System and Structure of English Classroom Discourse at Junior High School in Medan

Maulidina Mutia
University of Sumatera Utara, Indonesia
e-mail: *maulidinamutia10@gmail.com*

Masdiana Lubis
University of Sumatera Utara, Indonesia
e-mail: *masdianalbs26@gmail.com*

Nurlela
University of Sumatera Utara, Indonesia
e-mail: *nurlelamajrul@usu.ac.id*

Abstract:
This study aims to investigate the system and structure of English classroom interaction at Medan's Jabal Rahmah Mulia Boarding School. The records of a discussion in communication a video recording by Zoom Meeting among understudies and an English educator are viewed as information to be concentrated on utilizing a talk examination approach in light of Martin's Conversation Analysis (CA) model inside Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics structure (SFL). The foundation of the framework and construction of the English study hall connection are the challenges to be addressed. The examination saw movement types, temperament types, and the discourse capability of different provisions. The discoveries show that understudies act as initiators, while English educators work as allies, with optional knower (k2k1) moving sort for the most part; the communication is one of data exchange instead of labor and products, as conversationalists favor decisive and utilize basic sparingly. As per the discoveries, Question (Q) appears to generally satisfy the data given. Inquisitive asking is most ordinarily used to exhibit that a design's relational significance doesn't be guaranteed to compare to its lexico-

sentence structure. This examination likewise shows how a study hall conversation happens in a characteristic set of mindset and discourse capability. It likewise demonstrates that understudies are on the requesting end of the scale, bringing about an absence of criticism in the communication.

Keywords*: System and Structure, Classroom Interaction, Martin's Model, Discourse Analysis*

1. INTRODUCTION

The term classroom interaction refers to the interaction between the teacher and learners, and amongst the learners, in the classroom. Earlier studies of the second language (L2) classroom interaction focused on the language used by the teacher and learners, the interaction generated, and their effect on L2 learning. There are four types of interaction observed during the teaching-learning process: (1) teacher-student interaction, (2) teacher – students interaction, (3) student (s) – teacher interaction, (4) student (s) – student (s) interaction. Teacher talk is defined as any words or sentences said by the teacher during the interaction of the learning process, including when the teacher gives an explanation, responds to questions, give feedback, and so on. Conversation analysis as one of the discourse studies approaches grows within the framework of Systemic Functional Linguistic by Halliday (1985). Martin's model (1992) provides a comprehensive set of discourse analysis that can be used to relate to the problem of this research since the whole conversation is viewed as a single event of system and structure.

Discourse analysis (DA) is sometimes defined as the analysis of language 'beyond the sentence. It refers to a general term for a number of approaches to analyze written, vocal, or sign language use or any significant semiotic event. Discourse analysts who study conversation note that speakers have a system and structure for determining when one person's turn is over, and the next person's turn begins. Historically, Zellig Harris was the first to use the term discourse analysis in 1952 (Stalpers, 1988). A rather ambiguous term, but referring to Alba-Juez (2009) and Sari et al. (2018), discourse analysis seems to attempt to study the organization of language anything above the sentence, and the language used in social, political, and cultural contexts. To conduct a discourse analysis study, Schiffrin (2001) described at least five different approaches, namely speech act, interactional sociolinguistics, ethnology of communication, pragmatic, and conversational analysis approaches.

Conversation analysis as one of the discourse studies approaches grows within the framework of Systemic Functional Linguistic by Halliday (1985). Martin's model (1992) provides a comprehensive set of discourse analysis that can be used to relate to the problem of this research since the whole conversation is viewed as a single event of system and structure.

There are some previous studies that talk about classroom discourse. According to Winanta (2020) in analyzing of teacher talk classroom interaction at the Senior High School level by using Foreign Language Interaction (FLINT) system proposed by Moskowitz (1971) found 'praises or encourages' took place as the highest type of 12 talk types in the FLINT system, 9 types were used by the teacher. Fikri (2014), Rahayu (2019), and Lubis (2019) discuss Classroom Interaction from the point of view of Gender, Male, Female, Role, and Dynamic Conversation. They did not talk about systems and structure in classroom interaction. System and Structure are important to research and that is useful for the readers to broaden knowledge from the point of view of classroom interaction.

Structure and system represent a concept of classroom discourse analysis under the framework of Systemic Functional Linguistics. According to Martin (1992), Structure and system employ a multilayered analysis of text in which the system refers to the analysis of move, whereas structure deals with the analysis of mood and speech function. System and Structure of Classroom Interaction research are to be done at Jabal Rahmah Mulia Boarding School Medan at 24 Jalan Balai Desa, Kec. Medan Sunggal, Medan Kota, North Sumatera province is to be investigated and done the research in a girl's dormitory at 24 Jalan Balai Desa, Medan Sunggal, especially in the grade of 9th Khadijah, especially in Cambridge Class that consists of 20 students. The analysis of the System and Structure is based on Martin's Model, especially in Classroom Interaction and the researcher wants to investigate how the interaction in the classroom. The interaction will be analyzed between the female teacher and the girl's student.

Students at Jabal Rahmah Mulia Boarding School Medan have some problems in interaction based on observation and interviews with a teacher and some students. The problems concerned with the system and structure of the language used interaction. In this school, there are some obstacles that are basically caused by the student's background. Although most of them did not have English as a daily discussion in their former school, they nevertheless know it and can converse in it. As a result, English is still being used in their daily interactions with others.

Research by McDuff, Kodra, Kaliouby, and LaFrance (2017) stated that women smile more than men, and there is evidence that women exaggerate expressive for positive emotion. Aspects to be investigated in this research are the system and structure of teacher talk and student talk in English classroom interaction because the conversation is a structurally organized phenomenon that has some kinds of order and therefore this research is conducted to identify how these sequences of order action are generated. Aswani (2016) conducted research that has been focused on classroom discourse analysis in English lessons using Martin's model of classroom discourse analysis. This research used a descriptive qualitative method to reveal the speech function, mood, and explain the pattern of moves that are realized in English classroom discourse. She concluded in her research that statement is the dominant type of speech function,

elliptical declarative for the dominant mood and secondary knower followed by primary knower (k2 ^ k1) is the dominant pattern of the move.

The scope of possibilities within qualitative research poses focused on the system and structure of student Classroom interaction in Boarding of Junior High School students in Medan, especially in 9th Grade of Khadijah which was identified by analyzing the move, mood, and speech function. The analysis is to be on the direct communication between the teacher and students in the class. The researcher is to analyze it by looking directly at the class and recording the conversation and then making it into a transcript. There are some transcripts that are to be analyzed. And next, the researcher is to be using Martin's Model in this analysis to solve the problem.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Online Interaction

Interaction among students is vital to ensure meaningful and deep learning (Azer, 2009). Interaction is an action among people derived from the mutual influence through which they can share, retrieve and store important knowledge (Din, Haron, Ahmad & Rashid, 2015). The "Social presence" of the students in an online learning environment is crucial to persuade students' active involvement and interaction in learning (Razzak, 2016). Online discussions offer students the opportunity to interact by responding to peers' and instructors' posts (Kent, Laslo & Rafaeli, 2016). The students may excel better in academic achievement and may construct new knowledge (Kimber & Wyatt-Smith, 2010) by utilizing online learning, as the students understand better through active interactions in social learning. Apart from that, interaction via social learning is able to bridge the gap among students, teachers, or lecturers in terms of communication (Al-Rahmi & Zeki, 2017). Thus, interactions must be coherent among peers as the discussion can proceed to online academic tasks such as research for relevant articles, discussion on assignments, and revisions (Din et al., 2015).

2.1 Martin's Model

There are students and an English speaker as subjects in this conversation analysis. They use language (discourse) to communicate with each other. Martin (1992) asserts that everyday language is itself a theory of the world, but in classroom discourse, a theory of conversation: pupil, request, information, answer, teacher (in this study is replaced with an English speaker), response, confirmation, rejection, sequence, reply, expectation, comment, dialogue, and authentic. According to Martin (1992), to analyze spoken discourse in a classroom is through interpersonal metafunction; there are multilayer aspects to analyze it, namely speech function, Mood, and move. Speech function has a role and commodity. Martin (1992) explains that there are four speech function and adjacency pairs, namely statement, acknowledge statement, question, response statement to question, offer, acknowledge offer, command, and response offer to command. Mood clause is the system that is realized in the selection of three illocutionary acts of stating, questioning, and commanding. According to Martin

(1992), there are some typical Mood in clauses, namely declarative, interrogative, elliptical declarative, imperative, and minor clauses. The realization of move is related to speech function and Mood. Conversation especially in classroom discourse is structured in terms of move. There are two of exchange in move, namely exchange of information and of goods and services. Halliday's theory on move concerns the term of nine types involving k1, k2, dk1, k1f, k2f, a1, a2, da1, a1f, a2f which involves exchanging information and goods and service. Move has the pattern to analyze conversation and dk1, k2, and k1 are the exchange of move structurally. However, in another case, the exchange can be represented with another representation of move called dynamics conversation.

Ginting (2010) analyzes the conversational systems and structures of the Karonese language. It attempted to find out the causes of how such systems and structures were realized. The results revealed that there were two conversational systems, namely, of typical and uncommon contexts. In both contexts there were speakers who were not permitted to give a direct talk, thus they had to speak via another person or an object. In her conclusions, she says that normally the structures of giving and asking for information are represented by k1 and k2, but in the Karonese language there are other representations, namely k1 (a2) and k2 (a2). In addition, there exist complex structures resulted not only from challenges, clarifications, confirmations, etc. but also from the relationship of tenor and contexts of the situation.

2.2 Interpersonal Meaning

Interpersonal meanings focus on the interactivity of the language and concern the ways in which we act upon one another through language. In either spoken texts or written texts, an interlocutor expects to tell listeners/ readers via text. This means that each text has a relationship between the providers of information and recipients of the information.

2.3 Discourse System and Structure

Martin (1992) created it as a supplement to English functional grammar, based on the generation of discourse analysis inspired by Halliday and Hasan's cohesiveness in English (2004). Structure and system represent two concepts of discourse analysis investigation under the framework of Systemic Functional Linguistics. The analysis presented is systematically related to a theory of discourse semantics, including the deconstruction of contextual issues.

The system employs a multilayered analysis of text in which system refers to the analysis of move whereas structure deals with the analysis of the exchange of information, exchange of goods and services, and dynamic of the conversation. The structure employs a multilayered analysis of text in which the system refers to the analysis of speech function and mood. Speech function deals with Statement, Acknowledge Statement, Question, Response Statement to Question, Command,

Response Offer to Command, Offer, and Acknowledge. And mood deals with Declarative, Elliptical Declarative, Question, Imperative, and Minor.

a. Move refers to the function or role played by a speaker (addresser) in a conversation in his/her relation to the function or role played by the hearer (addressee) and the commodity being exchanged. In conversation, it is to occur exchanging information where the addresser and addressee are to conduct questions or statements dominantly. According to Cheng (2004), the conversation is fundamentally a turn-taking activity, where taking a turn is regarded as the speaker's right and obligation. In conversation analysis, a wide range of aspects of conversation has been investigated such as its structure in terms of move. In this way, conversations are multi-dimensionally analyzed. It means that in a negotiation there are three dimensions that can be analyzed, they are move, speech function, and mood. A sort of "frame" on either side of the sequence of questions and answers is called move (McCarthy; 1991). It means, in conversation, it is possible to have some move. One move means one part of the exchange, or it can be said that move is every clause that is uttered by the addresser and addressee.

b. Speech functions (Martin, 1992) is a semantic aspect of meaning which is realized by mood at the level of lexicogrammar. That means mood is talking about the structure of the sentence and speech function is talking about the meaning of the sentence. Both of them should be realized in the sentence. In this case, speech functions should be realized by moods; they are (1) declarative, (2) interrogative, and (3) imperative. All of these are representations of human beings utterances in their communication. Therefore, speech functions are used to exchange human experiences through language function by using interpersonal meaning and realized by mood.

According to Eggins and Slade (2005), speech function is a functional analysis that attempts to determine the purpose of utterances and the interaction between interactants in a situation, particularly in terms of power distribution among the interactants. It is necessary to classify the speech functions based on the situations in which they are used, in order to capture the speech function types.

Speech Function Classes in casual conversation according to Eggins and Slade (2005) are defined not only functionally but also grammatically in terms of predictable selections of mood and modality, and semantically in terms of predictable appraisal and involvement choices. They can be analyzed from the move. Speech functions have many various forms in the sentence because the sentences are the unity of the kinds of structure which have the meaning of the sentences.

c. Mood, Halliday & Matthiessen (2014) conveyed that the relation between semantics and grammar is one of realization: the wording "realizes", or encodes, the meaning. The wording, in turn, is "realized by" sound or writing. There is no sense in asking which determines which; the relation is a symbolic one. It is not possible to point to each symbol as an isolate and ask what it means; the meaning is encoded in the wording as an integrated whole. The four speech functions (statement, question, offer,

and command) find their realization in mood which is an aspect of interpersonal function at the level of lexicogrammar.

The representation of speech function "statement" is realized by "declarative", "question" is realized by "interrogative", and "command" is realized by "imperative". However, the speech function of "offer" does not have an unmarked representation of Mood. It is realized by any one of the four speech functions.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The data source of the study is taken from an English school Jabal Rahmah Mulia Boarding School which is located at 24 Jalan Balai Desa, Kec. Medan Sunggal, Medan Kota, North Sumatera province was chosen to be the venue of the research because it is one of the English schools in Medan that oblige the students to speak English with local people and foreigners.

The data of the study is all clauses in the utterances or the dialog between teacher and female students while Teaching English in the classroom. The data is the utterances from two female teachers and 20 students of 9th Khadijah in the English Classroom Interaction. This study is to be investigated the teacher and female students. This research took in the odd semester. Conversation videos are documented in four meetings from the class in which each video recording lasts for 16-30 minutes.

In this study, a qualitative method was used. The source of data is all clauses in the utterances that were taken from an English School. The data was then analyzed after it was collected.

The data are collected through naturalistic observation and document analysis. The classroom interaction was observed through video recording via Zoom Meeting. To display the language used in the classroom, the recorded interaction is later converted to a conversation transcript. The data comprise types of classroom interactions including 1) student speaking to teacher; 2) teacher speaking to students. However, the main activity of the class is the student interaction with the English teacher, thus the focus of findings and discussion has been limited to the interaction of a student speaking to their English teacher. The analysis also makes use of a few extracts of a teacher speaking to students' utterances to showcase the existence of the certain type of findings.

This represented the date of the recording, and the class observed. As the data collection is completely done, the School principal declared it on a letter of completion research. The other method for collecting data was document analysis. Document analysis has advantages, namely, it is useful as a means of analyzing observational data and a researcher can delve into records and documents (Frankel & Wallen, 2011). In this research, the document analyzed is the video-recorded conversation transcription of English classroom interaction via Zoom Meeting. The following ways to collect the data:

1. The researcher makes a transcript from the interaction in the classroom that has already been recorded.
2. The researcher makes a label in the video file such as Transcripts (Theme). This represented the date of the recording and the class observed.
3. The researcher collects in utterances or conversations.
4. As the data collection is completely done, the school principal declared it on a letter of completion research.

The other method for collecting data was document analysis. In this research, the document analyzed is the video-recorded conversation transcription of English Classroom interaction.

All of the data are collected by using documentation, then analyzed and described descriptively. The data were analyzed using several appropriate steps the theory of Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014) is to analyze the data with three steps:

Step 1. Data Collection, from the method used, is observation, interviews, and documentation. All of these data types have one key aspect in general, the analysis mainly depends on the integrative and interpretive skills of the researcher. Interpretation is necessary because the data collected is rarely in the form of numbers, data-rich in details and length.

Step 2. Data Condensation refers to the process of selecting, focusing, simplifying, abstracting, and transforming the data contained in the records.

Fields and transcripts in this study are described as follows:

a. Selection (Selecting)

According to Miles and Huberman (2014), researchers should act selectively, that is, determine which dimensions are more important, which relationships might be more meaningful, and, as a consequence, what information can be collected and analyzed. For this step, the researcher is to collect the data when recording the interaction in the class and find out the utterances or statements by students and teachers by observation and documentation and then select the data by referring to the formulation of the research problem.

b. Focusing

Miles and Huberman (2014) stated that focusing on data is a form of pre-analysis. At this stage, researchers focus on data related to the formulation research problem. This stage is a continuation of the selection stage data. The researchers only focus on the problems based on the formulation problem.

c. Summary (Abstracting)

The stage of making a summary of the core, processes, and statements that needs to be maintained so that they remain in it. At this stage, the data that has been collected is evaluated, especially related to the quality and adequacy of the data. For this step, the

researcher summarizes those data into a transcript. Analyze the text in multilayered analysis to identify the system and structure of English Classroom interaction and findings, as well as the discussion, started in this step.

Based on those opinions, the researcher wants to find out the system and structure during the classroom interaction in that school that, basically, this school just has female students. The writer of this research chose 20 female students because females are more expressive than men. The data source of this research is a teacher and student interaction in English that was conversed in the classroom. Based on the analysis, the researcher develops a rule or model to explain the occurrence of the structure and system.

4. FINDINGS

The proper conversation analysis framework indicated and intended by Martin's theory, such as recording, transcribing, identifying, and classifying, was properly implemented to reach a sensible result.

The transcripts of recorded conversations between an Indonesian instructor, an English teacher, and pupils in a classroom at Jabal Rahmah Mulia Boarding School in Medan during a speaking-practice lesson are used in this study. The following are the results of the data analysis.

4.1. MOVE

The data reveals nineteen categories of move, with a total of 138 units of move, including eight types of knowledge exchanges, one type of good and service exchange, and seven forms of the dynamic move. The tables below show some examples of the data.

The exchange of knowledge and information is mostly used by teachers and students in interaction. The number of occurrences is 36 (26%). One of the exchanges of knowledge and information is as the following.

Table 1. The Example of Secondary Knower Followed by Primary Knower (k2∧k1)

Unit	Move	Utterances
8/3	k2 k1	T1 : why do you hate Spiderman movie? S : I think it's like for boys.

Teacher as a secondary knower (k2) who always asks for information or asks questions of the student, this sort of move sequence appears the most in the study, as seen in table 4.1. Then, as the primary knower, the student responded to the question (k1). It is assumed that the students responded to the teacher's (English) responses about her mind while they talked about Films in a simple statement. It demonstrates that language use in classroom interaction between students and teachers is still low.

4.2. SPEECH FUNCTION

The analysis of clauses in the classroom interaction regarding speech functions has shown that response statement to question (RSQ) is the most common pattern, which signals that most of the clauses in the interaction are declarative in mood.

The data is classified into speech functions and each adjacency pair appeared with a total of occurrences are 502. They are statement (S), acknowledge statement (AS), question (Q), response statement to question (RSQ), and command (C). The examples of the result are presented in the subsections below.

Identified in the text 169 are Response Statement to Questions (RSQ), which constitute 33, 6 %. Response Statement to Question (RSQ) dominance denotes that there is a continuously running interaction among the parties. An example of data is given below.

Table 2. The Example of Response Statement to Question (RSQ)

Unit/Conversation	Types of Speech Function	Function	Utterances
3/3	Response Statement to Question (RSQ)	Answering to question	S : Play roblocs ummi.

An important aspect of classroom interaction is the manner in which interlocutors handle a response to a question. This speech function is the adjacency pair of questions. In accordance with the native's role as a primary authority (k1), this speech function is dominantly produced by him. Martin (1992) describes a response statement to a question (RSQ) as a pair of questions.

4.3 MOOD

In the data, there are five types mood in the clause that occurred. They are declarative, interrogative, imperative, elliptical declarative, and minor in which the total of utterances of mood is 504 occurrences. An illustrative example taken from the conversation dialogue is to represent the significant mood system in the interaction under study.

Declarative is one of the basic options of the English mood system which just as interrogative are grouped under indicative since semantically, declarative, and interrogative express the exchange of information. The texts in the conversation under study are the second dominantly declarative in their mood; this relates to the interlocutors' real convictions and highlights the utterance are dominantly statements of experience. According to data analysis, declarative has 177 occurrences or 35, 1 %. One of the dialogues which reflects this pattern is shown and analyzed below.

Table 3. The Example of Declarative

Unit/ Conversation	Types of Mood	Utterances
17/2	Declarative	T1: and the other is the substitute holiday, so we have a lot of holidays, especially for this semester, you will find a lot of holidays, uumm fasting holiday, Eid Fitr holiday you have and also the imlek holiday so it is very great for you ya, next okay a lot of beautiful places that you could find when you have holidays, for examples mom ask you do you have any plans for us to go this holiday? You can simply say mom I want to go to Paris, I want to see Eifel there, I want to go to London because I can practice my English there, I want to go to Brazil, I want to go to Spanish and you don't have to go out Indonesia actually for your holiday.

Declarative has a function to express a statement and a way to answer a question completely. The example states an answer from the teacher (English) when she explains the material. As shown in the analysis above, the English teacher gives an explanation about the *Substitute Holiday* composed of a declarative sentence. She clarified that students can go anywhere when they've got their holiday. Declarative clauses are highly preferred in both spoken and written discourse because they give as much information as possible to the addressee. The English teachers as mostly primary knowers (k1) succeeded in opting for declarative clauses in expressing factual information about some information to the students.

5. DISCUSSION

As a result of the studies, there are 19 different types of move exchanges in the text. The secondary knower is the most common move pattern, followed by the main knower (k2k1). This finding supports Martin's (1992) claim that k2 and k1 dominate the representation of movement in classroom engagement. Because the relationship is built in a purely knowledge-oriented way, type a2a1 is a loner in the group. The acceptable explanation for this is that the learner, as a secondary knower (k2), always seeks information from the teacher (English). In this situation, the teacher primarily serves as a source of information.

This result is identical to the research findings of Aswani (2016) who investigated English Classroom Discourse Analysis of SMA Negeri 1 Students Tanjungbalai using Martin's model of conversation analysis. She also declared that k1 and k2 was the dominant structure in the classroom discourse with the same explanation that classroom interaction normally occupies the exchange of knowledge in the form of asking and giving information.

Having proved in finding that there are 6 types of speech functions in the text. The dominant appearance is Question (Q) which reaches 211 occurrences or 42,0%. This speech function appears in the text in order to complete the giving information as the way for answering the question.

Then, the second position is Response to Question (RSQ) which has 169 occurrences or 33,6%. It is in accordance with the pair of Response Statement to Question (RSQ) as stated by Shalehoddin & Ashari (2016) in their paper entitled "Move" Analysis in Classroom Interaction (An Functional Grammar Approach) that classroom conversation is dominated by statement and question i.e. the interaction refers to discussion situation. Regarding speech function, the students dominate the opening because they deliver questions then followed by responses from the English teachers.

The questions proposed aim at getting information from the English teachers. This is an indication that students play the role of initiators, while the teachers are supporters. Students initiate the exchange by the question, just the other way the English teacher's initiation is encoded in a statement. This fact also indicates that students are demanders, while the English teacher is a giver.

The choice of mood depends on the role the speaker selects in the speech situation and what role he/she assigns to the addressee. From the finding above, it can be elucidated that there are 5 typical mood in the text and the Interrogative appears at the highest rate. Interrogatives in this text purposively get into asking for information around the class. It has 210 occurrences or 41, 6 % in this text. Interrogative mood typically finds out information. The category of finding out the information is mostly used by the English teacher because she acts as the main facilitator during classroom interaction.

In the text under study, the English teacher produces much more clauses than the students in his way of responding to questions. This frequent employment of the declarative mood reflected in the conversation corresponds with Meisuri's conclusion in her research entitled Moves in Classroom Interaction: IRF Moel of Sinclair and Coulthard Research (2014) that classroom interaction is largely dominated by teachers. A large number of declarative mood shows the speaker's effort to exhibit his/her competence in delivering information.

In this case, the interrogative takes the second position. It has 113 occurrences or 34,7%. The sequence of declarative and interrogative appeared in order to complete the process of giving and demanding information.

6. CONCLUSION

Learning is increasingly being recognized as a fundamentally social activity, there has been a steady increase in the study of classroom interaction. As a result, information is viewed not as being delivered but as being altered through interaction. Martin's Conversation Examination (CA) model could be used inside Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) framework to provide a comprehensive analysis of the system and structure of English classroom interaction.

This study has taken deliberate steps in examining elements of the system and structure of an English classroom interaction at Jabal Rahmah Boarding School Medan. The analysis focuses on move structure, choice of mood, and speech function.

This study is evaluated utilizing Martin's (1992) Conversational Analysis, which can contribute significantly to a researcher's grasp of how to assess the system and structure of English classroom interaction. In terms of the system, it indicates how mood and speech function in a conversation transcript, as well as how they are marked or unmarked during coding. The structure is concerned with movement patterns and dynamic communication. It's also a good idea to look at the other meaning strands for additional inquiry. Based on the preceding conclusion, this type of research will almost certainly be much better when conducted over a longer period of time with more participants in order to provide input in other contexts. Other instruments, such as questionnaires, can be used to provide more thorough information.

As a result, these investigations may be able to evaluate whether the methodology used in this study is an appropriate model for comparing Conversational Analysis (CA) types in various discussion contexts. More importantly, such research may identify places where the present technique could be improved. Martin's theory is well suited to examining classroom conversation. As a result, it is advised that CA be used more widely in studies of normal classroom interactions, either alone or in combination with other forms.

This study has several difficulties in conducting the research, including data collection, data coding, and analysis processes, data calculation, collecting the theories, and describing findings and discussion. Therefore, it is suggested that a researcher to concept a detailed research plan and strategy, have as many references as possible, and prepare a research timeline well. Classroom interaction has a lot of scopes that are worth to be investigated, thus it is beneficial to conduct a similar study with different frameworks such as types of classroom interaction, foreign language interaction (FLINT), teacher-students communication strategies, and non-native English-speaking teacher (NNEST) and many others topics of analysis.

7. REFERENCES

Allwright, D and K. M. Bailey. (1991). *Focus on the Language Classroom: An Introduction to Classroom Research for Language Teachers*. Cambridge University Press.

Al-Rahmi, W.M., & Zeki, A.M. (2017). A model of using social media for collaborative learning to enhance learners' performance on learning. *Journal of King Saud University-Computer and Information Sciences*, 29(4), 526-535.

Aswani, A. (2016). *English Classroom Discourse Analysis of SMA Negeri 1 Students Tanjungbalai*. Medan: University of Sumatera Utara

Azer, S.A. (2009). Interactions between students and tutor in problem-based learning: The significance of deep learning. *The Kaohsiung journal of medical sciences*, 25(5), 240-249.

Brown, H.D. (2001). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.

Butt, D., Rhondda F., Susan F., Sue P., & Collin Y. (2009). *Using Functional Grammar: An Explorer's Guide*. Macmillan Education Australia.

Cheng, W. (2004). *Intercultural Conversation. Amsterdam*. John Benjamin Publishing Company.

Cohen, L., Lawrence M., & Keith M. (2007). *Research Methods in Education.* Routledge.

Cresswell, J. W. (2013). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Method Approaches.* SAGE.

Dagarin, M. (2004). *Classroom Interaction and Communication Strategies in Learning English as a Foreign.* ELOPE.

Din, N., Haron, S., Ahmad, H., & Rashid, R.M. (2015). Technology Supported Cities and Effective Online Interaction for Learning. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 170, 206-214.

Eggins, S., & Diana S. (2005). *Analysing Casual Conversation*. Equinox.

Fikri, Z. (2015). Mood Structure Analysis of Teacher Talk in EFL Classroom: A Discourse Study Based on Systemic Functional Linguistic Theory, GaneC Swara, 9(1), 86-95.

Fraenkel, J.R., & Wallen, N.E. (2009). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education*. McGraw-Hill Higher Education.

Ginting, S. A. (2010). *Sistem dan Struktur Percakapan dalam Bahasa Karo.* Medan: University of Sumatera Utara

Halliday, M.A.K & Christian M.I.M.M. (2014). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. Routledge.

Hanafiah, R. (2016). Analysis of Lexical Density and Grammatical Intricacy in Thesis Abstract of English Department Student of USU. *The ASIAN EFL Journal*. 5, 47-51.

Kent, C., Laslo, E., & Rafaeli, S. (2016). Interactivity in online discussions and learning outcomes. Computers & Education, 97, 116-128.

Kimber, K., & Wyatt-Smith, C. (2010). Secondary students' online use and creation of knowledge: Refocusing priorities for quality assessment and learning. Australasian journal of educational technology, 26(5).

Martin, J.R. (1992). *English Text System and Structure*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

McCharthy, M. (1991). *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge University Press.

Meisuri, (2014). *Moves in Classroom Interaction: IRF Model of Sinclair and Coulthard Research*. Medan: University of Sumatera Utara

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook*. SAGE Publications

Nuha, U. (2014). *Transactional and Interpersonal Conversation Texts in English Textbook*. Kudus: State Institute for Islamic Studies (STAIN).

Razzak, N.A. (2016). Strategies for effective faculty involvement in online activities aimed at promoting critical thinking and deep learning. Education and Information Technologies, 21(4), 881-896.

Schiffrin, D. (2003). *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Shalehoddin & Erwin A. (2016). Move Analysis in Classroom Interaction (An Functional Grammar Approach), *Journal Anglo-Saxon*, 7(1), 73-81.

Suherdihas. (2009). *Classroom Discourse Analysis: A Systemiotic Approach*. Research Book on Classroom Discourse Analysis.