



# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION



### 1.1 The Background of the Study

Human beings use a language in their lives for various purposes. They use language to talk about their experiences of the world, to describe events, to interact with others, to establish the relationship, to maintain social contact, to influence their behavioral, and to express their point of view. Language is used to convey broad historical meaning.

Language is a tool of communication, either spoken or written communication. Communication is the activity of conveying information. It involves a sender and a receiver (or receivers) conveying information through a communication channel. Communication is sent by the sender through a communication channel to a receiver, or to multiple receivers.

In the classroom, communication plays important part. It conveys the process of transferring knowledge. It involves teacher as a sender and students as a receiver or vice versa. The successful communication in the classroom affects to the education quality.

There are two types of classroom communication, teacher centered and students centered. Teacher centered deals with teacher as main sender of information, while students are just being reviewer. Conversely, students centered deals with both students and teacher as reviewers and sender of information. It means both of teacher and students learn together (Huba & Freed, 2000:1).

Nowadays, students centered should be optimized while teacher centered should be minimized. Unfortunately, teacher centered still used in many classroom communication (Amman & Mustafa, 2006:3; Wachidah, 2010:53). It should be a critical review for viewing classroom communication in which teaching and learning process occurs inside the schools.

Related to viewing classroom communication, Greenleaf (1993:3) used discourse as a fine lens through which to view the teaching and learning that occurs inside schools. Discourse describes the use of language. In the classroom, discourse deals with the relationship between language and classroom context in which it is used (McCarthy, 1991:5). Discourse within classroom is expected to be coherent, meaningful in which the words are linked to one another, therefore the process for transferring knowledge runs well.

There are two types of discourse, spoken discourse and written discourse (Dahal, 2010:22). Spoken and written discourse differs for many reasons. Spoken discourse is more complex, since it involves variations in speed (generally faster than writing), loudness/quietness, gestures/body language, intonation, pitch range, stress, rhythm, pausing and phrasing. Spoken discourse has to be understood immediately, while written discourse can be referred to many times. In classroom, spoken discourse dominates the process of transferring knowledge from teacher to students.

Language researchers since the early 1980s have turned more and more to Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) as a pedagogical and analytic tool for analyzing discourse within classroom (Breen and Candlin, 1980; Harman, 2008;

Shayegh, Hassanzadeh, and Hoseini, 2011). Scheppegrell (2004:3) argues for the importance of using SFL in the classroom discourse context as follows:

*In the absence of an explicit focus on language, students from certain social class backgrounds continue to be privileged and others to be disadvantaged in learning, assessment, and promotion, perpetuating the obvious inequities that exist today.*

SFL theory is one response to these demands.

SFL is functional approach to language, which sees language in social context (Lai, 2010:167). It fulfills three functions (metafunctions) of language use, namely: (a) to represent; (b) to exchange; and (c) to organize experience (Saragih, 2007:1). In the classroom, it analyzes and explains how meanings are made in within discourse.

SFL through its metafunctions has interpersonal metafunctions which deals with spoken discourse. The interpersonal metafunction refers to what kind of interpersonal relationship is being conveyed or constructed and what the roles and relationships are. Within the domain of interpersonal metafunction, spoken discourse in the class have frames for the interpretation of educational data in the linguistic basic needs. In the class, interpersonal metafunction shows how teacher and students establish and maintain social contact. It provides a basis for making claim about the ways in which information is being shared and meaning is being constructed in the classroom (Otten, 2010:9 and Bumela, 2012:106).

For revealing more information of interpersonal metafunction in the classroom, it would require an analysis of classroom discourse. The analysis of classroom discourse can provide insight about interpersonal metafunction. In classroom, the existence of interpersonal metafunction is controlled. Classroom controls interaction, turn-taking and structure of change in discourse.

There are power and control which are embedded in or hidden within a classroom discourse. Furthermore, Aman & Mustafa (2006:3) show that classroom discourse formally structured and controlled by one dominant party.

Teacher by virtue of their teaching status dominate classroom discourse. The classroom discourse led by the teacher and involving the whole class typically has large structural junctures that delimit lessons and task, and phases within them.

This condition becomes more complex in the classroom of social science subjects. Based on researcher experience, discourse within social science subjects basically lacks the ability to achieve the pedagogic aims of an integrative curriculum. This is due to classroom discourse having primarily interactive functions that marginalize knowledge input or thinking abilities. Besides, in such classroom discourse the priority is on teacher teaching that allows collectively minimal students involvement as compared to their intellectual needs. This kind of discourse is not beneficial to students and having this awareness can initiate improvements in education.

To expound the above idea, this research is conducted to analyze the classroom discourse on the basis of interpersonal metafunctions since it is very close for revealing the spoken discourse within the class, primarily in social science classroom.

## 1.2 The Problems of the Study

The problems of the study must be clearly stated so that the objective of the study and method used can be well determined. In line with the background, the problem of the study is formulated in the form of a question as follows.

1. What types of interpersonal metafunctions occur in the classroom discourse of Sociology, Economics, and History subjects?
2. How are the interpersonal metafunctions realized in the classroom discourse of Sociology, Economics, and History subjects?
3. How is the control of interpersonal metafunctions in the classroom discourse of Sociology, Economics, and History subjects?

## 1.3 The Objectives of the Study

Based on the above problems, the formulations of the objectives of the study are:

- 1) to investigate types of interpersonal metafunctions occur in the classroom discourse of Sociology, Economics, and History subjects;
- 2) to describe the realization of interpersonal metafunctions in the classroom discourse of Sociology, Economics, and History subjects;
- 3) to describe the control of interpersonal metafunctions in the classroom the discourse of Sociology, Economics, and History subjects.

#### **1.4 The Scope of the Study**

The scope of this study was focused on spoken discourse used by groups of teacher and students at social sciences classes, particularly Sociology, Economics, and History.

The analysis of spoken discourse was based on interpersonal metafunctions. The investigation was focused on the realization of mood and modality which occurred on the spoken discourse and control of such mood and modality in the classroom discourse.

#### **1.5 The Significances of the Study**

Theoretically, the findings are also useful for linguistic developments. It enriches the discussion about the application of functional grammar in classroom discourse. It reveals the discourse beyond the classroom.

Practically, the findings of this study are useful for teachers. It can be a good input for teacher for enriching their knowledge about classroom discourse. Furthermore, for linguist, these findings can be a good comparative study for the future research related to the application of the realization of interpersonal function in classroom discourse.