



AL-MUDARRIS : journal of education, Vol. 4, No. 2 Oktober 2021
Homepag : <http://e-journal.staima-alhikam.ac.id/index.php/al-mudarris>
ISSN : 2620-5831 (print), ISSN: 2620-4355(online)
DOI : 10.32478/al-mudarris.v%vi%i.847
Article type : Original Research Article

A Conversational Analysis of a Lesson in the School

Suha Idress Mohammed

Nineveh Directorate of Education, Ministry of Education, Iraq
suhaninawa@gmail.com

Abstract

The interaction between the teachers and the students determines the success of the teaching learning process. Teaching dose not only involve the transmission or reception of information as well as it is a chance for conversation and discussion. The aim of this study is that to analyze how teacher-student interaction is expressed conversationally, i.e., how it is started and closed. It is also intended to describe the discorsal structure of verbal interaction as reflected in the classroom. The study hypothesises that the teacher- student discourse structure is complex, and the main speaker is the teacher. As well as the students are not passive listeners. Finally , the study has come up with that the teacher and the student have an effective role in the classroom.

Keywords: Conversation Analysis, Discourse Analysis, Students, classroom, listening.

Abstrak

Interaksi antara guru dan siswa menentukan keberhasilan proses belajar mengajar. Dosis pengajaran tidak hanya melibatkan transmisi atau penerimaan informasi serta merupakan kesempatan untuk percakapan dan diskusi. Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk menganalisis bagaimana interaksi guru-siswa diekspresikan dalam percakapan, yaitu bagaimana itu dimulai dan ditutup. Hal ini juga dimaksudkan untuk menggambarkan struktur wacana interaksi verbal yang tercermin di dalam kelas. Hipotesis penelitian ini adalah bahwa struktur wacana guru-siswa itu kompleks, dan pembicara utamanya adalah guru. Serta siswa bukan pendengar yang pasif. Akhirnya, penelitian ini menemukan bahwa guru dan siswa memiliki peran yang efektif di dalam kelas.

Kata kunci: Analisis Percakapan, Analisis Wacana, Siswa, Kelas, Mendengarkan.

INTRODUCTION

The interaction between the teaching learning process. It is believed, Abdesslem (1993: 222 cited in Al- Sa'ati, 2004: 1) point out that formal settings (classroom) hinder normal linguistic development and contributes to learner's

communicative competence. He adds that teachers have become convinced of the need to make the classroom as normal as possible.

Teaching does not only involve the transmission or reception of information. The teacher also has to simulate desire within students for learning, to stimulate their interests guide them towards all types of knowledge and train them to be intimate and cooperative with each other (Al-Sa'ati, 2001: 1).

Teaching is an interactive process. It involves classroom turn-taking place between the teacher and student during activities such as, informing, leading, discussion motivating and evaluating. It is a matter of procedures which the teacher and his/her students use to show their understanding of talk. The interaction of the classrooms are different from many other contexts of talk in that the teacher has a formal status that gives him/her greater right to speak than other speakers (Al-Sa'ati, 2004:89).

Aims of the Study

The aim of this study is that to explain how teacher- student interaction is expressed conversationally, i.e. how it is initiated maintained and closed. In addition, this study intended to investigate and describe the discursive structure of the verbal interaction as reflected in the classroom, what type of utterance can appropriately follow what or how turns are distributed, i.e. how the turn talking system is manipulated.

Hypotheses

The study hypothesizes that:

1. Teacher- student discourse is a complex of interactional units that are interrelated and organized. These units are shared and manipulated by both the teacher and the student during their interaction with one another.
2. The actual role of the teacher, who is usually regarded as the main speaker, is to support and encourage students to participate and initiate speaking turns rather than merely answering questions.
3. Students are not passive listeners.

Procedures and Data Collection

The data to be analyzed in this study are recorded lessons collected inside the classroom. The teacher gives this lesson as homework. It is new, it has not been presented before, and has been recorded during the teacher and student discussing it. The analytical procedure in this study as follows:

1. Collecting instances involving teacher- student discourse.
2. Breaking this discourse into standard sequences.
3. Analyzing them showing their units and structure.

The model

The model upon which the analysis is based is that of Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) with some modifications. When the teacher says to the student "read" or "say", Sinclair and Coulthard relate these to the 'elicitation' act, but we believe it is related to 'directive' act. Sinclair and Coulthard's system developed to deal with

structure of classroom discourse proposes that lessons be able to be analyzed as come up with five categories: they are “lesson, transaction, exchange, move and act”.

Conversation Analysis and Discourse Analysis

Conversation Analysis

A Conversation Analysis is used in linguistics to refer to a technique in the sense of everyday, normally retaining the skills of ‘ethnomethodology’. This method deals with real conversations to form what chattels are used in a systematic way (Crystal, 2003: 108). According to Mey (1993: 215) conversation analysis originates from the initial work of a group of ethno methodologists namely, sacks and schegloff who began, in the 1960's examining what happens in real, actual talk and looking at conversation as adiscourse and not as text. (*cf.* Hazem and Kanaan,2020; Khuder et al., 2021).

They discovered that, contrary to precious claims conversation is rule governed. The rules are abit different from phonological or syntactic once in that there is no formal set of rules that can generate all and only conversational structures This doesn't mean however, that conversation is unstructured but the structure is of a different nature from that of a clause or sentence because conversation involves, not a single speaker, but another speakers. Thus, conversation analysis shows that verbal interactions are both structurally organized and contextually oriented and abasic goal of the analysis is illustrating these structures and determining how they are interrelated. On his part, Yule (1996:143) claims that the conversation in English can be expressed as “an action where, for the most part, two or more people turns-talking at speech. Naturally, only one individual speaks at a time and there tend to be a prevention of quiet between speaking turns”.

Conversational analysis, the most noticeable and prominent from of ethnomethodological research, is involved with illustrating the approaches in that the numbers of a culture involve in social communication. “A key goal of conversational analysis (CA) is to examine social interaction to reveal organized practices or patterns of actions” ([www.2006:1](#)). CA studies of interaction containing code- switching(ibid).

Discourse Analysis (DA)

DA is characterized as the language in use and DA is affected with the investigation and analysis of language in use. The most important point is that linguistic elements (language) can not be realized without reference to the situation of construction, linguistic and extra-linguistic wherein they are used. DA provides investigation both form of the language and the function of a language (Al- Sa'ati, 2004: 46).

The question to be asked about any particular linguistic item is not only about its form, but about its uses: what the speaker (or written) hopes to reach, and what he in fact reaches with this specific linguistic item. Grenoble (cited in Al- Sa'ati, 2004: 46) points out that discourse analysis is a branch of linguistic that requires full knowledge of understanding she adds that discourse analysis is active and

dynamic and goals at analysis the total picture of natural communication, examining how the whole of language comes together in its linguistic and extra linguistic contexts.

In discourse analysis, the specialist might want to get in to account phonetics syntax, semantics, pragmatics and paralinguistic features in addition to real world knowledge (Grenoble, 2000: 2 cited in Al- Sa'ati, 2004: 47). (*cf.* Hazem and Mohammed, 2021).

The data are rarely in the form of a sentence but in the form of larger texts beyond the sentence. The discourse analyst works with features include, for example, hesitations, repetitions incomplete clauses, words, ect...

Essentially, a language is a method of acting and letting others do the same and therefore, a speaker or the one who is given a turn to speak should be aware of what he/she is uttering during the speech specially according to the place and time of uttering the speech (context) (Coulthard, 1985: 1) In the same line, Levinson (1983:295- 296) discourse analysis (DA) is the kind of conversation analysis that comes closest to the classical model of grammar as traditionally oriented towards syntax, with a little admixture of semantics. For many linguistics. DA obviously implies "Old- fashioned", grammar and speech act- adapted assessment of a spoken language.

One might give away that DA is however another, simple enlargement of the grammar, for specific linguistic, the appropriate method of doing an extended linguistic analysis, by viewing of well-formed sentences, and the text itself as a well-formed "super- sentence" (May, 1993: 194).

By contrast, the conversation analysis (CA) approach bases itself on the observation, gathering and analysis of large masses of data in particular if authentic parts of language use, and in particular of all sorts of dialogues as they go on in actual life. Thus, CA research has been responsible, among other things, for elaborate methods of transcribing conversation somethings which is not trivial task at all if one wants to get everything down on paper and not just the words, all the words and nothing but the words, DA, like classical transformational grammar in its various avatars, has something to contribute when it comes to understanding human texts in all their aspects, grammatical as well as use oriented (Mey, 1993:195).

Accordingly, discourse analysis is a broad field that consists of different theoretical approaches ranging from functionally-based approaches, including pragmatics, speech act theory, conversation analysis, textual linguistics, the ethnography of speaking, psycholinguistics and variation analysis to every formal theories such as discourse representation theory (Al- Sa'ati, 2004: 59).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

Teaching is an interactive process. It involves classroom turn-taking place between the teacher and students. This interaction is different from many other context of talk in that the teacher has a formal status that give him/ her greater right to speak than other speakers.

This work represent teaching as communicative. It proves teacher student discourse is rule- governed and patterned in terms of transmission and reception of in formation. Such patterning is important in showing how classroom in teraction is expressed conversationally, how it is initiated developed and closed. The emphasis should not only on the content of classroom interaction and the persons involved in the process, but also on the process itself and its formal and functional characteristics.

In this study, the analysis of the data depends on patterns and strategies they are employed by the teacher and the students to from the classroom discorsal structure. It will start from the rank of "act" and proceed up words (act, move, exchange, transaction, and lesson)(Al- Sa'ati, 2004: 90).

Discussion and Analysis the data

1. Acts:

Francis and Hunston (1987: 112) point out that “acts are the elements at the smallest level of the conversation point of language modelling”. Sinclair and Coulthard (1975: 23) state that 'act' corresponds to the grammatical unit 'clause'. Discourse is concerned with the functional properties of on item, i.e what the speaker is using the item for. Our analysis has produced classes of acts that will be presented be presented below with their names and formal realization (Al- Sa'ati, 2004: 91-94).

1. Marker (m): it is understood by a closed-class of item “Well”, “Ok”, “Yes”.

M- T¹/ “Well”, “Ok”.

M- T/ “So”, Well”.

M- T/ “Ok”, ”Ok”.

M- T/ “Ok”, Do you understand me?

M- T/ “Yes”, Who wants to start?

1- Starter (S): it is realized by a statement, question or command. It’s function is to provide information about or direct attention to the initiation.

S- T/ “Last lecture we have studied regular and irregular verbs”.

S- S²/ “I have an example”.

S- T/ “Let me continue”.

S- T/ “Now let’s talk about the differences between present perfect and past”.

S-T/ “Yes, Who wants to start?”.

2- Elicitation (el): It is realized by a question. Its function is to request a linguistic response.

el- S/ “Sir, dose it have a relation with past?”

el- T/ “Can you tell me the difference between third person (S) and plural (S)?

el- T/ “What are the types of questions do we have?”

3- Check (ch): it is realized by a closed class of polar questions concerned with the student having questions or the teacher, to ask whether they understand.

ch- T/ “Do you understand me?”.

4- Directive (d):

¹ T: Symbol used for teacher.

² S: For student.

- d- T/ "Try to derive your own example!"
d- T/ "Don't read what is complicated and understood!"
d- T/ "I want you to read carefully".
5- Informative (i):
i- T/ "SO, yes refers to positive answer and (No) refers to negative answer.
i- S/ "We have two types of questions".
7- prompt (p): = commands and a closed class of item at that "go on" or "come on"
a preceding utterance.
p- T/ "Yes, go on".
p- T/ "Yes, please, continue" .
p- T/ "Yes, com on".
8- Cue (cu): information contains only three exponents.
Cu- T/ "Do you have any other definition?"
Cu- T/ "Any other definition?"
Cu- T/ "What else?"
Cu- T/ "What's more?" "Any new things?"
9- Bid (b): = the verbal and nonverbal elements, "Sir", "raised hand" or finger
clicking.
b- S/ "Sir, here I have an example".
b- S/ [N]³ raised his hand to answer the question and to discuss or to contribute.
10- Nomination (n= names of the students. Its function is to give permission to
student to contribute. (cf. Meteab et al. 2020)
n- T/ "Yes, [M], Yes, [S], Yes [E]".
n- T/ "Yes, [B], Yes, [N]".
11- Acknowledge (ack): = "Ok", "yes".
S/ "Ok", "yes".
T/ "mm" "yes" → ack- T/ "mm", "yes".
12- Reply (rep):
T/ "Can you give me an example about present perfect tense?"
rep- S/ "Have you ever been to France?"
"Yes".
13-React (rea): It is realized by nonlinguistic action and linguistic one. Its functions
is to provide the appropriate non linguistic response.
T/ "Do you understand me?"
rea- S/ "Yes, Sure".
14- Comment (com): it is realized by statemen.
Com- T/ "Notice here, the question asks about any time in the past".
Com- S/ "and the verp in the past simple tense talks about a definite time in the
past".
15- Accept (acc):
T/ "give me an example".
S/ "for example: my friends is a teacher, my friends is not a teacher. So, whether
the sentence is positive or negative (i.e) I have friend.
acc- T/ "Yes, good, good".

³ an abbreviated from for the name of the student

16- Evaluate (e): = “good”, “Yes”, “No”. The evaluation can be positive or negative.

The previous example is also applicable here.

17- Silence (^): It is realized by a pause. It has three functions, either for thinking, or un conviction or agreement.

T/ “For example” ^”, yes, for example “your brother is in the hospital”.

S/ “^” i.e agreement on the part of the student that the example is clear and there is no comment.

18 -Meta statement (ms): =help the student to understand what the teacher is going to tell them to explain the lesson.

ms- T/ “In this lecture, we are going to takle another important subject”.

19- Conclusion (Con): = anaphoric account usually alexical item “So”, “than” occurs at the end of transactions.

Con- / “So, in brief, words for nationalities are adjectives. We usually make them by changing the name of the country to the person belongs to“.

20- Loop (l): = items like: “pardon”, “eh”, “ha”, “again please”.

T/ “Pardon”, “again please”.

S/ “Pardon”, “again please”.

2. Moves:

Moves consists of one or more acts. Coulthard (1985: 125-126) argues that the relationship between moves and acts in discourse is similar to that between words and morphemes in grammar. The move is the minimal contribution some move consists of single act. (move= turn).

Also , it can be informative ,elicitation, directive or check.

T/ “Do you understand me?”.

S/ “Yes, Sir, sure”.

3.Exchanges:

Colthard and Montgomery (1981: 99) define an exchange so the unit concerned with negotiating the transmission of information. Grenoble (2000: 9) believes that an exchange is the basic unit of interaction because it consists of contributions by two participants to form a largest unit viz the transaction. Kamil and Hazem (2020:14) argue that the students of English use and apply the target prepositions according to their native language.

T/ “When you are explaining somethings, you need to put your ideas into the right order”.

S/ “We need to order our thoughts in correct form and arrangement”.

Hazem (2015) concludes that students still have a long way to go in writing satisfactory essays in English.

4.Transaction:

Transaction are combinations of boundary and teaching exchanges. Transaction may start through a initial interchange and may end with a terminal exchange. Coulthard (1985: 123) believes that the teacher’s role involves choosing atopic. Meteb and Hazem (2020 a: 420) conclude that the key argument between the

two stems from the understanding of a number of linguistic classifications in several of these structures in Arabic opposed to the deficiency of such structural differences in English. (cf. Hazem and Meteab, 2019).

5. Lesson:

Sinclair and Coulthard state that transactions combine to form the highest unit on the rank scale of classroom discourse, viz 'lesson'. Thus "lesson" may be described as an unordered series of transactions. Kamil and Hazem (2020:14) argue that the students of English use and apply the target prepositions according to their native language. (Meteab and Hazem, 2020b).

CONCLUSIONS

This study has investigated some systematic properties of language use which are related to the structure of teacher-student in a classroom. It investigates the structure of teacher- student discourse and the rules of communicating in the process of teaching. Having adopted Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) system, we have looked at the structure of a lesson with the aim of recognizing the patterns and strategies used by teachers and students.

The study has come up with some findings:

1. Teacher- student discourse is a patterned, ruled and organized activity which consists of transactions, exchanges, moves and acts.
2. The analysis has presented twenty acts that are manipulated by both teachers and students, viz- marker, starter, elicitation check, directive, informative, prompt, cue, nomination reply, comment, accept evaluate science, metastatement, conclusion. loop, react, bid and acknowledge.
3. Teachers have given students a chance to present ideas, ask, questions, participate and comment, so, they have been active participants not passive listeners although teachers dominate discourse in all lessons.
4. Teachers and student have taken are active role in the classroom. Teachers have not only presented information or asked questions, but listen to students and evaluate them, and give them time to answer and comment.
5. Finally, code switching is found in the classroom as a means of explaining some details concerning the suspect itself on the part of both teachers and students.

REFERENCES

- Al- Sa'ati, N. (2004). The Structure of Teacher- Student Discourse. Unpublished ph. D. Thesis: University of Mosul.
- Crystal, D. (2003). A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics. Blackwell.
- Coulthard, M. (1985). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. 2nd ed. Harlow: Longman Higher Education Division.
- Hazem, A. H. (2015). A Syntactic-o-Semantic Study of English Resumptive Pronouns in University Students of English Written Performance. *Journal of Tikrit University for the Humanities* 22(12):1–37.
- Hazem, A. H, & Meteab, W. Y. (2019). Nominal Constructions in Modern Standard Arabic With Reference to English. *International Journal of Applied*

- Hazem, A. H., & Kanaan, M. H. (2020). Domain Adverbs in Legal English Texts: Problems and Strategies. *IUP Journal of English Studies*, 15(4), 130-141.
- Hazem, A. H., & Mohammed, S. I. (2021). Mitigating Devices in Mosuli Iraqi Arabic with Reference to English. *Ijaz Arabi Journal of Arabic Learning*, 4(2).
- Kamil, D. F. & Hazem, A. H. (2020). The Impact of Arabic on The Written English Performance of Second-year Students in Relation to Prepositions. *Journal of University of Babylon for Humanities*, 28(2), 14–24.
- Khuder, S. A., Hazem, A. H. & Kanaan, M.H. (2021). The Role of Discourse Markers in Organizing Literary Discourse: H.G. Wells' The Time Machine as a Case Study. *ADAB AL-RAFIDAYN* 84 (51), 1-26
- Levinson, C. (1983). *Pragmatics: An introduction*. Cambridge University press.
- Meteab, W. Y., Kamil, D. F. & Hazem, A. H. (2020). A Syntactic Analysis of Cognate Accusative in Arabic with Reference to English. *Journal of the College of Basic Education* 26(106):54–68.
<https://doi.org/10.35950/cbej.v26i106.54>
- Meteab, W. Y., Hazem, A. H. (2020 a). A Morpho-Syntactic Approach to Translating English Verb Phrases in Literary Texts into Arabic. *Journal of Adab Al- Kufa* 1(44):805–814.
- Meteab, W. Y., Hazem, A. H. (2020 b). Demonstratives in English with Reference to Arabic : A Syntactico-Pragmatic Study. In *Proceedings of the 12th International Congress on Language, Literature and Culture Researches*, Sami BASKIN (eds.),404-421. HİTİT University: SAYBİLDER Publications. <https://dekok.org/tr/>
- Mey, J. (1993). *Pragmatics: An introduction*. Cambridge : Blackwell.
- Yule, G. (1996). *The Study of Language*. Cambridge, Universtiy Press.
- www. (2006). *Discourse Analysis*. From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia .<http://www.guenic/includes/tecfa/icrem/includes26/htm>.