Environmental expression using discourse analysis
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Abstract. This research aimed to investigate the teacher’s expression in the classroom environment. Regarding the issue, there is one main purpose of the study that is to investigate the language choice of the teacher in teaching English as a foreign language. The investigation is aimed to explore the field of language teaching specifically in terms of the language choice by the teacher in teaching English as Foreign Language (EFL) which can be improved. Classroom environmental investigation was conducted in this study since it enabled the researcher to record behavior as it is happening. The data then transcribed and coded to get the core. Based on the data in this study it can be concluded that essentially teacher had complied with the language choice changeably for the use of English as the target language and the use of Indonesia as the students’ first language (L1). The teacher participant uses TL just for simple communication with the students in her classroom environment.

1. Introduction

The field of teaching and learning environment are possibly vary in language form [1], therefore, even though the teacher has prepared a lesson plan and but the realization might be completely different. Further, in target language use (TL), other form of language also appear in language classroom as known as teacher and students’ native language or first language [2].

In the classroom environment, the character of the teacher’s language choice and its reason may vary, in a certain stage, it can take a form as a language pattern. [3] stated that we might be competent in getting obvious function or division labor of each language over in-depth inquiry of classroom interaction. Yet, it is crucial to be displayed that the oral interactions even in the classroom may be anything but anticipated and unambiguous even though it is also found that there will be a particular form following it [4].

The researchers have used various kinds of approaches to study teacher’s language choice in the classroom environment, focusing on their interaction with the students during the learning process. Some of the studies, inclined to look over the teacher’s language choice in the field of sociolinguistics.
Under other conditions, it appears that only certain studies taking teacher’s language choice as their focus. Based on the framework above, we focusing this report to inspect the teacher’s language choice in the classroom environment. Regarding the issue, there is one main purpose of the study that is to explore the language choice of the teacher in teaching English as a foreign language. This purpose is then separated into a definite purpose to find out the teacher’s inclination to using both L1 and TL in teaching English. This exploration is narrowed down to study the pattern of the language choice and L1 function(s) which were performed by the teacher participant in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom environment. The investigation is aimed to inspect the area of language teaching specifically in the field of the language choice implemented by English teacher as Foreign Language (EFL) which can be enhanced or developed to enlarge teaching quality.

2. Methodology
This study was a qualitative descriptive form. In this investigation, one female English teacher was chosen as a participant. The English teacher that was chosen has been teaching English for more than five years. The selected teacher teaches English in the sixth semester. The selected teacher has Javanese and Indonesian as her first and dominant language use, however, the dominant language that is used to interact with the students in the university area is Indonesian. Therefore, the native language that was investigated was limited to Indonesian only. This particular condition is also in line with the students’ background who have both Buginese, Tae’ and Indonesian as their first and dominant language use. The quantity of the students reaches up to 30 students per class. The selected teacher teaches English in the same class twice a week and each of the section lasts for about 80 minutes (2x40 minutes). The study was conducted four times during the English lesson itself but only two of the four data was taken as the valid data.

Classroom observation was conducted in this study since it covered up the researcher to register language behavior as it is happening. To gain a general outline of a teacher’s language choice, we exploited the classroom environment through observation. The data which were taken from the observation has consisted of the transcription of the teacher’s language usage in the classrooms. The data was further analyzed to find out the language choice that was used by the teacher during the lesson. The transcription was explored and coded (extracted) by focusing on the aspect that might cause the existence of the L1 during the lesson.

3. Result and discussion
The data was taken from the voice recording of teacher participants in university. The recording was taken from the class interaction at the sixth semester in that university. The data then analyzed through the transcription and coded in item 1 to item 6:

3.1. Extract 1
T : o ya ... ee ... chairman help me please to collect your ... yours friends assignment
S : kumpul bu? (Collect ma’am?)
T : iya (yes) ... please collect your assignment (Item 1)

The teacher asked her students to collect all the assignments. She used English in this conversation by saying “chairman help me please to collect your ... yours friends assignment”. But she did it differently in item (2). A subsection

T : rafika ... oo ... itu (Oo ... that is Rafika)
: ee ... well ee ... about “placing order” ... I have explain to you ee ...
exactly last week on Friday but ee ... at the time I have not finish this
chapter yet because I think the time is not enough so ee ... I decided to ... give you my material In soft file, and I want to ask you, ee ... have you learn it?

S: just little miss
T : iya maksudnya, tentang “placing order” saya sudah jelaskan ... namun ... belum begitu jauh dan karena waktunya jumat itu saya berikan ... materinya dalam bentuk soft file. Iya sudah dipelajari?
(Yeah I mean, about “placing order” I already explained It. But it’s not clear enough and because that was Friday I gave the material in soft file. Well, have you learnt it?)

In item (2), the teacher participant used English to check students’ progress from the last meeting by saying “about “placing order” ... I have explain to you ee ... exactly last week on Friday” and “have you learn it?”. She used TL in this activity. The students answered that they didn’t understand the material yet. After that, she asked the student back with the same statement but she switched the TL into L1 this time. A few moments after, in item (3) she decided to use L1 (Indonesian) in her material conclusion.

T : ada itu bentuknya indentive style saya sudah gambar dipapan. Membuat surat bisnis itu nda panjang singkat saja. Ya kan anda bisa liat contoh yang saya berikan ... ada itu ... yang dalam bentuk word. Pendek itu ... nda panjang kalo surat bisnis, iya ... (I already drew the form of indentive style in the whiteboard. Business letter isn’t the complex letter; it is a simple letter with short content. You can see the example that I give to you, it was in word file. It’s a short letter; business letter isn’t long at all, yeah ....)
T : o ya ... anda sudah mencatatkan bentuk indentive style?
(Oh yeah ...you wrote the form of indentive style, don’t you?)

The English part was just about the title of the material “indentive style” and the name of the file “word” where the example of the material was given before. Take a look of the item (3).

3.2. Extract 2
On the second meeting, the transcription began with the teacher instruction to not to write the material. She made an announcement.

T : oh ya for our material dont waste your time to making note, to make note, because I will give you my material. Yace ... untuk materi kita kalian jangan menghabiskan waktu mencatat ya karena saya nanti akan berikan ji materinya ini, dikopi kembali ini lagi.
(You don’t have to waste your time to write down our material because I will give this material to you later, you can copy it down).

In the first time she used English. She told her students to not make any note “oh ya for our material dont waste your time to making note, to make note, because i will give you my material”. But then, she translated her announcement into Indonesian “untuk materi kita kalian jangan menghabiskan waktu mencatat ya karena saya nanti akan berikan ji materinya ini”. She switched the code from TL into L1. It was the same with item (5).

T : o ya ini ... ee ... today our material, there are two ya ... the first i tadi (was) letter requesting payment and ... making a knowledge paymentee ...bagaimana membuat surat keterangan, membuat surat permintaan pembayaran yah ... surat
permintaan pembayaran, dan bagaimana kita e memberitahukan kepada pihak penjual bahwa kita sudah melakukan e ... pengiriman uang dan begitu juga dari pihak penjual memberitahukan kepada kita bagaimana kita telah melakukan ... ee pengiriman barang. Pokoknya dari pihak penjual ada dari pihak pembeli ada, ada dari pihak penjual memberitahukan bahwa sudah di ... transfer barangnya, pihak pembeli juga harus memberiahukan bahwa misalnya, sudah dikirimkan uangnya ya, begitu ... 

(you can make an official statement letter, make a requesting letter for the payment yeah ... a requesting letter for the payment, and how we inform the seller that we have already ee ... sent the money and so do the seller, they have to inform us that they ... ee ... sent the goods. In short, the seller and the buyer exchange the information about the transaction, the seller inform that they transferred the goods, the buyer also confirm about the payment, like that) (Item 5)

The teacher participant mostly used Indonesia to explain the material in the classroom activity. We can see this in the item (5), where the teacher just used English at the beginning of the explanation, “today our material, there are two va ... the first is”, mixed by “tadi” (was) in Indonesian and continued by “letter requesting payment and ... making a knowledge payment” in English. The rest of the explaining after was conducted in L1. Compare it with the extract item (6):

S: bii ... ibu itu saya yang pertemuan ketiga hadir k
(ma’am ... I was present in the third meeting)
T: kenapa disitu silang?
(Then why it’s a cross sign there?)
S: terlambat k itu hari dating
(I was late that time)
T: disitu masih absen yang dikertas itu hari tidak ada pi itu
(It was an absent in the paper, but you wasn’t there that time)
S: iya ... iya ... iya ...
(Yes ... yes ... yes ...)
S: ada, Cuma satu hari k tidak hadir bu
(Yes, I just absent for a day ma’am)
T: kenapa nda melapor? Kalo begitu melapor, saya mana mengenali mahasiswa saya, yang ada itu mahasiswa mengenali do ... sen, ya
(Why didn’t you report it? You have to report it to me; how come I recognize my entire student, the student should do that ... yeah) (Item 6)

In this extract item (6), the teacher participant has a conversation with her student about the attendant list. Some of the students complained about the record of the attendant list. The teacher confirmed it back. The teacher use L1 in this conversation with her students. None of this conversation used TL.

The result from the classroom discourse analysis shows that there is a distinctive pattern of the teacher’s language choice. The teacher participant preferred to use TL in pre-teaching activity in the small quantity. This has happened in the extract item 1 (1) and 1 (2). She use TL in everyday greeting and asked the students to collect the assignment. It was likely that the teacher used TL in the conversation that easily understood by the student.

There was a contrast difference in the use of L1. She preferred to use L1 when she had a conversation with the students: clarified the material, deal with the attendant list, asked student comprehension, and explained the material. It can be said that the teacher participant chose to use L1 in the conversation that can lead to a misunderstanding. The use of L1 was about to translate the explanation in TL before.
L1 can be used to clarify grammar and to transmit the definitions of new words and sentences [5]. Notwithstanding, the teacher should define the L1 all the time, in example an expression or idiom since it’s originally authentic. As well, if the learners are incapable to distinguish the contrast, the prompt translation can margin them up to make “false analogies and interferences” [6] between the languages. In this case, the use of L1 in along with L2 by the educationist can be more adequate than their privilege use of L2 by cause of their “keen awareness of the differences between L2 and the learners’ L1” [7], which could hand over the mark of the learners’ issues with grammars and reading comprehension in their learning.

4. Conclusion

The highlight of this study was on finding out the pattern of the teacher’s language use and also the L1 function as the result of the teacher’s language use in the classroom environment. The participant of the study was an English teacher who teaches English in university in the sixth semester. The aim of the study was answered by describing the data which was gained from the classroom observation to the teacher participant by using recording transcription in the classroom environment.

Thusly, based on the data in this study, it can be concluded that essentially the teacher had complied the language choice changeably for the use of English as the target language and the use of Indonesia as the students’ first language (L1). The teacher participant uses TL just for simple communication with the students. But when she wanted to explain complex material, she chose to use L1. She likely preferred L1 than TL to avoid misunderstanding. Therefore, L1 use can be determined as marked language use. Hopefully, the outcome of this investigation could contribute to a better understanding of the real classroom language usage.
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