triadic sequence (the *feedback* or *evaluation*) for validation that they have performed as expected.

And according to Walsh (2006:1) said "Language classrooms are language classrooms [original emphasis], and for the teacher to monopolise control of the discourse through, for example, asking only display questions while possibly appropriate to the culture of geography or maths classes, would seem to deny language learners access to what they most need opportunities for real language use. And the underlying structure of second language lesson is represent by sequence of discourse that was IRF as teacher initiation-learner response-evaluation or feedback by the teacher". But, latest version is F as follow up.

The illustration of IRF from Walsh (2006:5) as below:

**(I)** T Two things to establish for the writer at the beginning of the story. One situation. What is the situation at the beginning of the story anybody? What's the situation Douglas? Have you read the story Douglas?

**(R)** S No sir.

**(F)** T Ah that won't help then will it who's read the story what is the situation at the beginning Michael? Is it Michael?

Based on Sinclair and Coulthard model in Cockayne essay (2010:7) framing and focusing moves, which realize boundary exchanges; and opening, answering, and follow-up moves, which realize teaching exchanges. As elements of structure, these are labeled I, R, and F and the S&C model is often referred to having an IRF, three-part structure.

According to Hale (2011:38) that Initiation-response-feedback (IRF) pattern, is kind of the least understood skills a teacher's have, because this skill is

not teachable, and yet, ironically, it is perhaps one of the most important. It seems to have as much or more to do with the personality of a teacher and the ability to form camaraderie with his or her students than it does with the actual ability to teach. The IRF is safe and comforting because, in many ways, it is what is expected in classroom discourse by both teachers and students. Furthermore Cazden (2001:5) stated curriculum standards now place less emphasis on products, fact, or procedures to be learned and correspondingly more emphasis on processes and strategies for learning and doing. So, teachers are being asked to deliberately give up relying so heavily on the traditional three part pattern of classroom lessons Initiation-Response-Evaluation/Feedback (IRE/IRF) that best fits the transmission of facts and routinized procedures.

### **2.3 Turn-taking**

In classroom discourse, turn taking is the important point to be analyzed. Then, according to Renkema (2004: 163) stated “Verbal interaction is realized by turn taking. In conversation, there is no limit to the length of a turn. A turn can vary in length from a single word to a complete story”. The model of turn taking by Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson consists of two components: the turn-construction component and the turn-taking component.

The rules of turn taking (ibid: 173-174):

For any turn, at the initial transition-relevance place of an initial turn-constructional unit:

- a. If the turn-so-far is so constructed as to involve the use of a current speaker select next technique, then the participant thus selected has the right and is obligated to take the next turn to speak; no others have such rights or obligation, a transfer occurs at that place.
- b. If the turn so far is so constructed as not to involve the use of a current speaker select next technique, then self-selection for the next speakership may, but need not, be instituted. The person who first starts at that moment acquires the right to a turn. And transfer occurs at that place.
- c. If, at the initial transition-relevance place of an initial turn-constructional unit, neither 1a nor 1b has operated and following the provision of 1c, the current

speaker has continued, then the rule set (a) to (c) re applies at the next transition-relevance place, and recursively at each ensuing transition relevance place, until transfer is effected.

From some theories of Wienmann (1927:9), we can conclude all by these points:

1. **Interrogative Request:** A question specifically directed to the other member of participant. For the example is “Can you repeat number two”.
2. **Completion:** The completion of declarative “statement” with no attempt being made by the speaker to continue. For the example is “*Haaa*” as shock expression.
3. **Buffers:** Short word or phrases which are “content-free” more or less stereotypical, and which either precede or follow substantive statements (e.g., “but uh,” “you know,” “or something,” “um,” “well,” and “uh-well”). For the example is “You still wrong. You know? “Her uncle, her uncle” if subject.”
4. **Interruption:** The attempt to assume the speaking role before it has been relinquished by the current speaker” Then, Raux (2008:10) stated that another important phenomenon of turn-taking is barge-in or interruption. A barge-or interruption in happens when the user attempts to interrupt a system prompt. System designers typically take one of two approaches to handle barge-in: they either ignore it altogether, in which case the user is forced to listen to every system prompt in its entirety, or they base barge-in detection on the VAD alone, interrupting a system prompt whenever the VAD detects user speech. For the example is “*Ssssstttt!* Who still laugh? Whose paper? Second? Aini, please listen or I will..”
5. **Simultaneous Talking:** Speaking by both interactants at the same time. (This includes simultaneous turns, where both speakers attempt to hold the floor at the same time.) For the example is “We can....” at the same time another said “We can conclude that...”
6. **Shutter Starts:** Short words (including nonfluencies) or phrases repeated with increasing frequency by one interactant while the other interactant holds the speaking role (e.g., “I . . . I . . . I . . . I think we should vote now.”) For the example is “I...I...I would like to present my example sentence”

**7. Reinforces:** Words that provide feedback to the speaker, but do not necessarily attempt to gain the speaking role for the interactant emitting them. Short questions asking for clarification are coded in this category. (Examples include: “Yeah,” “yes,” “um-hm”) For the example is “Yes, you are right”

Let know, Wienmann (1972: 17) stated that turn-taking in conversations not only helps us apportion the floor, but also serves a symbolic function of helping the interactants to define their relationship. The way in which this ritual is managed by one interactant will affect the judgments made about him or her by the other interactant.

#### **2. 4. Topic**

In discourse, there is a topic to deliver our good meaning and the purpose too. So, according to Gundel (1999: 4) that topic is associated with relational givenness-newness in the sense that topic is given in relation to focus and focus represents the new information predicated about the topic. Then, the association here is logically independent of referential givenness/newness, which is not necessarily connected to topic or focus at all. So, Krifka (2001: 1) stated “Perhaps as important as the notion of focus and the two notions have sometimes be treated as contraries to each other.” Also (Ibid) stated that if discourse topic is about what a part of a discourse is about.

#### **2.5 Power**

If two or more people in conversation, they have the relationship of each other, specifically in power. They have different behavior area of power. In classroom, teacher is controlling all of things that happens. It means that teacher knows and control student’s linguistic behavior. In the classroom teacher has power as responsible and teacher’s role to control students while learning process. According to Brown and Gilman (1960:187) stated that power is a relationship between two persons or more and nonreciprocal in the sense that both cannot have power in same area of behavior of conversation. “And also people have to push exchange beyond the level of our view of the social world and seek to understand exchange as the means, however limited, of gaining power over people and control over resources

in the widest sense” by Kement (2005: 78). In the other hand from a CDA perspective, power is a central condition of social life; power is not static but dynamic. Power is generated as a natural effect of human beings’ interactions and it circulates among participants (Fairclough, 2003; Foucault, as cited in Gordon, 1980; Orellana, 1996; Ramos, 2004; Wodak& Meyer, 2001 in Mendes’s article 2012: 175)And also stated “power is not something alien to a specific group of people, but a trait that is exerted by the members of a community” by Hitchman, 2000, as cited in Ramos 2004 (ibid)

From some theories, we can conclude about power and solidarity in some points. They are:

- 1. Control:** Teacher has power of controlling students which according to Fairclough (1989:43) said “power in discourse is to do with powerful participants controlling and constraining the contributions of non-powerful participants”. And also according to Tannen (1993: 169) stated that everyone has different degree of power to control the behavior of others. Attention, however extents about the solidarity which can be a form of control. So, Cazden (2001: 82) said “the most important asymmetry in the rights and obligations of teachers and students is over control of the right to speak”.
- 2. Struggle:** It also taken from Fairclough (1989:43). He claim that power is a kind of commodity which can be won and exercised only in social struggles in which it may also be lost. Accordingly Foucault in journal that power not as something that dominant members but in terms of the relationship between power and resistance. And (ibid:55) also stated that the idea of 'power behind discourse' is that the whole social order of discourse is put together and held together as a hidden effect of power. Furthermore, Berry 2002; Rathbun 2008, 690-1 in Boucher (2013:2) stated that unequal power relationships do impact upon the extent to which answers are given to questions of teacher. So, according to Orellana 1996 in Mendez and Garcia (2012:176) stated “Power relations are always relations of struggle, though those struggles may take different forms and assume varying degrees of intensity”
- 3. Judgment:** Power is also associated with being judgmental. High-power individuals are more likely to express their opinions (Anderson & Berdahl,

2002; Berdahl & Martorana, 2006; Galinsky, Magee, Gruenfeld, Whitson, & Liljenquist, 2008) and feel more entitled to judge others (Goodwin, Gubin, Fiske, & Yzerbyt, 2000) than low-power individuals by Wakslak (2014:6)

4. **Silence (lack of power):** Tannen (1993: 178) “The shorter parsers ended up doing most of the talking, another sign interpreted by their interlocutors as dominating the conversation. But their intentions had been to fill in what to them were potentially uncomfortable silences, that is, to grease the conversational wheels and ensure the success of the conversation. In their view, the taciturn participants were uncooperative, failing to do their part to maintain the conversation”. And also Lozano 2009 in Mendez and Garcia (2012:176) stated teachers usually see silence as a way to indicate lack of understanding; however, silence can also be used to force a member of a group to participate. So, according to Cazden (2001: 82) that beside teacher have the role-given right to speak any time and to any person, teacher can fill any silence or interrupt any speaker.

## 2.6 Solidarity

In other hand, teacher has solidarity to give chance for students which according to According to Brown and Gilman (1960:189) “solidarity is the name we give to the general relationship and solidarity is symmetrical. So it related in the classroom refer to Sequeiros 1997 in (Mendez and Garcia 2012: 176) found that teachers and students consider solidarity as a sporadic, romantic value that entails closeness with others”. In our study, we observed that students expressed solidarity toward the teacher when they asked their partners to pay attention to the teacher’s explanations, even though this demonstration of solidarity was not regularly stated in the classroom.

Furthermore, the concept of solidarity in linguistic illustrated that Deborah Tannen has investigated the way solidarity is expressed through linguistic channels. According to Tannen (1996), solidarity and power have ambiguous relations as both can be generated using the same linguistic means. In that sense, when a person expresses solidarity, elements of power relationships emerge depending on the intention of the speaker and the interpretation of the hearer.

Solidarity is, for instance, a feeling of togetherness and willingness to take the consequences of that, gift giving is often associated with concrete and material objects exchanged on certain occasions between people having a certain type of relationship to each other by Komter (2005:1-2), And the specifically about the social solidarity (ibid: 2)is regarded as the glue that keeps people together, whether by mutually identifying and sharing certain norms and values, or by contributing to some common good, or both.

**1. Closeness:** It emerges in conversational discourse (Tannen 1993: 167), “I note that power and solidarity are in paradoxical relation to each other. That is, although power and solidarity, closeness and distance, seem at first to be opposites, each also entails the other. Any show of solidarity necessarily entails. Power, in that the requirement of similarity and closeness limits freedom and independence. At the same time, any show of power entails solidarity by involving participants in relation to each other. This creates a closeness that can be contrasted with the distance of individuals who have no relation to each other at all”. So, Sequeiros 1997 in (Mendez and Garcia 2012: 176) found that teachers and students consider solidarity as a sporadic, romantic value that entails closeness with others. Also Yule (1983:3) stated “In sociological and anthropological literature the phatic use of language has been frequently commented on particularly the conventional use of language go open talk-ex: changes and to close them”.

**2. Paying attention:** Sequeiros 1997 in (Mendez and Garcia 2012: 176) observed in his study that students expressed solidarity toward the teacher when they asked their partners to pay attention to the teacher’s explanations, even though this demonstration of solidarity was not regularly stated in the classroom. Furthermore, the concept of solidarity in linguistic illustrated that Deborah Tannen has investigated the way solidarity is expressed through linguistic channels.

## 2.7 Previews Studies

The first previews study was from Yulianto who finished his study of English Department in Muhammadiyah University of Surabaya through his

final project titled “The Use of Power and Solidarity in Classroom Discourse in Speaking Class at SMK Negeri 1 Surabaya” published in 2015. He analyzed power and solidarity that used by teacher and students in classroom discourse. Firstly, he divided the categories of power and solidarity that used in speaking class, the effect of employing the power and solidarity, and the reason of implementation in speaking class. He used theory classroom discourse from Rymes 2009 so specific to IRF from Sinclair and Coulthard 1975. The second by using Speech Act theory from Searle 1999, next was classification of power and solidarity. And the last he used Turn Taking theory from Sack, Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson 1974. And from his research found utterances that contains of power and solidarity with categorizing and the reason for implementing. This research almost same with the research that created by the writer about power and solidarity in speaking class. And also using same theories. But it was different with the preview study in some reasons. First, he used speech act theory. Second, the source of the data was taken only from one class of school. Third, the research found about reason for implementing power and solidarity in classroom.

And the second of previews study was from A. Dzo’ul Milal, whom finished his study of English Department in IAIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya through his final project titled “Indicators of The Practice of Power in Language Classroom”. He analyzed some strategies performed teacher that indicate power in managing and conducting language teaching and learning process. The theories that he used were context by Drew and Sorjonen 1989, speech act by Wunderlinch 1980, power by Brown 1987 and Ellis 1986, and classroom discourse by Ramirez 1988. The data were audio-visual recording and observation. The result of its recording were transcribed and the observation was done by taking field notes. He analyzed using the techniques of qualitative data analysis. The research found the indicators of teacher’s wield of power over the learners during classroom interaction were the amount of speech, frequency of directive acts, initiative of interaction, control of topic, teacher being questioner, use of closed questions, teacher’s use of modelled extraction, and teacher’s answering own questions. This research

was similar with the research that the writer created. But it was different in some points. First, he only analyzed of power. Second, the analysis was found the indicators of teacher's wield of power over the learners during classroom interaction.

Based on both of the previews studies, it can be concluded that the content of the study is similar to the research that created by the writer. For example was about the way for taking data by using audio-visual recording and observed some phenomena by field notes. But it was different in the result and some theories that relation with classroom discourse. However, the research that created by the writer focuses on power and solidarity in speaking class from two Muhammadiyah high schools.