

PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS' POWER DOMINANCE AND INTERACTION STRATEGIES IN EFL CLASSROOM DISCOURSE

Rama Dwika Herdiawan¹, Agus Rofi'i²

^{1,2}English Language Education Department, Universitas Majalengka

* Corresponding Author: ramadwika@unma.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received : Jan 19, 2023

Revised : July 10, 2023

Accepted : July 25, 2023

Available online : July 31, 2023

Kata Kunci:

Dominasi Kekuatan, Strategi Interaksi, dan Strategi Kelas

Keywords:

Maximum of 5 keywords separated by comma (,), crucial to the appropriate indexing of the papers, are to be given.

ABSTRAK

Wacana kelas secara harfiah berarti bahasa dan interaksi yang digunakan oleh guru dan siswa untuk membuat konsep pembelajaran dalam konteks pendidikan. Wacana kelas adalah bagian dari analisis teks yang berkaitan dengan pembicaraan di kelas. Studi saat ini terkait erat dengan analisis wacana kritis (CDA) untuk menyelidiki dominasi kekuasaan serta strategi interaksi kelas dalam pembicaraan guru-siswa. Data yang terkumpul dianalisis berdasarkan metafungsi bahasa menggunakan SFL menggarisbawahi analisis wacana multimodal. Temuan mengungkapkan bahwa hasil penelitian mengungkapkan bahwa guru sering menggunakan bentuk imperatif untuk memaksakan otoritas. Hal ini kemungkinan disebabkan oleh fakta bahwa siswa tidak secara bebas berpartisipasi

dalam semua kegiatan. Mereka memanggil nama siswa untuk menentukan siapa yang paling sering berbicara atau menjawab pertanyaan. sebagian besar pertanyaan yang diajukan oleh calon guru adalah pertanyaan pajangan. Mayoritas siswa menanggapi dengan pernyataan singkat daripada tindak lanjut tanggapan yang lebih lama. guru pra-jabatan menggunakan pola wacana monologis dalam seminar mereka, terlepas dari fakta bahwa mereka menegaskan bahwa mereka memilih yang dialogis untuk digunakan. Hal ini mungkin karena naskah budaya dan pentingnya peran guru dalam sistem pendidikan. Temuan penelitian ini dapat membantu para praktisi di lapangan dalam hal menggunakan ucapan yang sesuai dalam kerangka EFL, yang dapat memfasilitasi partisipasi dan keterlibatan siswa dalam interaksi kelas.

ABSTRACT

Classroom discourse is literally meant as the language and interaction employed by the teacher and the students to conceptualize learning in the educational context. Classroom discourse is a part of text analysis which is concerned with classroom talk. The current study is closely related to critical discourse analysis (CDA) which aims to explain power dominancy as well as classroom interaction strategies in the teacher-student talk. The data collected were analyzed based on the language meta-functions using SFL underlining critical discourse analysis which is in line with qualitative method. The findings reveal that the result of the study revealed that teachers utilized the imperative form to impose authority the majority of the time. This is likely due to the fact that students did not freely participate in all of the activities. They were calling on students' names in order to determine who would talk or answer questions the most of the time. the majority of the

questions that the pre-service teachers posed were display questions. The majority of the students responded with brief statements rather than follow-up responses that were longer. the pre-service teachers employ a monologic discourse pattern in their seminars, despite the fact that they assert that they choose a dialogic one to use instead. It's possible that this is due to cultural scripts and the importance placed on the role of the teacher in the educational system. The findings of the study could be helpful to practitioners in the field in terms of employing suitable speech within the framework of EFL, which might facilitate students' participation and engagement in class interactions.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-NC](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) license.

Copyright © 2021 by Author. Published by Universitas Bina Bangsa Getsempena



INTRODUCTION

Teacher has a pivotal role to promote the students' comprehension towards every single of discursive texts in classroom discourse. Teachers act out as mediators (Feuerstein in Xiongyong, Samuel, Hua, 2012) and facilitators and monitors (Richards 2011, 2006). In order to implement their roles successfully, they are needed to employ the proper strategies particularly classroom interaction strategies in which they get interactive with their students in EFL classroom discourse. Classroom discourse is literally meant as the language and interaction employed by the teacher and the students to conceptualize learning in the educational context. Classroom discourse is a part of text analysis which is concerned with classroom talk. It theoretically covers the language and interactions employed by the teacher and learners to embody interactive learning (Jenks, 2021). It reflects various kinds of issues occurring in language classrooms and covers the context in which the second/foreign language is implemented, the activities that language learners do, and teachers' and learners' engagement in classroom activities.

According to Nuthall, (2020), the first study of Classroom Discourse (CD) was initiated in 1910 by taking a record of teachers and students talk in classrooms. The first studies showed that the verbal engagement between teachers and students who had specific structure that was much similar to all classrooms, at all grade levels, and in all countries. In a number of countries, because of lack of an English-speaking support outside the classroom, CD is considered as a sort of model for language and learners' successful performance resulting from classroom interactions (Ingram, 2019; Liu & Le, 2012). The first studies on CD were concerned with teachers' language but it represents an aspect of classroom process research that depicts the joint significances of teacher and students. Because the primary purpose of an EFL class is employing language in context, therefore, the discourse employed in the classroom is both teacher-student and student-

student-based. The existing purpose of EFL classrooms is gaining interaction with students and the EFL teachers are required to communicate to each other all the time. It becomes an interactive process for the teachers to control and manage the whole process the classroom. Based on Bhatia et al. (2008), language functions meaningful when it is employed in a context, and language in context is regarded as discourse. The discourse which teachers employ to state their dominancy varies across different fields and in different cultures.

One of the related issues in EFL (English as a Foreign Language) classroom discourse is the presence of imbalanced power dynamics between pre-service teachers and students. This power dominance affects an authoritative teaching style that restricts students' active participation and engagement in the learning process. The effects of an imbalance of power are caused by the lack of, or the presence of a circumstantial constraint or a different social entity (Loo, D. B., Maidom, R., & Kitjaroonchai, N, 2019). When pre-service teachers employ their power dominantly, it often covers a lack of student involvement in classroom discussions. Students may perceive intimidated or reluctant to discuss their opinions, which develop their language development and communication skills. In addition, the prevalence of power dominance in the classroom influences students' autonomy in language learning. Pre-service teachers may accelerate control of most activities and decision-making processes, leaving students with fewer opportunities to take ownership of their learning journey. In this case, consequence of power dominance is the adoption of a teacher-centred approach rather than a student-centred one. This approach can hinder student engagement, critical thinking, and creativity, as the focus remains on the teacher's authority and content delivery. Therefore, when pre-service teachers do not employ appropriate interaction strategies, effective communication between teachers and students can be compromised. This may lead to misunderstandings, misinterpretations, and limited comprehension of the language being taught. Difference position within the school structure is one of the factors that determine the selection of forms of communication. Communication between principals, teachers, and students formally still tends to be vertical rather than horizontal (Eriyanti, R. W., 2018). In a classroom dominated by the teacher's power, students may become disinterested and demotivated to actively participate in the learning process. This lack of motivation can negatively impact language acquisition and overall academic performance. Power dominance can create an atmosphere where students are hesitant to speak and experiment with the target language due to fear of making mistakes or being

judged. Consequently, this can limit their language output and hinder their language development. Students from diverse backgrounds and varying language proficiency levels may face unequal opportunities in participating and expressing themselves in a power-dominant classroom. This can lead to exclusion and hinder the creation of an inclusive learning environment. Addressing these problems requires pre-service teachers to undergo training and professional development programs that emphasize student-centred teaching approaches, effective communication techniques, and strategies for creating an inclusive and supportive EFL classroom. By promoting collaboration, active student participation, and a nurturing learning environment, pre-service teachers can facilitate a more conducive and enriching language learning experience for their students.

The notion of power dominancy becomes a point of interest for discourse analysts. Not only in politics or society but also the classroom, power domination is traceable (Bhatia, et al., 2008). The prominent role of the teacher is mostly controlling and being able to manage the classroom. Therefore, a teacher employs a sort of discourse to actualize his/her authority over the students. The classroom discourse is mostly focusing on spoken discourse instead of written discourse (Hyland, 2011). Thus, every single of clause, sentence, and expression which are conveyed by the teacher may contain an interpretation and specific meaning based on the situation. Studying the classroom discourse in different contexts and cultures can give the related information about how to conduct communication with the students, matching with the demands of new generations and the new era. Therefore, because of its main role in educational contexts, this study aims at investigating Pre-service power dominancy and interaction strategies in EFL classroom discourse.

Research Questions

1. What types of specific speech act are employed in the discourse of the teachers in the classroom to ascertain their dominancy and power?
2. Which types of questions (display questions or referential questions) do teachers use more in their classes?

In conclusion, this study sheds light on a significant aspect of language education. Through an in-depth exploration of pre-service teachers' behaviour in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms, the study has uncovered valuable insights into power dynamics and interaction strategies. It underscores the crucial role that power plays in shaping classroom discourse. Pre-service teachers, as they navigate their roles as

facilitators of language learning, must be acutely aware of the power dynamics at play and their potential influence on student engagement and participation. Recognizing the unequal distribution of power is essential for fostering an inclusive and empowering learning environment, where students feel comfortable expressing themselves and actively participating in discussions. Furthermore, the identification of various interaction strategies employed by pre-service teachers provides practical implications for teacher training and professional development programmes. Equipping educators with the knowledge and skills to facilitate equitable, engaging, and learner-centered discussions can greatly enhance the overall classroom experience and boost language acquisition outcomes for students. Nevertheless, the study also brings to light the complex nature of power dynamics in EFL classrooms. Future research in this area should continue to explore the factors that shape power relations and delve deeper into how these dynamics impact students' language learning experiences. Additionally, investigating the perspectives of students and experienced teachers could provide valuable insights into effective instructional practices and ways to mitigate the negative effects of power imbalance. This also contributes significantly to our understanding of power dynamics and interaction strategies in EFL classrooms. By fostering a more inclusive and empowering learning environment, pre-service teachers can harness the potential of classroom discourse to facilitate meaningful language learning experiences for their students. Emphasizing the importance of equitable interactions, continuous teacher training, and further research in this field will undoubtedly enrich EFL education and benefit language learners in the UK and beyond.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The current study is closely related to critical discourse analysis (CDA) to investigate power dominance as well as classroom interaction strategies in the teacher-student talk in terms of qualitative method. CDA is an interdisciplinary study of discourse that considers language as social practice (Fairclough 2001) and takes into account the context of language use (Wodak 2001). Halliday (1978) claim that a discourse as text is both a process and a product, created, embedded and interpreted in a specific social context. Therefore, CDA scholars state that the choice of language users make represents their intentions, ideologies and thoughts (Widodo 2018). CDA demonstrates how texts and social actions modify the ideological system by providing particular values in social lives (de Los Heros, 2009). In terms of evaluating such ideologies, Halliday's

(1978) systemic functional linguistics (SFL) technique, when combined with lexicogrammatical or microlinguistic analysis, could be effective. As a multi-layered discourse, this study focuses on two elements of linguistic and visual choices in texts (Kress and van Leeuwen 2006; Widodo 2018). This current study focuses on providing some evidences in relation to the research topic. It is focuses on gathering the data through observing the teachers' performances. The data collected were analyzed based on the language metafunctions using SFL underlining multimodal discourse analysis. In terms of the critical analysis, the researcher employed a number of steps, as follows:

Steps	Descriptions
1. Familiarizing the data obtained	the data should be read thoroughly for familiarization until they are well-understood for initial coding.
2. Data Coding	The data collected were all highlighted for analysis. The coding assisted the researcher to provide relevant themes.
3. Naming the themes on the data	The researcher selected the highlighted data to convert the general data into specific ones. The key themes of data findings also helped the researcher to analyze the coded data
4. Themes' review	The researcher rechecks the coded themes in the dataset for the purpose of filtering the important data which are relevant to the study. At the same time, the themes are reviewed for naming the relevant ones.
5. Categorizing the themes	Each data finding was defined based on its scope and characteristics.
6. Writing up	The further step was writing the data based on the analysis of power dominance and classroom interaction strategies

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

What types of specific speech act are employed in the discourse of the teachers in the classroom to ascertain their dominance and power?

In order to analyze the discourse that the instructors used in the classroom, instances of their talks that involved specific discourse to retake control of the class were gathered and tallied. This allowed for the interpretation of the discourse that the teachers employed. Using O'Keefe's (2011) classification of speech acts, an investigation into their power and dominance was carried out. The frequency and proportion of such analyses are presented in Table 1 below:

Types of Speech Acts	Frequency	Percentage
Declarative	52	11
Imperative	150	80
Interrogative	50	9
Total	202	100

As displayed in Table 1, the most frequently deployed speech act by teachers to maintain authority and dominance was an imperative form, followed by interrogatives. Declarative was employed less frequently than the other two types of speech acts. This demonstrates that pre-service teachers utilized imperative forms more frequently than other types. They were delivering the command to ask the kids to undertake a chore or an exercise in order to project power and display authority or dominance. This demonstrates that in many educational environments, lessons are still primarily concentrated on the teacher. The following are some examples of the teachers' statements.

Example of Imperative:

Do the task in pairs and submit it before Tuesday!

Example of Interrogative:

Why do you say so?

Example of Declarative:

You are required to answer the questions with some evidences.

Ellis's (1994) classification on display and referential questions was utilized in order to evaluate the question kinds. This was done in order to investigate the number of research questions and types utilized by the instructor. The table 2 that follows provides information regarding the mean, frequency, and percentage of display questions as opposed to referential questions in each of the classes that were observed.

Teachers	Display Questions		Referential Questions	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1	15	20,55	12	18,71
2	11	15,07	10	15,63
3	9	12,33	7	10,94
4	14	19,18	13	20,32
5	24	32,87	22	34,37
Total	73	100	64	100
Mean	14,6		12,8	

According to what is shown in Table 2, the use of display questions and referential questions was not distributed in an equal manner. The average proportion of display questions was only slightly higher than the proportion of referential questions (56.45%, compared to 43.55%, respectively). In two of the classes, the teachers asked the same number of display and referential questions, and in the other classes, the number of display questions was greater than the number of referential questions. The exception to this was one of the classes, in which the teacher asked more referential questions than

display questions. To put it another way, the majority of the classes that were observed contained a greater number of display questions than referential questions.

The result of the study revealed that teachers utilized the imperative form to impose authority the majority of the time. This is likely due to the fact that students did not freely participate in all of the activities. They were calling on students' names in order to determine who would talk or answer questions the most of the time. This was done so that every student could have an equal opportunity to participate during class time. The pre-service teachers were under the impression that the timid students' limited command of the English language would cause them to be very submissive if they were given the opportunity to pose inquiries or participate in activities of their own volition. They never spoke unless they were specifically prompted to do so. As a consequence of this, teachers had a position of dominance and authority, and the lessons were centered on the teacher. The majority of Iranian educators who took part in this study were of the opinion that their country's students still look to them as the leaders of their courses and the focal point of the learning environment. Their students are the containers that need to be filled with information, and they are still dominating in the Iranian environment. They are seen as knowledge sources. Because of this, the children did not have any issues with being instructed on what to do and how to execute the exercises. The prefabricated lesson plans that the principals of the schools required the instructors to implement were still another reason why they had to assign certain activities at particular times.

Which types of questions (display questions or referential questions) do teachers use more in their classes?

In addition, the findings demonstrated that the majority of the questions that the pre-service teachers posed were display questions. The majority of the students responded with brief statements rather than follow-up responses that were longer. The 'wait time' that the teachers utilized was insufficient, which is why the number of times the teachers spoke was greater than the number of times the students spoke. It is line with Eryanti, R.W. (2018) who the degree of teacher dominance is represented in the use of directive, assertive, and expressive acts.

The current investigation revealed, moreover, that the pre-service teachers employ a monologic discourse pattern in their seminars, despite the fact that they assert that they choose a dialogic one to use instead. It's possible that this is due to cultural scripts and the importance placed on the role of the teacher in the educational system. The vast majority

of students continue to be dependent on their teachers, and they prefer to carry out activities or assignments that are controlled or directed by their instructors. Thus, power is not just meaning only in human interaction in particular contexts crystallized in teachers talk; the class arrangements also and situations and that language does not only shape are signs of power (Maftoon, P., & Shakouri, N., 2012).. The display questions made up the majority of the quiz. As a consequence of this, when students were replying to questions, they used shorter responses or pre-specified answers rather than referential, authentic queries of a high cognitive level, and they primarily limited themselves to their textbooks. These findings are in complete agreement with those that were found by Barekat and Mohammadi (2014), Chalak (2019), and Khany and Mohammadi (2016), all of which stressed the role of monologic patterns utilized by Iranian EFL teachers.

CONCLUSION

The current research focused on the classroom discourse utilized by Indonesian EFL teachers and included an analysis of their dominancy, teacher speak, different types of questions, and patterns of classroom discourse. The findings of the study indicated that the pre-service teachers utilized particular speech in order to ascertain their dominancy and power in the classrooms. A monologic discourse pattern with display questions was also found to be used by the educators, as evidenced by the findings. According to the findings of the study, many educational institutions continue to employ the time-honored method of one-way, teacher-directed instruction. Making an effort to transition these monologic settings to dialogic ones and preparing the conditions for such a change should be done as soon as possible. An investigation of the classrooms and an evaluation of the discourse and interactions taking place within the classes from emic and etic perspectives could help to get a clear picture of what the status quo is and find strategies to shift to more learner-centered approaches by promoting students' different abilities and preparing them, as well as their teachers, in a variety of situations at different levels of knowledge.

The findings of the study could be helpful to practitioners in the field in terms of employing suitable speech within the framework of EFL, which might facilitate students' participation and engagement in class interactions. It might also help legislators, curriculum creators, or school administrators construct more effective curricula for the foreseeable future. When teachers think about what they teach in the classroom from the point of view of an emic perspective, it can assist them in conducting self-evaluations and

provide them with additional insights that can be used to evaluate the success of their students based on the manner in which the teachers present the material, the type of discourse they use, and the types of interactions they engage in while working in classroom settings. It should be mentioned that this study, like any other study, is not complete on its own and may retain certain limits. These limitations may be owing to those limitations surrounding time, place, facilities, or instruments used in this very specific research study.

REFERENCES

- Barekat, B., & Saeedeh, M. (2014). The contribution of the teachers' use of dialogic discourse pattern to the improvement of the students' speaking ability. *Procedia*, 98, 353–362. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.426>
- Chalak, A. (2019). Classroom discourse and Interaction features of Iranian EFL teachers [Paper presentation]. *Fifth International Conference on Language, Discourse, and Pragmatics (LDP)*, Ahvaz, Iran.
- De Los Heros, S. (2009). Linguistic Pluralism or Prescriptivism? A CDA of Language Ideologies in Talento, Peru's Official Textbook for the First-Year of High School. *Linguistics and Education*, 20, 172–199, [doi:10.1016/j.linged.2009.01.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2009.01.007)
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford University Press.
- Eriyanti, R. W. (2018). Power gap as one of the trigger of verbal abuses committed by teachers in schools. *International Journal of Instruction*, 11(1), 363-378.
- Fairclough, N. (2001). *Critical Discourse Analysis as a Method in Social Scientific Research*. In *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, edited by R. Wodak and M. Meyer, 121–138. London: Sage.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*. London: Edward Arnold
- Ingram, J., & Elliott, V. (2019). *Research methods for classroom discourse*. Bloomsbury
- Loo, D. B., Maidom, R., & Kitjaroonchai, N. (2019). Non-native English speaking pre-service teachers in an EFL context: examining experiences through borderland discourse. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 1–18. [doi:10.1080/1359866x.2019.16072](https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866x.2019.16072)
- Maftoon, P., & Shakouri, N. (2012). The concept of power in teacher talk: A critical discourse analysis. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 19(8), 1208-1215.
- Jenks, C. J. (2021). *Researching classroom discourse*. Routledge.

- Khany, R, & Mohammadi, S. (2016). An analysis of the English class discourse in the Iranian high schools. *The Qualitative Report*, 21(10), 1817 -1835.
- Kress, G., and T. van Leeuwen. (2006). *Reading Images: The Grammar of Visual Design*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge
- Liu, J. & Le, T. (2012). A case study on college English classroom discourse. *International Journal of Innovative Interdisciplinary Research*, 2, 1-10.
- O'Keeffe, A. C. (2011). *Introducing pragmatics in use*. Routledge
- Richards, Jack C. (2006). *Communicative Language Teaching Today*. Cambridge: University Press
- Richards, Jack C. (2011). *Competence and Performance in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Widodo, H. P. (2018). A Critical Micro-Semiotic Analysis of Values Depicted in the Indonesian Ministry of National Education-Endorsed Secondary School English Textbook. In *Situating Moral and Cultural Values in ELT Materials: The Southeast Asian Context*, edited by H. P. Widodo, L. V. Canh, M. R. G. Perfecto, and A. Buripakdi, 131-152. Cham, Switzerland: Springer
- Wodak, R. 2001. *What CDA Is About- a Summary of Its History, Important Concepts and Its Development*. In *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, edited by R. Wodak and M. Meyer, 1-13. London: Sage
- Xiongyong, C., Samuel, M., Hua, C. (2012). Evaluation of EFL Teachers' Roles from The Perspective of Mediation: Case Studies of China's Secondary School Classroom Practices. *International Reviews of Social Sciences and Humanities*. 3 (1), 118-134.