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ABSTRACT
This study is concerned with the classroom discourse structure in English lesson in MTS Negeri Rantauprapat. The objectives of this study were to describe the classroom discourse structure, to describe how the classroom discourse are realized by teacher and students and the reasons for the realizations of the way they are. The source of the data in this study were English teacher and also the students while the data of the study are the utterances from the teacher and the students and non verbal as marked in the text. The instruments used for collecting data were video tape recorder and researcher’s field note. The data were collected by observing and recording the utterances uttered by the teacher and students and writing all non verbal linguistic that teacher and students did in the classroom while teaching learning process and classified them into types of exchanges as Sinclair and Coulthard theory. The findings of this study showed that the classroom discourse structures were dominantly realized by Initiation and Response (IR) structure. It was reflected in Teacher direct, Teacher elicit and teacher inform. There were some reasons why the realizations as the ways they are. (1) The teacher as a centre of interaction in the learning teaching process which is dominantly than the students. (2) The teacher gives some question without any caring to the evaluation, appreciation and feedback that makes the students only answer the teacher’s question without any feedback to make dialogue not suitable with IRF structure. (3) Students have been disciplined not to speak in classes without a teacher’s direction, and most of them are unwilling to speak English.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Classroom is a particular room in a school where the lesson and learning teaching process takes place. Classroom discourse tends to be a main major interaction in the class. It is a central interaction between teacher and students because most of time spent in the class is communication or spoken discourse. In the other hand, discourse is spoken or written communication between people especially serious discussion of particular subject and discourse underpins everything that occur in the classroom setting (Rhymes, 2008).

The objective of learning English in the classroom based on curriculum 2013 is to increase students’ skill in English communication (Nuh, 2014), that means the teacher is demanded to have good discourse and enable students to communicate in English. It is not easy thing for teacher and students to do it because English is still foreign language for them to use in their daily interaction. Thus, learning of English at schools can not be said successful because both teacher and students are busy with one goal, namely passing on the exam, although now the schools themselves hold the conversation exam for the students, the national exam is still what the teacher and students are worried about because what is stated in the curriculum is sometimes different from what is carried out in the classroom (Rini, 2014).

Classroom discourse is normally considered as ‘formal’ if the teacher want to teach, they should wear formal uniform, should behave and use polite discourse when they have interaction one each other. The
students also should do the same things if they want to come in and come out from the classroom, they should say ‘greeting, having excuse in advance and usually raising their hands if they want to ask questions or to give a comment and to suggest a suggestion. it is unlike ordinary conversation, teacher are rarely ask question to which they do not know the answer, however, teachers’ question in the classroom is normally want to know the students’ capability, to repeat and test previous lesson but in real time, people generally ask questions to find out something they do not know. All those activities are done by discourse between teachers and students in the classroom. Classroom discourse analysis has an important role in development of students skill in communication. Rymes (2008:5) stated that there are four reasons why classroom discourse is important to be analyzed: 1. Insight gained from classroom discourse analysis have enhanced mutual understanding between teachers and students, 2. Teachers have been able to understand local differences in classroom talk going beyond stereotypes or cultural generalization, 3. When teachers analyze discourse in their own classroom, academic achievement improve and 4. The process of doing classroom discourse analysis can itself foster an intrinsic and lifelong love for the practice of teaching and its general life affirming potential. In line with that Sinar (2007:2) added and commented that teachers’ discourse will enable the students develop through activities in the classroom. Furthermore, Marshall (2012) also argued that classroom discourse can affect various aspects of student learning in science. In the same way, as teacher who teaches in the classroom, they are demanded to utilize classroom discourse to keep engage students on communication practice, to enhance and evaluate their communication skill.

The model of analysis will be used in this study is Sinclair and Coulthard (1975), he developed a model of classroom discourse involving a series of ranks and levels arranged in hierarchical order. A structure of three-part exchanges: Initiation (I), Response (R), and Feedback (F), known as IRF. The example of classroom analysis, as follow:

Teacher: Good Morning (Initiation :I)
Student: Morning (Response :R)
Teacher: Good, thanks (Feedback : F)

These three moves above, the teacher’s initiation, the student’s response and the teacher’s feedback, consist of an exchange. Sinclair and Coulthard proposes that in teacher-student interactions, the response part of the exchange was typically followed by a third move on the teacher’s part. This move consists of an evaluative commentary on the students’ response, which they termed as feedback. This feedback move is a function of the teacher’s power to control language and meaning since it signals what is to be viewed as relevant knowledge within the discourse. The IRF sequence has been widely accepted by the researchers as a beneficial category to analyze the classroom discourse.

In other case, one teacher does not use English discourse in teaching English, it is stated by Simbolon (2014:01) in her recently study that English teacher and student are using source language a long their learning teaching process, they forget that the objective of teaching English is to enable students to be able to speak or communicate in English. And also he claims many teachers, especially English teachers, who teach English in school, almost do not teach in English. They focus on their attention on the transformation of academic knowledge or skills in source language.

Therefore, one of the most important to view intensively in this study is The analysis of classroom discourse structure in the teaching process because when both teacher and student can use and utilize the opportunity in the classroom as well as possible, thus, they will be easily to master English as a tool of communication in their daily classroom interaction.
Based on consideration above, it may now realize how important it is to study classroom discourse analysis to help and make students able to communicate in English. Walsh (2011:35) argues that one of the most useful ways to help teachers develop and improve their professional practices is to place classroom discourse at the centre of the process. By helping teachers understand interactional processes more fully and by getting teachers to study their own use of language and its effects on learning, it is possible to greatly enhance deep understandings of classroom processes, thereby improving the quality of both teaching and learning. In line with point of view above, Simbolon (2014:5) sums up in her current study that to get students able to communicate in English at school; there should be teachers who have good discourse in English.

In accordance with this background, language teachers need to conduct classroom discourse Analysis as a tool to improve their own teaching quality and most importantly the education of their own students in general, therefore, the researcher want to carry out the research about the analysis of classroom discourse structure in MTS Negeri Rantauprapat in Labuhanbatu. Through this research, it is hoped can provide contribution and new finding that classroom discourse will give impact to enhance and generate teachers’ quality and students’ outcome. The researcher chooses the school is because it is model for other school in Labuhanbatu.

II. RESEARCH QUESTION
1. What are the structures of the classroom discourse?
2. How is the classroom discourse realized by the teacher and students?
3. Why is classroom discourse realized is the way it is?

1. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The centre activity of teaching learning process is normally used and took place in the classroom. The term classroom discourse refers to the language that teacher and students use to communicate with each other in the classroom. Talking, or conversation, is the medium through which most teaching takes place, so the study of classroom discourse is the study of the process of face-to-face classroom teaching. The framework analysis of the authentic language in classroom discourse will be analyzed by using the Sinclair and Coulthard model of Initiation, Response, Feedback (IRF) structure. An initiation is realized by an opening move which causes others to participate in an exchange. A response is realized by an answering move, the function of which is to be an appropriate reply to the opening move. Follow-up moves then realize the feedback element; they let a pupil know how well he or she has performed.

The structures of classroom discourse consist of the IRF exchange, namely initiation by the teacher, followed by students’ response and then followed by teacher’s feedback to evaluate and appreciate the students’ response. The ideal discourse structure in the classroom is expected tend comprises IRF structure between teacher and students communication in the classroom.

Sinclair and Coulthard model has five class, 1. Lesson, 2. Transaction, 3. Exchange, 4. Move, 5. Acts. The lesson is the highest class and act is the smallest level in the classroom discourse. The ‘act’ is the smallest rank of discourse; there are twenty-two types of acts, but the three most important emerged are ‘elicitation’, ‘directive’ and ‘informative’. Elicitations function to request a linguistic response, directives request a nonlinguistic response such as writing or listening, and informative convey facts or ideas. Acts combine together to form five move, There are five classes of moves,
Firstly, there are framing moves, which are used to structure the lesson and are often followed by focusing moves, which are there to draw students’ attention to the direction of the lesson.

III. RESEARCH METHOD

The researcher briefly applies qualitative descriptive or content analysis research design. Descriptive research design simply describes what data shows or what is going on by counting the percentage of what is set source of the data. Qualitative analysis is then applied to find out theoretically how teacher and students discourse structure realized in the classroom. In the other word, qualitative research is conducted through intense with participants in naturalistic setting to investigate the everyday or exceptional lives of individual. Groups, societies, and organizations (Miles and Huberman, 2014)

According to Bogdan and Biklen (1982) stated that a research is descriptive with the natural setting as the direct source of the data and the researcher is the key instrument. In this thesis, the data will be analyzed based on Miles and Huberman (2014:31), the analysis consist of three concurrent flows of activity; 1. Data condensation, 2. Data display and 3. Conclusion drawing/verification.

IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Based on the problems of the study, theoretical review, and data analysis, the following findings elaborate the objective answer of the problems of this study.

1. The classroom discourse structures were dominantly realized by Initiation and Response (IR) structure. It was reflected in Teacher direct, Teacher elicit and teacher information exchanges.

2. It was found that the classroom discourse structures were only three exchanges as most dominantly occurred in MTS Negeri Rantauprapat. They are teacher direct, teacher elicit and teacher inform. The other exchanges occur are boundary (framing and focusing move), , Directive, Informing, check, accept, React, Reply, nomination, marker, Bid and conclusion.

3. These classroom discourse structure were occurred for some reasons. It is because (1) the teacher as a centre of interaction in the learning teaching process which is dominantly than the students. (2) The teacher gives some question without any caring to the evaluation, appreciation and feedback that makes the students only answer the teacher’s question without any feedback to make dialogue be suitable with IRF structure. (3) Students have been disciplined not to speak in classes without a teacher’s direction, and most of them are unwilling to speak English in front of their classmates because they fear making mistakes and causing laugh from others. The students simply can not speak freely because of their poor spoken English, so they only speak when they were asked to in most of particular cases in the class.

V. DISCUSSION

The classroom discourse structure in MTS Negeri Rantauprapat was analyzed and only the exchanges occurred in it. It was found that not all exchanges occurred in the transaction of the discourse. Sinclair and Coulthard divided the classroom discourse structure into eleven subdivisions exchanges, they are teacher elicit, teacher direct, teacher inform, pupil elicit, pupil inform, check, Re-initiation (II), Listing, Reinforce, and Repeat.
In this research it was found that there were only teacher direct, teacher elicit and teacher information as the most dominantly occurred and check, repeat, reinforce, boundary and reinitiation also occurred but in least quantity.

These structures were also formed dominantly by IR structure. Feedback was seldom occurred in the structures. It can be seen in teacher elicit exchange. The exchange without feedback makes the dialogue between teacher and students in one particular way of communication.

The structures occurred for some reasons. (1) The teacher as a centre of interaction in the learning teaching process which is dominantly than the students. As Nunan (1989:76) has pointed that “If we want to enrich our understanding of language learning and teaching, we need to spend time looking in classroom. (2) The teacher gives some question without any caring to the evaluation, appreciation and feedback that makes the students only answer the teacher’s question without any feedback to make dialogue not suitable with IRF structure. Meanwhile (Richards and Rodgers in Yu (2009); suggested that teachers’ responsibility is to organize the classroom as a setting for communication and communicative activities. (3) Students have been disciplined not to speak in classes without a teacher’s direction, and most of them are unwilling to speak English in front of their classmates because they fear making mistakes and causing laugh from others. The students simply can not speak freely because of their poor spoken English, so they only speak when they were asked to in most of cases in the class.

Related to the discussion of this study, the following suggestions are suggested:

It is suggested that English teacher should apply IRF structure and analyze their subject or lesson material by using Sinclair and Coulthard theory to find out their classroom discourse structures so they can achieve and chase the quality of their teaching learning process in the class. It is suggested that teacher should give any feedback such as evaluation and appreciation to students in every exchange they communicate in the class, especially for elicitation exchange. It is suggested that teacher gives chances for the students to practice based on their mind freely and appreciate them and then hopefully the classroom have a good discourse structures in the English communication and it will contribute to the effectiveness of teacher students’ outcome and result in English classroom discourse in the class. It is suggested to the next researcher to study classroom discourse structure between teacher and students in the learning teaching process which related with cultural implication and social perspective.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

Based on result and discussion held previously, it could be drawn a conclusion. The study concerned on English classroom discourse in MTS Negeri Rantauprapat. The objectives of this study are to describe the classroom discourse Structures, to describe how classroom discourse structures are realized by teacher and students, and to reason for the realizations of the way they are. After having analyzed the data, the conclusions are stated as follows:

1. The classroom discourse structures were dominantly realized by Initiation and Response (IR) structure. It was reflected in Teacher direct, Teacher elicit and teacher information exchanges.
2. It was found that the classroom discourse structures were only three
exchanges as most dominantly occurred in MTS Negeri Rantauprapat. They are teacher direct, teacher elicit and teacher inform. The other exchanges occur are boundary (framing and focusing move), , Directive, Informing, check, accept, React, Reply, nomination, marker, Bid and conclusion.

3. These classroom discourse structure were occurred for some reasons. It is because (1) the teacher as a centre of interaction in the learning teaching process which is dominantly than the students. (2) The teacher gives some question without any caring to the evaluation, appreciation and feedback that makes the students only answer the teacher’s question without any feedback to make dialogue be suitable with IRF structure. (3) Students have been disciplined not to speak in classes without a teacher’s direction, and most of them are unwilling to speak English in front of their classmates because they fear making mistakes and causing laugh from others. The students simply can not speak freely because of their poor spoken English.
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