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Abstract: This present study is intended to analyze the dominant type of attitudinal system that expressed by the teacher. This study utilized qualitative method with Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as research design. As for research sampling, this study involved an English teacher and one science class of eleventh grade students in one of secondary school in Majalengka. In order to collect the data, the researcher utilized the instrument of observation. Then, this data were analyzed by using Appraisal Theory that proposed by Martin and Rose (2007). As for the results, this research found that the dominant type of attitudinal system that expressed by the teacher is Affect category. It indicated that both the teacher frequently expressed his opinion, feeling and emotion through their talk. Furthermore, these talks mostly expressed in positive way. It indicated that the teacher always tried to build a positive atmosphere by saying positive talks in order to stimulate the students to become active in the classroom. Therefore, it can be said that it is very important for the teachers to pay more attention in managing their talk since it can affect students’ interaction in the classroom.
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INTRODUCTION

In EFL classroom, the interaction between the teacher and students is considered as one of the most essential parts in teaching and learning process. This interaction is a two-way process in where the teacher and students can influence each other (Dagarin, 2004; Nurmasitah, 2010; Wagner; cited in Shalihah, 2017). Brown (2006) defines classroom interaction as a collaborative exchange of thoughts, feelings or ideas which leading to a reciprocal effect on each other. Hence, in the classroom interaction not only relates to the action but also followed by the reaction.

Moreover, the classroom interaction is considered can lead the success of teaching and learning process. One of the biggest factors in determining that success is depend on the quality of teacher’s interaction with the students particularly in his/her language use which commonly termed as teacher talk (Yanita, Yusuf, & Gani, 2016). In addition, teacher talk is defined as the source of language knowledge which used to instruct language communication and organize the activities in the classroom (Nasir, Yusuf, and Wardana, 2019). Related to the EFL classroom, the teacher talk take a part as a vehicle of language acquisition which contributes as the major source of comprehensible target language input (Nunan, 1991; Wang, 2014; Aisyah, 2016; Jing & Jing, 2018; Nasir, et.al., 2019). It is in line with Long (cited in Yanfen and Yuqin, 2010) who argued that the conversational and linguistic modification that occur in classroom discourse can facilitate the student’s acquisition because it can provide the students with the input they need.

Besides, teacher talk can affect students’ interaction in the classroom particularly when the teachers give the feedback towards students’ performance. This feedback is used to let the
students know how well they have performed in order to increase students’ motivation and to build a supportive classroom atmosphere (Richards & Lockhart, 2007). In giving their feedback, the teacher can express it in positive or negative way. For positive feedback, it can be in the form of praises, while for negative feedback, it can be in the form of criticism. Both of these feedbacks are considered important. For instance, when teacher praises the students, it can bring out the students’ willingness to participate more in the classroom since it can boost students’ confidence and their self-esteem (Aisyah, 2016; Crespo, 2002). Whereas, teachers’ criticism can change students’ behavior from non-acceptable to acceptable pattern (Nasir et al., 2019). However, the teacher’s critics should be given carefully, it should not leave a bad effect on students’ feelings (Gharbavi & Iravani, 2014). Hence, it can be said that it is important for the teacher to give feedback towards students’ performance in the classroom.

Furthermore, the interaction in EFL classroom is also helpful for practicing the students’ ability in communication, particularly in practicing their speaking skill in target language. The students can use the input language that they have got before and practice it in communication in the classroom. However, the students frequently have the less chance to practice their language since the teachers use the time allocation inappropriately with their talk (Harmer, 2001). Most of interaction in EFL classroom are dominated and controlled by the teacher talk (Rashidi & Rafieerad, 2010; Nurmasitah, 2010; Gharbavi & Iravani, 2014; Jing & Jing, 2018). It denotes that the proportion of interaction is not equal and reciprocal. Whereas, the most important thing in the classroom interaction is not the quantity of teacher talk, it precisely inclined to its quality (Gharbavi & Iravani, 2014; Jing & Jing, 2018). It refers to how the teacher provides comprehensible input that assists the learners to understand and acquire the language (Harmer, 2001a). Therefore, it is exactly crucial for the teachers to notice and control their talk in the classroom both in its quantity or even the quality. An appropriate teacher talk can contributes to the harmonious situation which simultaneously cultivates a more friendly relationship and creates more opportunities for the students to interact actively (Yanfen & Yuqin, 2010).

Dealing with the ideal classroom interaction, another aspect that can build a harmonious situation depends on the attitudes and intentions of the people involved which are the teacher and students (Dagarin, 2004). The attitudes can be seen on their talk while teaching and learning process which relate to their feelings and how they react and evaluate upon the people and events in the classroom. The discussion about attitudes is a part of appraisal theory, precisely attitudinal system which relating to affect (someone’s feeling), judgment (someone’s character) and appreciation (the value of things). This theory is proposed by Martin which as the development of Halliday’s domain of interpersonal meaning that described in Systemic Functional Linguistics (Badklang & Srinon, 2018; Nurdiyani, et.al, 2019) which highlight how people make a meaning in social contexts (Herdiawan, Saleh, & Sutopo, 2020).

In appraisal system, attitude is connected to social interaction among human beings since it negotiates to someone’s evaluation related to the feeling, things, and people that exist in his/her environment (Martin & Rose, 2007). In other words, attitudes relate to the interpersonal meaning where the language is used to establish the relationship among the people both in the form of spoken or written discourse. Furthermore, Martin and Rose (2007:26) termed attitudes as “something to do with evaluating things, peoples’ characters, and their feelings”. In details, Martin & Rose (2007) divided the attitudes into three subsystems namely affect (people’s feeling), judgement (people’s character) and appreciation (the value of things). These kinds of attitudes are the main focus of this present research in
relation to analyze the classroom discourse. Related to this, the further discussion about the types of attitudes will be illustrated and elaborated as follows:
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This attitudinal system can be expressed positively and negatively. Besides, it also can be realized explicitly or implicitly. Martin & White (2005) named this realization into inscribe and invoked attitudes. Inscribe or explicit attitudes are apparently indicated through evaluative lexis, particularly adjectives which unfold the meanings by themselves (Badklang & Srinon, 2018). On the other hand, those attitudes are directly shown by using words that name specific emotion (Martin & Rose, 2007). Meanwhile, implicit or invoked attitudes are realized through the choice of ideational meanings, lexical metaphors, and non-core vocabulary items (Martin & White, 2005). All those kinds of attitudinal realization above showed the ways of attitudes are expressed. Every person has their own ways in expressing their attitudes. Hence, the appraisal system can be used to negotiate and analyze the interactive discourse in the classroom. Furthermore, appraisal system can be employed to analyze how the teachers build the atmosphere in the classroom through their talk, it is positive or negative which simultaneously can affect the students' interaction in the classroom.

However, the study of classroom discourse that using appraisal analysis is rarely conducted. Recently, most of studies utilized appraisal theory to analyze academic writing, news, articles, advertisements, leader's speech, etc. For instance, Fitriati, Solihah, & Tusino (2018), and Lam & Crosthwaite (2018) used this theory to analyze the narrative and argumentative writing; Nurhadi (2017), Thahara et.al (2019) and Nurdiyani et al. (2019) utilized it to investigate news articles in printed mass media; Wijaya et.al (2019) employed it to analyze the contents of advertisements, and Rohmawati (2016) used it to analyze Obama’s speech. Related to this, I as the researcher attempt to conduct a research through appraisal theory in analyzing the teacher talk in the classroom. Therefore, this research is conducted with the objective as below:

- What is the dominant type of attitudinal system of teacher talk in the classroom interaction?
METHOD

Since this present study is intended to analyze the dominant type of attitudinal system that expressed by the teacher, this study utilized qualitative method with Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as research design. As for research sampling, this study involved an English teacher and one science class of eleventh grade students in one of secondary school in Majalengka. This sample is selected by using the technique of purposive sampling, where the sample is chosen based on a number of criteria which are: 1) The English teacher is a professional teacher who has long track record experiences in teaching English particularly in secondary level; 2) The students are the eleventh grades who take English as specialization of language subject who considered have a high interaction in the classroom.

In order to collect the data, the researcher utilized the instruments of observation in order to record the classroom discourse in the classroom. Around two meetings of teaching and learning process were taken by using audio-visual taped. Then, these data were transcribed into field note as an excerpt. After transcribing the data, the researcher analyzed the data through the appraisal theory that proposed by Martin and Rose (2007). The data that have been analyzed were presented in the form of tables, the point percentage of each type of attitudinal system, and the description of interpreting data. While the techniques that the researcher used in order to present the data including the technique of tabulation data and descriptive analysis.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In order to answer the research question, around two meetings of classroom interaction had been analyzed. It had been found that there were around 123 instances of attitudinal system that produced by the teacher. Regarding to the point of analysis, the dominant type of attitudinal system that mostly produced by the teacher is Affect category which dominates over half of teacher talk. It gets the point of percentage 53.66 % with the total amount 66 instances. It indicates that the teacher frequently expresses his feelings, opinions and emotion through his talk. It is in line with what Brown (2006) stated in defining classroom interaction, the teacher and students can exchange their thoughts, feelings or ideas as a form of interaction. Moreover, from the teacher talk analysis, it also shows that about 31.71 % of teacher talk belongs to appreciation category which follows by judgment that acquires only 14.63 %. As for the proportion of these three categories of attitudinal system, it can be showed in this following diagram:
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Furthermore, all these kinds of attitudinal system are expressed by the teacher in two
general ways, positively and negatively. This following figure will show the proportion of
positive and negative realization of teacher’s attitudinal systems:

![The Attitudinal System of Teacher Talk](chart)

**Figure 2.3.**
The Proportion of Attitudinal System Realization of Teacher Talk

As the figure showed above, it can be seen that the teacher mostly expresses his talk
in positive way, precisely in affect and appreciation categories. It indicates that the teacher
always tries to build a positive atmosphere so that the students will attempt to interact actively
in the classroom. Whereas for judgment category, it is dominated by negative attitudinal
system which get the points with a percentage 20.32 % of the total teacher talk, these negative
talks are not intended to demean the students’ personal, but it is intended to show what
students need to correct and improve in the next performance. For better understanding, it can
be seen on this following explanation related to how the teacher expresses his talk.

For affect category, almost all the instances are expressed in positive way (51.22 %). There is about 2.44 % of affect category that expressed negatively. It shows that the teacher
always tries to build a good atmosphere by means of expressing his feelings, opinion and
emotion positively. The examples below illustrate the analysis of affect category on teacher
talk in positive way.

| Clause | Speaker | Excerpt | Aff. |
|--------|---------|---------|------|
| 23a.   | T       | **The question, please!** | (+)  |
| 55a.   | T       | **Don’t be afraid** if you feel that you have very stupid question | (+)  |
| 57a.   | T       | there is **no stupid question** | (+)  |
| 97a.   | T       | **please always try** to use English | (+)  |
| 98a.   | T       | But if you feel that your English is not so beautiful, you think that you have very bad English, **don’t be worried ok.** | (+)  |
| 103a.  | T       | **Do not think about the pattern, the grammar,** do not really think about that ya **Meski campur-campur nanti juga ketika anda berani berbicara otomatis lancar.** (even though you mix your language, **if you dare to talk, automatically you will be fluent**) | (+)  |
| 101a.  | T       | **Don’t worry** | (+)  |
From the examples above, it can be seen that the teacher always tries to build a good atmosphere by saying a positive talk in order to provoke the students’ encouragement in asking questions and speaking in English. In clauses no. 23a, 55a and 57a, the teacher convinces the student to ask a question even they think that it’s a stupid question. He also adds that there is no stupid question. Besides, the rest of clauses (97a, 98a, 103a, and 105a) show that the teacher assures his student to be brave to speak up in English though their English skill is not good enough. For the teacher, the important thing is the students always try to speak in English and keep to practice. All these positive talks are intended to build positive atmosphere in the classroom. Through this positive atmosphere, it can cultivate a more friendly relationship and creates more opportunities for the students to interact actively in the classroom (Yanfen & Yuqin, 2010).

Besides, the teacher also uses positive talks in order to appreciate what the students have done. For instance, we can see it on the clauses below.

| Clause | Speaker | Excerpt | Appr. |
|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 44b.   | T       | *Iya dilanjutkan penjelasannya. Tadi udah bagus.* (continue your explanation, *it was already good*) | (+) |
| 46b.   | T       | *Ok, very good presentation* from the first group. | (+) |
| 47b.   | T       | *I really appreciate the effort* because you prepare your presentation in very short time *ya* | (+) |
| 49a.   | T       | *By the way it is a very beautiful slide ya.* | (+) |

Based on the examples above, it can be seen that the teacher praises the students’ work start from their explanation while answering the question, the slides that they made, and their performance while presenting the materials. These praises are intended to motivate the students in order to keep their enthusiastic to participate actively in the classroom. It is in line with Aisyah (2016) and Crespo (2002) who stated that teacher’s praise can bring out the students’ willingness to participate more in the classroom since it can boost students’ confidence and their self-esteem.

On the other hand, the teacher also utilizes the negative reaction towards the students’ performances (see on the clauses no. 50b, 106a, 118a). Although the teacher talks in negative way, but the meaning is quite the opposite. These talks are intended to show what students need to improve in the future.

| Clause | Speaker | Excerpt | Appr. |
|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 50b.   | T       | And actually **there are some correction** related to the analyzing of figurative speech | (-) |
| 106a.  | T       | **There are some weaknesses** of analyzing your figurative speech *ya*  
*Kalau anda terjemahkan kata perkata nanti kadang ceritanya hambar ya* (if you translate word by word, **the story will be flat**) | (-) |
| 118a.  | T       | *| |
The three clauses at the beginning (9a, 47a, 53a) show that the teacher criticizes the students while they explain the material very quickly. The teacher asks them to be slowly because the teacher is worried that the other students will not understand what is being explained. Whereas, the four rest clauses (82a, 83a, 86a) refer to the teacher talk while showing the confusion that made by the students, such as when the students skip the step of presentation, analyze the figurative speech inaccurately, or write the song translation from Google or another resources. By criticizing students’ performances, the teacher hopes they can correct and improve it in the next presentation. In other words, this criticism can change students’ behavior from non-acceptable to acceptable pattern (Nasir et al., 2019). However, the teacher’s critics should be given carefully, it should not leave a bad effect on students’ feelings (Gharbavi & Iravani, 2014). Therefore, to sum up the discussion about how the teacher expresses his talk, it can be stated that both positive and negative talk had the same role that is as teacher’s feedbacks. These feedbacks are considered as important aspect in learning process where it can be used to let the students know how well they have performed, to increase students’ motivation and to build a supportive classroom atmosphere (Richards & Lockhart, 2007). Moreover, these feedbacks also give positive effects for the students. It can motivate the students to be better and encourage the students to become active in the classroom interaction.

CONCLUSION

Based on the explanation above, it can be concluded that the dominant type of teacher talk that expressed by the teacher is Affect category. Furthermore, for the realization of attitudinal system that expressed by the teacher, most of them is expressed in positive way both in expressing his feeling or opinion (affect), and also in evaluating the students’ work or their behavior (appreciation). It indicates that the teacher always tries to build a positive atmosphere by saying positive talk in order to support the students to interact actively in the classroom. Meanwhile, for negative attitudinal system, these negative talks are not intended to demean the students’ personal, but it is intended to show what students need to correct and improve in the next performance. Therefore, it can be said that the positive and negative teacher talk have the same goal that is as an effort to create a supportive learning atmosphere for students.
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