English Education Journal

Realization of Actional and Formulaic Competence in Teachers' Talk in English Language Class

Andi Tenry Lawangen Aspat Colle⊠, Sri Wuli Fitriati

Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Article Info	Abstract
  	A number of studies have investigated the phenomenon of teachers' talk to explain its role in the process of acquiring a target language in a classroom setting. However, studies of teachers' talk in the field of communicative competence and it sub-competence have not much done yet. Three English teachers at SMAN 1 Semarang, SMA Nasional Karangturi Semarang, and SMA Mardisiswa Semarang were involved in this spoken discourse study to explain the realization of actional competence which proposed by Celce_Murcia et al. (1995) and formulaic competence based on the Biber et al's. (2004) theory in teachers' talk. Furthermore, this study also explained the relationship between those competencies. The findings of this study revealed that English teachers mostly performed actional competence in five sub-categories namely asking questions, giving instructions, explaining, reacting to interlocutors' speech, and complementing. Related to the realization of lexical bundles, teachers' talk mainly contained verb phrase along with dependent clauses. In contrast, lexical bundles that incorporate noun phrase and preposition fragments accounted for only a small proportion of lexical bundles. Dealing with the relationship between both competences, it revealed that there is a stock of lexical bundles on each language function. Seeing there is a relationship between both competences, the teachers must choose appropriate utterances in a given situation as the model for the students. The teachers need to maintain a balance, they are not only focused on grammar and pronunciation, but also have adequate knowledge and competence of lexical bundles for performing appropriate language functions. © 2019 Universitas Negeri Semarang

⊠Correspondence Address:
Kampus Pascasarjana Unnes, Jalan Kelud Utara III Semarang 50237, Indonesia
E-mail: tenry.colle@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

In Indonesia, most students are frequently exposed to English in the classroom. In other words, classroom language is the chief source of foreign language learning and in some places are the only source. The kind of language used by the teacher for instruction in the classroom is known as Teacher's Talk. According to Sinclair and Brazil (1982), teacher's talk is the language in the classroom employed to give directions, explain, and check students' understanding. Seen from that definition, it can be said that when those three kinds of activities occurred, language functions are also derived. The functional use of language is not only based on certain grammatical rules but also it is how we understand the context and use the language in order to fulfill those purposes. In brief, a language function is a language that is performed for social purposes.

In this study, I focused on the realization of language functions in teachers' talk and highlight seven categories of language functions which proposed by Celce-Murica et al. (1995) in actional competence. Seven categories of language functions in this competence are an interpersonal exchange, information exchange, opinions, feelings, suasion, problems, and future scenarios (1995). Furthermore, Celce Murcia et al., said that "the frequency of language functions in real life communication has resulted in highly conventionalized forms, fixed phrases and formulaic expression in every language" (1995, p.19).

In other word, language functions are typically associated with conventionalized formulaic routines. Consequently, teachers also need to build up a repertoire of such phrases in their talk to be able to perform language function effectively. Thus, Celce-Murica (2007) added a new component of communicative competence was formulaic competence. Formulaic competence under investigated in this study was lexical bundles because those are a recurring sequence of three or more words that appear frequently in natural discourse, either oral or written (Biber et al., 2004).

Researches and practices about actional and formulaic competence in language education have been conducted in various context, such as actional competence in students' talk (Sutopo, 2015), formulaic competence in conversation (Neno & Agusties, 2016; Khusnita & Rukmini, 2016), formulaic competence on written discourse (Rukmini & Sugiati, 2017), teachers' talk time (Rezaee & Farahian, 2012, Liu & Zhu, 2012; Tsegaye & Davidson, 2014; Husna, Hartono & Sofwan, 2015).

Sutopo (2015) concerned on how language functions acquired by a student of pre-school at Mondial Education. The study concluded that with the parents help the child acquired a number of language functions namely interpersonal exchange, information exchange, opinions, feelings, suasion, problems, and future scenarios. In another context, Neno and Agustien (2016) carried out a descriptive qualitative study about formulaic competence manifested in students' interaction of English Study Program in Timor State University. It was found that the students used collocations and lexical bundles mostly. Similarly, Khusnita and Rukmini (2016) investigated realization of formulaic competence in 13 students of English Department of UNNES Graduate Program. The finding indicated that inserts were produced mostly, followed by collocation. In addition, it was known that the students were more familiar with literal meanings instead of idiomatic meanings. However, there were many unnatural expressions in their interactions therefore formulaic expressions have to get more attention in teaching instruction.

Rukmini and Sugiati (2017) analyzed the application of formulaic expressions in the conversation texts of senior high school English textbooks grade X, XI, and XII entitled "Bahasa Inggris". The result demonstrated there were only four of five formulaic expressions types identified, they were lexical bundles, idiomatic phrases, collocations, and inserts. Meanwhile, they did not frequently occur in the conversation texts of the textbooks. It was concluded that the expressions were not native-like, so the

conversation texts of the textbooks need to be improved.

In teachers' talk time context, Rezaee and Farahian (2012) asked 12 intermediate learners to participate in their study to examine the amount of teacher talk in the classroom and investigated the role of teachers' questions on students' learning. The results of the study showed that in each class session, 62% to 73% of the class time was devoted to teacher talk and almost 20% to 25% was allocated to student talk with the rest of the class time devoted to other tasks such as the groups works to related questions or issues raised by the teacher to the whole class.

In addition, Liu and Zhu (2012) analyzed the phenomenon of teacher talk time in college English class in University of Jinan (UJN). The finding revealed that teacher talk time dominated most of the class time, which coincided with the questionnaires, 67% of respondents thought that their teacher spoke more than 20 minutes per class. Further, Tsegaye and Davidson (2014) researched the proportion of teacher and students talking time in the language classroom in the Ethiopian context. It was found that EFL teachers used an average of 83.4% and students were only an average of 16.6% of the classroom time to talk. This implies that teachers dominated the class and gave less opportunity for students' interaction and language use which was against the rule of communicative language teaching.

Moreover, Behtash and Azarnia (2015) addressed the teacher's talk time of 4 Iranian language school teachers. The findings revealed that teachers talk had a large proportion of class time that was almost 75% of the class time while student talk time (STT) comprised less than 20% of the class time. Lastly, Husna, Hartono, and Sofwan (2015) aimed at finding out the pattern of teacher's talks and students' talks occurred during the classroom interaction of the second semester of Cendekia Utama Nursing College. The result showed that the most dominant pattern occurred in the classroom interaction was the teacher spent (55.7%) while students spent (40.3%) in their time. The findings of those studies above were in line with the literature reviewed on TTT which came to the conclusion that teacher talk usually comprises more than two-thirds of the class time. Thus, one-way communication still dominants class teaching and learning.

The studies reviewed above show that there are many teachers' talk studies that have been conducted in various contexts. However, studies of teachers' talk in the field of communicative competence have not much done yet. Whereas, the purpose of teaching English as a foreign language in Indonesia under the 2013 curriculum is to develop students' communicative competency both oral and written language (Permendikbud, 2016). Therefore, the language instruction used by the teachers must be integrated with the component of communicative competence such as actional and formulaic competence.

The appropriate model of language functions and lexical bundles in teachers' talk are important for students in English acquisition. Thus, this research intends to fill the gap with the focus on the realization of actional and formulaic competence as sub-competence of communicative competence at teachers' talk. This study is needed to be done to give a contribution to the theory of communicative competence in terms of actional and formulaic competence, and its contribution to English language teaching and learning in the Indonesian context.

METHOD

This study belonged to qualitative research used spoken-discourse analysis research. According to Boston (2002), spoken discourse analysis is the analysis in the field of spoken and focus to its functions. Functions here mean that the analysis focuses on the meaning, the intention and the one's reason for saying it. Thus, in this study, I explained the actional and formulaic competence which were realized in teachers' talk in English language class. The research participants were one

Indonesian male teacher of English in SMA Negeri 1 Semarang. He was addressed as Teacher A. And, two female English teachers in SMA Nasional Karangturi Semarang and SMA Mardisiswa Semarang. They were addressed as Teacher B and C respectively. The instruments of this study were audio tape recordings and an interview guidelines. There were four steps in the procedures of analyzing data, namely: transcribing, highlighting, classifying, and analyzing. Based on the need of the study, I used investigation triangulation to minimize the subjectivity of the researcher's interpretation. The expert involved in this study was Dr. Fernandes Arung, M.Pd. He is a lecturer in Sembilanbelas November Kolaka who has previously conducted some researches related to communicative competence qualitatively. Besides investigation triangulation, member checking also was used to validate the judgments towards the findings where English teachers of SMA Negeri 1 Semarang, SMA Nasional Karangturi Semarang, and SMA Mardisiswa Semarang were interviewed in order to confirm the language functions used in the classroom.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section provides realization of actional and formulaic competence in teachers' talk, in addition, the relationship between both of competencies in spoken discourse.

Realization of Actional Competence in Teachers' Talk in English language class

Interpersonal Exchanges
Greeting

Tt.1 : Assalamualaikum Warahmatullahi Wabarakatuh

Ts.1 : Waalaikumsalam warahmatulahi Wabarakatuh

Tt.2 : Good morning Guys!

Ts.2 : Morning, sir

How are you today?

t.3

From the excerpt above, the greeting was the first words exchanged by the interlocutors. The teacher usually did it in the opening phase, before they started the activity and welcomed the students who joined the class that day. It was indicated by the clause *Assalamualaikum Warahmatullahi Wabarakatuh*, *Good morning* then followed by saying the addressee name was *guys*. In addition, greeting expression from teacher A followed by the students' response by replying *morning, Sir* as well, and then continued to the content of the conversation, pre-sequence before content noticed in this turn-taking in form of asking students' live (*how are you today*).

Leave Taking,

During teaching activity, the teacher performed leave-taking by utilizing the expression *Happy weekend everyone* which is a sign of stating goodbye.

Identifying oneself,

The English teacher introduced myself to the students as the researcher who joined in their English language class that day. It could be noticed by the clause *I'll tell you a bit about her. She is a student from Semarang State University, She's ….*

Expressing gratitude,

The example of the expressing gratitude that is expressed by saying *thank you.*

Expressing compliment/praising,

Most of the acts of complimenting in this research were expressed by using the word "good". It occurred frequently in the whole lesson. In accordance with that, Crespo (2002) states that the teacher gave compliment or praises will help students to build their self-esteem in order to convey their thoughts.

Thus, teacher's activities are not only conducting lesson plan and develop teaching material but also praise and encouragement in motivating students to learn as Thomas in Burnett (2002) referred praise as the positive reinforcement to stimulate desirable behavior.

He also suggested that praise could be a motivational tool in not only classroom interaction but also teacher-students relation by describing behavior or assignment that merits the praise, mentioning student's name, and choosing the praise word carefully. In other words, in doing their daily activities in the classroom, the teacher can support students with praising, complimenting and tell the students that their ideas and works are valuable.

Reacting to interlocutor's speech

It is used to indicate that someone gives attention or follow the speaker's speech. The teacher performed this language function by repeating the student's answer.

Information Exchanges
Asking Questions,

It was marked by the use of interrogative form in term of WH-Question *(How do you translate word proverbs into Indonesia?)* and Yes-No question *(Do you know what proverbs mean).* Language function of asking question appeared to be the most frequent one in teachers' talk. The result of the current study is consistent with the findings of the previous studies (Sofyan & Mahmud, 2014; Putri, 2015; Aisyah, 2016; Winarti, 2017) which concluded that teachers' questions take up a very high percentage of teachers' talk in language classrooms. Questioning is demonstrated as being widely used in the observed EFL classrooms because asking questions have some functions such as:

Building Interaction

To elicit the data about the first function of asking the question, I utilized interviews. The result of the interview showed the teachers agreed that the role of the teacher's question in facilitating language learning in the classroom was very important. Giving question is important in terms of building interaction in the classroom.Teacher C

"Memberikan pertanyaan juga bisa sebagai bahan exercise untuk speaking. Jadi, ketika saya menanyakan sesuatu dalam Bahasa Inggris, mereka menjawabnya meskipun tidak sempurna semua Inggrisnya, mesti satu dua tiga kosakata yang pakai Bahasa Inggris, ada beberapa anak yang dicampur, bagi saya itu tidak masalah, membuat anak belajar latihan berkomunikasi didalam kelas" *(Giving question to the students can be used as the speaking exercise. When I ask something in English, although they answer my question imperfectly, some students combine between English and Indonesia, but I think, it is no a problem, as far as they can practice their ability to communicate in the classroom)*

In teacher-students interactions, increasing the use of questions from teachers could develop the active participation of students as Yanfen and Yuqin (2010) stated, "By asking students some questions, the interaction will be motivated quickly and heatedly." This is also consistent with Qashoa's study (2013) which revealed that teachers engage in a large amount of questioning since questioning is a key tool for classroom interaction. The data collected confirmed that the use of the questioning techniques used in English classes helped students become more involved in classroom interaction

Checking Students Understanding & Reviewing the Previous Material

The teacher is likely to ask for students' understanding within an issue. Look at to the excerpt below:

T.143 : Okay, today we gonna be talking about proverbs and riddles. So, do you know what proverb means? Do you know what proverbs mean? The proverb means in Indonesia, I give you an example, like 'United we stand, divided we fall'. That one of the proverb. What is it? 'There is no gain, without pain'. That's proverbs. *(What what)* What are they?
T.144 : Yes, what do you call it in Indonesia then?
(Teacher A)

In the presented excerpt, the question was asked in order to assist students in getting the notion of the proverbs. Teacher A asked students by saying *"Do you know what proverb means?"* in which account the close-ended questions as students answered with a short phrase *"Yes"* This type of questions is often being administered by the teacher as he always trying to ensure students understand each word that becomes the topic material in teaching activity. Questions were not merely given to ensure students' understanding, the teacher also asked the students to review the previous material given as said by teacher C in the interview section.

"Giving question itu saya gunakan sebagai satu tolak ukur, tolak ukur dalam mengukur kemampuan siswa atau mengukur seberapa jauh pemahaman siswa

dalam memahami penjelasan atau materi yang saya sampaikan … untuk mereview mata pelajaran, atau materi yang sudah disampaikan sebelumnya tadi" (I performed giving question activity as a tool in order to measure the students' understanding about the material given by me …. It also used for review the previous material)

She often reviewed the previous material by asking questions because she assumed that the students would try to understand every question from the teacher and remember it. In addition, the teachers often repeated their questions many times until the students could answer them correctly. The elaboration above, in line with Xiao Yan (2006) statement who stated that teacher used questions for the following purposes: to check or test understanding, knowledge or skill and to get learners to review and practice previously learned material.

<u>Stimulating the Students' Interest/Participation in Learning</u>

Research by Gall (1984, p.56) reveals that "questioning can stimulate students' interest, encourage them to think and focus on the lesson content." On the other hand, the role of teachers in asking the question is very essential to make students talk a lot and to give them the opportunity to think a lot as well. In Nystrand and Gamoran (1997) as cited in Zhang (2010) stated that only authentic discourse can engage students, and authentic questions must stimulate students to think and reflect on the consequences of their ideas, not just recall their past experiences. Then, Al-Farsi (2006) stated that the teachers sometimes used questions to give new information. Example:

Okay, today we gonna be talking about proverbs and riddles. So, do you know what proverb means? Do you know what proverbs mean? The proverb means in Indonesia, I give you an example, like 'United we stand, divided we fall'. That one of the proverb. What is it? 'There is no gain, without pain'. That's proverbs. (What what) What are they?

(Teacher A)

Teachers A gave the students new vocabulary that the students might be not known before. He did not give them the meaning in Bahasa Indonesia directly, but he preferred to give them many questions as a clue so that the students could catch the meaning. According to the result of the interview, the reason for the teacher used this way was to

encourage them to think first in order to make them understand the meaning of the new word by themselves. The role of the teacher here was a facilitator in the learning process in the classroom. Brown (2001) explained that a less directive role might be described as facilitating the process of learning, of making learning easier for students: helping them to clear way roadblocks, to find shortcuts, to negotiate rough terrain.

Giving Information

The goal of informing is to tell someone about certain facts they do not know. Informing was occurred in teachers' talk as in example as follows:

T.283 : *Waktu sangat berharga atau penting maka manusia harus menggunakan waktu sebaik mungkin.* Do you use time very well? ….

T.284 : For the western people, time is money. If you work to someone and then you can't be a lazy worker at all. Because they have already paid you some money, so they will ask you to come up with the good work. Even maybe when you fell *(fell)* bit unwell and then they will say 'come on, you have to work because I have paid you' that happens in the western. Then, number two kinds of proverbs. We have aphorism. These proverbs offer advice.

(Teacher A

Teacher A informed the students about western working habit which is very disciplined. Then, he continued told his students that although you were sick, you still need to go work because they have already paid you. The language function of giving information produced by the teacher above was expressed in order to enrich the students' knowledge.

Explaining

The example of it is presented in the highlighted below:

T.42 : Opposing views. At the same or different views?

T.43 : Yes, see. Paragraph two and three in opinion essay, explain two things of the same points of views. And paragraph four you guys also address the opposing opinion. Opinions which are different from paragraph two and paragraph three.

(Teacher B)

Teacher B was trying to enlighten the students about the generic structures of opinion essay. She explained the material after the students answered her question, where she

explained that paragraph two and three in opinion essay provide two similar points of views and the fourth paragraph explain the opposing point of view.

Giving explanation or lecturing is the most important part in teaching and learning as it where all the information is being conveyed to the students in the teaching and learning process. It was a dominant language function in all classes. As Putri (2015) revealed in her study about the type of teacher talk in EFL class of a vocational school in Bandung which was showed, teacher relied hard on asking questions then, lecturing the students. In line with Yanfen and Yuqin's study (2010), giving explanation was also in a high number of teacher talk after asking questions.

The teachers in the classes explained more about the new material that the students never knew before. For example, in the first meeting in Teacher A class, the teacher was going to explain the material about proverb and riddles *(Now we gonna be talking about proverb and riddles. Okay. We are going to talk about proverb and riddles)*. He used the word "to be going to," in this case, the teacher would explain much information about the topic to make the students understand.

Expression of Opinions
Expressing opinion
Relating to this language function, the teachers performed it to state their though. It was acknowledged as *I think.*

Finding Out about Someone's Opinion
The teachers performed this expression in form of WH-Question by saying *what do you think it is important?* In another occasion, the English teachers also performed this in Yes-No form (*Do you think having breakfast is important?*) and modal/semi-modal verb question (*Can I have other opinions?*)

Expressing Feelings
Expressing of likeness
It showed in the utterances I would be glad if you come forward voluntarily.

Expressing of dislike
It was acknowledged by utterances *I don't like pointing.*

Expressing of disappointment,
An example of stating disappointment is exemplified below:

T.1	:	So, the reason why I do not, I did not respond immediately to Solomon, an apology is because I have mix feeling
T.2	:	I have mix feeling of wanting to understand the situation and disappointed at the same time. By the way, Mo, even before you said that you already forgiven.
T.3	:	Okay, boys, girls, we need to go quickly as we already lose fifty minutes. Well, for today. Let's just feel okay about this. I just hope that next Friday things would be better.

(Teacher B)

In this context, the teacher expressed this feeling because almost her students came late in the classroom after joining Science class in the laboratory.

Dealing with feelings had a small frequent of teacher talk type during the observation. It was in a line with Zambrano's study (2003) that dealing with feelings shown by the teacher was only 0.48%. It means that dealing with feelings rarely happened in the class. It also supported by Nasir, Daud, and Masturah's research (2016) which investigated the categories of teacher's talk that occurred in an English classroom of a senior high school in Banda Aceh. The result of this study showed the lowest frequency of the teacher's talk type during the observation was dealing with feeling. This type of teacher's talk took place only 7 utterances (1.5%) during three meetings.

Expression of Suasion
Giving Suggestion
The aim of suggesting is to give or mention an idea, possible plan, and action for other people to consider. The example of giving suggestion in teacher's talk was *You'd better ask your father. 'Father, tell me what my name is? What does it mean?'*

Requesting
The purpose of requesting is to ask politely something or someone to do something. The teacher produced requesting during the

teaching and learning process as shown in the clause *Can you share it.*

Giving Instruction/Directions

All teachers often gave many instructions/directions during the classes. Because it was one way to make the students practicing their English in the classroom. The example of this expression was teacher A instructed the students to close their books repeatedly when he tried to dig the students' prior knowledge up about topic under discussion that day by saying *Close it! Close it! Close your book, please! It is not the time to open your book, yet* (T.78) and *Hallo! Okay. Close your book!* (T.79).

This language function category also took up dominant portion from the whole lesson. The direction was provided in order to guide students doing given assignments. As Brown (2001) states that students need directions and facilitations regarding how they should demonstrate the whole ideas they own systematically. The instructions were given whenever students are asked to have group discussions, doing a presentation, or reading a passage.

T.149	:	Guys. Then you choose five of them, if you have reasons please tell your friend why do you choose those five proverbs no the other proverbs. You may come up with the reasons, each of it or maybe the whole you talk about the reasons in general about why you choose those five proverbs. At least, you have reasons why you choose that one. *Minimal ada alasannya sih kenapa sih kamu memilih sebanyak itu kok hanya* five of them.
T.150	:	After choosing them, memorize them, and then, tell them in front of the class. It's free when you think you're ready to come up in front of the class. Again, for those who have been ready to come to the front of the class, please do. Are you ready Kamal?
		(Teacher A)

In the presented excerpt above shows, teacher A was asking students to tell five proverbs that they had chosen and also explained the reasons why they chose them using their own language.

Giving Advice

Teacher A performed this language function in the discussion section and related to the students who came late that day. The teacher advised the students to manage their time by saying *So, you have to manage your time well. Make sure that you go to bed quite early. Not more than eleven* (Teacher A)

Persuading/Encouraging

Encouraging happened in the middle of the teaching and learning process where the teacher and the students were interacting interpersonally. The Example of encouraging was performed by a teacher in order to support his students to be more active in the classroom by saying *don't feel afraid of saying something. Come on! … If you mistake, it's okay. Mistakes, making mistake is part of learning, right? So, feel free (feel free) and feel okay if you want to say something just say it. You don't have to be afraid, … Come on, you can do it!* (Teacher A)

Granting Permission

Tthe purpose of granting is to allow someone to do something. Granting found in this study deals with accepting student's permission to enter the classroom by saying *yes, coming please* (Teacher C).

Expression of Problems
Apologizing

It is the act of saying sorry. It shows that someone is feeling sorry for having done something that causes other people problems or troubles. The example of apologizing performed by the English teacher involved the clause *I'm sorry* (Teacher B). It is understandable since the word *sorry* is generally used to signal an apology.

Forgiving

The teacher performed this competence was indicated in clause *By the way Mo, even before you said that you already forgiven* (Teacher B).

Expression of Future Scenarios
Expressing Hopes

It is used to express hope for someone's success or happiness. Here is an example of

wishing *Let's just feel okay about this. I just hope that next Friday things would be better* (Teacher B).

Expressing and Eliciting Plans

The example of this expression was very clearly performed by the teacher at the end of teaching activity, it was: *next Monday, We're going to expand your writing into complete opinion or for and against essay. Yes. Happy weekend IPA 1* (Teacher B)

Discussing Capabilities of Doing Something

The example of this language function was performed by saying *come on, you can do it!* This expression uttered because teacher A believes his students have capabilities in relating to English skill.

Realization of Formulaic Competence in Teachers' Talk in English Language Class

Teachers' talk mainly contained a verb phrase along with dependent clause fragments. In additions, lexical bundles that incorporate noun phrase and preposition fragments accounted for only a small proportion of lexical bundles. Concerning the first main structural category "verb phrase fragments", English teachers were noticed of using 1st/2nd person pronoun + VP fragment *(You don't know, I think, I want to you),* 3rd person pronoun + VP fragment (*It's gonna be, We are going to talk*), verb phrase (*We have to, don't forget).*

Then, they also used a yes-no question *(have you got, do you know, do you want to)* and WH-question fragments *(what does it mean?, What is it? Where are you?).* Though less frequent, discourse marker + VP fragments *(I mean).* Moreover, no example of "verb phrase (with a passive verb)" was found in the participants' talk. These findings, accordance with several previous studies such as Biber et al., (1999); Biber et al., (2004); Hyland, (2008a); and Conrad and Biber (2015).

Biber et al., (1999) earlier research about lexical bundles in conversational and academic prose showed that in conversation, almost 90% of all common lexical bundles incorporate verb phrases. Building upon the structural categories developed earlier, Biber et al., (2004) investigated the use of lexical bundles in university classroom teaching and textbooks. This previous study provides a finding that almost 90% of the lexical bundles in spoken discourse were clausal that incorporate a verb phrase such as *I don't want to, we're going to do.* "1st/2nd person pronoun + VP fragments" were the most common structure in teachers' talk, since speech relies heavily on a more direct physical context to deliver the meaning or message, the English teachers chose active verbs as the preferred simple and straightforward structures to best convey their lessons.

Then, common active verb phrase *(going to + verb)* helps to raise the students' awareness towards the forthcoming information, on the other hand, it also has a function to publicize the topic material that would be taught. Relating to this structure, the pronoun *we* in the bundle *we are going to discuss …* was by far the most frequent lexical bundle in the corpus. It shows the teachers dependence on using engagement markers especially the first person plural *(we)* to make the students feel that they are part of the activity. They are required to be engaged in the process of learning rather than being a mere listener. This adds to the social dimension in academic lectures that traditionally were viewed as serving monologic and transactional purposes that are often not analyzed for efforts in making contact with the audience.

Second most frequent among the major categories were lexical bundles incorporating dependent clause fragments. English teachers were found to use 1st/2nd person pronoun + dependent clause fragments (*I don't know if, I don't know what)*, WH-clause fragments *(…+ know how many …., …. + know what does …. Mean?)*, to-clause fragments *(if you want to say, … + would like to …),* and the last, *that*-clause fragments (*I think that we have to …., I believe that …).* The frequent use of the dependent clause category may manifest consistent features of spoken discourse which included more clausal lexical bundles in spoke discourse (Biber et al., 2004).

Biber et al., (2004) investigated the use of lexical bundles in two university instructional registers: classroom teaching and textbooks showed that conversation primarily contains more bundles incorporating clause fragments. Concerning on sub-categories of dependent clause fragments, one way of raising the students' awareness is through using a variety of dependent clause structures, especially in the case of "*if* clause fragments" such as *if you turn around* in:

By the way, <u>if you turn around</u>, we've got a visitor today. Yes. I'll tell you a bit about her. She is a student from Semarang State University, She's doing her master degree and why she here because she need to collect some data for her research. So, she's a student and researcher at the same time. Miss. Tenry **(Teacher B)**

The use of this sub-structure in Teacher B's talk in order to raise the students' attention towards my existence as the research in the classroom that day.

E.g.

The least frequent category was lexical bundles in teachers' talk was incorporating noun phrase/preposition phrase fragments. The sub-categories of this structure revealed that teachers only used a noun phrase with *of*-phrase fragments *(the kids of, the example of, most of the time)* and prepositional phrase expressions *(at the end of, for a long time, at the same time)* during teaching and learning. Findings seem to be in line with the previous studies on academic English (Biber et al., 1999; Biber & Conrad, 1999; Hyland, 2008b). Biber et al., (1999) earlier finding of lexical bundles on academic prose showed that almost 70% of the common bundles in academic prose consist of noun phrase expression (e.g. *the nature of the*) or a sequence that bridges across two prepositional phrases (e.g. *as a result of*).

A similar result, Biber and Conrad (1999) which comparing lexical bundles across register namely academic writing and conversation showed that noun phrase and prepositional phrase fragments (e.g. *one of the most, an increase in the*) are two most important patterns in academic writing. Those finding above was also confirmed by Hyland (2008b) who informed that grammatical features of 70% of bundles found in written academic discourse

as preposition + noun phrase fragments (*on the basis of, in the case of*), noun phrase + *of*-phrase fragments (*a wide range of, one of the most*) as well as anticipatory it fragments (*it is possible to, it is clear that*). Thus, this fact lends support to the idea that spoken registers uses more verb phrases and dependent clause bundles and does not normally use bundles with a noun and prepositional phrases, as opposed to academic prose.

The Relationship between Actional and Formulaic Competence in Teachers' Talk in English Language Class

The relationship between both of competence could reveal in the example patterns of suggesting, requesting, and giving advice are most contained "1st/2nd PP + VP fragments structure".

[1] Ooo, you don't know. <u>You'd better </u>ask your father. 'Father, tell me what my name is? What does it mean?

Lexical bundles *you'd better* + … is categorized into "1st PP + fragments structure" where it usually used to perform language function of giving a suggestion.

[2] If you just can open it at Atmodo, <u>could you share it at Line</u>? I think it is also easy, right? I mean to share the file to the line.

Example number 2 is comprised of "Yes-no question fragments" namely *could you …?* in order to perform language function of requesting.

[3] So, <u>you have to</u> manage your time well. Make sure that you go to bed quite early. Not more than eleven.

.g.

The lexical bundle *you have to* + … does the participant to give an advice perform associating with "1st PP + fragments structure" and it.

Based on the findings presented above, it can be understood that there is a relationship between actional competence in term of language function and formulaic competence particularly on lexical bundles on spoken discourse. One of the early findings of lexical bundles was that they are present in written and spoken registers alike and they were considered "as building blocks in the construction of

discourse" (Cortes, 2013). Lexical bundles are seen as "important building blocks of coherent discourse and characteristic features of language use in particular settings" (Hyland, 2008, p.8). In the same line, Biber, Connor, and Upton (2007) maintain that move patterns are considered as the "main building blocks" of a register (p. 53).

Since lexical bundles learnt as "wholes and not as strings of individual words" (Perez-Lantada, 2014, p.83), they may be automatically retrieved and rendering speech more fluent. It also functions as discourse frames to express new propositional information, structuring a discourse and facilitating "pragmatically efficient communication". It is evident that structural types of lexical bundles tend to perform a specific function in a specific register. In other words, as explained by Celce-Murcia et al., (1995, p.19), "the frequency of language functions in real life communication has resulted in highly conventionalized forms, fixed phrases, and formulaic expression in every language". In simple word, lexical bundles are realized or manifested in the language functions.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This section provides the conclusion of the study, limitations and suggestions for future research.

Conclusion

After analyzing the realization of actional competence in terms of language function in teachers' talk, it was found that in interpersonal exchanges, the English teachers performed their competence by performing a greeting, leave-taking, introducing someone, expressing gratitude, giving a compliment and reacting to interlocutor speech. Reacting to interlocutor's speech frequently occur in the teachers' talk, it means that the clause or clause complexes happened in the spoken language. Similarly, one of many characteristics of the spoken register is a response occur to show attention given to interlocutor directly, this clearly shows us about

the differences between spoken and written language.

For information exchanges competence, the sub-categories were produced by the teachers namely asking for information, giving information, and giving an explanation. Meanwhile, throughout the analysis of the data, only one category of expressing opinion performed by the teachers was expressing and finding out about opinion. The next competence was expressing feeling, it was performed by the participants in form of expressing like dislike, and disappointing.

In the case of expression of suasion, the sub-categories performed by the teacher were also varied. They include giving a suggestion, requesting, instructing/direction, advising, persuading/encouraging, and granting permission. Then, expression of the problem was also performed by the teachers that spread out only in the sub-category of forgiving and apologizing. The last, in line with sub-categories of future scenarios expression, the teachers performed this competence in terms of expressing hope/wishes, expressing plans/intentions, and discussing the possibility and capability of doing something.

From the realization of language functions above, there are five sub-categories of language functions which were mostly occurred in the teachers' talk namely asking for information/questioning, giving instruction/direction, explaining/lecturing, reacting to interlocutors' speech, and complementing/praising.

Secondly, related to the realization of lexical bundles in teachers' talk, it can be concluded that lexical bundles mainly contained verb phrase along with dependent clauses. In contrast, lexical bundles that incorporate noun phrase and preposition fragments accounted for only a small proportion of lexical bundles. This finding aligns with the findings of previous researchers where that academic speech primarily comprises more lexical bundles with verb and clause fragments, while academic writing reported using more bundles

incorporating noun and prepositional phrase fragments

Dealing with the relationship between actional and formulaic competence, this study reveals that the frequency of language functions used has resulted in highly conventionalized forms, fixed phrases, and formulaic expression. In simple word, each social move or language functions, there is a stock potential expression (lexical bundles) on it. Such as language function of asking questions are associating with "Yes-no question fragments" such as *do you want …?, are you going …?* and "WH-question fragments" such as *how do you …?, what are you …?.* Language functions of giving an opinion, suggesting, requesting are comprised of 1st/2nd PP + VP fragments lexical bundles such as *you need to …, you have to …, you'd better …..* Thus, seeing there is a relationship between actional and formulaic competence in teachers' talk, where language functions that are occupied teachers' talk in teaching activity include many set phrases (lexical bundles), thus it needs attention. The teachers must know enough about it to choose appropriate utterances in a given situation as the model for the students. Thus, it needs to maintain a balance: the teachers are not only focused on grammar and pronunciation but also have adequate knowledge and competence of vocabulary and stock phrases (lexical bundles)

for performing appropriate language function. Because mastering only vocabulary and phrases for speech acts without appropriate knowledge of and focus on grammar and pronunciation will result in fluent but inaccurate and therefore limited oral competence. Mastering only grammar and phonology results in linguistically accurate but socially dysfunctional oral communication.

Limitations

This study was carried out with 3 language teachers at Senior High School level through spoken discourse analysis of their talk in the classroom setting. Yet, since the result can change in the different level of school with a

different setting, it may not be possible to generalize the findings of the study.

Even though the participants performed language functions and lexical bundles through their talk, it is not obvious whether those are taught in the classroom. Therefore, the use of language functions and lexical bundles by the participants may not be based on the assumption that they are taught in the classroom.

The methodology used in conducting this study could also be considered as a limitation where the study did not investigate the effectiveness of actional and formulaic competence in the teachers' talk. It described these teachers' competencies which were realized in their speech production but not how effective they are in facilitating students' language acquisition.

Suggestions

Formulaic competence that was realized in teachers' talk was focused only on lexical bundles. Future studies might well consider other categories of formulaic competence such as insert, idioms, and collocations to be used in order to collect comprehensive data.

The methodology of analysis used in this study can be used as the foundation to investigate not only actional and formulaic competence realization as the component of communicative competence but also six components of communicative competence in teaching English in EFL classroom and also to investigate the realization among those components. Moreover, the investigation might yield different results if students in the classes are surveyed and interviewed as well. This inclusion would allow for a comparison of what teachers and students think about language functions and lexical bundles which was realized in teachers' talk.

Then, the data of teachers' talk in this study was an audio recording of 3 Indonesian teachers which is essentially spoken English as a foreign language. Future recommendations would be to compare teachers in other parts of the world that use English as a first/second

language in constructing their teaching and investigating various factors influencing the realization of language functions and lexical bundles in their talk.

Another area of further research is needed to use different discourse as the unit of analysis, especially the ones involving written discourse. For instance, investigating the realization of actional and formulaic competence in an English textbook, or research articles in any discipline. It will build larger corpora in order to lead more accurate analysis and more generalizable findings. Additionally, another direction for future research involves experimental design. Such study could address the crucial issues of effectiveness and comprehensibility of teachers' talk in the relation to the students' output.

REFERENCES

Aisyah, N. (2016). An analysis of teachers' talk in an EFL classroom. *Journal of English and Education*, 4(2), 63-79. Retrieved from http://ejournal.upi.edu/index.php/L-E/article/view/4633/3232

Al-Farsi, N.M. (2006). Teachers' questions in the Basic Education Classroom. Retrieved from http://www.moe.gov.om/portal/sitebuilder/sites/eps/English/MOE/baproject/Ch%205%20Questioning%20in%20the%20basic%20education%20classroom.pdf.

Biber, D. et al. (1999). *The Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. London: Longman.

Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Cortes, V. (2004). *If you look at ...*: Lexical bundles in university teaching and textbooks. *Applied Linguistics,* 25(3): 371-405.

Biber, D., Connor, & T. Upton. (2007). Discourse on the move. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Boston, J. S. (2002). Form and Function: An Example of Spoken Discourse Analysis.

Brown, H.D. (2001). *Teaching by Principles an Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy (Second Edition).* Pearson Education Company.

Celce-Murcia, M., Dornyei, Z., & Thurrel, S. (1995). A pedagogical framework for communication competence: A pedagogical motivated model with content specifications. *Issues in Applied Linguistic*, 6(2), 5-35. Retrieved from https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2928w4zj

Celce-Murcia, M. (2007). Rethinking the role of communicative competence in language teaching. Eds. Eva Alcon Soler and Maria Pilar Safont Jorda. *Intercultural Language Use and Language Learning.* Dordrecht: Springer, 41-57. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4020-5639-0

Conrad, S., Biber, D., & Leech, G. (2002). *A student grammar of spoken and written English: workbook*. Longman.

Cortes, V. (2013). The purpose of this study is to: Connecting lexical bundles and moves in research article introductions. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 12, 33–43. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2012.11.002

Crespo, S. (2002). Praising and correcting: Prospective teachers investigate their teacherly talk. Teaching and Teacher Education 18, 739-758.

Gall, M. (1984). Synthesis of Research on Teachers' Questioning. *Educational Leadership*, 42 (3), 50-56.

Husna, H. A., Hartono R., & Sofwan, A. (2015). Teacher's and students' talks and their nonverbal communication in the classroom interaction. *English Education Journal*. 5(1), 1-8. Retrieved from https://journal.unnes.ac.id/artikel_sju/eej/6839

Hyland, K. (2008a). Academic clusters: text patterning in published and postgraduate writing. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 1*8(1), 41-62.

Hyland, K. (2008b). As can be seen: Lexical bundles and disciplinary variation.

English for Specific Purposes, 27, 4-21. doi: 10.1016/j.esp.2007.06.001.

Khusnita, D., & Rukmini, D. (2016). The EFL Learners' Perceptions and Realizations of Formulaic Sequences in Casual Conversation. *English Education Journal,* 6(2), 68-78. Retrieved from https://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/eej/article/view/13058

Liu, M., & Zhu, L. (2012). An investigation and analysis of teacher talk in college English class. *Canadian Center of Science and Education*, 2(5), 117-121. doi: 10.5539/ijel.v2n5p117

Nasir, C., Daud, B., & Masturah, N. (2016). How much talk should the teacher talk? A study of teacher talk in an English classroom. In *Proceedings of English Education International Conference*, 1(2). 205-208.

Neno, H., & Agustien, I.R.H. (2016). The use of formulaic expression in EFL students' interaction. *English Education Journal*, 6(1), 39-44. Retrieved from https://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/eej/article/view/12778

Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Dan Kebudayaan Nomor 21 Tahun 2016. *Standar Isi Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah*. 28 Juni 2016.

Peres-Lantada, C. (2014). Formulaic language in L2 and L2 expert academic writing: Convergent and divergent usage. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 14(2), 84-94

Putri, D. S. (2017). The Analysis of Teacher Talk and The Characteristic of Classroom Interaction in English as A Foreign Language Classroom. *Journal of English and Education*, *3*(2), 16-27.

Qashoa, S. H. (2013). Effects of teacher question types and syntactic structures on EFL classroom interaction. *The International Journal of Social Sciences*, 7(1), 52-62. Retrieved from https://www.tijoss.com/7th%20volume/sulaiman.pdf

Rezaee, M., & Farahian, M. (2012). An exploration of discourse in an EFL classroom: Teacher talk. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences,* 47, 1237-1241. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.806

Sinclair, J. McH., & Brazil, D. (1985). *Teacher Talk.* London: Oxford University Press.

Sutopo, D. (2015). Parent involvement in scaffolding a child's English language functions. *Journal of Philosophy, Culture and Religion*, 8, 15-21. Retrieved from http://www.iiste.org/Journals/index.php/JPCR/article/view/23415

Sofyan, R. R., & Mahmud, M. (2014). Teacher talk in classroom interaction: A study at an English department in Indonesia. *ELT WORLDWIDE*, 1(1), 45-58. doi: 10.26858/eltww.v1i1.841

Tsegaye, A. G., & Davidson, L. M. (2014). The ratio of teacher talking time to students talking time in EFL classroom: A case in six partner preparatory schools of Haramaya University, Ethiopia. *Abhinav National Monthly Refereed Journal of Research in Arts and Education*, 3(5), 1-5. Retrieved from http://abhinavjournal.com/journal/index.php/ISSN-2277-1182/article/view/222

Winarti, (2017) "Classroom Interaction: Teacher and Student Talk in International Class Program (ICP)," *The 4th International Conference on Language, Society and Culture in Asian Contexts*, *KnE Social Sciences*, 220–226. DOI 10.18502/kss.v1i3.742

Xiao Yan. (2006). *Teacher Talk and EFL in University Classroom.* School of Foreign Languages and Literature Chongqing Normal University & Yangtze Normal University, China. Retrieved from https://www.asian-efl-journal.com/thesis_Ma_Xiaou.pdf

Yanfen, Liu & Yuqin, Zhao, 2010. A Study of Teacher Talk in Interactions in English Classes. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics,* 33 (2). 76 -86.

Zambrano, G. (2003). Teacher Talk at Three Colombian Higher Education Institutions. Universidad Ricardo Palma.

Zhang Y. (2009). Classroom Discourse and Student Learning, Asian Social Science, 4 (9), 80 -83. doi: 10.5539/ass.v4n9p80