Communicative Styles of English Students at the State University of Makassar

Murni Mahmud
murnimahmud@unm.ac.id
English Department of the Faculty of Languages and Literature
State University of Makassar, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Communication has a crucial function in English language teaching because failure in communication will result in unsuccessful process. Therefore, it is important to investigate the styles of communication used in the classroom, especially by students. The focus of this paper is to explore the expressions used by a group of students to communicate in the classroom. This paper is based on a study conducted in 2015 at the State University of Makassar, South Sulawesi, Indonesia. This study focused on two English classes which employed classroom presentations as the learning strategy. To collect data, the researcher recorded the classroom presentations of the two classes. Twelve recordings from twelve groups of students were obtained, transcribed, and analyzed by using discourse analysis approach. The communicative styles used by the students were discussed based on the communication strategies of Dörnyei and Scott (1997) and the students' talk was analyzed based on Brown's FLINT system (2000). Findings show that students employed various styles to communicate in the classroom presentations. Their communicative styles can be in the form of speech acts, discourse markers, language choices, address terms, and the inclusion of regional terms derived from the Bugis-Makassar language such as the pronoun -*ko* and softeners -*mi* and -*ji*. Findings of this study are relevant in the development of English language teaching, particularly in effort to create effective classroom interaction.

Keywords: communication; communication strategies; communicative styles; classroom presentation; classroom interaction; English language teaching

INTRODUCTION

Issues in language learning and teaching are still important consideration for practices in English language teaching, such as who are the subjects and what they do in the class, are main topics for discussions. Studies on issues in language learning and teaching are plenty, either from teachers' perspectives (Peng Wen J. et al., 2013; Lee Mun Woo, 2014) or from students' perspectives (Serag, 2011; Lee Ji Young et al., 2013; Wakabayashi, 2013). An example of study based on teachers' perspective was by Lee (2014) who had investigated the teachers' perception on national curriculum of English learning in South Korea and found that teachers had difficulties in implementing the communicative ways of teaching. From students' perspectives, Serag (2011) found that students had low motivation to study English due to their lack of confidence in their ability to write papers and to deliver English oral presentations.

Studies also proved that there were plenty of debatable issues in the classroom that had to be taken into account in order to produce effective input in English language teaching. One of them was the issue of politeness in teacher and student interaction (Zena, Marlyna Maros & Nor Fariza Mohd Nor, 2012; Senowarsito, 2013). Gender issues in relation to English language teaching have also been investigated recently (Mahmud, 2010; Roohani & Zarei, 2013; Viriya & Sapsirin, 2014).

Teachers have been encouraged to rely on student-centered learning by trying to involve students in the process. By doing so, teachers expect that students can learn independently and creatively. One of the techniques that is applicable for student-centered learning is by assigning students to conduct classroom presentations. Teachers can put students into groups, distribute topics, and let the students design the topics for presentation. In the class, students are encouraged to be ready for presentation by preparing power point presentation. In practice, students in group will discuss the topic in the class, open the floor for discussions, and attain feedback from teachers. This technique allows students to share ideas and encourage more discussions in the class.

This shows that strategies of communication in the class are important. Therefore, teachers and students need to apply effective communication strategies (CS, henceforth). Studies in terms of communication strategies had attracted many scholars. Somsai and Intaraprasert (2011) proved that communication strategies are helpful in assisting students to cope with face-to-face oral communication problems. In the study conducted on Arabic language classes, Ashinida Aladdin (2012) found the effective function of communication strategies as "a systematic technique to convey messages and therefore can assist students in improving their communication in the target language". In line with these findings, Tan Kim Hua, Nor Fariza Mohd Nor and Nayef Jaradat (2012) indicated some effective strategies for communication such as code-switching and interlingual strategy. Other studies revealed that the various communication strategies, such as refusal strategies can become important indicators for students' active interactions in the class (Amarien, 2010; Hiba, Salasiah Ceh Lah & Raja Rozina, 2011)

This paper attempts to stress on the importance of classroom presentations as a teaching strategy to build good interaction between teachers and students and among students in the class. The idea in this paper is to highlight the importance of students' active roles in teaching and learning process, by focusing on how they communicate during the classroom presentations. Findings in this study are valuable to understand how teachers and students should interact in the class.

RELATED LITERATURE

COMMUNICATION AND COMMUNICATIVE STYLES

Communication refers to the process of transferring or sharing ideas from one to another. Success in communication is achieved whenever messages are conveyed and transferred clearly and understandable. Tan Kim Hua, Nor Fariza Mohd Nor and Nayef Jaradat (2012, p. 832) state that communication "permeates virtually in all human interaction activities". In addition, the process of communication, especially for humans is undoubtedly complex. This complexity is due to the fact that "humans communicate cognitively, emotionally, and socially" (Tan Kim Hua, Nor Fariza Mohd Nor & Nayef Jaradat 2012, p. 832). This shows that communication holds important roles in human life. To gain successful communication, problems during the communication process should be avoided.

The process of transferring information, sharing ideas, and transmitting knowledge may vary depending on many different aspects. Individual, of course, have their own ways in doing all the said communicative activities. In addition, nobody speaks the same way, although they are speaking the same language. This is commonly known as communicative style. Urea (2013) states that "communication style represents the ensemble of characteristics a person possesses, and reflected in the communicative act" (p. 6). Urea (2013) further states that communication skill is "a personality feature", which can be in the forms of "specific ways of receiving/decoding the message; personal qualities in processing/interpreting

messages; specific ways of expressing the response, and personal particularities of feedback" (p. 6).

In order to be successful in communication, good strategies are needed. Therefore, we need CS. Dörnyei and Scott (1997, p. 182) define CSs as "language devices used to overcome communication problems related to interlanguage deficiencies". Somsai and Intaraprasert (2011, p. 86) conclude that CSs are commonly used to "bridge the gaps between the linguistic and sociolinguistic knowledge of the foreign language learners and those of the interlocutors in any communication situation". It is also to keep the flow of the talk. It can be inferred here that CSs are intended to overcome the communication problems in order to gain effective transfer of ideas.

Many scholars had given attention to the application of communication strategies since the first taxonomy of communication strategies was introduced by Tarone (1977). Studies on CSs was then flourishing and resulted in many different strategies for communication (Færch & Kasper, 1983; Bialystok, 1983; Paribakth, 1985; Willems, 1987; Bialystok, 1990; Poulisse, 1993; Dörnyei and Scott, 1997). These communication strategies aim to handle communication problems and to reach the optimal function of communication.

One of the taxonomies of communication strategies was proposed by Dörnyei and Scott (1997), in which communication strategies are divided into three domains, namely direct strategies, interactional strategies, and indirect strategies. Direct strategies, for examples, are achieved through message abandonment, message reduction, code-switching, etc. In interactional strategies, questions are used as appeal for help, comprehension check, clarification, and confirmation. The final strategy is indirect strategies which include the use of fillers and repetition (p. 197).

Communication strategies can be seen in the expressions which are used to communicate the message. One of them is by using speech acts. Two important linguistic philosophers, Austin (1962) and Searle (1969) had proposed taxonomies of speech acts. Searle (1969), for example, proposed five classes of speech acts: (1) representatives (e.g. asserting, concluding), which commits the speaker to the truth of the expressed proposition, (2) directives (e.g. requesting, questioning), which are attempts by the speaker to get the addressee to do something or to direct someone towards some goals of the speakers, (3) commissives (e.g. promising, threatening, offering), which commit the speaker to some future course of action, (4) expressives (e.g. thanking, apologizing, welcoming, congratulating), which express a psychological state and express the inner state of the speaker, and (5) declarations (e.g. appointing, excommunicating, declaring), which affect immediate changes in the institutional state of affairs and tend to rely on elaborate extra-linguistic institutions. Therefore, analysis on speech acts can become a good resource in investigating language use and communicative styles in one particular group.

CLASSROOM INTERACTION AND CLASSROOM PRESENTATION

Classroom interaction is the key point in this study. Classroom interaction is important since it provides information on how teachers and students interact in the class. Furthermore, effective classroom interaction will result in successful teaching. This issue had been observed by many scholars (Milal, 2011; Inan & Fidan, 2012). In Milal's study, for example, there are "positive relations between the activities in the lesson, the types of communicative acts performed and the power exercised in the class, and the effective achievement of the pedagogical objectives" (pp. 13-14). This means that all activities by teachers and students in the class contribute to success of teaching objectives. In addition, through the analysis of teacher questions in Turkish, Inan and Fidan's (2012, p. 1070) study reveals positive relations between the "discursive structure of language classrooms and the relationship between the

happenings in the classroom". This shows that the languages used for communicative purpose in the class influence activities in the class.

One aspect of classroom interactions is teacher talk and student talk. Nunan (1991) states that the use of teacher talk is definitely necessary as "it will manage and monitor the interactions in the class" (cited in Setiawati, 2012, p. 3). Furthermore, Setiawati's study on the use of constructive teacher talk (2012), showed that teacher talk serves "not only as a medium to achieve young learners' learning objectives but also as a tool to organize the classroom". It is through language that teachers either succeed or fail in implementing their plans. Similarly, Yanfen and Yuqin (2010, p. 76) note that "the success of teaching depends largely to a large extent on the way teachers talk and interaction that occur between teachers and students", which implies that teachers and students' communicative styles in the class will influence the success of the whole classroom interaction.

Brown (2000, p. 170) cited interaction analysis in foreign language classroom, which is referred to as the FLINT system. This system demonstrates specific styles of communication in the class which are commonly employed by teachers and students (Table 1).

TABLE 1. FLINT System of Classroom Interaction

Teacher Talk	Student Talk
Deals with feeling which is in a non-threatening way, accepting, discussing, referring to, or communicating understanding of past, present or future feelings of the students.	*Student response, specific which is responding to the teacher within specific and limited range available or previously practiced answers.*
Praise or encourage the students. It is praising, complementing, telling students why what they have said or done is valued. Jokes are also part of this point.	*Student response, open-ended or student-initiated which is responding to the teacher with students' own ideas, opinions, reactions, feelings.*
Uses ideas of students such as clarifying, using, interpreting, summarizing the idea of students. The ideas must be rephrased by the teacher but still be recognized as being student contributions.	*Silence which is pause in the interaction. This includes silence during a piece of audiovisual equipment.*
Asks questions to which the answer is anticipated. This does not include rhetorical questions.	*Confusion, work-oriented when more than one person at a time talking. This also includes confusion, non-work-oriented*
Gives information, fact, own opinion or idea: lecturing or asking rhetorical questions. This includes correcting without rejection.	*Laughter*
Gives directions referring to giving directions, requests, or commands that students are expected to follow such as directing various drills; facilitating whole-class and small-group activity.	*Uses the native language*
Criticizes student behavior which means rejecting the behavior of students, trying to change the non-acceptable behavior and communicating anger, displeasure, annoyance, dissatisfaction with what students are doing. This includes criticizing student response.	*Nonverbal, gestures or facial expressions*

Brown (2000, p. 170)

The use of communicative styles in classroom presentations is definitely crucial. In classroom presentations, teachers and students can employ various expressions that can be categorized as teacher talk and student talk, adapted from the FLINT system of Brown (2000).

RESEARCH METHODS

This study is based on discourse analysis approach. The analysis of this classroom presentation is based on the framework of discourse analysis which relies on data recording,

data transcription, data selection, and data interpretation. Gee (2011, p. 9) defines discourse analysis as "the study of language-in-use; the study of language at use in the world, not just to say things, but to do things". Jones (2011, p. 10) also refers to discourse analysis as a process of "entextualization, in which activities include transforming actions into texts and texts into action". In this study, classroom recordings were transcribed into text and the texts were then interpreted into actions. The analysis of the students' expressions using a discourse analysis approach is intended to intensively explore how students employ communicative styles in the class, as valuable input for better classroom interactions in the class.

The participants of this study are students of an undergraduate program at the State University of Makassar. The study was conducted in 2015. This study took one class purposively as the sample. There were 50 students in the class and they were taking Sociolinguistic course, in which the classroom presentation as a technique of discussion was applied. The students were in the fifth semester. In order to obtain data on the English students' classroom presentation, the students were assigned randomly into 12 groups of discussion which consisted of four to five persons. Each group was assigned one topic for presentation. Each group presented the topic using power point presentation and the presentation of each group was recorded. To reduce the students' anxiety, audio recording was used instead of video recording. In addition, recordings were conducted by the students using the recording function on their mobile phones.

Overall there were 12 recordings taken from this study which represented 12 groups. The recording for each group lasted for one and a half hour. The researcher initially listened to the recordings. The data were then transcribed. Since the transcriptions were long, the data were then selected based on the purposes of the present study. The data were then interpreted and analyzed in the forms of conversation extracts. In the extracts, relevant data were identified and discussed. The results were processed based on the framework of communication strategies by Dörnyei and Scott (1997), while data from the students talk were analyzed based on Brown's FLINT system (2000).

FINDINGS

After analyzing the data from the recording, some communicative styles used by the students in the classroom presentations were identified. Those communicative styles were divided into some parts based on the types of expressions that the students produced. They are explained as follows:

SPEECH ACTS PRODUCTIONS

The first finding from this research is the speech acts production, which include opening presentations in the form of greetings, topic presentation, ending presentations, inviting questions and several types of questions.

Extract 1: Opening the Presentation
Nur: **Okay, Assalamualaikum Warahmatullahi Wabarakatuh. Thanks for the times. We are from group two. We will give you presentation about varieties of language. The first is introduction**. *It's about global and specific statements, linguistic items, varieties of language and speech communities. I give chance to Arif to give statements about global and specific statements and linguistic items. Time is yours.*
Arif: **Okay, thanks before.** *The first point is global and specific statements...*

In extract 1 Nur, the moderator, opened the presentation by greeting all the students in the class. Nur used the Islamic greeting, "***Assalamualaikum Warahmatullahi Wabarakatuh***" (piece be upon you all). Nur also expressed her gratitude by saying "***Thanks for the times***", and introduced her group and topic. She then gave the chance to other speakers to speak in turn. When the second speaker, Arif, took his turn to talk, he directly said "***Okay, thanks before***" and then explained the topic. Another example can be seen in extract 2 .

Extract 2: Opening the presentation
Ima: ***Assalamualaikum Warahmatullahi Wabarakatuh. Good morning everybody. Thank you for this chance given to me. We are from group three and we will explain about*** *"Culture, Language and Thought". My name is Nurhalimah. My friends' names are Rina Kurniati, Wirdayanti Syam and Fitrayani Amir.*

In extract 2, Ima, as a moderator, greeted the class in two ways. First she used the Islamic greeting, "***Assalamualaikum Warahmatullahi Wabarakatuh***" (piece be upon you all). Next, she used the English greeting, "***Good morning everybody***". She then continued by thanking everyone, introduced the group and the topic, "***Thank you for this chance given to me, we are from group 3 and we will explain about...***".

Both speakers, Nur and Ima, in extract 1 and 2 demonstrated to other students how to begin the presentation. Expressions of greetings, thanks, and introduction are examples of speech act productions. In these extracts, greetings and thanks were used as signals to begin the presentation and to acknowledge the presence of the participants. The act of introducing, either the group members or the topic, was also effective to start the discussion. All these expressions are good and effective strategies to begin communication in the class. The following extracts depict the ways students presented the topics:

Extract 3: Presenting the topic
Nisa: *Language and Dialect, on this part,* ***I will explain*** *about meaning of language and dialect in general. (Reading the note). First is about language. Language is human system of communication that uses arbitrary signals, such as voice sounds, gestures...*

In extract 3, the speaker, Nisa, signaled that she is going to explain the topic; "***I will explain***". She then read the paper that had been prepared. Another example is as follows:

Extract 4: Presenting the topic
Rahma: *Okay the next.*
Eka: ***Well..I will continue the material***. *(Reading the note). Now see in part B speech as a signal of social identity. There are three points that I will explain. The first is non-relation social categories. The second is power and solidarity and aa the linguistic aa signal of power and solidarity.*

In extract 4, Rahma, who was also a moderator in another group of presentation invited the next speaker to express opinion. Eka then responded by saying, "***Well..I will continue the material***". Later, Eka also read the note that she had prepared.

Two extracts (extract 3 and 4) show expressions which can be categorized as speech acts of explanation and presentation. Both extracts show that the students, through speech acts, express themselves based on their objectives by explaining what they want to do. When Nisa and Eka said, "***I will explain***" and "***I will continue the material***", they were actually stating directly about what they are going to do in the presentation. Those expressions function as strategies to convey the ideas in the presentation. The next two extracts (extract 5

and 6) are examples of how students end their presentation and invite participation from the class.

Extract 5. Ending the presentation and Inviting Questions
Nur: Okay I think **that's all about our presentation and I want to ask you guys if you have any questions, please**. *The first is Ifah,*
Mus: *Can you explain with example about global and specific statements and speech community?*
Nur: **Next** *(inviting more questions)…*

In extract 5, Nur said "***that's all about our presentation***"*,* which was followed by a statement to invite questions from the participants; "***I want to ask you guys if you have any questions, please***". The same strategy can also be seen in extract 6:

Extract 6. Ending the presentation and Inviting Questions
Ima: **Okay that's all our presentation and now we open question session**. *Okay what's your name?*
Mega: *My name is Megawati from group five. What is prototype theory? Okay, thank you.*
Ima: **next question**…*(inviting more questions)*

Ima said, "***Okay that's all our presentation and now we open question session***". In this case, Ima signaled the end of the presentation. She also said "***now we open question session***" to invite participants to ask questions.

Extract 5 and 6 are examples of expressions used by the students to end the presentation and to invite participation. Those expressions can be categorized as speech act of concluding and inviting, in which the speakers concluded the presentation and invited other students to participate by asking questions about the topic that had been presented. These expressions also function as strategies to transfer ideas and messages between the group presenter and the participants in the class. The following extracts show how students use questions to communicate their messages in the classroom presentation:

Extract 7: Questions by students
Mia: **Can you explain** *with example about global and specific statements and speech community?*
Apri: **tolong jelaskan** *lebih spesifik lagi apa itu monolingual, bilingual, dan multilingual serta apa perbedaannya? (**please help to** explain in more specific way about monolingual, bilingual, and multilingual..what are the differences?)*
Nia: **try to** *mention the differences between code-switching and code-mixing and give examples*

In extract 7, speakers, Mia, Apri, and Nia used questions indirectly by using request formulations such as the use of "***can you***" and "***try to***". Apri, another speaker asked a question by saying, "***tolong jelaskan***". This expression is from Indonesian language, which means "***please help***". The extracts showed that in the process of asking questions, students applied indirect requests. Another strategy of asking question can be seen in the next extract:

Extract 8: Questions by students
Inal: **Okay now I will open section**. *Yes, please Indri…*
Indri: **What is the difference between local accent and teacher accent?**
Inal: *Next…*
Mega: **What is the linguistic competence and communicative incompetence?**

When Inal said "***Ok now I will open section***", he is actually inviting questions from the class. Indri and Mega then posed questions directly by saying "***What is the difference between local accent and teacher accent?***" and "***What is the linguistic competence and communicative incompetence?***". These ways of questioning tended to be very formal and direct. This is different from the questions put forward in extract 7, in which the questions were asked indirectly in the form of requests. Another form of questioning strategy is demonstrated in extract 9.

Extract 9: Questions by students

Eka: ***Well, thank you very much for the chance given to me****. I'm Eka from group four, you explain the…about the scope of quantitative studies of speech, why study speech quantitative, methodology and so on but you don't explain..a-actually..**what is quantitative speech..quantitative? Can you explain what is actually speech quantitative?***

Mega: *Attention!* ***Thank you****, for the next question*

Ros: *aa well,* ***thanks for the chance****, aa my name is Ros, I'm from group three aa my question is aa in method…in methodology. In methodology, there is, there are five, there are five stages in a sociolinguistics, and **my question is aa what aa what is the processing the figures and then give the step of the processing?** Okay.* ***Thank you****.*

In extract 9, Eka stated her question with the expression of thanks and explained her confusion about the topic. Besides asking, "***what is quantitative speech..quantitative?***", which was direct question, Eka used a request type of question by saying, "***Can you explain what is actually speech quantitative?***". The same was true of Ros. Ros first expressed her thanks (***thanks for the chance***), asked a question (***my question is aa what aa…the step of processing***), and said thanks again (***Thank you).*** This extract shows that students applied several strategies of asking questions. Expressions of thanks were used to accompany the questions, which made the questions indirect. Another example of questioning strategy can be seen in the next extract:

Extract 10: Questions by Students

Indah: *ee Indonesia can be called ee a bilingual country or multilingual country. Using so many kinds of languages.* ***Choose what do you want?***

Iwan: *Indonesia…Indonesia is multilingual?*

In extract 10, Indah was explaining a topic on bilingual and multilingual. She then asked a question, "***choose what do you want?***". The use of this question was different from the questions in the previous extracts. During the presentation, the question that Indah asked can be seen as a strategy to help the audience comprehend the topic. The question was not intended to be answered, but only to stress the point of the presentation.

It is concluded that the four extracts (extract 7, 8, 9, 10) showed how students use questions to communicate and the questions are intended for different purposes. In extract 7, questions were asked directly. In extract 8, questions tended to be indirect by using requests. By using "***can you***" and other expressions for assistance, such as "***tolong***" (please help) and "***try***", the students in the presentation were trying reduce the threat of the questions. In extract 9, the use of thanks together with requests created a smooth flow of presentation. In extract 10, the question was used only to emphasize the messages. The students' questions in these four extracts were used to effectively communicate ideas across in the presentations and to handle miscommunications of the ideas. Questioning as a form of speech act functions as a communicative strategy.

DISCOURSE MARKERS

Another important aspect of students' communicative styles is the use of discourse markers. This can be seen in the following three extracts:

Extract 11: Asking a question
Akbar:Please introduce your self
*Dini: I'm Dini from group four. **Well..I don't get the point about a real and familiar world. Well**..you **can give ee explain the point about the two points**. **Okay,** thank you.*

Extract 12: Answering a question
*Riski : **Okay,** I will try to answer the question of Indri's*
*Ros: **yeahh..**maybe some like this local action and…the use of English we are talking*
*Inal: The answer from Mega's question, linguistic competence. It concerns any language linguistic incompetence, **as we know that** .The children begin speech,*

Extract 13: Giving explanation
*Desy: **Okay**, **hmm,** I will going, **eh..**I'm going to ee continue the presentation by Akbar, **ya**, **ee** sociolinguistics and sociology and **ee** of language. **Ya ee, as we know,** sociolinguistics is a study that discusses about **ee** linguistics and sociology. **You know ee** linguistics is a study about **ee** language...*

In extract 11, Dini asked a question because she was not clear about the previous statement. Before asking the question, "***Can you give ee explain the point about the two points***", she said, "***well, I don't get the point about a real and familiar world***". The expressions of "***ee***", "***okay***", and "***well***" are fillers in order to maintain the flow of the ideas. The same situation can be seen in extract 12, when Riski, Ros and Inal also used "***okay***", "***yeahh***", and "***as we know that***". In extract 13, Desy uttered "***okay***", "***hmm***", "***eh***", "***ya***", "***ee***", "***as we know***" and "***you know***".

Fillers or discourse markers in the three extracts function to maintain the flow of the conversations among the students, to stress important points in the discussion and to avoid hesitation in speaking. During the presentation in English, students might be nervous or they might forget their ideas. The use of these discourse markers indicated that the students were trying to bridge the gap of missing ideas, to gain time and to convey the messages clearly.

LANGUAGE CHOICES

Another important issue is the language choices among the students.

Extract 14: Explaining about a topic
Arif: *Okay, so actually, it's difficult to differentiate which one [is] code-mixing and code-[switching] because we generalize it in the same term. **Jika kita lihat pada tataran konteks karena yang beda kan keduanya adalah..masing-masing pada keduanya adalah proses penyatuan atau tercapainya dua frasa atau lebih, contohnya ketika saya menjelaskan seperti ini, saya akan menjelaskan kepada kalian** (seen from its context, because the differences lie on the process of grouping two phrases or more.., for example, when I explain like this, I will explain to you all). What is actually the meaning of philosophy?*

In extract 14, Arif switched from English into Indonesian language (the second line). This happened because Arif could not explain some technical process and definition, hence,

Indonesian language was chosen for this purpose. Arif used English and then decided to use Indonesian language in order to explain the topic clearly. This phenomenon was mostly found in all of the students' presentations. Another example is as follows:

Extract 15: Answering a question
Ika: *I will try to answer it. The question is* **seberapa besar pengaruh budaya ayah dan ibu dalam perkembangan bahasa anak, begitu?** (*I will try to answer it. The question is how big is the influence of father and mother's culture on the children development, is that what you meant?'*)

Ika began by speaking in English. However, when she restated the question, she used Indonesian language; "*The question is* **seberapa besar pengaruh budaya ayah dan ibu dalam perkembangan bahasa anak, begitu?**". This shows that when the speaker wanted to be clear about the question, she switched into Indonesian language. She also asked, "**begitu?**" (is that what you meant?), which aimed to ensure that the question which was asked in English retained its meaning when Ika translated it into Indonesian language. The switch from English into Indonesian language made her understood the question better. Another condition for language choices can be seen in the following extract:

Extract 16: Asking a question
Siti: *Maybe, maybe you can, aaa make, aaa your question, more aaa clear, it likes that, so if you ask about what? what factor? what social factor?* **Maksudnya disini...faktor-faktor apa yang membuat orang bertutur, speech means tutur atau berbicara?** *(Maybe, you can ask questions clearly, like that, so if you ask about the social factor... I mean here...what are the factors influencing people to speak? Speech here means the oral communication...)*

Extract 16 shows how the speaker tried to ease her communication by switching from English into Indonesian language. Siti tried to speak English, but she appeared to have difficulties, as seen in her use of the filler "***aaa***". In order to explain her ideas clearly, she then switched to Indonesian language: "**Maksudnya disini...faktor-faktor apa yang membuat orang bertutur, speech means tutur atau berbicara**". The code-switching strategy helped her to explain the meaning of the question, in which she eventually could answer the question correctly.

The three extracts (extract 14, 15, and 16) provided evidence of code-switching due to some reasons. The three extracts showed that code-switching is a form of communication strategies for students to overcome their problems in communication. The students began by speaking in English, but when it came to deeper and detailed explanation, students switched into Indonesian language to deliver their comprehension and understanding about the topic.

ADDRESS TERMS

The recordings also show the use of address terms as a way to refer people in the conversation. Students in this study used certain address terms that can be seen in the following extracts:

Extract 17: Addressing older people in the class
Ros: *The next question from* **Kak** *(older brother) Sahri..*
Ika: *I will try to answer it..*

Extract 18: Using names to address each other
Mega: Okay, attention please. Okay, we want to answer the second question from **Ros.** By
      Yuni.
Ros: Okay

      Ros applied address term from Indonesian language "***Kak***" (older brother) to address her classmates (extract 17). Students in the class are not of the same age and not the same grade. Sahri is one of their seniors. To address their seniority, Ros used the address term "***Kak***", which is a formal expression. In extract 18, the students used names to address each other to show their intimacy and familiarity. In extract 19, a different address term was used by the student:

Extract 19: Addressing the teacher
Inal: *ini ada ee statement* **Mem** *bilang ee apa. There is a statement,* **Mem** *said. There are*
        three types from variety language like language from dialect, dialect from ee register
        and dialect for ee creoles and dialect from ee pidgin..pidgin...

      In addressing their teacher, the students used the term "***Mem***" (madam). This is a formal address term used for older people in Indonesian society. This term was also employed in the classroom interaction.
      The three extracts (extract 17, 18, and 19) indicated that students used different ways of addressing people when they communicate with different interlocutors, while names are mostly used among themselves to create intimacy and familiarity. When addressing their seniors who were older than them, despite being classmates, the students used the Indonesian address term "***Kak***" (older brother) to acknowledge the seniority. When communicating with their teacher, the students used "***Mem***" (madam), a more formal term of address. These address terms also function as communication strategies by students in the class to create a smooth flow of conversation.

THE INCLUSION OF REGIONAL TERMS

The inclusion of regional terms which are derived from the students' mother tongue in the classroom presentation is also obvious. Although the students used English as the main language for communication, the speakers also used terms derived from their mother tongue, which is a mixture of Indonesian and Bugis-Makassar language. Bugis-Makassar language is a language spoken mostly by the students since they are mostly from Bugis-Makassar ethnic group, a specific ethnic group in South Sulawesi, Indonesia. The examples are in the following extracts:

Extract 20: Asking people to record the presentation
Rina: *And the next Basic-level concept is*
Ida: ***Ima, merekamko…****(Ima, **you record it**)*
Rina: *Several..the notion of prototype in psychology which suggests that there may be less*
        difference than might be expected in the organization of word and meanings,

      When Rina continued with the explanation, Ida asked Ima to record by saying, "***Ima, merekamko***" *(Ima, you record it)*. Ida found it too late to record the presentation since the explanation had already started. She incidentally said to Ima, ***"Ima, merekamko"***, which is a mix of Indonesian and Bugis-Makassar language. The word "***merekam***" (to record) is from Indonesian language, with the Bugis-Makassar particle *–ko* added at the end of the word. The use of particle *-ko* at the end is an informal pronoun to address familiar persons in Bugis-

Makassar language. Since Ida was addressing her friend, she, therefore, used the pronoun -
ko.

Extract 21: Answering a question
Eka: What is speech quantitatively?
Sri: **Samaji (just the same)**
Yuni: That is same.

The use of expression "**samaji**" (just the same) was also influenced by the students'
regional language. The word "**sama**" (the same) is from Indonesian language whereas '**ji**'
(just) is a kind of softener from Bugis-Makassar language. Similar to extract 20, the inclusion
of these regional terms was to maintain the flow of the conversations. Another example is in
extract 22:

Extract 22: Answering a question
*Ida: Okay, aa thanks for this chance that given to me. My questions aa why study speech
         quantit-quantitavely? In this context aa if each text contained instances of only one
         variant for each variable, then it could be located in the relevant multidimensional
         linguistics. What [is] the meaning aa what is the meaning [of] multidimensional
         linguistics?*
Yuni: **Jawabmi (just answer it)**
Mega: Okay. Give more time to answer the question
Yuni: **Jawabmi nomer satu?(Just answer number one)**

The use of "**mi**" (just) by Yuni is an example of a term which is derived from Bugis-
Makassar language. This is usually used as a softener which means "**just**". In extract 22 Yuni
used it with Indonesian language "**jawab**" (answer).

The three extracts (extract 20, 21, and 22) demonstrated the inclusion of regional
terms which is derived from students' regional language. Although the presentation was
mostly delivered in English, terms such as pronoun **-ko** and softeners **-mi** and **-ji** were
borrowed from the students' regional language. These expressions function to bridge the gap
in communication and to avoid miscommunications in the class.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Twenty-two extracts of conversations were presented as the samples of conversations which
were transcribed from twelve classroom presentations. Overall, the findings show various
expressions used by the students as strategies to communicate in the class. The first one is the
speech act productions. Ten extracts (extract 1-10) demonstrated the use of greetings, thanks,
introductions, questions, requests, and invitations. These expressions are evidence of speech
acts based on Searle's taxonomy (1969) in terms of expressive, commissive, and directive
speech acts.

The finding shows that speech acts are useful means of expressing meanings and
therefore, can be used as strategies to communicate. Previous studies on the use of speech
acts also confirm that speech acts contain meaningful expressions to help people convey their
ideas and messages. Triana Hetti Waluati and Idris Aman (2011), for example, reported on
the crucial function of refusal as one type of speech acts in social culture. In addition, through
the expressions of condolences, Yasser Al-Shboul and Marlyna Maros (2013) depict the
benefit of condolences in social media communication.

Another communicative style can be seen in the form of discourse markers (extract
11-13). These markers are commonly used to bridge the gaps in communication which is

caused by hesitation, or lack of knowledge on the topic. This is in line with Siti Nurbaya Mohd Nor's study on discourse markers (2012), who found significant roles of discourse markers. Siti Nurbaya Mohd Nor (2012, p.3) states that discourse markers "have a positive impact on the smooth flow of conversation, in that they help the participants in the interaction to take or hold their speaking turns". Zuraidah Mohd Don and Tam Shu Sim (2016) also confirmed that discourse particles play crucial roles in interaction especially in turn taking. The present study has shown that fillers or discourse markers is a useful way to communicate.

Findings from this study also show that throughout the classroom presentations, the students switched to Indonesian language due to several reasons (extract 14-16). The language they used and the switches from one language to another functioned to help them to communicate their ideas. Tan Kim Hua, Nor Fariza Mohd Nor and Nayef Jaradat's study (2012) had also established the significant function of code-switching as a means of communication. In fact, based on the study of their study, code-switching is "the most frequently employed communication strategy" (2012, p. 831). Rido Akhyar, Noraini Ibrahim and Radha Nambiar (2015) also proved the important role of code-switching as one of the interaction strategies in the class, such as in giving explanation, example, and instruction.

The next finding from this study is about the use of address terms when addressing different interlocutors (extract 17-19). These address terms were also effective as a strategy to communicate. In fact, it can help students to maintain the formality and intimacy aspect of the interaction. Claymen (2010, p.161) states that "address terms are a resource for managing certain expressive properties of talk". Therefore, by using address terms, speakers can manage their talk, hence, communicate effectively. Other studies by Hua Zhu (2010) and Afful (2010) also found the crucial roles of address terms in the process of language socialization and in the students' communication respectively.

The inclusion of regional terms which is derived from students' first language (L1) on the students' expressions (extract 20-22) is a significant contribution from this study. This was supported by Makulloluwa (2013, p. 594) who found that L1 "not only makes the input more comprehensible but also minimizes communication breakdowns". In addition, Paker and Karaagaç's study (2015, p. 111) revealed the inseparable function of using mother tongue in ELT such as "rapport building purposes", "making the topic/meaning clear (by giving examples, explaining, making extra explanations, etc.)", "explaining difficult concepts or ideas" and others. The findings established significant functions of the first language or mother tongue in the learning process. L1 or mother tongue might help students to communicate their ideas and bridge the gaps in information transfer.

With reference to Dörnyei and Scott's (1997), communicative styles used by the students in the classroom presentations in the present study can be categorized into some parts. The dominant use of questions throughout the presentations indicates the crucial functions of questions as a form of communication strategy. Students used questions for help, clarification, and comprehension check. Dörnyei and Scott (1997) categorized these as interactional strategies. The students also used code-switching and fillers (discourse markers) as strategies to communicate. Based on this framework, new communication strategies were produced, which are the use of address terms and the inclusion of regional term (derived from students' first language).

The communicative styles shown by the students in this study also contribute to the discussion of students' talk under the framework of the Brown's FLINT (2000). It can be seen that the application of questions in the classroom presentations indicated how students use "responses" in the class as strategies to communicate. One of the findings which is also relevant is the use of native language, whereby some expressions are used as styles of communication and therefore function as communication strategies.

Findings from this study has contributed significantly to the process of English language teaching at the State University of Makassar and in other universities in Indonesia, particularly, where English is studied as a foreign language. Students in the class may display different styles of communication. Various expressions they produced can become effective strategies to communicate in the class, which can also bring benefits to the ELT process. Teachers who are teaching in the class should be aware of the different communicative styles to assist students in using the appropriate and effective communication strategies in the process of learning English. Therefore, this study needs to be further explored, especially in terms of the effects of communicative styles on students' achievement in the learning process. In addition, studies in classroom interaction needs to be intensively explored, for example, differences in using communication strategies between gender or between age group and other variables. Other potential communication strategies might be found and therefore, effective classroom interaction can be further obtained.

REFERENCES

Afful, Joseph Benjamin Archibald (2010). Address Terms among University Students in Ghana: A Case Study. *Language and Intercultural Communication. 6*(1), 76-91.

Ashinida Aladdin (2012). An Analysis of the Usage of Communication Strategies in Arabic Oral Communication. *GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies. 12*(2), 645-666.

Amarien, N. (2010). Interlanguage Pragmatics: A Study of the Refusal Strategies of Indonesian Speakers Speaking English. *TEFLIN Journal. 8*(1), 1-12.

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Brown, D. H. (2000). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy* (4th Ed.). USA: Longman.

Bialystok, E. (1983). Some Factors in the Selection and Implementation of Communication Strategies. In C. Færch & G. Kasper (Eds.). *Strategy in Interlanguage Communication* (pp. 100-108). Harlow, UK; Longman.

Bialystok, E. (1990). Communication Strategies: A Psychological Analysis of Second Language Use. London: Blackwell.

Claymen, S. E. (2010). Address Terms in the Service of Other Actions: The Case of News Interview Talk. *Discourse and Communication. 4*(2), 161-183.

Dörnyei, Z. & Scott, M.L. (1997). Review Article Communication Strategies in a Second Language: Definitions and Taxonomies. *Language Learning. 47*(1), 173-210.

Færch, C., & Kasper, G. (1983). Plans and Strategies in Foreign Language Communication. In C. Faerch & G. Kasper (Eds.). *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication* (pp. 20-60). London: Longman.

Gee James. Paul. (2011). *How to Do Discourse Analysis: A Toolkit*. New York and London: Routledge.

Hiba, Qusay Abdul Sattar, Salasiah Che Lah, & Raja Rozina Raja Suleiman. (2011). Refusal Strategies in English by Malay University Students. *GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies. 11*(3), 69-81.

Hua, Zhu. (2010). Language Socialization and Interculturality: Address Terms in Intergenerational Talk in Chinese Diasporic Families. *Language and Intercultural Communication. 10*(3), 189-205.

Inan, B. & Fidan, D. (2012). Teacher Questions and Their Functions in Turkish as a Foreign Language (TFL) Classes. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences. 70*(2013), 1070-1077.

Jones, R. H. (2011). Data collection and Transcription in Discourse Analysis. In K. Hyland & B. Paltridge (Eds.). *Bloomsbury Companion to Discourse Analysis* (pp. 9-21). London: Bloomsbury.

Lee Ji Young, Su Kyoung Mo, So Hee Lee & Kiwan Sung. (2013). Korean English Speakers' Perception of East-Asian English Speakers' Performance. *The Journal of ASIA TEFL. 10*(4), 1-12.

Lee Mun Woo. (2014). Will Communicative Language Teaching Work? Teachers' Perceptions Toward the New Educational Reform in South Korea. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics. 3*(2), 1-12.

Mahmud, M. (2010). Language and Gender in English Language Teaching. *TEFLIN Journal. 21*(2), 172-184.

Makulloluwa, E. (2013). Code-switching by Teachers in the Second Language Classroom. *International Journal of Arts & Sciences. 6*(3), 581-598.

Milal, A. D. (2011). Indicators of the Practice of Power in Language Classrooms. *TEFLIN Journal. 22*(1), 1-15.

Paker, T. & Karaagaç, Ö. (2015). The Use and Functions of Mother Tongue in EFL Classes. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences. 199*(2015), 111-119.

Paribakht, T. (1985). Strategic Competence and Language Proficiency. *Applied Linguistics. 6*, 132-146.

Poulisse, N. (1993). A Theoretical Account of Lexical Communication Strategies. In R. Schreuder & B. Wittens (Eds.). *The Bilingual Lexicon* (pp. 157-189). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Peng Wen J., Elizabeth McNess, Sally Thomas, Xiang Rong Wu, Chong Zhang, Jian Zhong Li, Hui Sheng Tian (2013). Emerging Perceptions of Teacher Quality and Teacher Development in China. *International Journal of Educational Development. 34*, 77-89.

Rido, Akhyar, Noraini Ibrahim, & Radha Nambiar M. K. (2015). Interaction Strategies of Master Teachers in Indonesian Vocational Classroom: A Case Study. *3L: Language Linguistics Literature®, Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies. 21*(3), 85-98

Roohani, A. & Zarei, M. (2013). Evaluating Gender-bias in the Iranian Pre-university English Textbooks. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics. 3*(2), 1-12.

Siti Nurbaya Mohd Nor (2010). Discourse Markers in Turn-initial Positions in Interruptive Speech in a Malaysian Radio Discourse. *Multilingua. 31*(2012)*, 113-133.

Searle, J. (1969). *Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Senowarsito, S. (2013). Politeness Strategies in Teacher-student Interaction in an EFL Classroom Context. *TEFLIN Journal. 24*(1), 82-96.

Serag, A. (2011). Teaching English Writing Skills: Developing Learner Autonomy in Japanese Context. *International Journal of Arts and Science. 4*(10), 223-237.

Setiawati, L. (2012). A Descriptive Study on the Teacher Talk at EYL Classroom. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics. 1*(2), 33-48.

Somsai, S. & Intaraprasert, C. (2011). Strategies for Coping with Face-to-face Oral Communication Problems Employed by Thai University Students Majoring in English. *GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies. 11*(3), 83-96.

Tan Kim Hua, Nor Fariza Mohd Nor & Nayef Jaradat. (2012). Communication Strategies among EFL Students: An Examination of Frequency of Use and Types of Strategies Used. *GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies. 12*(3), 831-848.

Tarone, E. (1977). Conscious Communication in Interlanguage: A Progress Report. In H. D. Brown, C. A. Yorio & R. C. Crymes (Eds.). *On TESOL '77.* Washington DC: TESOL.

Triana, Hetti Waluati, Idris Aman. (2011). Speech Act of Refusal among Minangkabau Young Generation: A Reflection of Popular Culture in Social Interaction. *GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies*. *11*(1), 17-34.

Urea, R. (2013). The Influence of Communication Style on the Reactivity to Social Changes at Mental Deficiencies Preadolescents. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences. 78*, 6-10.

Viriya, C. & Sapsirin, S. (2014). Gender Differences in Language Learning Style and Language Learning Strategies. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics. 3*(2), 1-12.

Wakabayashi, R. (2013). Learners' Roles in a Peer Feedback Task: Do They View Themselves as Writers or Reviewers. *The Journal of ASIA TEFL. 10*(3), 1-12.

Willems, G. M. (1987). Communication Strategies and Their Significance in Foreign Language Teaching. *System. 15*(3), 351-364.

Yanfen, L. & Yuqin, Z. (2010). A Study of Teacher Talk in Interactions in English Classes. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics. 33*(2), 76-86.

Yasser Al-Shboul & Marlyna Maros (2013) Condolences Strategies by Jordanians to an Obituary Status Update on Facebook. *GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies*. *13*(3), 151-162.

Zuraidah Mohd Don & Tam Shu Sim (2016). Prosody and Particles: A Study of Interaction in a Malaysian Academic Meeting. *3L: Language Linguistics Literature®, Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies. 21*(3), 17-33

Zena, Moayad Najeeb, Marlyna Maros & Nor Fariza Mohd Nor (2012). Politeness in E-mails of Arab Students in Malaysia. G*EMA Online Journal of Language Studies. 12*(1), 125-145.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Murni Mahmud is a Professor of Anthropology Linguistics at English Department of the Faculty of Languages and Literature, State University of Makassar, Indonesia. Her research interests are in Anthropology Linguistics, Discourse Analysis, and gender studies. She teaches Anthropology Linguistics, Psycholinguistics, Morphosyntax, Sociolinguistics, and Discourse Analysis at undergraduate and graduate levels.