



P-ISSN 2355-2794  
E-ISSN 2461-0275

## Am I Getting My Point Across? Microstructure of English Classroom Discourses by Acehese Teachers

Meta Keumala<sup>1,2</sup>  
Dohra Fitriisia<sup>\*1</sup>  
Iskandar Abdul Samad<sup>1</sup>  
Sofyan Abdul Gani<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of English Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education,  
Universitas Syiah Kuala, Banda Aceh 23111, INDONESIA

<sup>2</sup>Insan Qurani Islamic Boarding School, Aceh Besar 23363, INDONESIA

### Abstract

*For English teaching practice, productive talks that spur students' comprehension, creativity, and problem-solving ability are vital. This research aimed at finding out the spoken discourse based on six phases of microstructure in English classrooms. The data were obtained recordings and observations of two English teachers, chosen through purposive sampling, from Islamic senior high schools in Aceh. The data were concerned with the lexical density or the ratio of content to grammatical or function words within a clause. They were analyzed through thematic analysis which consists of five steps: data familiarization, code generation, theme search, themes revision, and theme definition. It was found that the total lexical density obtained by the first teacher in Class A was 63.66% and in class, B was 66.52%, while the second teacher in Class A was 71.74% and in Class B was 68.12%. The second teacher 2 in Class A had a higher lexical density than the first teacher even though both of them are considered to produce a high lexical density of around 60-70%. The formality of spoken discourse of the two teachers shows that the first teacher produced 172.5 while the second teacher produced 184. It means that the second teacher's spoken discourse was more formal than the first teacher's discourse. To analyze the utterances of teachers and to find the density of language used in the classrooms during the teaching and*

---

\* Corresponding author, email: [dohra\\_fitrisia@unsyiah.ac.id](mailto:dohra_fitrisia@unsyiah.ac.id)

**Citation in APA style:** Keumala, M., Fitriisia, D., Samad, I. A., & Gani, S. A. (2022). Am I getting my point across? Microstructure of English classroom discourses by Acehese teachers. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 9(1), 78-93.

Received May 1, 2021; Revised October 2, 2021; Accepted December 1, 2021; Published Online January 17, 2022

<https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v9i1.20954>

*learning process is important because they implicitly inform whether the language used is understandable for the students or not.*

**Keywords:** Classroom spoken discourse, critical discourse analysis (CDA), microstructure, non-native English teachers.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Classroom discourse is a crucial way of establishing linguistic awareness and understanding the meaning of language—in this case, English—in the classroom. The idea is that students need frequent and consistent opportunities to catch up on important materials during teacher talks in the classroom. For English teaching practice, it is important to deliberate productive talks that spur students' comprehension, creativity, and problem-solving ability. When the materials are delivered in a well-organized structure, teachers can boost the possibility of their understandings (Garton, 2012).

Teacher talk refers to how language teachers approach language students in ways that vary from how they address other types of students in the classroom (Ellis, 1985). They acclimate to both the structure and the work of the language to promote communication. Teachers play an important role in teaching and learning classrooms as language input providers and language models to be imitated by students, similar to classroom interaction. As far as acquisition, teacher talk is essential since it is most likely the significant wellspring of fathomable target language feedback the student is probably going to get. The sum and sort of teacher talk is even viewed as a definitive factor of progress or disappointment in classroom instruction (Ur, 2000).

While the complete frameworks of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) are often perplexing, activities that incorporate CDA components have been recommended for use in language classrooms to develop basic language awareness (Cots, 2006; Wharton, 2011). Until this point in time, notwithstanding, there has been generally little research directed into the adequacy of these CDA-based exercises in bringing Critical Language Awareness (CLA) up in English Foreign Language (EFL) students. According to Jorgensen and Phillips (2002), discourse analysis refers to the general idea that language is structured based on different patterns that people use in different areas of social life. Discourses are contexts that are broader than sentences, and teacher talks can also be classified as discourses.

Discourse analysis has grown into a wide-ranging and heterogeneous discipline that finds its unity in the description of language above the sentence and an interest in the contexts and cultural influences affecting language in use. It is also now, increasingly, forming a backdrop to research in applied linguistics, and second language learning and teaching in particular (McCarthy, 1992). Learners must master not only new vocabulary, syntactic patterns, and phonology, but also discourse competence, sociolinguistic competence, strategic competence, and interactional competence. They require opportunities to examine language's systematicity at all linguistic levels, particularly at the highest level (Riggenbach, 1999; Young & He, 1998).

One problem for second language learners is limited understanding with a variety of interaction techniques in the target language (Demo, 2001). As a result, one

of the objectives of second language instruction is to expose students to various discourse patterns in various texts and interactions. Allowing students to study language, or making them discourse analysts, is one way for teachers to incorporate discourse studies into the second language classroom (Johnson, 1995). Learners get a better awareness and comprehension of the discourse patterns associated with a certain genre or speech event, as well as the sociolinguistic elements that contribute to linguistic variance across settings and situations, through experiencing natural language use in authentic settings (Hatch, 1992).

The problem that can be spotted in the material explanation of English classes in high schools is the current classroom discourses. Halliday (1985) states that there is a strong relationship between discourse and language learning. From the researchers' experience and preliminary observation, teachers do not follow any sequential rules in delivering the materials. To some extent, this condition has an impact on students' comprehension and achievement in English subjects. Cazden (2001) supports that nowadays, most teachers still use non-traditional classroom discourse where there is no structure to follow in classroom talks. Skidmore (2000) further adds that in this classroom discourse, teachers, seen as someone who knows and possesses the truth, dominates the class, while the students are those who are ignorant and in error. Therefore, what teachers say to students and how they say it is important to be further analyzed in the micro and macro level of analysis.

There are some previous studies related to CDA. First, in the context of EFL, an analysis was done by Nesia and Ginting (2014) who focus on finding the lexical items formed in reading texts of the 'Look Ahead' textbook and the type of genre that has the highest lexical density in the reading texts. The results reveal that the lexical density of explanation texts is 58,42% and 52,05%, review texts are 55,73% and 53,51%, narrative texts are 48,96% and 43,97%, and discussion texts are 47,79% and 42,57%. The highest lexical density of the reading texts is the explanation text with a percentage of 58.42%. This meant that explanation text is the most difficult text to be comprehended in the textbook.

Outside the educational context, CDA explores the internal meaning of the Indonesian anthem from the CDA perspectives in which it uses the stages of Fairclough's (1989) Critical Discourse Analysis framework (1989). The study, carried out by Surjowati (2021), includes the microanalysis concerning lexical features in the text, meso analysis concerning the process production and interpretation of the text, and macro analysis concerning ideological effects and hegemonic processes in discourse. This study analyzed the attitude system of appraisal where the results showed that from the affect viewpoint, the Indonesian anthem composer is seen as an educated young man who witnessed people suffer and did not only express his feeling of joy with the coming independence of Indonesia and the gratefulness, but also the insecurity and anxiety with the possibility of other forms of colonialism.

Hanafiah and Yusuf (2016) construed the lexical density (LD) and the grammatical intricacy (GI) in linguistic thesis abstracts written by undergraduate English department students. This study proves that the average score of GI and LD successively is 1.84 and the LD index is 0.57. Those abstracts are characterized as written language because of having a high degree of LD index which is more than 0.4 and the use of simple language represented by a low degree of GI index.

The 'microstructures' refer to minor structures within a type of material. Glowalla and Colonus (1982) describe microstructure as the study of individual

sentences and the relationships between sentences and words. What is measured in terms of microstructure analysis is the lexical density of a clause or sentence. Lexical density is the complexity that develops when a person speaks or writes as the sentences develop (Halliday, 2004). As proposed by Ur (2000), lexical density is the number of specific running words. The following example provides a brief illustration of the conceptual development of lexical density:

**The Trust has offered advice to local government authorities on cemetery conservation** (Halliday, 1985, p. 61).

There are eight lexical items in this sentence that are printed in bold. And four items are not printed in bold. This means that there is a proportion of eight lexical items out of twelve items in total, and using Ur's (2000) original method, the lexical density would be 67% or 0.67; which is the result of eight divided by twelve.

Therefore, analyzing the utterances by classifying the phrasing, formality, and verbal tense to decide the density of language used by the teacher in the classrooms during the teaching and learning process is important. Concentration on dissecting the sort of language can be enlightening, powerful, or promotional, depending on the text genres (O'Hair et al., 2004). The verbal composition (i.e., the genre of language, contemplating the motivation behind each utterance produced by the teachers) is determined after classifying it according to its tense, aspect, modality, and voice (Downing, 2014). Hence, the researchers focused on the microstructure analysis of morphological and lexical density analysis, which is the sentences uttered by teachers in the classrooms and whether they were understandable for the students. The research question to be answered is, 'what are the microstructures employed by English teachers in their classrooms?' Studies that investigate the teacher discourse during teaching are still limited, especially in Aceh, Indonesia. Thus, the researchers carried out this study in order to find out the microstructures of the classroom spoken discourse in relation to English language teaching performance.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Microstructure points to the local meaning of the discourse, by observing the semantics, syntactic, stylistic, and rhetoric aspects. The use of words, proposition, and certain rhetoric in media is understood by van Dijk (1989) as part of the writer's strategy. The use of certain words, sentences, and stylistic is not only viewed as the way of communication but also as a method of communication politic to influence common premise, create the backing, strengthen legitimate, and evacuate the adversary or the opponent (Rosidi, 2007). Furthermore, the microstructure is an effective way to observe the next rhetorical and persuasive process when someone conveys the order (van Dijk, 1989). Certain words perhaps are chosen to clarify the choice and posture. The microstructure is divided into four aspects, those are, semantic, syntactical, stylistic, and rhetoric aspects.

Casan-Pitarch (2017) exposes that there are seven divisions of microstructures. To begin with, language typology as stated by Schneider and Barron (2014), can be classified into a different narrative, descriptive, directive, expository, and argumentative categories. The first item of microstructure analysis focuses on the

study of types of language. Second, the analysis of morphology includes the quantification of the different word categories into percentages: nouns, determiners, adjectives, prepositions, verbs, pronouns, adverbs, conjunctions, and interjections. By this analysis, the most common word composition of a genre can be explained (Casan-Pitarch, 2017). Third, the morphological formality divides words into two broad categories in this analysis (Heylighen & Dewaele, 1999). Fourth, is the terminology of microstructures analysis. It focuses on showing the relevance of certain words in the text, and consequently, their presence should be more or less obligatory. Fifth is the verbal analysis which concerns the verbal components of the genre. Sixth, the analysis of personal pronouns focuses on the use of personal pronouns. Last, the analysis of syntax focuses on the classification of the clauses into simple, compound, or compound-complex.

Referring to this theory, the researchers limit this microstructure analysis research to morphological analysis and lexical density. The morphological analysis of this research calculates the total of content and function words in teachers' spoken discourse in order to see the formality of the utterances. Meanwhile, the lexical density analysis seeks the dense of the utterances. In brief, the review of the references is discussed in the next sub-sections.

## 2.1 Morphological Analysis

The microstructure concerns the morphological structure produced by the teachers in the classroom. Morphology is characterized as the words in a language (Shore et al., 2013). This examination includes the evaluation of the diverse word classifications into rates: things, determiners, modifiers, relational words, action words, pronouns, qualifiers, conjunctions, and interpositions. With this investigation, the most well-known word arrangement of a class can be clarified. The utilization of certain word classifications is more typical than others. Subsequently, it appears that this investigation is important to clarify the genre of a sort.

Everyone can tell the difference between formal and casual ways of expressing themselves. In a relaxing conversation among close friends or family members, normal-informal speech might be created. However, a precise and broad definition of 'formality' is not readily apparent (Heylighen & Dewaele, 1999). Nouns, adjectives, prepositions, and articles belong to the formal, non-deictic category of words, whose frequency is predicted to rise with the formality of a text. Pronouns, verbs, adverbs, and interjections fall within the deictic category, which is projected to decrease in frequency as speech styles become more formal. There is no pre-existing relationship between formality and the remaining category of conjunctions.

To decide the degree of level of formality of a certain text, the equation displayed below by Heylighen and Dewaele (1999) is typically used.

$$F = \frac{(\text{noun freq.} + \text{adjective freq.} + \text{preposition freq.} + \text{article freq.} - \text{pronoun freq.} - \text{verb freq.} - \text{adverb freq.} - \text{interjection freq.} + 100)}{2}$$

**Figure 1.** The formula to analyze Formality.

Figure 1 displays the formula for analyzing the level of formality used in a verbal composition. When the formal category frequencies are added, the deictic category frequencies are removed and normalized to 100, a measure that will always grow as formality increases is obtained. As a result, the formula in Figure 1 is used.

The frequencies are represented as a percentage of the total number of words in the excerpt divided by the total number of words in the excerpt. The value of “F” will then fluctuate between 0 and 100 percent (but has never reached these limits). The higher the value of F, the more formal the language extract is anticipated to be. Although the subclasses (nouns, verbs, etc.) are mentioned above, the formula can be made more comprehensive by simply enabling or disabling whichever words appear to be more formal and whichever words appear to be more deictic. This is useful in cases where the above grammatical categorizations are uncertain or data is unavailable, such as when the number of nouns is known but the number of articles or interjections is unknown (Heylighen & Dewaele, 1999).

The ability of a second language classroom to enhance learners’ communicative skills in the target language is limited, even with the most communicative approaches. This is due to a limited number of language contact hours, limited opportunities to connect with native speakers, and limited exposure to a variety of functions, and limited exposure to the variety of functions, genres, speech events, and discourse types that occur outside the classroom.

## **2.2 Lexical Density Analysis**

Lexical density is a term that is used in text analysis. Thornbury and Slade (2006) state that lexical density is a measure of the ratio of the text’s content words to its function words. It is different from Johansson (2008), in which he states that lexical density is the term that is most often used for describing the proportion of content words (nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs) to the total number of words. Moreover, Halliday (1985) gives a more detailed explanation of lexical density. He defines lexical density as the number of lexical items, as the proportion of the number of running words. Halliday refers to using lexical items than a lexical word because they may consist of more than one word, for example ‘stand up’, ‘take over’, ‘call off’, and other phrasal verbs that function as single lexical items. A text with a high proportion of lexical items or content words has high information than a text with a high proportion of function words (prepositions, interjections, pronouns, conjunctions and count words).

In other words, Rahmansyah (2012) states that the higher the lexical density of a text is, the more information there is and the more difficult it is for readers to understand. If the text has more grammatical items than the lexical items, the text is categorized as having a lower lexical density. On the contrary, if the text has more lexical items than the grammatical items, the text is categorized as the high lexical density. Moreover, Sholichatun (2011) notes that a high lexical density measures of around 60–70%, a medium lexical density measures of around 50-60%, and a lower lexical density measure of around 40-50%. Lexical density is calculated by dividing the number of content words by the number of words. The lexical density measures the density of information in any passage of text, according to how tightly the lexical items (content word) have been packed into the grammatical structure.

Furthermore, lexical items or content words are those which contain the main semantic information in a text, and they are fallen into the four main lexical word classes: noun, verb, adjective, and adverb (Jeffries, 2006). According to Thornbury and Slade (2006), content words are words that carry a high information load such as nouns, adjectives, lexical verbs, and some adverbs. Moreover, Halliday (1985) defines lexical items as part of an open system rather than a closed set because it is possible to new items can be added. In conclusion, lexical items or content words are parts that carry high information in text and are called open classes in which new words can be added.

### 3. METHODS

In this study, the researchers used discourse analysis which analyzes the spoken discourses made by English teachers in Aceh, Indonesia. The subjects of this research were chosen by purposive sampling. The participants of this study are two English teachers from Islamic senior high schools in Aceh Besar, Oemardiyah Islamic Senior High School, and Al-Falah Abu Lam U Islamic Senior High School. Only one teacher of each school could participate in this study because they met the criteria of: (1) the teacher has been teaching for at least two years; (2) the teacher teaches high-school students; and (3) the teacher is an English teacher.

The source of the data in this study is the spoken discourse produced by the teachers during teaching. The data were audio-visually recorded using the camera Canon EOS 600D, for two meetings for each teacher. The recordings were further transcribed for data analysis. The teachers were coded as School I/Teacher I (T1) for Oemardiyah Islamic Senior High School and School II/Teacher II (T2) for Al-Falah Abu Lam U Islamic Senior High School. The data were also collected through observations on the classroom situations during the teachers students interactions by focusing specifically on the teachers' spoken discourses.

The techniques used in analyzing the data were thematic analysis and interactive analysis. The microstructure data were analyzed through thematic analysis by Braun and Clarke (2006). The transcript of spoken discourse produced by English teachers was familiarized, then generated. After the code generation process, the researchers searched for related themes.

### 4. RESULTS

The microstructure in this research concerns the lexical density, the ratio of content words (i.e., nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs), to grammatical or function words (e.g., pronouns, prepositions, articles) within a clause. The results for each of these concerns are explained in the next sub-sections.

#### 4.1 Lexical Items

Knowing the number of lexical items is one of the important processes in microstructure analysis in order to obtain the amount of lexical density contained in the spoken discourse produced by the teachers. The researchers first counted and

analyzed the lexical items in the transcript. The transcript was separated into two schools, School I and School II. Each school was then divided into two classes, Class A (CA) and Class B (CB).

**Table 1.** Types of lexical items (content words) in the spoken discourse.

School/meeting		Types of lexical items (content words)				Total
		Noun (%)	Adjective (%)	Verb (%)	Adverb (%)	
I	CA (%)	386 (39.91%)	128 (13.23%)	235 (24.30%)	218 (22.54%)	967
	CB (%)	397 (35.35%)	167 (14.87%)	317 (28.22%)	242 (21.54%)	
	CA+CB (%)	783 (37.46%)	295 (14.11%)	552 (26.41%)	460 (22%)	
II	CA (%)	176 (38.93%)	48 (10.61%)	126 (27.87%)	102 (22.56%)	452
	CB (%)	278 (41.55%)	132 (19.73%)	153 (22.86%)	106 (15.84%)	
	CA+CB (%)	454 (40.49%)	180 (16.05%)	279 (24.88%)	208 (18.55%)	

Table 1 shows that T1's classrooms, specifically in Class A (CA), there were 386 nouns (39.91%), 128 adjectives (13.23%), 235 verbs (24.30%) and 219 adverbs (22.54%). Meanwhile, in Class B (CB), there were 397 nouns (35.35%), 167 adjectives (14.87%), 317 verbs (28.22%), and 242 adverbs (21.5%). The number of values obtained for both classes are 783 nouns (37.46%), 295 adjectives (14.11%), 552 verbs (26.41%), and 460 adverbs (22%).

In T2's classrooms, it was found in Class A (CA) that there were 176 nouns (38.931%), 48 adjectives (10.61%), 126 verbs (27.87%) and 102 adverbs (22.56%). In Class B (CB), there were 278 nouns (41.55%), 132 adjectives (19.73%), 153 verbs (22.86%), and 106 adverbs (15.84%). The number of values obtained for both classes are 454 nouns (40.49%), 180 adjectives (16.05%), 279 verbs (24.88%), and 208 adverbs (18.55%).

## 4.2 Grammatical Items

Other data calculated in the microstructure are grammatical items produced by both teachers. The calculation and classification methods applied were similar to the previous lexical items' calculations. Items that enter the calculation include auxiliary verbs (aux.), pronouns (pron.), preposition (prep.), determiners (det.), conjunctions (conj.), adverbs interrogative (adv. int.), and interjections (interj.).

**Table 2.** The classification of grammatical items in the spoken discourse.

School /Meeting		Types of grammatical items (function words)							Total
		Aux. (%)	Pron. (%)	Prep. (%)	Det. (%)	Conj. (%)	Adv. Int. (%)	Interj. (%)	
I	CA (%)	90 16.30	72 13.04	129 23.36	85 15.39	144 26.08	17 3.07	15 2.71	552
	CB (%)	90 (15.92%)	107 (18.93%)	127 (22.47%)	42 (7.43%)	179 (31.68%)	10 (17.6%)	10 (17.6%)	
	CA+CB (%)	180 (16.11%)	179 (16.02%)	256 (22.9%)	127 (11.36%)	323 (28.91%)	27 (2.41%)	25 (2.23%)	
II	CA	22	23	42	34	36	16	5	178

	(%)	(12.35%)	(12.92%)	(23.59%)	(19.10%)	(20.22%)	(8.98%)	(2.80%)	
CB	32	40	83	51	48	38	21	313	
	(%)	(10.22%)	(12.77%)	(26.51%)	(16.29%)	(25.5%)	(12.14%)	(6.70%)	
CA	54	63	125	85	84	54	26	491	
+CB	(%)	(10.99%)	(12.83%)	(25.45%)	(17.3%)	(17.10%)	(10.99%)	(5.29%)	

Table 2 shows that for T1 in School I, specifically in CA phase, the grammatical items (function words) produced were 90 auxiliaries (16.30%), 72 pronouns (13.04%), 129 prepositions (23.36%), 85 determiners (15.39%), 144 conjunctions (26.08%), 17 adverbs interrogative (3.07%) and 15 interjections (2.71%). In CB, there were 90 auxiliaries (15.92%), 07 pronouns 1 (18.93%), 127 prepositions (22.47%), 42 determiners (7.43%), 179 conjunctions (31.68%), 10 adverbs interrogative (1.76%) and 10 interjections (1.76%). The total of each item in both classes were 180 auxiliaries (16.11%), 179 pronouns (16.02%), 256 prepositions (22.9%), 127 determiners (11.36%), 27 adverbs interrogative (2.41%), and 25 interjections (2.23%).

In T2's classes, it was found that the grammatical items (function words) produced in CA were 22 auxiliaries (12.35%), 23 pronouns (12.92%), 42 prepositions (23.59%), 34 determiners (19.10%), 36 conjunctions (20.22%), 16 adverbs interrogative (8.98%) and 5 interjections (2.80%). In CB, there were 32 auxiliaries (10.22%), 40 pronouns (12.77%), 83 prepositions (26.51%), 51 determiners (16.29%), 48 conjunctions (2.55%), 38 adverbs interrogative (12.14%) and 21 interjections (6.70%). The total of each item in both classes are 54 auxiliaries (10.99%), 63 pronouns (12.83%), 125 prepositions (25.45%), 85 determiners (17.3%), 84 conjunctions (17.10%), 54 adverb interrogatives (10.99%) and 26 interjections (5.29%).

### 4.3 Lexical Density

After obtaining the total lexical items, the researchers then calculated the percentage of lexical density from the teachers' utterances in two schools and two different classrooms. The percentage of results from applying the formula can be seen in Table 3.

**Table 3.** The percentage of lexical density.

Lexical density characteristics					
	Teacher 1		Teacher 2		AV
	C A	C B	C A	C B	
Total content words	967	1123	452	669	
Total words	1519	1688	630	982	
Total lexical density (%)	63.66%	66.52%	71.74%	68.12%	67.51%

It can be seen in Table 3 that the total content of T1's Class A and Class B were 967 and 1123. Meanwhile, the total words of Class A were 1519, and Class B with 1688. These results obtained a percentage of the lexical density of 63.66% in Class A and 66.52 % in Class B. Furthermore, in T2's Class A and B, she produced 452 and 669 content words, and the total words produced were 630 in Class A and 982 in Class B. So, the total lexical density of T2 in Class A was 71.74% (high lexical density), and in-Class B, it was 68.12% (medium lexical density).

To exemplify the findings, the following transcripts from the audio-video recordings during the observations are displayed to provide samples of the lexical density calculations.

- (1) As usual, before we start our lesson, I will check your attendance list first.  
(Transcript Code SP/T1/CA)

The utterance in (1) is produced by T1 which consists of 7 content words from 14 words with the lexical density of 20% (0.2). It was a simple sentence to begin the lesson. The teacher used the modal 'will' to express what she planned the students to do that day.

Next, in the content phase, T1 tried to review the lesson by expressing two clauses, present perfect tense, and simple present tense. The example in (2) shows 5 content words out of 13 words with a total lexical density of 38% (0.38).

- (2) As we have discussed yesterday, explanation text is about social, natural, political phenomenon.  
(Transcript Code CP/T1/CA)

The example in (2) shows the verbal group which is the constituent that functions as finite plus predicator (or as predicator alone if there is no finite element) in the mood structure (clause as an exchange), and as a process in the transitivity structure (clause as representation). On the contrary, T2 in Class B tended to produce short sentences when she explained and commanded her students. The following transcript, to lead, has three simple sentences produced at one time. The example in (3) has 13 content words out of 24 words with a lexical density of 54% or 0.54.

- (3) There is a text about Malin Kundang. You have to read the paragraphs carefully. I give you 10 minutes to read the text, ya.  
(Transcript Code: CP/T2/CB)

In the interaction phase of (3), T2 actively involved students in the learning process through questions and answers and instruction. For example, T1 asked a question to discuss the contents of the text attached in the book, as shown in (4).

- (4) If it has erupted, so what will it be?  
Ya, dia akan solidify dan membentuk batu sehingga menjadi pegunungan yang kita temukan saat ini.  
[Tr: Yes, it will solidify and form rock so it becomes volcanoes that we see Today.]  
(Transcript Code: IP/T1/CA)

In (4), the question asked by T1 is a conditional clause. The lexical items are 4 out of 9 words with a lexical density of 40% or 0.4. This is an interrogative clause asking cause and effect. While in the next sentence, there are also two clauses in the Indonesian language and an English word 'solidify' that seems to be one of the words that the students must memorize. The mixture of Indonesian and English languages is also found on many other occasions. The main purpose is as communicative strategies for the teacher to make sure that the students understand the lesson. The lexical density of this stage has the greatest amount compared to the other five phases. The ratio of lexical items found in structural items in the exemplification, evaluation, and

conclusion phases sentences, are more or less the same as the previous phases. The examples are provided as follows:

- (5) *Kalau di dalam teks, yang mana orientation teks tersebut? Dari mana? Sampai mana? Tolong kalian lihat.*  
 [Tr: If the one in the text, which one is the orientation part? From where? Until? Please take a look.]  
 (Transcript Code: EP/T2/CB)
- (6) Back to the performance, you have to make an opening, for example, Assalamu'alaikum, good morning, everyone. Today, I am going to explain to you about an example of explanation text. Mention the title.  
 (Transcript Code: EP/T1/CA)
- (7) Now, answer the questions below the texts. I give you 15 minutes. I divide you into groups. I appoint you with a number. Remember your own number.  
 (Transcript Code: EvP/T2/CB)
- (8) I will conclude the lesson, we have learned about explanation text, the examples as explained by you in your performances.  
 (Transcript Code: CoP/T1/CA)

In data (5), the Indonesian sentence stated by T2 has 5 content words out of 16 words. The students were guided to see the examples in the textbook. She asked simple questions and gave them instructions to look at the text carefully. Data (6) is one of the utterances produced by T1 in the exemplification phase process. In one part of the process of interaction between teacher and students, in three sentences there was a total of 14 content words out of 32 words. This example shows that lexical items with not many content words can make it easier for students to understand the teacher's explanation. The same case is also seen in data (7) and (8).

#### 4.4 Morphological Formality

Morphological formality is counted in order to know the formality of language produced by the teachers in their spoken discourses. Earlier, Figure 1 has shown the equation used to decide the degree of formality level of a certain text. It is the guidance for the researchers to measure the formality of spoken discourses of the two teachers, calculated based on the frequency of noun, adjective, preposition, article, pronoun, verb, adverb, and interjection. From the results of the equation, it shows that T1 produced 172.5 while T2 produced 184.

Teacher I:

$$F = \frac{783 + 295 + 256 + 127 - 179 - 552 - 460 - 25 + 100}{2} = \frac{345}{2} = 172,5$$

Teacher II:

$$F = \frac{454 + 180 + 125 + 85 - 63 - 279 - 208 - 26 + 100}{2} = \frac{368}{2} = 184$$

From the results of the equation, the morphological value of formality from T2 is higher than T1. The difference occurs because the number of frequencies of each lexical and grammatical item from each teacher is not equal.

## 5. DISCUSSION

As previously detailed in the results section, it was found that lexical and grammatical items have different amounts for each teacher in every meeting. After examining the data, the researchers found that T1 produced a higher total of lexical and grammatical items than T2. Thus, T1, for example in Class A, tended to produce fewer spoken discourses, 63.66% compared to Class B at 66.52%. This happens because, in Class B, students needed more explanation compared to the previous class. Likewise, T2 also had fewer total spoken discourses than T1. For T2, it was found that in Class A there was a value of 71.74%, greater than Class B with 68.12%. The acquisition of lexical items affected the percentage value lexical density and average value. In brief, T1 has a lower lexical density value than T2, as well as its morphological formality value.

Saragih (2006) explains that lexical density describes the number of content words (noun, verb, adjective, and adverb) per clause. Then, the lexical density of a text can be calculated by expressing the number of contents carrying words in a text/sentence as a proportion of all the words in the text/sentence (Eggins, 1994). To add, Halliday (1985) considers that the use of the conditional clause is as the interpersonal metaphorical of mood in the form of declarative sentence proposing an indirect command. It is the same as the T2 who also used the same modal verb but in the past form 'would'. A verbal group is the expansion of a verb, in the same way, that a nominal group is the expansion of a noun, and it consists of a sequence of words of the primary class of verb. He further notes that, with a material process, on the other hand, the present-n-present has become the norm, and the simple present has a noticeably 'habitual' sense, as in the examples given earlier. Treating the tenses as a simple list also suggests that there is a clear-cut distinction between those tenses that exist and others that do not.

Thomson and Martinet (1995) say that a conditional sentence has two parts, the 'if'-clause and the main clause. They also state that a conditional sentence has three kinds or types, in which each kind contains a different pair of tenses in some variations. Just as Azar (2002) says that a conditional sentence consists of an 'if' clause (present condition) and a result clause.

According to Moattarian and Tahririan (2013), the ways which help people to solve communication problem is called communication strategies. Maldonado (2015) states that five factors affect the use of language as communication strategies, such as students' proficiency level, the situational context, source of communication difficulty, students' personality, and students' closeness of the language. By mixing some words in two different languages, the teachers' expectation of the students' comprehension is achieved.

Another study on microsystemic organization of phonological system by Oh (2015) shows that the general cross-language tendencies and language-specificities of the organization of phonological subsystems among nine languages, within the complex systems framework in which language is defined as a complex adaptive

system adjusting itself to its environments by means of self-organization. The results confirm the following two hypotheses that (i) consonants play a more important role in lexical access than vowels and that (ii) only a few phoneme contrasts play an important role in lexical access due to cognitive efficiency and robustness in speech communication, regardless language-specific differences.

Results of the studies conducted in microstructure analysis (Oh, 2015; Rao et al., 2017) did not show significant differences between morphological formality and lexical density in the classroom spoken discourse. On the other hand, in the current study, a significant difference was found between the spoken discourse of two teachers in two different schools. This reflects the effect of lexical density of the teachers which impacts the students' understanding. In Indonesia, Aceh particularly, the teachers' spoken discourse plays a vital role in the teaching and learning process. This condition, in fact, has contributed to the difference in results of the research to the previous studies.

After presenting the findings, the researchers give some suggestions for improvement of the quality of teaching and learning in EFL classrooms. First, teachers should make sure that their utterances are understandable for the students. It is needed for the teachers to mix the native and target language to gain a better comprehension of the lessons by the students. The teachers should also use correct grammar. This is an essential point of learning a language. Finally, the teachers should follow the sequence of processes in teaching the English language as written in their lesson plans to ensure that the goals of learning are achieved at the end of the lessons.

## 6. CONCLUSION

The results of lexical and grammatical items calculations show that T1 produced them more than T2. In T1's classrooms, the number of values obtained were 783 nouns (37.46%), 295 adjectives (14.11%), 552 verbs (26.41%), 460 adverbs (22%), 180 auxiliaries (16.11%), 179 pronouns (16.02%), 256 prepositions (22.9%), 127 determiners (11.36%), 27 adverbs interrogative (2.41%) and 25 interjections (2.23%). In T2's classrooms, it was found that the numbers of values obtained for both classes were 454 nouns (40.49%), 180 adjectives (16.05%), 279 verbs (24.88%), 208 adverbs (18.55%), 54 auxiliaries (10.99%), 63 pronouns (12.83%), 125 prepositions (25.45%), 85 determiners (17.3%), 84 conjunctions (17, 10%), 54 adverbs interrogative (10.99%) and 26 interjections (5.29%).

Furthermore, the total lexical density obtained by T1 in Class A was 63.66% and 66.52% in Class B, while T2 in Class A was 71.74% with 68.12% in Class B. This means that T2 had a higher lexical density than T1 even though both of them are considered to produce high lexical density (i.e., 60-70%). To calculate the formality of spoken discourse of the two teachers, the researcher looked at the frequency of nouns, adjectives, prepositions, articles, pronouns, verbs, adverbs, and interjections where T1 produced 172.5 while T2 produced 184, indicating that T2's spoken discourse was more formal than T1.

Even though this study has answered the research question, its limitation is apparent due to the time constraint in conducting the research. Therefore, future related researches are expected to gain more data from more EFL teachers and with more

classes to observe to reinforce and better comprehend the results achieved from this present study.

## REFERENCES

- Azar, B. A. (2002). *Understanding and using English grammar* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Pearson Education
- Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006) Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Casan-Pitarch, R. (2017). A proposal for genre analysis: The AMS Model. *EPIC Series in Language and Linguistics*, 12, 235-246. <https://doi.org/10.29007/hbg9>
- Cazden, C. B. (2001). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning*. Heinemann.
- Cots, J. (2006). Teaching ‘with an attitude’: Critical discourse analysis in EFL teaching. *ELT Journal*, 60(4), 336-345. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccl024>
- Demo, D. A. (2001). *Discourse analysis for language teachers*. ERIC Digest (ED456672). ERIC Development Team. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED456672.pdf>
- Downing, A. (2014). *A university course in English grammar*. Routledge.
- Eggins, S. (1994). *An introduction to systemic functional linguistics*. Pinter Publisher Ltd.
- Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding second language acquisition*. Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. Longman
- Garton, S. (2012). Speaking out of turn? Taking the initiative in teacher-fronted classroom interaction. *Classroom Discourse*, 3(1), 29-45. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2012.666022>
- Glowalla, U & Colonus, H. (1982). Toward a model of macrostructure search. *Advances in Psychology*, 8, 111-123. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-4115\(08\)62685-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-4115(08)62685-0)
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *An introduction to functional grammar*. Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Hanafiah, R. & Yusuf, M. (2016). Lexical density and grammatical Intricacy in linguistic thesis abstract: A qualitative content analysis. *Proceedings of the 1st English Education International Conference (EEIC)*, 1(2), 43-46.
- Hatch, E. (1992). *Discourse and language education*. Cambridge University Press.
- Heylighen, F. & Dewaele, J. M. (1999). *Formality of language: Definition, measurement and behavioral determinants*. Free University of Brussels.
- Jeffries, L. (2006). *Discovering language: The structure of modern English*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Johansson, V. (2008). Lexical diversity and lexical density in speech and writing: A developmental perspective. *Working Press*, 53, 61-79.
- Johnson, K. (1995). *Understanding communication in second language classrooms*. Cambridge University Press.

- Jorgensen, M. & Phillips, L. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Maldonado, M. R. (2015). Communication strategies used by different level L2 English learners in oral interaction. *Revista Signos Estudios de Linguística*, 49(90), 71-93. <https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-09342016000100004>
- McCarthy, M. (1992). *Discourse analysis for language teachers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Moattarian, A. & Tahririan, M. H. (2013). Communication strategies used in oral and written. *Sheikhbahee EFL Journal*, 2(1), 21-37. <https://doi.org/10.22034/efl.2013.79179>
- Nesia, B. H. & Ginting, S. A. (2014). Lexical density of English reading texts for senior high school. *TRANSFORM: Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning of FBS Umimed*, 3(2), 1-14
- O'Hair, D., Rubenstein H., & Stewart, R. (2004). *Speaker's guidebook: Text and reference*. Bedford/St Martin's Press.
- Oh, Y, M. (2015). *Linguistics complexity and information: Quantitative approach* [Doctoral dissertation, The University of Lyon]. Dynamique Du Langage. [http://www.ddl.cnrs.fr/fulltext/Yoonmi/Oh\\_2015\\_1.pdf](http://www.ddl.cnrs.fr/fulltext/Yoonmi/Oh_2015_1.pdf)
- Rahmansyah, H. (2012). *Grammatical intricacy and lexical density of the SMA student's textbooks* [Master's thesis, Universitas Negeri Medan]. Digital Repository Universitas Negeri Medan. <http://digilib.unimed.ac.id/3632/>
- Rao, A. P., Reddy, M. B., & Narayanan, S. (2017). Micro and macrostructure discourse analysis in persons with idiopathic Parkinson's disease. *Speech, Language and Hearing*, 20(4), 196-205. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2050571X.2017.1303026>
- Riggenbach, H. (1999). *Discourse analysis in the language classroom: Volume 1, The spoken language*. University of Michigan Press.
- Rosidi, S. (2007, December 15). *Analisis wacana kritis sebagai ragam paradigma kajian wacana* [Critical discourse analysis as variance of paradigm inquiry on discourse]. Malang: Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim.
- Saragih, A. (2006). Metaphorical representations and scientific texts. *Englonesia: An Indonesian Scientific Journal on Linguistics and Literature*, 2(1), 1-11.
- Schneider, K. P., & Barron, A. (2014). *Pragmatics of discourse*. de Gruyter Mouton.
- Sholichatun, S. (2011). *Content analysis of reading materials in English on sky textbook for junior high school* [Bachelor's thesis, IAIN Walisongo]. Walisongo Institutional Repository. <http://eprints.walisongo.ac.id/id/eprint/1968/>
- Shore, R., Ray, J., & Goolkasian, P. (2013). Too close for (brain) comfort: Improving science vocabulary learning in the middle grades. Researchers take a multidisciplinary approach to investigating how middle grades students learn science vocabulary. *Middle School Journal*, 44(5), 16-21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00940771.2013.11461868>
- Skidmore, D. (2000). From pedagogical dialogue to dialogical pedagogy. *Language and Education*, 14(4), 283-296. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500780008666794>
- Surjowati, R. (2021). Exploring interpersonal meanings on the discourse of Indonesian national anthem from the CDA perspectives. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 8(1), 360-380. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v8i1.17439>
- Thomson, A. J., & Martinet, A. V. (1980). *A practical English grammar*. Oxford University Press.

- Thornbury, S., & Slade, D. (2006). *Conversation: From description*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ur, P. (2000). *A course in language teaching practice and theory*. Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1989). Structure of discourse and structure of power. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 12(1), 18-59. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.1989.11678711>
- Wharton, S. (2011). Critical text analysis: Linking language and cultural studies. *ELT Journal*, 65(3), 221-229. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccq068>
- Young, R., & He, A. (1998). *Talking and testing: Discourse approaches to the assessment of oral proficiency*. John Benjamins.