

Functional Communication by Primary Teacher in Framing an Effective Classroom

By
Yuli Christiana Yoedo
English Department
Faculty of Letters
Petra Christian University
yuli.christiana@yahoo.com

Abstract:

This paper proposes the importance of building functional communication in order to create an effective classroom. It reviews briefly the significance of the strategies, the features of classroom discourse and the approaches for investigating classroom discourse. Highlights are given to primary teachers because they lay the foundation of fundamental education for young generation. The knowledge of those three focuses guides teachers to create a better learning atmosphere for their students. Finally, this paper presents the description and examples to comprehend the strategies, the features and the approaches.

Key words: *functional communication, primary teacher, framing, effective classroom*

The communication patterns uncovered in language classrooms are extraordinary, different from those uncovered in content-based subjects. The communication is unique since the linguistic forms used are frequently at the same time the objective of a lesson and the means of accomplishing those objectives. In other words, meaning and message are one and the same thing. It is clear that language is both the focus of activity, the central objective of the lesson, as well as the instrument for achieving it, that is, the need of the students to use the language (Walsh, 2006: 3).

Simple utterances produced by the teacher might carry more than one meaning and function. By understanding the merits and shortcomings of the discussion in the classroom, important lesson can be obtained. It is beneficial to improve the teaching and learning of English language. By exploring classroom discourse, teachers hopefully will realize more their great impacts on the students at present and in the future. By emphasizing on functional communication in framing an effective classroom, teachers will prepare their students to enter real communication in the real world.

Knowing the huge impact on their students, teachers should always update their knowledge from a wide range of perspectives since professional understanding is multifarious. Other than, building and exploring knowledge from a variety of theoretical perspectives, teachers secure and expand what they know. They are responsible for adapting the curriculum to meet the needs of this diverse range of children. They need to understand the linguistic issues such children face and how to adapt the curriculum to promote rapid language learning (*see*: Ellis and McCartney, 2011: 1,2,6-7).

Why are primary teachers so important here? The reason is because they lay the foundation of fundamental education. Young generation has the rights to take advantage of the appropriate education as early as possible. They have the rights to get the opportunity to enjoy a conducive classroom learning atmosphere as much as possible.

Discussion

In order to frame an effective classroom, teacher needs to build functional communication. One of the strategies, for instance, is by introducing how to use certain pattern, not only the right form of the pattern in grammar teaching. Besides explaining how to make imperatives, teachers need to enlighten their students about the function, that is, imperatives are used between people who know each other well or to subordinate (see in Holmes, 1992: 293). Other examples:

Student's Expression	Teacher's Correction	Remarks
Will you help me?	Would you help me?	Instead of using 'will' in asking a request to an older/strange person, students are reminded to use 'would' to give a proper sense.
Can I go to the toilet?	May I go to the toilet?	In order to get a permission to go to toilet, 'may' is recommended. 'can' only reflects the ability.
Can you get it for me?	Can you get it for me, Please?	The students' expression is grammatically correct but it is improper if it is addressed to an older/strange person.

Larsen-Freeman (2010) confirms that it is not enough for the students only know the right form but they also need to use the form in context. She, then, explains that teaching grammar means guiding learners to use linguistic forms accurately, meaningfully, and appropriately. She proposes a balance between grammar and communication, between language form and language use.

There are, at least, two reasons why teachers ignore the function. First, it is because they have no knowledge of the function. The Second reason is because they lack sufficient understanding to improve the children's communication skills. Therefore, in the current educational climate it is particularly important that teachers have an understanding of applied linguistics. It is the time for teachers to pass a variety of applied linguistics lenses to children's work permits them to identify the wrong patterns and promote new ways of understanding, including the use of the patterns in correct situations (see Ellis and McCartney, 2011: 6).

The other strategy used by teachers is by broadening their perspective on classroom discourse. They need to know about the four features of classroom discourse. Other than, they also need to be familiar with three approaches offered to explore classroom discourse. These three approaches are important to be applied in observing their colleagues' classes or as a guideline to improve their own classroom discourse.

Exploring classroom discourse here refers essentially to the analysis of texts in classroom contexts, and especially to analysis of classroom talk. That is, the talk that

takesplace between teacher and students and between students in school (Hammond, 2011: 291). It is based on the assumption given by Cazden (1988) that what goes on in classroom is so composed by language (Hammond, 2011: 292). In addition, Chaudron (1988) notifies that teacher talk represents approximately two-thirds of classroom speech. According to Johnson (1995) this is the way how teacher control both the content and structure of classroom communication (see in Walsh, 2006: 5-7).

The four features of classroom discourse cover the control of patterns of communication, elicitation techniques, repair strategies and modifying speech to students. Teachers control most of the patterns of communication, mostly through the ways in which they limit or allow students' interaction, take control of the topic, and facilitate or deter learning opportunities. In this case, teachers should have the role to manage student contributions which will establish the success of a lesson. They are in charge not only to teach the language but also to arrange practice activities in the classroom (Walsh, 2006: 3).

Controlling the patterns of communication means that teachers control both the topic of conversation and the turn-taking. The teachers control them primarily by restricting or allowing students' interaction, taking control of the topic, and facilitating or hindering learning opportunities. The underlying structure is typically represented by sequences of discourse moves IRF, where *I* is teacher initiation, *R* is learner response and *F* is an optional evaluation or feedback by the teacher. The model is referred to as the IRF sequence, as illustrated below by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975):

- (I) T Two things to establish for the writer at the beginning of the story. One situation. What is the situation at the beginning of the story, anybody? What's the situation Douglas? Have you read the story Douglas?
- (R) S No sir.
- (F) T Ah that won't help then will it who's read the story what is the situation at the beginning, Michael? Is it Michael?

(Walsh, 2006)

As can be seen in above illustration, for every move made by the students, a teacher makes two. It supports what Chaudron (1988) concludes that teacher talk represents approximately two-thirds of classroom speech. According to Musumeci (1996), the teachers' and students' expectations regard question and answer routines are proper classroom behaviors. This is how conversation, in a classroom, is characterized. The feedback given by a teacher to a student is significant and needed to make the students feel good. Besides, the time constraints facing teachers confirm question and answer routines as the most effective means of progressing the discourse (Walsh, 2006: 5-7).

The second feature which most characterizes language classrooms is elicitation techniques. It deals with how a teacher asks questions to control the discourse. The importance a teacher's choice of questioning strategies can have on students' participation. A teacher's use of questions is the single most-used discourse modification to aid and maintain participation among students. Here, the teacher's questions facilitate the production of target language forms or correct content-related responses. His choice of elicitation technique or the use of appropriate questioning strategies depends on the function of a question in relation to what is being taught or the teacher's pedagogic goal. If the teacher's agenda at this stage in the lesson is to check comprehension, then his choice of elicitation technique, that is giving students the display and closed type of questions, is appropriate and in line with his pedagogic goal. If however, he aims to promote class discussion, a different type of questioning strategy

would be needed, using more open, referential questions. Open type of questions, such as why-questions, initiate longer response (Walsh, 2006: 7-9). In other words, the length and complexity of student's utterances are determined more by whether a question is closed or open than whether it is a referential or display one. It is obviously here that the length and type of student contributions are very strongly influenced by the nature of the questions being asked. Students have more interactional space and freedom in both what they say and when they say it in casual conversation and when teacher's comments are non-evaluative, relating more to the content of the message than the language used to express it (Walsh, 2006: 8).

According to Van Lier (1998), apart from questioning, the activity which most characterizes language classrooms is repair strategies or correction of errors. Correcting linguistic errors directly and overtly in the L2 formal context is not an embarrassing matter as long as the teachers are able to maintain face in the classroom. This feedback is needed since it is crucial to learning. Relating to pedagogic goals, teachers are open to many options whether to correct error directly or indirectly, overtly or covertly (Walsh, 2006: 10).

Van Liers (1996) adds that learning can only be optimized when teachers are sufficiently in control of both their teaching methodology and language use. Lynch (1996) suggests three reasons for the interest in language modification by teachers for students. First, this is important because of the link between comprehension and progress in L2. If students do not understand the input they receive, it is unlikely that they will progress. Second, is the issue of the influence of teacher language on student language. The third reason is the need for teachers to modify their speech owing to the difficulties experienced by students in understanding their teachers. Without some simplification or reduction in speed of delivery, it is highly unlikely that students would understand what was being said to them (Walsh, 2006: 12-13).

Chaudron (1988) finds that language teachers typically modify four aspects of their speech. In the first instance, vocabulary is simplified and idiomatic phrases are avoided. Second, grammar is simplified through the use of shorter, simpler utterances and increased use of present tense. Third, pronunciation is modified by the use of slower, clearer speech and by more widespread use of standard forms. Finally, teachers make increased use of gestures and facial expressions (Walsh, 2006: 12-13).

There are three approaches available for investigating classroom discourse, namely interaction analysis approaches, discourse analysis approaches, and conversation analysis approaches. Interaction analysis approaches comprise a series of observation instruments, or coding systems, which are used to record what the observer deems to be happening in the L2 classroom. From these recordings and the statistical treatment, classroom profiles can be established. These kinds of observation instruments possess the following features. First, they use some system of ticking boxes, making marks and recording what the observer sees. Second, they are reliable, enabling ease of comparison between observers and generalization of results. Third, they are essentially behaviorist, assuming a stimulus/response progression to classroom discourse. Fourth, they have been used extensively in teaching training, particularly for developing competencies and raising awareness (Walsh, 2006: 39-40).

Wallace (1998) divides interaction analysis approaches into the system-based approaches and the *ad hoc* approaches. The system-based approaches have a number of fixed categories so they do not need to design one from scratch and no need for validation. The system-based observation instruments provide several discourse models of classroom interaction. Bellack and colleagues (1966) offer three-part exchange: solicit, respond, react –

or as it is now more commonly described: initiation, response, feedback. Flanders (1970), developing Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC), provides classification as follows: Teacher talk, Pupil talk and Silence. Teacher Talk is classified into 1. Accept feelings, 2. Praises or encourages, 3. Accepts or uses ideas of pupils, 4. Ask questions, 5. Lectures, 6. Gives direction, 7. Criticizes or uses authority. Pupil Talk is classified into 1. Response and 2. Initiation. Meanwhile, Silence here focuses on the Period of silence or confusion. In 1984 Allen, Frohlich and Spada introduced their system *Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching (COLT)*. There was an attempt, in the instrument's 73 categories, to enable the observer to make a connection between teaching methodology and language use.

The instrument is directly linked to communicative methodology and considers how instructional differences impact on learning outcomes. It was formulated in two parts. Part A focuses on classroom organization, tasks, materials and levels of learner involvement. Part B analyses learner and teacher verbal interaction, considering such things as evidence of an information gap, the existence of sustained speech, the quantity of display versus referential questions. The COLT instrument is proper to be used in qualitative and quantitative modes of analysis (Walsh, 2006: 40-3).

The *ad hoc* approaches to classroom observation involve designing an instrument to address a specific pedagogic issue. It focuses on the detail of the interaction to understand complex phenomena which cannot be handled by system-based approaches. The focus of this instrument is teacher talk. The aim is to help teachers achieve a fuller understanding of the relationship between language use, interaction and opportunities for learning. They permit a finer grained understanding of a specific feature of the discourse. An *ad hoc* approach to interaction analysis is called SETT (Self-Evaluation of Teacher Talk) (Walsh, 2006: 44).

Here is the SETT instrument:

Feature of teacher talk	Tally	Examples from your recording
(a) Scaffolding		
(b) Direct repair		
(c) Content feedback		
(d) Extended wait-time		
(e) Referential questions		
(f) Seeking clarification		
(g) Confirmation checks		
(h) Extended learner turn		
(i) Teacher echo		
(j) Teacher interruptions		
(k) Extended teacher turn		
(l) Turn completion		

(m) Display questions		
(n) Form-focused feedback		

Here is the SETT key

Feature of teacher talk	Description
(a) Scaffolding	(1) Reformulation (rephrasing a learner's contribution) (2) Extension (extending a learner's contribution) (3) Modelling (correcting a learner's contribution)
(b) Direct repair	Correcting an error quickly and directly.
(c) Content feedback	Giving feedback to the message rather than the words used.
(d) Extended wait-time	Allowing sufficient time (several seconds) for students to respond or formulate a response.
(e) Referential questions	Genuine questions to which the teacher does not know the answer.
(f) Seeking clarification	(1) Teacher asks a student to clarify something the student has said. (2) Student asks teacher to clarify something the teacher has said.
(g) Confirmation checks	Making sure that teacher has correctly understood student's contribution.
(h) Extended student turn	Student turns of more than one clause.
(i) Teacher echo	(1) Teacher repeats a previous utterance. (2) Teacher repeats a student's contribution.
(j) Teacher interruptions	Interrupting a student's contribution.
(k) Extended teacher turn	Teacher turn of more than one clause.
(l) Turn completion	Completing a student's contribution for the student.
(m) Display questions	Asking questions to which teacher knows the answer.
(n) Form-focused feedback	Giving feedback on the words used, not the message.

The SETT framework is as follows:

The aim: to understand the relationship between language use, interaction and learning opportunity

(a). Research Questions:

1. In what ways do teachers, through their choice of language, create opportunities for learning?

2. How do teachers, through their use of language, increase opportunities for learner involvement?
3. What evidence is there that teachers 'fill in the gaps' or 'gloss over' student's contributions to create a smooth flowing discourse, thereby reducing opportunities for learning?

(b). Steps:

- Step 1: Look quickly through one of the lesson transcripts and make brief notes under the following headings (a) quantity and quality of teacher language; (b) quantity and quality of learner language; (c) appropriacy of teacher talk.
- Step 2: Watch the video EXTRACT. Using the transcript. Identify the different classroom modes. Comment on the type and purpose of teacher talk used in each mode.
- Step 3: Watch a second extract. Identify the different modes and be ready to comment on the appropriateness of teacher talk in each mode.
- Step 4: Look at the SETT instrument. Working with a colleague, comment on what you understand by each of the categories. Which categories would you expect to help hinder learner contributions?
- Step 5: Using the key to SETT, identify one example of each category in your own data. Make a note of the page and turn numbers. Check with a colleague if you are not sure.
- Step 6: Watch the first video extract again, this time using the SETT instrument and the transcript. Identify any examples of the SETT categories as you watch. Mark on the transcript using A-N. Compare with two colleagues and make a note of any differences in the categories you chose.
- Step 7: Listen to an audio-recording of part of a lesson. Using SETT, keep a tally of the different features of teacher talk. Write down one or two examples.

(Walsh, 2006: 165 – 170)

The second approach available for investigating classroom discourse is discourse analysis (hereafter DA) approaches. In 'traditional' primary school classrooms where status and power relations are demonstrated clearly, the most classroom communication is characterized by an IRF or IRE structure. Meanwhile, in the contemporary L2 classroom, where there is far more equality and partnership in the teaching-learning process, the interaction patterns are more complex. In this setting, an utterance can perform a multitude of functions. In this case, DA approaches need to be adopted (Walsh, 2006: 45-8).

Different speech communities emphasize different functions and express particular functions differently. There are a number of ways of categorizing the functions of speech. (1) Expressive utterances express the speaker's feelings. (2) Directive utterances attempt to get someone to do something. (3) Referential utterances provide information. (4) Metalinguistic utterances comment on language itself. Poetic utterances focus on aesthetic features of language. (5) Phatic utterances express solidarity and empathy with others. (see in Holmes, 1992: 285-6)

Finch (1998) proposes a set of language functions. Due to their diversity, functions of language might be divided into two categories: **micro functions** which refer to specific individual uses, and **macro functions** which serve more overall aims. There are seven functions belong to the first category, i.e. **physiological, phatic, recording, identifying, reasoning,**

communicating and pleasure. Physiological function serves the purpose to release physical and nervous energy. **Phatic function** is intended to link people and make the coexistence peaceful and pleasant. Recording function denotes using language to make a durable record of things that ought to be remembered. **Identifying function deals with the ability to** identify the objects and events. **Reasoning function** refers to the language as instrument of thought. **Communicating function** would probably be pointed at by most language users without major consideration. It covers requesting, apologizing, informing, ordering as well as promising and refusing. **Pleasure functions means that language** gives pleasure both to the speakers and listeners **through the use of assonance, alliteration, onomatopoeia**, syntactic rules, novelties of meanings juxtapositions and language games.

Finch (1998) appends that Macro functions include **ideational, interpersonal, poetic and textual functions**. Ideational function refers to the conceptualizing process involved in our mental activities. It makes us understand what happens around us. Interpersonal function emphasizes that language is mainly a social phenomenon. It enables to project the speaker in the desired way and to represent the speaker. **Poetic function** refers to the ability to manipulate language in a creative way. Textual function refers to the ability to create long utterances or pieces of writing which are both cohesive and coherent by using certain linguistic devices. The language functions which are related to our discussion are expressive, directive, referential, metalinguistic, **phatic, identifying, communicating and interpersonal function**. **Holmes' referential function actually works for the same purpose as Finch's informing function.**

Any utterance may in fact express more than one function, and any function may be expressed by a stretch of discourse which doesn't exactly coincide with an utterance. For example, *Yes, its beautiful* could be categorized as primarily expressive or phatic function. The directive function could be expressed either in direct or indirect way. There are many direct ways, such as: *please stand up, would you mind closing the door?, submit the homework*. The examples of indirect forms are: *your mouth must be tired, I can't hear the teacher's voice, You must be worn out*. Theses utterances are addressed to someone who is talking all the time beside the speaker when they should pay attention to the teacher's explanation (Holmes, 1992: 286-9). The speaker's consistency of using certain form of a directive shows his ideology. Ordering students to clean the whiteboard, teachers who respect their students prefer *please clean the whiteboard* to *clean the whiteboard*.

A little different from above discussion, there is another view. The classroom data might also be analyzed according to their structural patterning and function. For instance, the interrogative structure '*what time does this lesson end?*' could be interpreted as a request for information, an admonishment, a prompt or cue. The sample shows that one utterance may have more than one function. In terms of form, this kind of analysis is clearer. In terms of function, there are overlapping similarities between communicating function and a request for information (Walsh, 2006: 48).

Other than investigating the function and form of the teacher's utterances, the observation might be directed to the ideology and identity displayed by the teacher. As suggested by Kumaravadivelu (1999), in order to comprehend what actually happens in the L2 classroom, the observer needs to recognize the teachers' ideologies and identities (see in Walsh, 2006: 59). Concerning ideologies, Brian Paltridge (2006: 45) informs that ideologies often tend to be 'hidden' rather than overtly stated. Oxford Advanced Learner's dictionary defines ideology as manner of thinking, ideas of a person, group, etc. It is important to know

that texts are never ideology-free. Nor can they be separated from the social realities and processes they contribute to maintaining. Spoken and written genres are not just linguistic categories but also the performance of significant process by which dominant ideologies are transmitted .

There are a number of ways in which ideology might be explored in a text. For example, by looking at textual features in the text, looking at the framing of the text, relating the text to other texts, relating the text to readers' and speakers' own experiences and beliefs. The framing of the text here means how the content of the text is presented. What concepts and issues are emphasized (Paltridge, 2006: 45). Thus, teacher's style, a simple plane of linear variation within the speech of a single person, might reflect his ideology. For example, the teacher's drive to maintain particular speech might mirror his/her ideology Following Martin Joos's classification, there are the five levels of formality in spoken and written English 'frozen', 'formal', 'consultative', 'casual' and 'intimate' (see in Coupland, 2007: 1, 10, 43, 177). Teachers usually use the first three levels of formality, i.e 'frozen', 'formal' and 'consultative'. The teachers' choice to maintain particular level indicates the ideology that they want to uphold.

From the following scene from *Sex and the City* we can see Charlotte's ideology – the principle belonging to an individual or group. Carrie had just discovered an engagement ring in her boyfriend, Aiden's, overnight bag. She then went into the kitchen and vomited. She is telling her friends about this incident:

Charlotte	: You're getting engaged!
Carrie	: I threw up. I saw the ring and I threw up. That's not normal.
Samantha	: That's my reaction to marriage.
Miranda	: What do you think you might do if he asks?
Carrie	: I don't know.
Charlotte	: Just say yessss!!!!

The concept which is foregrounded in this conversation is that if a man asks a woman to marry him she could 'just say yes' (Paltridge, 2006: 45-46).

As mentioned earlier, grasping what actually takes place in the L2 classroom also involves an attentiveness of the teachers' identities. It is important since a teacher may possess a number of identities. The way in which teachers display their identities includes the way they use language, including their choice of levels of formality, and the way they interact with their students. The information a teacher gives off his identity depends on the context, place of interaction and purpose of discourse (Paltridge, 2006: 38-39). Meanwhile to make the classroom communicative, Nunan (1989) enlightens that the teacher has at least three main identities as a facilitator of the communicative process, as a participant, and as an observer and student. The different roles of the teacher will make students feel closer to him/her and feel free to express themselves.

Holmes (1992: 245, 248) confirms that the speaker's speech style is affected by the addressees and the context. In fact, it is also influenced by the speaker's ideology and identity (see: in Paltridge 2006: 38, 45). The speech style here encompasses the choice of vocabulary, grammatical construction and pronunciation (Holmes, 1992: 248; Walsh, 2006: 12). For examples, the primary school teachers will use short, simple sentences and common words. Concerning pronunciation, they will use slower, clearer speech and standard form. In a

Christian school, greeting like *Syallom*, which means *Salam damai sejahtera*, is common used either by teachers or students. This word, certainly, is not used in non Christian schools. The use of *Syallom* reflects the speaker's identity as a Christian. The teacher's decision to make use of short, simple sentences, common words, slower, clearer speech and standard form may reflect his ideology that a proficient teacher is a teacher who always understands his students and assists his students to comprehend the lesson.

The teacher's ideology may also be recognized through his repair strategies or correction of errors. The consistency of the way teacher correcting linguistic errors whether directly or indirectly, overtly or covertly really reflects his/her manner of thinking. The teacher's effort whether to maintain students' face or not in the classroom is important to observe.

Walsh (2006, 48) mentions the limitations of DA approaches in general. They do not succeed in detecting role relations, context and sociolinguistic norms which have to be followed. In short, a DA treatment fails to adequately account for the dynamic nature of classroom interaction and the fact that it is socially constructed by its participants. By the same token, DA approaches do not adequately account for the range of contexts in operation in a lesson and for the link between pedagogic purpose and language use. To overcome these shortcomings, conversation analysis (hereafter CA) approaches need to play their roles.

CA approaches focus on the function of language as a means for social interaction by giving emphasis to context and the sequence of utterance. Their primary philosophy is that social contexts are not static but are persistently being formed by the participants through the use of language and the ways in which turn-taking, openings and closures, sequencing of acts, and so on are locally managed. Interaction is examined in relation to meaning and context; the ways in which actions are sequenced is fundamental to the process. Heritage (1997) highlights that interaction is deemed to be context-shaped and context-renewing. It means that one contribution depends on a previous one and subsequent contributions create a new context for later actions. Context here is shaped and renewed by the participating students and teacher (see in Walsh, 2006: 50).

CA approaches are suitable for interpreting and account for the multi-layered structure of classroom interaction. Here no utterance is categorized in isolation and contributions are observed in sequence. The investigation includes (1) turn-taking organization, (2) turn design, (3) sequence organization, (4) lexical choice and (5) asymmetry of roles. (see in Walsh, 2006: 53).

According to Walsh (2006) the characteristics of the three approaches mentioned above are as follows:

I A approach	DA approach	CA approach
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear status & power relation between teacher and learner 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Far more equality & partnership 	Participants have equal status and rights
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher-initiated communication 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Far more learner-initiated communication 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Far more student-initiated communication
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher-fronted classroom interaction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less reliance on teacher-fronted classroom interaction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less reliance on teacher-fronted classroom

		interaction
• More quantitative	• More quantitative	• More qualitative
• Context: static	• Context: static	• Context: dynamic
• More Product-oriented Techniques	• More Product-oriented Techniques	• Process-oriented techniques
• Interpret from structural categories	• Interpret from functional categories	• Interpret from the data
• Aim: Fitting data to preconceived categories.	• Aim: Analyzing data according to their structural patterning and function.	• Aim: Analyzing the structural organization of the interaction as determined by the participants.
• There is preconceived set of descriptive categories at the outset.	• There is preconceived set of descriptive categories at the outset.	• There is no preconceived set of descriptive categories at the outset.

Conclusion

In order to frame an effective classroom, teachers need to build functional communication. It may happen by emphasizing the importance of functions, not only patterns in grammar teaching and by having more understanding on classroom discourse. By emphasizing on functional communication, teachers will prepare their students to enter real communication in the real world. By exploring classroom discourse, teachers hopefully will realize more their great impacts on the students at present and in the future. Primary school teachers also take this responsibility since they have to lay the fundamental base for the right education to the young generation. Hence, they call for highly particular and appropriate knowledge, directly arising from, and pertinent to, curriculum and real life. Such exploration is more valuable than providing extensive information of the structural patterns. Other than, teacher is linguistically more ideological compared to the students in terms of classroom communication.

In exploring classroom discourse, teachers need to know about the features of classroom discourse and approaches for analyzing classroom discourse. The knowledge concerning these areas help teachers to create effective classroom. The four features of classroom discourse cover control of patterns of communication, elicitation techniques, repair strategies and modifying speech to students. Meanwhile, there are three approaches which are suitable for investigating classroom discourse. They are interaction analysis approaches, discourse analysis approaches, and conversation analysis approaches. The characteristics of the classroom interaction determine the approaches to be employed.

References

- Coupland, Nikolas. 2007. *Style: Language Variation and Identity*. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Ellis, Sue and Elspeth McCartney. 2011. *Applied Linguistics and Primary School Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Finch G. 1998. *How to study linguistics*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Freeman, L. 2010. "The Communicative Approach." Techniques and Principles in language teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 123-138.
- Hammond, Jennifer. *Classroom Discourse* (p.291-305). *The Continuum Companion to Discourse Analysis*. (edited by Ken Hyland and Brian Paltridge). 2011. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Holmes, Janet. 1992. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman Publishing.
- Nunan, David. 1989. *Designing Task for the Communicative Classroom*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Paltridge, Brian. 2006. *Discourse Analysis*. New York: Continuum.
- Walsh, Steve. 2006. *Investigating Classroom Discourse*. New York: Routledge