A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF THE SHIFT OF ROLES BETWEEN A TEACHER AND STUDENTS IN ENGLISH CLASSROOM DISCOURSE

Doni Ramdhani Suwandi
doni.suwandi@gmail.com
Departmen of English Education, Indonesia University of Education

Abstract: This study was aimed to figure out the exchange patterns during classroom interaction and its relation to the shift of roles of serving primary knower between a teacher and students. Thirty nine students of twelfth grade and an English teacher in a public senior high school in Bandung were involved as the participants. This study employed a descriptive-qualitative method, and the main data were classroom observation transcript and teacher's interview transcript. The data analysis was done by applying classroom discourse analysis through coding and categorizing utterances of teacher and students into exchange categories proposed by Suherdi (2009). The findings reveal that both Non-Anomalous (Knowledge-Oriented and Action-Oriented) and Anomalous Exchanges (Elliptical, Defective, and Broken) were found in the interaction between the teacher and the students, therefore the exchange categories affect the shift of roles of serving primary knower between teacher and students. With regard to the findings, two exchanges were likely to be dominant among other exchanges throughout four meetings of the lesson; those are DK1-initiated exchanges (30.19%) and A1-initiated exchanges (34.57%).

Keywords: *Classroom discourse analysis, Classroom Interaction, Shift of Roles*

Introduction

Language is produced in various ways according to the purpose of the language users and that different purpose will require kinds of language use. Language in discourse is employed to interact and communicate the same things with interlocutors such as thoughts, beliefs, and feelings (Suherdi, 2009). Furthermore, discourse is simply defined as the language in use (Rymes, 2008; Cook, 1989, cited in Jiang, 2012). Therefore, the use of language is analyzed by using discourse analysis.

Suherdi (2009, p. 6) asserts that discourse analysis as a way of approaching and thinking about a problem. As regards to discourse as the language in use, Paaso, Uusiautti, and Määttä (2013) say that thing outside the language usage is not the focus of discourse analysis.

Discourse can occur everywhere in any situation. In educational situation, discourse tends to happen in the

classroom. Classroom discourse covers all spoken interaction between teacher and students, also includes nonverbal interaction. Allwright and Bailey (1991, cited in Suherdi, 2009) say that concrete and concealed activities are the complex concept of interaction.

Not only teacher who is in charge of teaching-learning process, but also students. This can be realized by putting forward question and answer method in the classroom in order to provide students more opportunities to participate in the teaching and learning process (Suherdi, 2009).

Both teacher and students should be able to give appropriate contribution in the classroom. In addition, Liberante (2012) asserts turn taking is one of some aspects that influences students' outcomes and behaviour in teacher-students interaction.

The interaction between the teacher and the students takes place in a classroom. Therefore, in order to figure out the interaction patterns, classroom discourse analysis is needed to accomplish study's objectives. Moreover, McCarthy (1991) claims that classroom discourse analysis gives benefits to the evaluation of teacher's and students' outcomes.

Therefore, considering the above situation, this study intends to figure out the exchange categories in classroom interaction and its relation to shift of roles of serving the Primary Knower between teacher and students in English classroom context.

Literature Review

- **Classroom Discourse**

The interaction between the teacher and the students occurs in form of verbal language and non-verbal interaction. Particular routines communication occur in classroom interaction based on particular sociopolitical and pedagogical beliefs is considered as classroom discourse (Suherdi, 2009). However, sometimes students change the occurring of discourse because of their new way in delivering ideas (Rymes, 2008).

In the classroom interaction, both teacher and students have to participate in the teaching-learning process. Therefore, students' participation in the classroom is important, Kelly (2007) says that their participation in the classroom is influenced by teacher's way of negotiating conversations in the classroom in which puts them as the centre of classroom discourse.

Classroom discourse analysis is defined as the study of spoken interaction and written texts from both language functions and language forms (Demo, 2001, cited in Suherdi, 2009). Sinclair and Coulthard (1975, cited in Suherdi, 2009)

developed a system of analysing classroom discourse which covers classroom discourse as five ranks namely Lesson, Transaction, Exchange, Move and Act.

Furthermore, in classroom context, *Move* is generally divided into two kinds: Synoptic and Dynamic moves. Synoptic moves have exact patterns and its occurrences can be predicted, whereas, the occurrences of Dynamic Moves cannot be predicted as Synoptic Moves can (Suherdi, 2009). Based on Ventola (1987, cited in Suherdi, 2009) there are at least ten patterns of synoptic moves: K1, K1 ^ K2f, K1 ^ K2f ^ K1f, K2 ^ K1, K2 ^ K1 ^ K2f, K2 ^ K1 ^ K2f ^ K1f, DK1 ^ K2, DK1 ^ K2 ^ K1, DK1 ^ K2 ^ K1 ^ K2f, and DK1 ^ K2 ^ K1 ^ K2f ^ K1f.

In the meantime, dynamic moves are broken down into three systems: Suspending, Aborting, and Elucidating (Ventola, 1987, cited in Suherdi, 2009). As Ventola (1987) professed, Suspending system has four types namely Giving Confirmation, Backchannelling, Requesting Confirmation, and Checking. One type of each Aborting and Elucidating system is Challenge and Clarification. In addition, Suherdi (1994, cited in Suherdi, 2009) suggested and invented a new category of Dynamic Moves which is labelled as Sustaining. This Sustaining system consists of four moves which are Repetition, Rephrasing, Clues, and Corrections, with additional moves which maybe preceded by the first three moves (Repetition, Rephrasing, and Clues) namely Irrelevant and No Response move.

- **Categories of Exchanges**

As mentioned earlier, *Move* is divided into two types which are Synoptic and Dynamic moves. An exchange can be constructed by those moves; it can be constructed by only synoptic moves or even by synoptic and dynamic moves. According to Suherdi (2009), exchange can be categorized into two categories which are Non-anomalous and Anomalous.

The patterns of non-anomalous exchanges can be predicted as synoptic moves. These exchanges are broken down into two sub-categories which are simple and complex; further, complex non-anomalous exchanges are broken down into three sub-categories which are pre-inform extended, post-inform extended, and the mixture of both (Suherdi, 2009).

Whereas, anomalous exchanges, reagarding the name, are unusual exchanges because the occurrence of these exchanges cannot be predicted by the system of conversational structure of discourse (Suherdi, 2009). Furthermore, anomalous exchanges are broken down into three sub-categories which are elliptical, defective, and broken.

- **Classroom Interaction**

Interaction in the classroom includes verbal interaction and non-verbal performance (Allwright & Bailey, 1991, cited in Suherdi, 2009; Kääntä, 2010 cited in Sert & Seedhouse, 2011). Initiation from teacher is important because it can maintain the interaction and establishes roles and relationship among teacher and students (Brown, 2001; McCarthy, 1991), in addition, asking and answering method is dominant in classroom interaction (Suherdi, 2009).

Both teacher and students are responsible to give contribution in the classroom. Hence, they should share the same proportion in participating and contributing in the classroom. The teacher should give students chances to speak; therefore there will be a shift of roles between teacher and students. They exchange the roles by negotiating information to accomplish the lessons (Suherdi, 2009). Additionally, Suherdi (2009) defines shift of roles as the relation between status and power in the classroom interaction especially with the shift of roles of the primary knower.

Turn-taking maintains a mutual attention among parties involved in a conversation, and it defines their relationship (Wiemann & Knapp, 1999, cited in Maroni, Gnisci, & Pontecorvo, 2008). Moreover, shift of roles occurs at the point when there is a switch of speaker-change transition which includes syntactical, prosodic, and pragmatic aspects (Maroni et al., 2008).

By giving students chances to speak and participate in the classroom, it can establish the shift of roles among teacher and students. Christie (1994, as cited in Suherdi, 2009) states that teacher has vital role in directing and monitoring students' progress, while students have vital role in building construction of the achievement and learning outcome.

Methodology

This study employed a descriptive-qualitative case study research design. Qualitative study, as stated by Creswell (2012), refers to the study of a problem and its understanding of a central phenomenon. In addition, Yin (2003, cited in Baxter & Jack, 2008) defines case study as a type of study used to describe a phenomenon and the occurrence of the real-life context. Case study was chosen because according to Nisbet and Watt (1984, cited in Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007) it has several strengths as follows: 1) it can be undertaken by a single researcher; 2) it is strong on reality; 3) it is intelligible and the results are easily understood by the reader; 4) it provides insight into similar situations and cases;

and 5) it catches specific elements and unanticipated events.

Thirty nine students of twelfth grade and an English teacher in a public senior high school in Bandung were involved as the participants. Twelfth grade students were chosen because based on Brown (2001) the higher of proficiency level of the students, the more questions and instructions can be undertaken during the lesson.

The main data of this study were classroom observation transcript and teacher's interview transcript. Observation aims to gather open-ended, direct information by observing people and places at a research site (Creswell, 2012). The classroom observations and videotaping itself were conducted on 22nd August 2014, 3rd September 2014, 5th September 2014, and 10th September 2014. Each lesson was recorded for two hour lessons (90 minutes). The data gained from classroom observation then were transcribed to be analyzed in the next step.

The interview was used to gather the detailed personal information that cannot be directly observed by the researcher (Creswell, 2012). The interview was conducted by interviewing the teacher face-to-face and via instant messenger.

Data Presentation and Discussion

The following are the findings and discussions from the data obtained during this study, based on the data collection techniques used including analyses of classroom observation transcripts and interview.

According to the findings, Non-Anomalous Exchanges including Knowledge-oriented Exchanges and Action-oriented Exchanges were found in the interaction between teacher and students. K2-oriented exchanges tend to be dominant in the first meeting; it appeared 60 times (10.12%). K2-initiated exchanges were dominant where the students served as primary knower, while the teacher served as the secondary knower. In this case, teacher asked for information from the students as the information supplier. The teacher asked students' prior knowledge about narrative text; he tried to obtain as much information from the students to accomplish the lesson's objective. This reflects greater opportunities for the students to participate and give contribution in the learning process because they serve as primary knower who supply information to the secondary knower.

The occurrence of K1-initiated exchanges in which the teacher served as primary knower was not too significant. Based on Table A1, in the first meeting, K1-initiated exchanges only appeared 27

times (4.55%). These K1-initiated exchanges appeared in order to sort out and wrap up rough information supplied by students beforehand (Suherdi, 2009).

In the meantime, DK1-initiated exchanges appeared quite significant (7.42%). The teacher chooses to delay the knowledge by asking testing question (Suherdi, 2009) in order to check students' understanding about the lesson. The teacher uses testing question because the explanation of the lesson has already explained beforehand, hence assuming the students get the knowledge, the teacher tests students' current knowledge.

This kind of question was used to check students' existing knowledge about their previous meeting. After becoming the secondary knower in the K2-initiated exchanges by asking and checking students' prior experience about the example of narrative text, then the teacher shifted his role again from secondary knower to the primary knower in K1-initiated exchanges by sorting out and wrapping up information supplied by the students. Then, the teacher maintained his role as the primary knower in DK1-initiated exchanges by asking display question or testing question (Long & Sato, 1983, as cited in Suherdi, 2009; Suherdi, 2009).

With regard to the findings, in the first meeting, A1-initiated exchanges (6.24%) tend to be dominant compared to A2-initiated exchanges (0.51%). These A1-initiated exchanges occurred and were dominant due to teacher's request when checking attendance to ask the students to raise their hands as their names called.

Based on Table A2, elliptical exchanges tend to be dominant throughout four meetings of the lesson compared to defective and broken exchanges. These elliptical exchanges were dominant because the teacher wanted to check students' comprehension after they read texts. Additionally, these exchanges occurred in DK1-initiated pattern, but there was no obligatory K1 in the exchange. It is because the answer to the teacher's question is known to most of the students (Suherdi, 2009). Hence, the teacher does not follow up the students' answer because it is unnecessary to do.

The occurrence of A1-initiated exchanges throughout four meetings was significant and dominant. As aforementioned, teacher's request to raise students' hand while checking attendance caused these exchanges became dominant. In addition, in other meetings the students did some non-verbal performances such as numbering pictures and phrases, sticking jumbled sentences, writing on the board, etc. Mostly the non-verbal interactions were done in the group works. It indicates the shift locus of attention from the

teacher-centred to students-focused (Hammond, 1990 cited in Suherdi, 2009), additionally Brown (2001) asserts that the shift of focus from teacher to students is resulted from group work and it can create the classroom becomes more interactive.

In the meantime, DK1-initiated exchanges were dominant in the third and the fourth meeting (see Table A1). In the third meeting, it occurred 64 times (10.79%) and in the fourth meeting it occurred 53 times (8.94%). This indicates the teacher did not explain the topic anymore, but rather to check students' comprehension towards the topic. The teacher employed display or testing questions to check students' comprehension towards the lesson (Long and Sato, 1983, cited in Suherdi, 2009; Suherdi, 2009). The teacher had explained and provided some information beforehand; therefore he tested the students with some questions related to the topic being explained.

K1-initiated and DK1-initiated exchanges are more likely dominant in which the teacher serves as the primary knower, while K2-initiated exchanges are more likely dominant in the situation where the students serve as the primary knower.

In addition, A1-initiated exchanges tend to be dominant in which the teacher serves as the primary knower, while A2-

initiated exchanges are more likely dominant in which the students serve as the primary knower (Suherdi, 2009). It is clear that there is a role shifting of serving primary knower between teacher and students throughout four meetings of the lesson. With regard to the findings, teacher and students take turn as primary knower from one meeting to another in order to maintain classroom interaction.

Conclusions

As stated earlier, the aims of this study are to figure out the exchange patterns during classroom interaction and its relation to the shift of roles of serving primary knower between teacher and students. In order to complete the aims, a descriptive-qualitative case study was employed and conducted in one public school in Bandung, West Java.

The findings reveal that all Exchanges categories proposed by Suherdi (2009) appeared during the classroom interaction. Non-anomalous (Knowledge-oriented Exchanges and Action-oriented Exchanges) and Anomalous Exchanges (Elliptical, Defective, and Broken) were both found in the interaction between teacher and students.

With regard to the findings, DK1-initiated exchanges seem to be dominant among knowledge-oriented exchanges with total appearance 30.19%. In the

meantime, A1-initiated exchanges seem to be dominant with 34.57% out of all total appearance of non-anomalous exchanges throughout four meetings. In terms of complexity, simple non-anomalous exchanges are dominant, while, the appearance of complex non-anomalous exchanges is not too significant. This shows that a long conversation in one exchange between teacher and students did not occur very often.

In terms of anomalous exchanges, the findings show that elliptical exchanges are more likely dominant with total appearance 83.03%. Overall, based on the findings, it can be concluded that action-oriented exchanges are the most dominant among other non-anomalous exchanges and anomalous exchanges. It shows that there were many non-verbal performances performed by both teacher and students.

Based on the findings, therefore, it can be concluded that there is a shift of roles of serving primary knower between teacher and students. It can be seen from the pattern of K2-initiated exchanges which was dominant in the first and the second meeting where the students served as the primary knower. It can be seen when the teacher asked students' prior knowledge about narrative text. The students were the ones who knew the information; therefore, they served as the primary knower and supplied information

to the teacher. This pattern then followed by K1-initiated exchanges in which the teacher served as the primary knower. The teacher supplied correct information and wrapped up all rough information supplied by the students as suggested by Suherdi (2009).

Moreover, considering the percentage of knowledge-oriented exchanges, DK1-initiated exchanges seem to be dominant in the third and the fourth meeting. In delivering the information, testing or display questions as suggested by Long and Sato (1983, cited in Suherdi, 2009) and Suherdi (2009) were employed by the teacher in order to check the students' comprehension towards the lesson. The decision of choosing exchange patterns such as K1-initiated, K2-initiated, and DK1-initiated exchanges has affected the shift of roles between teacher and students. With regard to the findings, therefore, it can be concluded that there is a shift of roles of serving primary knower between teacher and students indicated by the occurrence of various exchange patterns in one lesson.

References

American Psychological Association. (2010). *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.). Washington DC: American Psychological Association.

Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative Case Study Methodology: Study Design and Implementation for Novice Researchers. *The Qualitative Report , 13*, 544-559.

Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedadogy* (2nd ed.). New York: Addison Wesley Longman.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research Methods in Education* (6th Edition ed.). New York: Routledge.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research* (4th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.

Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2009). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education* (7nd ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.

Jiang, X. (2012). A Study of College English Classroom Discourse. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies , 2*, 2146-2152.

Jurusan Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris. (2010). *Pedoman Penyusunan Skripsi* (2nd ed.). Bandung: Jurusan Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Fakultas Pendidikan Bahasa dan Seni Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia.

Kelly, S. (2007). Classroom Discourse and the Distribution of Student Engagement. *Social Psychology of Education , 10*, 331-352.

Liberante, L. (2012). The Importance of Teacher–Student Relationships, as Explored Through the Llens of the NSW Quality Teaching Model. *Journal of Student Engagement: Education Matters ,* 2-9.

Maroni, B., Gnisci, A., & Pontecorvo, C. (2008). Turn-Taking in Classroom Interactions: Overlapping, Interruptions, and Pauses in Primary School.

European Journal of Psychology of Education , 23, 59-76.

McCarthy, M. (1991). *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Paaso, E., Uusiautti, S., & Määttä, K. (2013). "Peace to Learn"— A Discourse Analysis of Pupils' Perceptions. *Journal of Classroom Interaction ,* 16-27.

Rymes, B. (2008). *Classroom Discourse Analysis: A Tool for Critical Reflection.* Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Sert, O., & Seedhouse, P. (2005). Introduction: Conversation Analysis in Applied Linguistics. *Novitas Royal ,* 1-14.

Suherdi, D. (2009). *Classroom Discourse Analysis: A Systemiotic Approach.* Bandung: CELTICS Press.

Suherdi, D. (2009). *Mikroskop Pedagogik: Alat Analisis Proses Belajar-Mengajar.* Bandung: CELTICS Press

APPENDIX A

Table A1

The Distribution of Non-Anomalous Exchanges in Relation to the Shift of Roles of Serving Primary Knower Between the Teacher and the Students

Exchange Categories		Meeting								Total	
		First		Second		Third		Fourth			
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
K1-initiated	Simple	25	4.22	10	1.69	13	2.19	14	2.36	62	10,46
	Complex	2	0.34	1	0.17	3	0.51	1	0.17	7	1,18
	Sub-total	**27**	**4.55**	**11**	**1.85**	**16**	**2.70**	**15**	**2.53**	**69**	**11,64**
DK1-initiated	Simple	40	6.75	10	1.69	49	8.26	32	5.40	131	22,09
	Complex	4	0.67	8	1.35	15	2.53	21	3.54	48	8,09
	Sub-total	**44**	**7.42**	**18**	**3.04**	**64**	**10.79**	**53**	**8.94**	**179**	**30,19**
K2-initiated	Simple	57	9.61	32	5.40	15	2.53	12	2.02	116	19,56
	Complex	3	0.51	2	0.34	1	0.17	4	0.67	10	1,69
	Sub-total	**60**	**10.12**	**34**	**5.73**	**16**	**2.70**	**16**	**2.70**	**126**	**21,25**
A1-initiated	Simple	37	6.24	60	10.12	54	9.11	53	8.94	204	34,40
	Complex	-	0.00	1	0.17	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0,17
	Sub-total	**37**	**6.24**	**61**	**10.29**	**54**	**9.11**	**53**	**8.94**	**205**	**34,57**
A2-initiated	Simple	3	0.51	5	0.84	3	0.51	-	0.00	11	1,85
	Complex	-	0.00	3	0.51	0	0.00	-	0.00	3	0,51
	Sub-total	**3**	**0.51**	**8**	**1.35**	**3**	**0.51**	**-**	**0.00**	**14**	**2,36**
Total		**171**	**28.84**	**132**	**22.26**	**153**	**25.80**	**137**	**23.10**	**593**	**100**

Table A2

The Distribution of Anomalous Exchanges in Relation to the Shift of Roles of Serving Primary Knower Between the Teacher and the Students

Exchange Categories	Meeting								Total	
	First		Second		Third		Fourth			
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Elliptical	24	14.55	4	2.42	90	54.55	19	11.52	137	83.03
Defective	4	2.42	3	1.82	9	5.45	4	2.42	20	12.12
Broken	3	1.82	2	1.21	0	0.00	3	1.82	8	4.85
Total	**31**	**18.79**	**9**	**5.45**	**99**	**60.00**	**26**	**15.76**	**165**	**100**