

MACROSTRUCTURE OF CLASSROOM SPOKEN DISCOURSES PRODUCED BY ENGLISH TEACHERS

Meta Keumala¹
Iskandar Abdul Samad
Dohra Fitrisia

Universitas Syiah Kuala, Banda Aceh, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

For English teaching practice, it is important to deliberate productive talks that spur students' comprehension, creativity, and problem solving ability. This research aimed at finding out the spoken discourse based on six phases of macrostructure in English classrooms. In this study, the writers employed observation guide sheets to collect the data and it was employed to 2 English teachers in Aceh Besar. The guide was developed based on Van Dijk (1980) on macrostructure in discourse society. The theory was adopted and adjusted based on the classroom spoken discourse. The data were analyzed using the interactive model analysis by Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014). The steps were data condensation, data display, and data verification by using a percentage formula. The findings indicate that two teachers conducted the process of teaching and learning activities according to the lesson plans that they had previously designed. Even though both of them had different teaching strategies, but the lesson plans had a complete structure with 6 steps in macro-phases.

Keywords: *classroom spoken discourse, macrostructure, macro-phases.*

INTRODUCTION

The significant point of English education in Indonesia is to create relational abilities, both oral and written aptitudes in all four skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. With a specific end goal to achieve motivations behind these guidelines, educators at schools need

¹ Corresponding author: meta.keumala@gmail.com

to complete appropriate types of talks during the teaching and learning process. However, nowadays, there are some problems found in the process of English teaching at high schools (Brown, 2001). First, students can hardly master English even though they have studied the language for six years at school - junior and senior high schools. Some students even take extra English courses, but they still cannot totally master English. Second, there are students who have negative behavior toward English. Consequently, English just drifts away every time it is taught. In this factor, basically, students have problems with learning in general. Last, teachers are less interesting for students because of certain factors, such as the teaching techniques which can be boring, the teacher's general personality, and the teacher talk.

The problem that can be spotted in the material deliverance in English classes high schools is that the current classroom discourse. Halliday (1985) states that there is a strong relationship between discourse and language learning. From the researchers' experience and preliminary observation, teachers did not follow any sequential rules in delivering the materials. To any extent, this condition has an impact on students' comprehension and achievement in English subject. Cazden (2001) supports that nowadays, most teachers still use non-traditional classroom discourse where there is no structure to follow in classroom talks. Skidmore (2000) further adds that in this classroom discourse, teachers dominate the class who is seen as someone who knows and possesses the truth, while the students are those who are ignorant and in error. Despite realizing that this fact needs to be altered, it happens in our contemporary English classes. Therefore, what teachers say to the students and how they say it is important to be further analyzed in the micro and macro level of analysis.

The investigation of the macrostructure comprises in the investigation of the significant structures and structures in the texts' details. It is alluded to significant structures as the selection of classes as well as the measurement of structures and substructures, and also the available moves and steps. The initial phase in the examination is to decide the accessible moves and steps. For this situation, the various moves and steps must be picked separately and choose which ones are important in consideration to different individuals (Inger & Nielsen, 2005). When the primary moves are resolved, the following stage comprises classifying them into steps. Subsequent to building up the

moves and steps, it is important to evaluate the structures and substructures of the various paragraphs, sentences, and words.

LITERATURE REVIEW

There are various essential components in English language instructions but the most significant one that plays the major role in many ESL/EFL classrooms and programs are the teachers. In Aceh, for many students, the English class is a place where a teacher talks and students listen. Students only respond when they are called on to answer a question. This condition determines students' general comprehension and initial perception of English. They rely solely on what teachers say during the class. Teachers' expectations can be very powerful and can influence student's attitudes and actions and lead to success or failure (Tomlinson, 2000). If teachers recognize the importance of constructive deliverance and interaction in their teaching and learning process, in general, more effective and efficient classroom management will contribute to time, energy, and even financial issues. Meanwhile in particular, students' memory can develop neat and well-accomplished information about the materials learned during the class because they feel attached to the materials (Kohn, 2006).

Classroom discourses can be a central element of acquiring linguistic knowledge and understanding the nature of language—in this case, English. The notion is that students need frequent and regular opportunities to catch up with the salient materials through the teacher talks during the classroom. For English teaching practice, it is important to deliberate productive talks that spur students' comprehension, creativity, and problem-solving ability. When the materials are delivered in a well-organized structure, we can boost the possibility of their understandings (Garton, 2012). Deep learning autonomy as mentioned by Gibbs and Coffey (2004) happens when a student tries to develop a strategy or approach based on their logical understanding so that seeing the path and hallmarks among the information can promote the likelihood that the student will be able to use or adapt that strategy in future situations. Hence, emphasizing what is taught and how it is taught, this study is crucial to analyze the talks closely on a specific theoretical ground in an attempt to describe effective classroom discourse to help increase comprehension in students.

This study was carried out by taking the Analysis of Multi-Genre Structure (AMS) framework in order to gain the appropriate data of

macrostructure of teachers' spoken discourse. Casañ-Pitarch (2017) states that the analysis of multi-genre structures (AMS) aims at determining the common features within a corpus of documents of the same nature. The objective of this AMS model is to help researchers determine the form of any genre related to the users' personal or professional fields; this involves the study of macro- and micro-structures Casañ-Pitarch (2017).

Moreover, the interaction pattern in the classroom situation and the design of lesson plan as the Initiation-response-feedback, or IRF. IRF is a pattern of discussion between the teacher and learner. The teacher asks a learner for rules about use of the present perfect, the learner gives an answer, and the teacher says whether that is correct or not (Rustandi, 2017).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research method of this study is basically qualitative in nature. Ary et al. (2018) explain that a qualitative study finds out a phenomenon, a process, or a particular point of view from the perspective of those involved. Specifically, in this current study, the researchers use discourse analysis which analyzes the spoken discourse made by English English teachers. Fairclough (2005) and Gee (2005) argue that discourse analysis is in general the analysis of the text, whether it is spoken interactions, written texts, or multimedia texts.

Research Participants

The subject was chosen by random purposive sampling utilized in qualitative research in an attempt to select participants in the qualitative research (Gay, Miles & Airasian, 2011). Therefore, the subject of this study is two English teachers who teach at senior high school in Aceh Besar, which are Oemardiyah Islamic Senior High School, and Al-Falah Abu Lam U Islamic Senior High School, both having the best scores in national examination. Only one teacher of each school participated in this study because they met the criteria: (1) the teachers had been teaching for at least two years; (2) the teachers taught high-school students; and (3) the teachers were English teachers. The object of this study was the spoken discourse produced while they were teaching.

Research Instrument

The researchers obtained the data by doing observation and employing an observation guide where it was carried out by note taking and video recording. Richards and Schmidt (2013) suggests four main areas for focusing observations: (i) the *setting* (e.g. context, spaces, locations), (ii) the *systems* (e.g. typical routines and procedures), (iii) the *people* (e.g. roles, relationships, responses) and (iv) the *behaviours* (e.g. timing, activities, events). The audio or video recordings have benefits in capturing observational data verbatim and are accurate and reliable sources of data. Audio recording is less intrusive, while video, although more intrusive, includes non-verbal behaviour. Accustoming participants in the presence of the recording device is likely to result in more authentic records of typical interaction (Burns, 2010). Each observations were conducted twice for each teacher where it spent 2 meetings of teaching and learning processes about 180 minute per teacher.

Technique of Data Collection

The data were collected through observations and interviews. As mentioned previously, both instruments were intended to be useful in the process of conducting the research. The processes, technically, are elaborated as follows:

First of all, observation of the process of teaching and learning was carried out by note taking and video recording. The researchers involved as a non-participant instrument because, in this type of study, the researchers were the key instrument (Merriam, 2009). The non-participant researchers only observed the condition and took notes on the phenomena that happened. In this research, the observations were done in two schools and on two teachers by employing the six phases of macro struture as proposed by Van Dijk (1980). Each observation was conducted twice for each teacher where it took 2 meetings of teaching and learning processes. The duration was 180 minutes per teacher which means that the total was 360 minutes or 6 hours for both teachers. This process was applied in order to know the real teaching and learning activities that occurred in the class to gain an understanding of the process of teacher talks. To see completely the complexities of numerous circumstances, coordinate cooperation in, and perception of, the marvel of intrigue might be the best research strategy.

The second process of data collection is an interview. The researchers conducted two interviews where each teacher from the

schools was asked about her perspectives on macrostructure phases. As noted by Van Dijk (1980), there should be six phases of an ideal process of teaching including: (1) structuring phase (greeting students, telling students the topic of the day); (2) content phase (explaining the content of the subject matter); (3) interaction phase (teacher asks validation from students whether they are clear enough about the subject matter); (4) exemplification phase (teacher gives examples toward the subject matter of the day to give clearer information for his/her students); (5) evaluation phase (teacher gives oral or written exercises to his/her students); and (6) conclusion phase (teacher gives confirmation toward correct answers and concludes the subject of the day). Each interview process was about 15 minutes. This was collected on the same day as the observation process right after the classes ended.

Technique of Data Analysis

After the data were collected, they were analyzed using the interactive model analysis by Miles, Huberman and Saldana (2014). The steps were data condensation, data display, and data verification. Data condensation occurred continuously throughout the life of any qualitatively oriented project. Even before the data were actually collected, anticipatory data condensation was occurring as the researchers decided (often without full awareness) which conceptual framework, which cases, which research questions, and which data collection approaches were to choose. As data collection proceeded, further episodes of data condensation occurred: writing summaries, coding, developing themes, generating categories, and writing analytic memos. After data condensation, the next step was data display which contained the data analysis happening in the natural setting to enable the researchers to draw a temporary conclusion. The last step was data verification where the researchers used the result from the previous steps as well as other theories to help her draw conclusions.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Results

The macrostructure includes the measurement of structures and the depiction of the moves and steps in the content. So as to achieve the principal point of this current study, a model for the investigation of multi-genre structures (AMS) has been planned in order to distinguish

and decide the particular pieces of objective of the genre. This study majorly employs the macrostructure framework offered by Van Dijk (1995). He further explains that macrostructures in the genre of analysis emphasize the structuring phase that describes the overall unity and coherence of the context from a global perspective. In more detail about the technical implementation of the six phases, the researchers analyzed each phase based on two teachers teaching in two different classrooms.

Table 1. Output Activities in the Macro-Phases

No	Macro-phases (Van Dijk, 1980)	Output Activities	Teacher I		Teacher II	
			Yes	No	Yes	No
1	Structuring phase	Greeting students.	√		√	
		Telling students the topic of the day.	√		√	
2	Content	Explaining the content of the subject matter	√		√	
3	Interaction	Teachers ask validation from students whether they are clear enough about the subject matter.	√		√	
4	Exemplification	Teachers give examples toward the subject matter of the day to give clearer information for his/her students.	√		√	
5	Evaluation	Teachers give oral or written exercises to his/her students.	√		√	
6	Conclusion	Teachers give confirmation toward correct answers and conclude the subject of the day.	√		√	

Table 1 shows that both teachers in two schools carried out the six macro-phases. First of all, in the structuring phase (SP), both teachers greet the students by first saying greetings. After that, the teachers asked students' conditions and directed the students by asking questions and expressing the topic directly. During SP, the teachers only asked questions about the state of students and the students who were absent. It can be verified that Teacher 1 (T1) did the SP process as shown in the following transcript.

(Teacher1) : *“As usual, before we start our lesson, I will check your attendance list first.”*

“In the last meeting I have told you about what you should do when you perform explanation text, so, I will review a little bit about explanation text.” [SP-Class A]

Moreover, Teacher 2 (T2) carried out preliminary activities such as those that had been designed in her lesson plan. It appeared that the teacher used full English without code-switching. The teacher also asked questions about the material that would be discussed at the meeting. This is briefly displayed as follows:

(Teacher 2) : *Good morning everyone. How are you today?
Very good. Now let me check your attendance list first. Does everybody come Today?
Okay. Now, let's start our lesson Today. Have you ever heard legend story?* [Class B]

As previously arranged, T2 told the subject matter to be discussed at the meeting at that time. However, she did not inform about core competencies, basic competencies, indicators, and KKM at the meeting that took place. It was obvious that the teacher only directed the students to watch YouTube shown online to find explanations about the narrative text. The teacher was not really involved in this activity while the students were also passive.

Next is the content phase (CP) where T1 asked students to open a textbook that had been learned in the previous meeting. The teacher asked the students to prepare themselves so that they could present their explanation texts themselves. Based on the observations on these findings, the teacher repeated the same material to clarify the instructions and tasks that they should finish.

(Teacher 1) : *Please open page 101. It will be helpful for those who should perform Today.
As we have discussed yesterday, explanation text is about social, natural, political phenomenon.
[Teks di dalam buku mempunyai semua komposisi generic structure yang seharusnya ada di dalam explanation text which include general statement, sequential explanation and conclusion].
(Tr : The passage in your textbook has all the generic structure composition which should be in the explanation text which*

include general statement, sequential explanation and conclusion)
[Content Phase/ Class A]

The material taught was explanation text so the teacher explained the definitions, text components, and generic structure of the genre. The teacher explained it with her own description specifically about the part of the text in the genre of explanation and to clarify the explanation, the teacher asked students to re-read the textbook.

While in this phase, T2 displayed relevant videos to start the activity in CP. T2 programmed core activities including reading, writing, listening and listening, where students were expected to read material from textbooks or other supporting books, from internet materials related to the social function of text interactions in giving and requesting information related to events occurring in the past which refers to the time of occurrence such as the form of past simple and present perfect tense.

The third phase as can be seen in Table 1 is interaction phase (IP) where this point the checklist was verified. The first school outlined the questioning session during this phase in order to provide an opportunity for students to ask questions about the linguistic element in the explanation text. T1 provided an opportunity for the students to ask questions about the structure of the explanation text. She questioned about the different explanations of explanatory text in English and Indonesian. In brief, it can be displayed as follows:

(Teacher 1) : *What was the text about?*

(Half Std) : *Volcanoes*

(Teacher 1) : *Yes, about Volcanoes that appeared some mechanical terms.*

In the mechanical terms, ada istilah tertentu yang beberapa diantaranya masuk ke dalam action verbs, di situ kita mengenal istilah magma, volcanic ash, gas, lava.

(Tr : *There are special terms including action verbs, there we know the term magma, volcanic ash, gas, lava.) Apa lagi? (Tr: What else?)*

(Half Std) : *Mountain rocks.* [Interaction Phase – Class A]

Additionally, T2 asked many questions to students mainly related to the structure of narrative texts. After a question and answer process, the teacher decided to play the video online via YouTube. The video comes

from an educational channel created by senior high school teenagers and uses a mixture of Indonesian and English. It is shortly described below.

(Teacher 2) : *Have you finished? (Half Std) Not yet. (Teacher 2) What does it mean orientation? Yes. Complication? (Half Std) Permasalahan*
(Teacher 2) : *For more detail, let's see the video. [Interaction Phase – Class A]*

The result of the recording is obvious that T2 had interacted with her students actively over CP. She asked many questions which were responded either by one or two most active students as well as by half and all students.

The fourth is the exemplification phase (ExP). The observations produced a figure that T1 in class A gave examples of text and the procedures for carrying out the presentations they had to do. The teacher also showed a variety of presentations that students could use when carrying out their assignments, while giving the example in the SP. In fact, it was also used in ExP.

Furthermore, the fifth step is evaluation phase (EvP). In this stage, the teachers gave oral or written exercises to the students. T1 was seen in the observation that she asked students individually to compile explanatory texts from various sources. The following transcript displays a little description of the process of EvP in one of T1 classrooms.

(Teacher 1) : *So for you who get the turn Today. Are you ready? Should I call the name one more time? So, who wants to be the volunteer before I call one by one? Jo? Wait, let me write down the people who should present Today. [Evaluation Phase – Class A]*

At the meeting, the students were expected to have prepared themselves to explain the contents of the text that had been prepared by applying the presentation steps that had been taught. The teacher also gave input from the aspects of the structure of the text, language and speech, word stress, and intonation. Meanwhile, T2 carried out the EvP as described briefly as follows:

(Teacher 2) *And now I would like you to sit in group. I will divide you in five (5) groups and I will divide you randomly by number 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. For number 1, please sit in 1 group. Number 2 in group 2. And so on.*

There is a text, please arrange the paragraphs into a correct text and put in correct order. Don't be noisy. [Evaluation Phase – Class A]

The last is the conclusion phase (Conclusion Phase). In this stage, the teachers gave confirmation towards correct answers and concluded the subject of the day. T1 carried out the closing activity by concluding the learning outcomes and asking students to express their opinions or feelings on the learning that had been carried out.

(Teacher 1) : *Okay so, the others who do not have chance Today, be ready in the next meeting. I will conclude the lesson, we have learned about explanation text, the examples as explained by you in your performances.* [Conclusion Phase – Class A]

T1 briefly conveyed the plan for the next meeting activity. At this final stage, the teacher expressed pride in the efforts of students who had performed and completed the assignment. While T2 did the process of generalization (drawing conclusions), as stipulated in the lesson plan as can be seen in the following transcript,

(Teacher 2) *So we have learnt about narrative text. There are definition and its generic structure. Please remember. I think that's all. Thank you.* [Conclusion Phase – Class A]

In this phase, the students discussed to conclude the material they have learned, present the results of group discussions classically, express their opinions on the presentations made, and ask questions on team presentations.

Discussion

Generally, in the process of teaching and learning, both teachers implemented the Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) pattern. Ur (2000) suggests that teachers should do initiations to exchange ideas, questions, and give feedback to students. Eventhough teachers are considered as the initiators, Ur (2000) also proposes that students are given the opportunities to begin the class and share their ideas. The role of teacher talk in this phase is in line with Kaneko (1991) who considers that the teachers use language for social goals in order to express private info which has no connection with the pedagogic purpose of the lesson.

The content phase (CP) for teachers is the chance for them to deepen and broaden a main topic that is going to be learned by their students and this time, both of them mixed the language both Indonesian and English language. It was obvious that students got and understood the explanations. This is in line with Kaneko (1991) says that the teachers' language is used for core goals, specifically the explicit pedagogic purpose of the lesson

The interaction phase (IP) is where the teachers should initiate their students to relate to the materials, the other students, and themselves. IP includes more parties in the classroom itself as Ur (2000) notes the classification forms of interaction including TT (teacher very active, students only receptive), T (teacher active, students mainly receptive), TS (teacher and students fairly equally active), S (students active, teacher mainly receptive), and SS (students very active, the teacher only receptive). In addition, the other interaction patterns may also include group work, closed-ended teacher questioning (IRF), individual work, choral responses, collaboration, student initiates-teacher answers, full-class interaction, self-access and open-ended teacher questioning (Ur, 2000).

In fact, three of the six stages of macrostructure were done randomly. After the opening as the structuring phase (SP) and content phase (CP) was carried out, both teachers mixed the interaction, exemplification, and evaluation phases. They repeated the phases in doing some activities. In order to lead the students to be in the evaluation phase (EvP), the teachers guided them by giving examples. This was proposed by Mehan (1979) who found that the general subject exercises comprise of three segments, (1) an opening stage, where the members educate each other that they are, truth be told, going to direct an exercise instead of some other movement, (2) a business stage, where data is traded among teacher and students, and (3) an end-stage, where members are helped to remember what went on in the center of the exercise.

During EvP, the teacher 1 (T1) gave individual tasks, while the teacher 2 (T2) ordered the students to finish a mini reading project in group work. Individualization, as explained previously, maybe in the form of ways and procedures based on the amount of work-demanded of the teacher in preparation (Ur, 2000). While on the other hand, group work learners perform a learning task through small group interaction. In order to activate the value practice of oral fluency, learners in class

may have responsibilities and independence which can improve motivation and contribute to a feeling of cooperation and warmth in the class.

Finally, the last phase of the macrostructure that is going to be described is the conclusion, where both teachers carried out to end the lesson. After they finished all the activities, they closed the lesson by making a summary of the whole lessons and reminding what students must do to attend the next meeting.

At the point when students had given the right reaction, the teachers for the most part gave a remark or only a concise affirmation (Richard and Lockhart (1994 as cited in Yanfen & Yuqin, 2010).

Consequently, teacher talk ought to be clear and comprehensible, which ought to contain no blunders. Noni (1994) expresses that the instructional language utilized by teachers ought to consistently serve the goals of furnishing students' procurement and colleague with the language, of advancing learning among them, and of starting class-association prompting correspondence. These targets will be achieved if the teacher language is suitable as far as articulation, sentence structure, and word collocation for the students as per their language capability, experience, and capability.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This study has described the results and discussion of macrostructures employed by English teachers in teaching their classes in Aceh Besar. Referring to the results, it can be exposed that first, the two teachers conducted the process of teaching and learning activities according to the lesson plans that they had previously designed. The lesson plans had a complete structure with 6 steps in macro-phases sourced from Van Dijk's (1980) theory. However, the teacher 1 (T1) and the teacher 2 (T2) had differences in levels and methods of learning. The T1 taught based on the textbook while the T2 taught using online sources other than the textbook. Moreover, The T1 gave a detailed explanation of the material and tasks related to the topic of learning text explanation, while the T2 played a YouTube channel to provide a topic explanation about the narrative text. In the evaluation activity, The T1 asked the students to compile text and present it in front of the class, whereas the T2 asked the students to work on problems in groups.

It is suggested that first, EFL teachers should teach in English because teachers are models for their students. Second, if it is needed for

the teachers to mix the native and target language, at least the native language is only about 70%. It is in order that the students may imitate the target language. Third, teachers should also use appropriate grammar. This is an essential point in learning a language. Last, teachers should follow the sequence of processes in teaching the English language as written in the lesson plans.

Practically, there are some parties who get the benefit from this study. First, English teachers can use it as a reference to revise their method of teaching deliverance so that students can comprehend their explanation easier and faster; second, it is recommended for other researchers who are interested in studying the domain of discourse analysis in relation to English teaching discipline to know the importance of spoken discourse in a language class.

REFERENCES

- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Irvine, C. K. S., & Walker, D. (2018). *Introduction to research in education*. Boston: Cengage Learning.
- Brown, D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (3rd Edition). San Francisco: San Francisco State University Press.
- Burns, A. (2010). *Doing action research in English language teaching: A guide for practitioners*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Casañ-Pitarch, R. (2017). A proposal for genre analysis: The AMS model. *Epic Series In Language And Linguistics*, 2, 235-246.
- Cazden, C. B. (2001). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning*. Portsmouth, Heinemann.
- Fairclough, N. (2005). Discourse analysis in organizational studies: The case for critical realism. *Discourse Studies*, 5(2), 258–284.
- Garton, S. (2012). Speaking out of turn? Taking the initiative in teacher-fronted classroom interaction. *Classroom Discourse*, 3(1), 29-45.
- Gay, L. R., Miles, G. E., & Airasian, P. (2011) *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications* (10th Ed.). Boston: Pearson Education International.
- Gee, J. P. (2005). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. London: Routledge.
- Gibbs, G., & Coffey, M. (2004). The impact of training of university teachers on their teaching skills, their approach to teaching and the

- approach to learning of their students. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 5(1), 87-100.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Inger, A., & Nielsen, A. (2005). Digital genres: A challenge to traditional genre theory. *Information Technology and People*, 18(2), 120- 141.
- Kaneko, T. (1991). *The role of first language in foreign language classroom* (Doctoral Dissertation). Temple University, Philadelphia.
- Kohn, A. (2006). *Beyond discipline from compliance to community*. Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Wiley Imprint.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd Ed.). New York: Sage Publications.
- Noni, N. (1994). *The instructional language used by the lecturers in the English classroom interaction at the English Departement of IKIP Ujung Pandang* (Thesis). Universitas Hasanuddin, Ujung Pandang.
- Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. W. (2013). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. London: Routledge.
- Rustandi, A., & Mubarak, A. H. (2017). Analysis of IRF (initiation-response-feedback) on classroom interaction in EFL speaking class. *EduLite: Journal of English Education, Literature and Culture*, 2(1), 239-250.
- Skidmore, D. (2000). From pedagogical dialogue to dialogical pedagogy. *Language and Education*, 14(4), 283-296.
- Tomlinson, C. A. (2000). *Differentiation of instruction in the elementary grades*. Champaign, IL: ERIC Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education. (ERIC Document No. ED443572).
- Ur, P. (2000). *A course in language teaching practice and theory*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1980). *Macrostructures: An interdisciplinary study of global structures in discourse, interaction, and cognition*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1995). *Principles of critical discourse analysis: Discourse & society*. London: Routledge.

- Yanfen, L., & Yuqin, Z. (2010). A study of teacher talk in interactions in English classes. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 33(2), 76-86.
- Yulianti, N. (2013). *A descriptive analysis of students' perceptions toward teacher's talk in English classroom (The study of Third Year Students in Language Program of SMA Negeri 3 Salatiga in the Academic Year 2013/2014)* (Unpublished Undergraduate Thesis). State Islamic Institute (IAIN) of Salatiga, Salatiga.