

Exchange Structures between English Lecturer and Health Information Management Students in English Class at Deli Husada Deli Tua Health Institute

Herawati Br Bukit

Institut Kesehatan Deli Husada Deli Tua, herawatihill02@gmail.com

Berliana R Br Naipospos

Institut Kesehatan Deli Husada Deli Tua

Abstract

The study reasons were to know what exchanges structures used between English Lecturer and Health Information Management (HIM) students and to obtain development of English learning strategies for health students. This research is conducted by descriptive qualitative. The data were clauses produced by English lecturer and HIM students. The data is analyzed based on Martin theory. In conversation, lecturer tends to has initiative to start it, meanwhile, the students tend to give respond by doing activity (evade) which are instructed by the lecturer. It is found 13 types corresponding moves of information, goods and services exchanges. The dominant exchanges structure were $k2^k1$ and $a1^a2f^a1f$. It is found different case, when lecturer gave the information to student that is marked by $k1$, it is followed by $k1$ or signed by $k2^k1(k2)^k1(k2)^k1$. There were two conversational systems namely congruent and metaphorical coding. In conversational structures, as the realizations of conversational systems, it is found some marked structures. Students didn't answer the question, because undeniable that health students have difficult ability for making dialogue in English therefore lecturer keeps the conversation going by undergone initiative actions such as giving information, asking question or giving instruction but s/he seems to repeat information.

Keywords: Congruent coding; English Teaching and Learning Conversation for Health Information Management (HIM) students; Exchange Structures; Metaphorical Coding; Speech function.

INTRODUCTION

The dialogue is 'a process of exchange' involving two variables: a commodity to be exchange: either information or goods and services, and roles associated with exchange relations: either giving or demanding. The simultaneous cross classification of these two variables of exchange commodity and exchange role defines the four basic speech functions. Someone will use language to interact each other; they are doing the establishing a relationship between the person speaking now and the

person who are probably speak next. Saragih (2013:26) states that the basic unit for analyzing dialog is the exchange that is set of moves which together develop a single proposition. Interaction between addressee and addresser in face to face conversation with in written conversation is different. Face to face conversation always involves body languages and gestures. But in written conversation that can be only realized in move. Move is defined as the function and commodity being exchange.

Classroom interaction has been a major research phenomenon in various fields of knowledge such as Discourse Analysis, Applied Linguistics and Education for some years now. Since then, the importance of classroom interaction as “a pedagogical tool and its critical role in improving the quality of the student learning experience” has gained wide recognition. However, despite the strength of research demonstrating the importance of classroom interaction as a pedagogical tool and its role in enhancing teaching and learning, we have known about how are the English learning processes for health students. In this paper, we examine the structure of such teaching exchanges (otherwise known as “moves”) and how they are initiated and managed in English language classes given by English lecturer and Health Information Management (HIM) students as a subject whereas sometimes there are many misunderstanding between them because most health students are still passive in dialogue by using English.

From the explanation, it shows move dynamics which cause length and complexity of structure. Beside it, researcher wants to investigate speech function types (statement, question, command and offer) that used by both participants. The study reasons are, firstly, it is useful to know what discourse structures are used in classrooms, particularly because utilizing the patterns described by exchange structure is not necessarily a good teaching strategy. If we don't know about it, the English learning processes won't be happened and it will be happen the misunderstanding. It results conversation structure is very dynamic and complex and sometimes it doesn't fulfill system and conversation structure that proposed by Martin and it is important problem in this research. Secondly, their speech functions are usually realized in interaction although they use body language. And thirdly, exchange structure study that performed at English classroom for Health students never do by other researchers.

Based on the background, researcher formulates study problems as following. They are what exchanges structures are found between English lecturer and Health Information Students (HIM) in English learning, how are exchange structures realized linguistically and why the exchanges are structured in the way they are.

Exchange structure is process of exchanging information in conversation (Saragih : 2013). The conversation components will take their turn during conversation. There are three components in conversation; they are speaker, message and listener. In other terms, some linguists use term addresser, message and addressee, but they still stand in same reference. With information exchanges the situation is more complex; it is not simply a matter of introducing a contradictory modality because these either function as or to negotiate the *k1* move. Rather, as with exclamations, interlocutors have to avoid grading probability or usually completely. The easiest way to do this following a *dk1* or *k2* move is to claim ignorance (Saragih:2013).

In conversation, the speaker who is raising question is not really to search the information that s/he doesn't understand. But s/he seems to delay the telling information. This is commonly found in English teaching and learning process for health students. The students sometimes did not answer the question, because it is undeniable that health students have a difficult ability for making dialogue in English therefore lecturer keeps the conversation going by undergone initiative actions such as giving information, asking question or giving instruction. On the contrary, when the lecturer tell the information that students asked, students always asked lecturer to repeat again the lecturer information because the lack of students ability to translate English into Bahasa. In this case, the exchange structure is different. This is to say that exchange structure is instrument of conversation analysis in language point of view, specifically discourse analysis point of view. A key to abbreviations used in this analysis can be found in following table:

Table 1. Key to Codes Used in ESA (Martin, 1992)

Types of Move	Code
<i>Synoptic Moves</i>	
Person giving information	k1
Person receiving information	k2
Follow up move by k1	k1f
Follow up move by k2	k2f
Delayed k1 move	dk1
Person carrying out action	a1
Person in receipt of action	a2
Follow up move by a2	a2f
Follow up move by a1	a1f
<i>Dynamic moves</i>	
Tracking moves	
Back channel	bch
Check	check
Response to check	rcheck

Clarification	cl
Response to clarification	rcl
Confirmation	rcf
Replay	rp
Response to replay	rrp
Challenging moves	
Challenge	ch
Response to challenge	rch
Justification	just
Response to justification	rjust

The corresponding moves or information to those goods and services exchange are summarized in the following table

Table 2. Corresponding Moves of Information and Goods & Service Exchanges (Martin:1992)

NO	Exchange	Move
	Information	Goods & Services
1.	k1	a1
2.	k1 ^ k2f	a1 ^ a2f
3.	k1 ^ k2f ^ k1f	a1 ^ a2f ^ a1f
4.	k2 ^ k1	a2 ^ a1
5.	k2 ^ k1 ^ k2f	a2 ^ a1 ^ a2f
6.	k2 ^ k1 ^ k2f ^ k1f	a2 ^ a1 ^ a2f ^ a1f
7.	dk1 ^ k2 ^ k1	da1 ^ a2 ^ a1
8.	dk1 ^ k2 ^ k1 ^ k2f	da1 ^ a2 ^ a1 ^ a2f
9.	dk1 ^ k2 ^ k1 ^ k2f ^ k1f	da1 ^ a2 ^ a1 ^ a2f ^ a1f

Speech function refers to a function performed by a speaker in a verbal interaction or conversation which specifies his or her role and the content or commodity transacted. In other words, the speech function involves or specifies the role played by the conversant, commodity exchanged and orientation taken by the interlocutors in the interaction. When the roles and commodities involved in interactions or conversations are interested, four speech functions are derived as summarized in table.

Table 3. Speech Functions (Saragih, 2013:18)

Roles	Commodity	
	Information	Good & Services
Giving	Statement	Offer
Demanding	Question	Command

The four speech functions are specified as the following:

- a. Giving / Information : Statement (S)
- b. Demand / Information : Question (Q)
- c. Give Goods & Services : Offer (O)
- d. Demand Goods & Services : Command (C)

In other words, with reference to semiotic system of speech function is analogous to meaning and Mood is expression. Thus, in their unmarked or congruent representations the basic or proto speech functions statement, question and command are respectively realized or expressed by declarative, interrogative and imperative mood.

Learning is a process that brings together cognitive, emotional, and environmental influences for the purpose of making changes in one's knowledge, skills, values, and worldviews and refers to a relatively permanent change in behavior as a result of practice or experience. In relation to English teaching learning, it suggests that the natural language acquisition can be difficult to replicate in the classroom, but there are elements which can help the students learn effectively. The elements are engaged, study, and activate. "Engage" is related to a teaching sequence where teachers try to arouse students' interest by involving their emotion. Meanwhile, the concept of "study" focuses on the language and how the language is constructed. The last element is "activate". This term refers to the exercise and activities which are designed to get the students using language as freely and communicatively as they can.

Classroom interaction is the internal process of learning that consists of sequence of the external interaction between two participants: the teacher on the one side and the learners on the other¹⁰. Hence, it can be said that classroom interaction is the sequencing process of exchanging information, ideas among the participants in the classroom. In conclusion, to reach a good quality of learning process, the lecturer should encourage students to be actively participating in learning process. Students must engage in asking question, answering questions, giving opinion, and the like.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research was analyzed by using descriptive qualitative research. It is used to support the method in order to describe the exchange structure between English lecturer and Health Information Management (HIM) students in English class at Deli Husada Deli Tua Health Institute with specifically dealing with Semantic level (which consist of mood and speech function) and lexicogrammar (specifically mood).

The research data were clauses found that occur from the conversation between English lecturer with HIM students. There were 10 contexts of dialogues. It is taken from direct observation through interaction from 79 participants. The sources of data were an English lecturer and 78 HIM Students. HIM students divided into grade 1 (31 students), grade 2 (30 students) and grade 3 (17 students). Researcher also asked other English lecturers of Deli Husada as many as 3 respondents that include English Team member who know English teaching techniques for health students. They became the informants.

FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATION

After research is done, some findings are found:

1. Exchange structures that were found from conversation between English Lecturer and HIM Students in English Class at Deli Husada Deli Tua Health Institute were 13 types corresponding moves of information and goods and services exchanges, namely: $k1$, $k1^{\wedge}k2f^{\wedge}k1f$, $k2^{\wedge}k1$, $k2^{\wedge}k1^{\wedge}k2f$, $k2^{\wedge}k1^{\wedge}k2f^{\wedge}k1f$, $dk1^{\wedge}k2^{\wedge}k1$, $dk1^{\wedge}k2^{\wedge}k1^{\wedge}k2f$, $dk1^{\wedge}k2^{\wedge}k1^{\wedge}k2f^{\wedge}k1f$, $a1^{\wedge}a2f$, $a1^{\wedge}a2f^{\wedge}a1f$, $a2^{\wedge}a1$, $a2^{\wedge}a1^{\wedge}a2f^{\wedge}a1f$, $da1^{\wedge}a2^{\wedge}a1^{\wedge}a2f^{\wedge}a1f$.
2. Exchange structures that were realized linguistically in term of speech function, speech function is realized in mood, and speech function and mood is realized in congruent and metaphorical coding.

Linguistically, exchange structures realized in term of speech function that occur their conversation are divided into initiating and responding. Initiating that occur in their conversation are statement (S), question (Q), offer (O), greeting (gr) and Command (C). Responding that occur in their conversation are acknowledgement statement (AS), response statement to question (RSQ), acknowledgement to offer (AO), response to greeting (rgr) and response offer to command (ROC). It was found the exchange structure of $k1$ continue to $k1$ ($k2$). And it is realized linguistically in term of speech function in question followed by response statement to question. In this case, question does not replied by answer, but question replied by question. This conversation consists congruent and many metaphorical coding, because there are marked or flouting of the common coding. It means that when the addresser (in this case student) asks some information, he didn't have comprehension in English so he asked the lecturer to repeat the information until he had full understanding. The researcher found the different case of conversation, this matters also causes this conversation don't follow the theory of exchange structure from Martin (1992). While the other conversation, it was found there is mismatches move

because theoretically when someone ask the information, it be marked by k2 and it is followed by k1. But, in this dialogue, it is found that when lecturer gave the information to student that is marked by k1, it is followed by k1 or it was signed by $k2^k1(k2)^k1(k2)^k1$. In addition, in this conversation, the lecturer wasn't only become person giving information (k1), but she also become person receiving information (k2) because she asked any other things about student's condition and experience. In this case student also plays as the secondary knower (k2) and primary knower (k1) because he was person receiving information about lecturer condition and person in giving information about his condition also. But it occurs the tracking such as challenge, response to challenge, clarification, response to clarification, replay, response to replay, check, response to check, justification and response to justification.

Speech functions are congruently expressed mood which build conversational structure. Here, moods were fully as the realization of speech functions. Although, it was found that it was clear of the lecturer that imperative was dominantly used in English teaching conversation and the dominant mood used by student was interrogative. Thus, in their marked or congruent and incongruent representation their basic speech functions. The researcher found that the conversation between English lecturer with student metaphorical coding is more dominant than congruent coding. In the conversation, there are many marked or flouting of the common coding, so metaphorical coding occurs. It can be seen that when student asked information about lecturer condition, the lecturer answered then response with asked information again to student. Then, student asked about lecturer opinion about the topic, lecturer directly to giving the information but student hadn't full understanding to speak up in English, so student asked lecturer to repeat her information again. But, the other conversation included to congruent coding because when the addresser asked question or information, in another way the addressee give the answer or information directly.

3. The reasons of the exchanges are structured in the way they are as follow:
 - The lack of English ability. It showed undeniable that health students have difficult ability for making dialogue in English therefore lecturer keeps the conversation going by undergone initiative actions such as giving information, asking question or giving instruction. There were many conversations that occurring student gave question to lecturer about the lecturer opinion and lecturer asked again about student opinion, whereas the student always ask information to

lecturer. In other words, when the student didn't understand about lecturer answer, he asked lecturer to repeat again until he had full understanding. It occurred because the lecturer used English language when they made the communication and the lecturer didn't want to give the translation into Bahasa.

- Education background. English lecturer with Health Information Management (HIM) students came from different education background. The context is English teaching, so English lecturer spoke up English and understand about lexicogrammar especially the roles of speech function in the communication systematically while HIM students didn't.

After having analysis the data, there are some points as the important ones to be discussed in this study. In the theory of exchange structure, mood is the realization of speech function in written form. Then, according to the Martin (1992) there are key codes that used in exchange structure analysis and there is one to one realization between speech function and mood. There is a marked or flouting of the common coding. It means that when the addresser give information, the addressee didn't know or understand the real or exact answer, it run out from the question. Whereas when lecturer answer the question about the assignment in English, the students didn't have full understanding in English, because they didn't have full comprehension when spoke up in English. It is signed by question followed by question. It was the metaphorical coding. This situation happened because the student is Health Information Students that don't have full comprehension in English speaking so lecturer always repeat again the information so that they didn't have miss communication.

It is same with the move analysis. There was unmarked code in the conversation k2 was responded by k1(k2). It was found unmarked code where moves in English lecturer and HIM students conversation were not as theory of conversation or basic unit conversation that proposed by Martin (1992) where theoretically move is structured by nine constructions. And in this analysis, the researcher found more than it. For example, theoretically a2 is followed by a1, k2 response by k1, but in this case It was found that k2 was responded by k1(k2). It was happened because the English lecturer with HIM students conversations are formal language, so most dialogues were not asking and giving questions, but it is prefer to maintain the attitude and courtesy of students to lecturers. So forming a good communication so that communication run well and didn't occur misunderstanding/ misscommunication. It also related in accordance with speech function analysis, it is showed from the beginning conversation; it is started from greeting and response to greeting. Finally, from this analysis, the researcher found many similarities between analysis and theory, but

there is a bit different of theory and analysis in term of move analysis. Then, in accordance with speech function analysis, there were found miss three points such as call, reponse to call and exclamation.

Finally, in accordance with the education background, situation and its influence in exchange structures, it showed that it can influence the structure of interaction. This is to say that a person will perform different knowledge and expression to different people and different topic. So, the factors that make question followed by question ($k_2 \wedge k_1 (k_2)$) occurred in this English class because the verbal violence that are the education background and situation from English lecturer and HIM students that include to language understanding whereas English lecturer has full basic and knowledge in English while HIM students are not English students so some of them do not have high skills in English, lack of vocabulary in English and sometimes they think English is not the main thing for their education.

CONCLUSION

The conclusions of the research were:

1. From eighteen potential exchange structures in English, there were only thirteen types corresponding moves of information and goods and services exchanges that occurred in the conversation between English lecturer with HIM students. The dominant exchanges structure were $k_2 \wedge k_1$ and $a_1 \wedge a_2 f \wedge a_1 f$. It is found different case, when lecturer gave the information to student that is marked by k_1 , it is followed by k_1 or signed by $k_2 \wedge k_1 (k_2) \wedge k_1 (k_2) \wedge k_1$. It wasn't follow Martin theory (1992).
2. It was found that that imperative was dominantly used by lecturer in English teaching conversation and the dominant mood used by student was interrogative. The researcher found that the conversation between English lecturer with student metaphorical coding is more dominant than congruent coding. In the conversation, there are many marked or flouting of the common coding, so metaphorical coding occurs. It can be seen that when student asked information about lecturer condition, the lecturer answered then response with asked information again to student. Then, student asked about lecturer opinion about the topic, lecturer directly to giving the information but student hadn't full understanding to speak up in English, so student asked lecturer to repeat her information again. But, the other conversation included to congruent coding because when the addresser asked question or information, in another way the addressee give the answer or information directly.
3. The reasons of the exchanges are structured in the way they are because the lack of English ability, education background, and situation context so most dialogues were not asking and giving

questions, but it is prefer to maintain the attitude and courtesy of students to lecturers. So forming a good communication so that communication run well and didn't occur misunderstanding/ misscommunication.

SUGGESTIONS

In relation to the conclusion, suggestions are staged as the following:

1. It is suggested that the English lecturer obtain development of English learning strategies for health students.
2. It is suggested that the Health Information Management (HIM) students increase their ability to speak up English well.
3. It is suggested that English lecturer and HIM students should know the interpersonal coding in order to avoid misunderstanding with one another and use speech function well because using speech function enable speakers and listeners to express their needs, messages and to give information clearly.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, U. 2018. The Structure of Classroom Discourse: 'Move' as a Teaching Exchange. *Ebonyl Journal of Language and Literary Studies*. Volume 1, No. 2 : 16 – 25.
- Bukit, H. 2016. Exchange Structures between Sellers and Buyers at the Deli Old Town Traditional Market. *Annual International Seminar on Transformative Education and Educational Leadershi*. Medan : UNIMED, 190-196.
- Febriyanti, Y.N. 2012. The Use of Multimedia Teaching Aids to Improve The Quality of The Speaking Teaching And Learning Process At The Eighth Grade Class Of SMP N 6 Yogyakarta in The Academic Year of 2011 / 2012. *UNY Journal*, Vol 1, 74.
- Gbenga Solomon Ibileye. Zaria: Izymac Fontz, 247 – 257.
- Hardman, J. 2015. *Tutor-student interaction in seminar teaching: implications for professional development*. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 17(1), 1-14.
- Innovative Language Teaching and Learning at University*. Available at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1469787415616728>. (Accessed 17th October 2017)
- Martin, J. R. 2012. *English Text: System and Structure*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Martin, J., Matthiessen, C., & Painter, C. 2011. *Working With Functional Grammar*. London : Arnold.
- Murray, E. Denise and Christison, MarryAnn. 2011. What English Language Teacher should know. *The Modern Language Journal*, Vol. 1, 224.
- Patrick, & O. Abraham (eds). 2016. *Linguistics, Language and Literature. A Festschrift for*

- Sadiq, M.J. (2016). 'Turn-Taking as a Pedagogical Strategy: An Analysis of Lessons in English as a Second Language (ESL) Classroom.' In O. Ayodabo, U.N. Butari, O, *Eternal Journal*. Volume 4, No. 2.
- Saragih, A. 2013. *Discourse Analysis: A Study on Discourse Based on Systematic Functional Linguistic Theory*. Medan : UNIMED.
- Saragih, A. 2013. *Introducing Functional Grammar*. Medan: UNIMED.

