

**REALIZATION OF SPEECH FUNCTIONS
BY PRIMARY SCHOOL LEARNERS
OF ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE**

**Yusnita Sylvia Ningrum
Dian Nuswantoro University**

Abstract: English learning in Indonesia share the same central characteristics of foreign language learning which lies in the amount and type of exposure to the language: there will be very little experience of the language outside the classroom, and encounters with the language will be through several hours of teaching in a school week. This paper as a result of a research describing the way the young learners negotiate meanings through their choices of speech functions and the realization of those speech functions through the choices of mood after they are being treated at school. The corpus of the data of this research is a stretch of approximately sixty-minutes dialogue between 5 primary school children and their teacher; the speech functions are categorized based on the Speech Function Network developed by Eggins and Slade (1997). It is found that children learning English as a foreign language can perform similar speech functions as adult in their spoken interaction. With the support from adult (teacher) and the proper environment, children whose native language is Indonesian and started to learn English when they were at school ages are able to interact with others, convey message and share ideas using English. They can also realize the speech functions into an organized and logical system of mood.

Keywords: speech function, primary school learners, foreign language, realization, mood and modality

In a multilingual context, like Indonesia, children have the opportunities to deal with many languages, including English. English for Indonesian (children) is a foreign language; it is not spoken by a native speaker (Indonesian). In most cases, children learn English at school. As it is a foreign language, English learning in Indonesia share the same central characteristics of foreign language learning which lies in the amount and type of exposure to the language: there will be very little experience of the language outside the classroom, and encounters with the language will be through several hours of teaching in a school week. Fortunately, English is the first and major foreign language taught in many schools in Indonesia. The exposure to English is more in amount than the exposure to other foreign languages. English has been in the curriculum in Indonesia for a long time.

As the *Critical Period Hypothesis* mentions that a critical point for language acquisition occurs around puberty, there is a growing awareness from Indonesian that English should be learnt from the very early beginning. In addition, learning foreign language at the young age is believed to achieve better result than learning it at the older age. There are many institutions providing English teaching for children. As the consequence, there are some children having the capability to speak English.

In relation to teaching and learning a foreign language for young learners (children), spoken language is the medium through which the new language is encountered, understood, practiced and learned. Rather than oral skills being simply one aspect of learning language, the spoken form in the young learner classroom acts as the prime source and site of language learning. New language is largely introduced orally, understood orally and aurally, practiced and automatized orally. Furthermore, foreign language lessons often provide all or most of children's experience of the language in use. Therefore, the best teaching children a foreign language (English) is teaching children to interact using it.

Halliday (1984:11) mentions that whenever someone uses language to interact, one of the things they are doing is establishing a relationship: between the person speaking now and the person who will probably speak next. The negotiation which characterizes spoken texts is achieved through the sequencing of moves, each of which performs a *speech function* or a *speech act*. When children use language to interact, they are creating relationship. Within the relationship, they negotiate meaning through their speech. In other word, children perform speech functions while they interact using their language.

In Vygotskian theory, children are seen as active learners in a world full of other people. The children's language development and learning take place in a social context, i.e. in a world full of other people, who interact with the children from birth onwards. Those people play an important role in helping children to learn, bringing objects and ideas to their attention, talking while playing and about playing, reading stories, asking questions. Adults mediate the world for children and make it accessible to them. With the help of adults, children can do and understand much more than they can on their own. In relation to language acquisition, children, and teacher, Lindfors (1980:201-223) argues that (1) the growth of language is a continuous process for children, (2) the growth of language is deeply rooted in the child's cognitive growth, (3) the growth of language involves the child as the active party in the learning process, (4) the growth of language is aided by an environment which is geared toward the child's ways of learning, (5) the growth of language is aided by an environment which is responsive to the child, (6) the growth of language is aided by an environment which focuses on meaning rather than on form, (7) the growth of language is aided by an environment which provides rich diversity of verbal and nonverbal experience.

Children learning English at school are believed to have acquired better language compared to those learning English without any guidance. Nunan (1993:106) argues that many aspects of children's grammatical as well as discursal ability continue to develop after they enter school. Though, Brown and

Yule as quoted by Nunan (1993:106) found that while pupils were able to use language for social purposes, they were much less skilled at using language for transactional purposes (language used to get things done in the real world). At school, children get all the help from the teachers to learn the language, and they get the supporting environment to interact using the language. Therefore, children learning English at school are supposed to be able to create role and relationship in a more delicate and developed way than before they are going to school. They may perform more functions in their interaction. Further, as their language develops, they may also realize the role and relationship in a more complex construction.

Apart from the fact that English is being a foreign language in Indonesia, children who learn the language at school are considered to have more than just linguistic competence. They, once again, are judged to know how to build communication using the language.

AIMS OF THE STUDY

This study analyzes the speech functions realization by children learning English as a foreign language. Particularly, this study focuses on the way children negotiate meanings through their choices of speech functions which are influenced by the interpersonal relationships and the realization of those meanings through the grammatical choices of mood to arrive at a successful interaction after they are being treated at school. The choice of school is based on the environment which enables children to learn foreign language effectively. The school chosen, MONDIAL Education, meets the requirements such as Lindfors' argued about the environment which help the students learn a language.

The data of this study is classroom spoken interaction involving children and a teacher obtained from recording activity. The children's speech functions are analyzed using Eggins and Slade casual conversation network. The network is a development of Halliday's basic speech functions. It gives delicate and detail description of types of speech functions. The unit of analysis of this study is moves.

The young children studied in this research are (1) Bella, 7, her parents are Indonesian (Javanese), she started learning English when she joined pre-school, she speaks English with her friends and teachers at school, (2) Satria, 7, his parents are Chinese, he speaks English with his friends and teachers at school, (3) Albert, 7, his parents are Chinese, he speaks English with his friends and teachers at school, (4) Ken-ken, 7;8, his parents are Chinese, he speaks English with his friends and teachers at school, (5) Anthony, 7, his parents are Chinese, he can speak Indonesian, he speaks English with his friends and teachers at school. All of the children were on the second year of bilingual class of MONDIAL Education.

LINGUISTIC FEATURES IN CHILDREN'S SPOKEN INTERACTION

Number of Turns

The number of turns reveals the information that there is a remarkably unevenness in the opportunity to talk. The teacher took turn for 126 times

(41.72%), one-third of the floor, indicated that she was the dominant speaker of the interaction. The rest of the turn was divided almost equally to the students – Albert took turn for 39 times (12.91%); Anthony, 38 (12.58%); Bela, 49 (16.62%); Ken-ken, 30 (9.93%); and Satria, 20 (6.62%). Of the 5 students, Bela is considered as the talk-active student since she took turn more frequently compared to her 4 friends. Satria, on the other hand, is judged to be the one who took less turn. Albert, Anthony, and Ken-ken were perceived to have almost equal opportunity to participate in the interaction.

Number of Moves and Clauses

Move and clause are two distinct units of analysis which relate one another. Move is a unit of discourse after which speaker change could occur without turn transfer being seen as an interruption. Clause is a grammatical unit in which most of the time realizes a move.

The number of moves produced by each interactant resembles the number of turns in the way it gives information who talks more than the other. Again, from the study, it is seen that the teacher produced the highest number of moves of all participants. She produced 196 moves in the interaction. It suggests that she was speech functionally dominant as she got more moves in her turns. The total number of students' moves is 220 distributed in such a way that Albert produced 66 moves; Anthony, 46 moves, Bela, 52; Ken-ken and Satria each produced 33 and 23 moves. Students made more moves than the teacher.

From the students' point of view, Albert was the one who is speech functionally dominant compared to his friend. He produced the highest number of moves than his friends. Furthermore, he also gets more value out of his turns, producing more moves though fewer turns than Bela; Bela took 49 turns with 52 moves, while Albert took 39 turns with 66 moves. On the other hand, Anthony, Ken-ken, and Satria did not show any significant information on the relation between turn and move. Each of them is considered to be speech functionally equal as they produced 46 moves in 38 turn, 33 moves in 30 turns, and 23 moves in 20 turns subsequently.

The teacher in the study, congruently with the number of turns and moves produced, made the highest number of clauses of the participants. She produced 263 clauses in her 196 moves. The students produced almost the same number of clauses as the teachers', that is 240 clauses, distributed into 71 clauses produced by Albert, 48 by Anthony, 62 by Bela, and 33 and 26 by Ken-ken and Satria successively. This information signs that the students were as contributive as the teacher. They altogether were in an equal position and capability to produce clauses as their teacher. However, when it is analyzed per speaker, Albert, once again, produced more clauses for his number of turns/moves. This confirms that he got more airspace than the others, more value from his role as speaker. The information of the number of clauses also reveals that there is substantial, but certainly not total, congruence between moves and clauses.

Number of Incomplete Clauses

Incomplete clauses may indicate that someone speaks in a careful and planned way. Someone could probably hesitate or stumble in his utterances. Another case that might be the cause of incomplete clause is there is another speaker who competes for the floor by interrupting the current speaker that the current speaker cannot finish his utterance.

Ken-ken and Satria, each of them made a single incomplete clause, Bela made 2 incomplete clauses, and Anthony had 4 incomplete clauses in the conversation. Albert produced more incomplete clauses than his friends in his more clauses. In some of his incomplete clauses, Albert was seen to control and plan what he was going to say.

- | | | |
|-------|--------|---|
| 181/a | Albert | (i) But the mountain is ... is... |
| 181/b | | (ii) We are still making the mountain again |
| | | (iii) and more rivers come |

In the excerpt above, Albert was very careful to convey his ideas about the mountain he made. He did not complete his first speech in 181/a since he thought he needed to give background information.

All the students made the incomplete clause to state that they need more time and plan to say what they mean.

Number of Declaratives

The students under study produced quite a lot of number of declaratives, either full or elliptical declarative. Full declarative clause usually has at least 2 elements which construct it, those are: Subject + Finite. The other elements of a declarative clause are Complement and Adjunct. Meanwhile, the elliptical declarative clause only needs to operate one element of full declarative clause, either the Subject, or the Complement or the Adjunct in isolation. Declaratives can present both factual information or attitudinal opinion. However, declaratives are also used to query prior talk, to challenge and to counter-challenge (Eggin and Slade, 1997: 85).

The full declarative clauses are produced when speakers are attempting to initiate a new exchange and when they are attempting to prolong their information.

- | | | |
|------|---------|-----------------------------------|
| 54/a | Anthony | (i) <i>I want my glue</i> |
| 54/b | | (ii) <i>but, I can't find it.</i> |

Anthony in the excerpt above made full declarative clauses to initiate new exchange. In this case, he gave factual information as he wanted his glue and prolonged the information saying that he couldn't find it in full declarative.

Declarative, which is used to query prior talk and to challenge and counter challenge were also produced by the student in the data.

Besides full declarative, there is also elliptical declarative in the data. The clauses will be realized elliptically when functioning as a response or reaction to an earlier clause.

- | | | |
|----|--------|--|
| 93 | Satria | (i) I get confused with it – with this scissors and paper. |
|----|--------|--|

94	Teacher	(i) You ... what?
95/a	Satria	(i) (<i>I'm</i>) <i>confused and messed.</i>

Albert produced 46 full declarative and 11 elliptical declarative, bigger in number than his other friends, Anthony produced 25 full declarative and 8 elliptical declarative, Bela made 31 full declarative and 6 elliptical declarative, Satria made 15 full and 7 elliptical declarative, while Ken-ken only produced 14 full declarative without any elliptical declarative. It suggested that Albert was a dominant participant compared to his friends. A participant of casual conversation who produces a lot of full declarative clauses is considered as a dominant participant, as s/he is always in frequent of providing information.

Number of Tagged Declaratives

Tagged declarative is type of clause which falls midway between the declarative and the polar interrogative. Structurally, it has the sequence of a declarative, with the Subject occurring before the Finite element.

From the study, it is only the teacher who produced tagged declarative, and it was only one in number.

Number of Polar Interrogatives

There are two kinds of polar interrogatives found in the study. They are full polar interrogative and elliptical polar interrogative. Both the students and the teacher produced the polar interrogatives. However, the number of polar interrogatives produced by the teacher is bigger than the ones produced by the students. Moreover, only Ken-ken who produced full and elliptical polar interrogatives. Other students only made full polar interrogative.

Full polar interrogative is typically used to initiate an exchange by requesting information from other.

110	Albert	(i) <i>Is it on or off?</i>
111	Teacher	(i) (<i>It's</i>) <i>On.</i>

In the excerpt above, Albert asked the teacher about the recorder. He wanted to know the condition of the recorder, whether the teacher set it on or off, and the teacher answered that it was on. However, if the speaker is reacting to prior talk and simply needs, for example, confirmation of something that has been said, then elliptical polar interrogative can be used.

Number of Wh-interrogatives

The same as polar interrogative, there are two kinds of Wh- interrogatives found in the study. They are full Wh-interrogative and elliptical Wh-interrogative. Both the students and the teacher produced the Wh-interrogatives. However, the number of Wh- interrogatives produced by the teacher is bigger than the ones produced by the students. Albert and Ken-ken produced both full and elliptical Wh-interrogatives, while the other students only made the full Wh-interrogative.

Full Wh-interrogatives are typically used to elicit additional circumstantial information.

- | | | |
|------|---------|-----------------------------------|
| 24 | Bela | (i) <i>What do we have to do?</i> |
| 25/a | Teacher | (i) Be careful |
| 25/b | | (ii) That's why |
| | | (iii) Put them here. |

Elliptical Wh-interrogative provides a way of querying, with varying force, any specific element of structure in an earlier clause.

- | | | |
|-----|---------|--|
| 273 | Albert | (i) <i>How to write nursery rhyme?</i> |
| 274 | Anthony | (i) N, U, R, S, E, nurse, Y |
| 275 | Teacher | (i) R, Y |
| 276 | Anthony | (i) R, Y |
| 277 | Ken-ken | (i) <i>How?</i> |

Albert's speech in turn 273 and Ken-ken's utterance in turn 277 are categorized into elliptical wh-interrogative. Albert and Ken-ken inquired the information in which the element of the information appeared in the earlier clause.

Number of Imperatives

Imperatives often function to make commands, i.e. to demand that someone does something. However, Eggins and Slade (1997:88) mentioned that in casual talk imperatives are often used to negotiate action indirectly, that is they function to encode advice.

From the analysis, the children did not produce many imperatives. It is understood in two ways. First, children are not in capacity of commanding. Imperatives function to command. They are equal with their friend and in sub position of the teacher. Therefore they do not have power to command others even their teacher. Second, the interaction is more on information sharing. Command is an act of demanding goods and services, so this kind function rarely happened in the interaction, consequently imperatives hardly found to be produced by the children. Those who made imperatives in the interaction are Albert (2), Anthony (1), Bela (2), and Ken-ken (1). Satria did not produce any imperatives.

- | | | |
|----|------|--------------------------------------|
| 57 | Bela | (i) Anthony, your work's going away. |
| | | (ii) <i>Be careful.</i> |

- | | | |
|-------|--------|-----------------------|
| 306/a | Albert | (i) O my God, |
| | | (ii) <i>See this.</i> |

Number of Minor Clauses

From the data analysis, the children produced several minor clauses. Albert produced 8 (8.51%) minor clauses, Anthony produced 12 (12.76%) minor clauses, Bela made 15 (15.96%) minor clauses, Ken-ken made 11 (11.7%) minor clause, and Satria made 5 (5.32%) minor clauses in the interaction.

As Eggins and Slade (1997:94-95) mentioned that there are three common types of minor clause, they are lexicalized minor clause, formulaic expression, and non-lexical items, the children produced three of them in the data.

- | | | |
|----|--------|------------------|
| 16 | Satria | (i) <i>Miss?</i> |
|----|--------|------------------|

98	Ken-ken	(i) <i>Ha?</i>
115		(i) <i>No, not yet, not yet.</i>
121	Bela	(i) <i>No.</i>
161	Satria	(i) <i>Excuse me.</i>
205	Albert	(i) <i>Yeah.</i>
212	Anthony	(i) <i>Yeah.</i>

The insignificant number of minor clauses (less than 20%) produced by the children suggests that the children tend to give clear response to prior moves by producing more major clauses.

Number of Modalities

Modalities are shown by the use of modalization and modulation. Modalization tempers the message with reference to degrees of frequency or probability, while the modulation is the qualification of the message with references to degrees of obligation, inclination, and probability.

The analysis reveals that Albert and Bela produced the highest modalities (15 and 12), followed by Anthony (10), Ken-ken (7), and Satria (4). This fact shows that Albert and Bela are the children who like to give effects to what they are saying. Both of them try to attract as well as give response to the interlocutor in an extravagant way. It makes them to be a nice partner of conversation. Moreover, the children never used usuality to temper the message. They used probability to talk about uncertainty, even though Satria was seen only used it once. Almost all of the children talked about obligation, except Ken-ken. And all of them used modulation of capability to talk about one's competence.

Analysis of Subject Choices

The analysis shows that most of the children are subject-centered in the interaction. It is characterized by the use of subject *I* in their speech. Albert used subject *I* for 10 times, Anthony used the highest subject *I* – that is 22 times, Bela used the subject *I* for 18 times, Ken-ken produced his speech using subject *I* for 10 times, and Satria used subject *I* the least one, that is 9 times.

Bela used the highest number of other subjects – 17 times. Other subjects mean subject choice other than *I*, *You*, and *We*. It makes a great difference because her friends only used other subjects in their interaction for less than 20 – Albert used it for 8 times, Anthony used it for 11 times, Ken-ken and Satria produced other subjects for 9 and 7 times.

From the analysis, however, it can be seen that Satria never addressed using *You* for naming the interlocutor he talked to.

SPEECH FUNCTIONS PERFORMED BY CHILDREN

The speech functions children perform are opening, continuing, react: responding, and react: rejoinder speech functions. The distribution of each speech function is given below:

- (1) Albert produced 9 opening speech functions, 26 continuing speech functions, 16 responding and 12 rejoinder speech functions.
- (2) Anthony produced 12 opening speech functions, 14 continuing speech functions, and 17 responding speech functions.
- (3) Bela made 19 opening speech functions, 9 continuing speech functions, 17 responding speech functions, and 11 rejoinder speech functions.
- (4) Ken-ken made 7 opening speech functions, 6 continuing speech functions, 12 responding speech functions, and 9 rejoinder speech functions.
- (5) Satria performed the least number of speech functions consisting of 9 openings, 4 continuings, 5 respondings, and 5 rejoinders.

Number of Opening Speech Function

Opening speech function, as the name suggests, is the one which has the function to start a talk in the conversation. Opening speech function shows that a speaker producing this kind of move has a certain degree of controlling over the interaction. As Eggins and Slade (1997) propose, opening speech function covers attending and initiating, in which the later consists of offering; giving command; giving statement – either fact or opinion, questioning – in the form of polar or wh-interrogative either asking opinion or factual information.

Opening: Attending Speech Function

Attending speech function is characterized by salutations, greetings and calls, all of which function to prepare the ground for interaction by securing the attention of the intended interactant. All the children in the study produced the attending speech function.

O: attending	16	Satria	(i) <i>Miss?</i>
R: responding:	17	Teacher	(i) Yes?

engage

The excerpt above gives an example of attending speech function produced by the student; it was produced by Satria. Satria called the teacher by saying *Miss* to get the teacher's attention. This utterance is therefore included into attending speech function.

Almost all of the attending speech functions produced by the students in the study were directed to the teacher by calling the teacher's name *Miss* or *Miss Melani*.

Opening: Offering Speech Function

Offering speech function is speech function used to give goods and services. In the data studied, only one student made an offering speech function, and the teacher produced only 2 offerings. It seems that giving goods and services did not happen frequently in the interaction. Goods and services are not the important things in the interaction. As it is said previously that the interaction

happened in a classroom setting, in which goods and services are not the things commonly discussed; rather it is information is the main thing discussed.

The offering speech function produced by Ken-ken can be seen in the following fragment. However, the realization of offering speech function is somehow incongruent.

O: I: offer	151	Ken-ken	<i>I need to close the door.</i>
R: responding	152	Teacher	Thank You.
		reply: accept	

In the excerpt above, when Ken-ken said *I need to close the door*, he actually did not just give statement. But, it could be viewed as an offering, since he intended to give service to others in the class to close the door. Furthermore, it was supported by the fact that the classroom was air-conditioned in which the door should be closed. And at the time the door was open. So, Ken-ken's utterance can be categorized as an offer.

Opening: Command Speech Function

Contrary to offering, command speech function is the one which is used to demand goods and services. The speaker of this speech function needs others to get goods and services for her. Command also shows someone's status and power. Someone produces more command in his utterances is considered as instructive and hence posses higher status and power than the addressee.

In the data studied, the teacher as the manager of the class produced the significant number of commands. She made 27 commands; whereas the students only produced 3 commands. 3 students made 3 commands, two students did not make it. All commands produced by the teacher were addressed to the students, while the students' commands were pointed to their friend. It reveals, once again, that teacher has higher status and power than students. She can give command to the students, but the students cannot. Student's commands were pointed to students' friends whose status and power were considered equal.

Opening: Statement Speech Function

Statement and offer are similar speech functions. Both are opening speech functions whose functions are to give, but statement and offer give something different. Offer gives goods and services, statement gives information. The information provided by the speaker producing statement speech function can be classified into attitudinal or evaluative information and factual information. Therefore, statement speech function can be furthered categorized into giving attitudinal or evaluative information and giving factual information.

In the data studied, almost all the participants produced statement speech function. However, giving factual information happened more frequently than giving opinion or attitudinal information. It can be understood since it is not in the capacity of the children to give opinion on others. Children at their age cannot judge subjectively yet. They give information based on what they know from the environments.

There were two students who did not produce statement giving attitudinal information. On the other hand, all students or children produced statement giving factual information; even the number of the later statement was bigger than the former. The total number of the statement produced by the students was extremely greater than those produced by the teacher. It reveals that the children gave more information than the teacher. The children conveyed their thought repeatedly. This information can also be treated as the way teacher let the students get the floor. By giving less information, the teacher let children talk each other, give information each other. Teacher's turn would come when the students were lack of information.

O: I: statement fact	177/a	Ken-ken	(i) <i>Miss Melani, I can make a big mountain.</i>
C: prolong: extend	177/b		(ii) But, he brake it.
R: rejoinder repair	178	Teacher	(i) He broke it.
R: responding: developing: elaborate	179/a	Ken-ken	(i) Yeah, he broke my mountain.

Ken-ken's utterance in turn 177/a is one of the examples of statement of fact produced by the students. Ken-ken told the teacher the truth that he could make a big mountain from sand. Similar and several other statements of fact were produced by the children in the data.

Besides giving factual information, the students also made opinion or attitudinal statements, either to their teacher or to their friend.

Opening: Question Speech Function

Question speech function is similar to command speech function, in the way that both of them are an act of demanding. They are different, however, in the case that questioning is an act of demanding information, whereas commanding is an act of demanding goods and services. Since information can be classified into factual information and opinion information, question speech function can also be further classified into question: fact and question: opinion.

In English, furthermore, question can be divided into open question and closed question. Open question is a question which requires an explanative answer. It is characterized with Wh-question words at the beginning of the question. Closed question, on the other hand, does not need an explanative answer. It is enough to give the answer 'yes' or 'no'. A closed question is characterized with polar interrogative construction. Hence, question speech function can be classified in detail as: question: open: fact, question: open: opinion, question: closed: fact, question: closed: opinion.

In the studied data, almost all participants produced all kinds of question speech functions. There was only one student who did not produce open question asking for factual information, only 2 students produced open question asking for opinion, and there 2 students who did not produce closed question asking for

factual information, and 3 students did not make closed question asking for opinion.

- O: I: question: 38 Anthony (i) *Where is my glue?*
 open: fact
 R: responding: 39/a Bela (i) I don't know
 reply: disavow

In the excerpt above, Anthony asked about the existence of his glue. He made a question using Wh-question word *where*, indicating that he produced an open question. While what he was asking to is about the factual information.

Number of Continuing Speech Function

Continuing speech function is speech function which is produced by speaker who has just finished his move. In a conversation, when one speaker finishes his move or talk, another speaker may get into the floor or the current speaker keeps on talking producing different move. The later is called continuing speech function. The continuing move then captures the options open to a speaker who retains the turn at the end of the move and who produces a move which is meant to be heard as related to an immediately prior move produced by the same speaker.

In the data under study, almost all the children produced all the continuing speech function. The total number of continuing speech functions produced by all children is bigger than the teacher's. The teacher only produced 51 continuing speech functions, while the children altogether made 59 continuing speech. It proves that the children may maximalize the turn they had to convey their ideas. The detail discussion of continuing speech functions acquired by children is given below.

Continuing: Monitoring Speech Function

Monitoring involves deploying moves in which the speaker focuses on the state of the interactive situation, for example by checking that the audience is following, or by inviting another speaker to take turn in which case the invited response is set up as a supporting response.

Only 1 student or child under study produced monitoring speech function.

- C: prolong: 26/b Albert (ii) Miss, (it's) a big hole.
 elaborate
 C: monitor 26/c (iii) *See*
 C: prolong: 26/d (iv) a big hole here.
 enhance

In the excerpt above, Albert in turn number 26/c invited the teacher to look at the hole he pointed at. The word *see* uttered with rising intonation indicates that he did not want to lose his teacher's attention while he was talking. The moves before and after the word *see* indicate that Albert took the same turn while his utterances had different function.

Continuing: Prolonging Speech Function

Prolonging speech functions are those where a continuing speaker adds to their contribution by providing further information. Eggins and Slade (1997:197) mention that a speech function and its prolonging continuation is perceived as one of expansion, meaning a prolonging move builds on or fills out the move it is logically connected with. Therefore a prolonging sequel may be one of elaboration, extension, or enhancement.

Almost all the children produced three kinds of prolonging speech function. There were, however, 2 children who did not made enhancement.

- | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|--|
| O: I: statement: 1/a | Satria | (i) Miss, yesterday we already used fact |
| | | it. |
| C: prolong: 1/b | | (ii) <i>But, it's broke.</i> |
| extension | | |

In 1/b, Satria added extra information on what happen to it (recorder) he had said in 1/a. Instead of saying *Miss, yesterday we already used this broken recorder*, he started his move by giving factual information like those is 1/a, then he added contrasting information on his previous one. The relationship of Satria's first and second moves is shown by the conjunction *but*. This kind of prolonging speech function is classified into extension.

Continuing: Appending Speech Function

Eggins and Slade (1997:199) say that appending move is mid-way between a continuing: prolonging speech function and a reacting: developing move. Appending move occurs when a speaker makes one move, loses the turn, but then as soon as he regain the turn he produces a move which represents a logical expansion of their immediately prior move.

In the data studied, almost all the children produced this kind of speech function. It happened because there were many gaps and overlaps in the interaction. There were several participants talking at the same time, then one of them decided to hold his turn for a moment. When he got the turn back, he continued his speech.

- | | | |
|---------------------------|---------|--|
| R: rejoinder: 43 | Bela | (i) Miss, what I have to do with this? |
| | | rebouncing |
| O: I: statement 44 | Anthony | (i) == <i>Miss, I lost ...</i> |
| | | fact |
| O: I: command 45 | Teacher | (i) == Cut all and make them in order, OK? |
| C: appending: 46 | Anthony | (i) I already lost ... |
| elaboration | | |

In the excerpt above, Anthony made an appending: elaboration speech function. His speech in turn number 44 overlaps with the teacher's turn number 45. He talked at the same time with the teacher who replied Bela's question. When the teacher terminated her turn, Anthony immediately continued his turn, even though it was an incomplete clause. The speech in 46 is an appending speech

function for its nature. Further, the appending speech here functioned to restate what had been said before, so it is elaboration even though there is no explicit conjunction used.

Number of Reacting: Responding Speech Function

Eggins and Slade (1997) distinguish the difference between responding and rejoinder in recating move. Responding is considered as reaction which moves the exchange towards completion, while rejoinder is reaction which in some way prolongs the exchange.

Responding: Developing Speech Function

Developing speech functions indicate a very high level of acceptance of the previous speaker's proposition. When someone accepts previous speaker's proposition, he might expand the proposition in the ways of elaborating, extending, or enhancing the proposition.

From the study, it is recognized that Satria is the only child who did not produce developing speech functions in the interaction. It suggests that he never showed his agreement to other participants in the interaction verbally. In addition, from the study it is also revealed that Bela is the only child that developed previous speaker's proposition using enhancement. It indicates that Bela is a very cooperative participant of the interaction. She provides interpersonal support for the initiator and at the same time offering further ideational content for negotiation. She is the only child in the interaction who develop previous speaker's proposition using elaboration, extension, and enhancement. An example of the developing speech functions is given below.

- | | | |
|---|----------------------|--|
| <p>C: prolong:
enhance</p> | <p>172/c Teacher</p> | <p>(v) Let's see

(vi) that you can finish it in 15 minutes. OK?</p> |
| <p>R: responding:
developing:
extend</p> | <p>173 Ken-ken</p> | <p>(i) <i>But, but I can make a mountain on the sand for 5 minutes.</i></p> |

Ken-ken in his turn 173 gave a contrasting detail to the teacher's proposition. It seems that Ken-ken's speech does not have any relation to the teacher's. However, if we analyze further by saying *but, but I can make a mountain on the sand for 5 minutes* actually Ken-ken accepts the teacher's proposition to finish the project in 15 minutes. Ken-ken assumed that if he only needed 5 minutes to make an artificial mountain on the sand, so he would not need 15 minutes to finish the project. He accepted the teacher's proposition by adding further contrasting details. The use of conjunction *but* shows that Ken-ken's utterance is highly connected to the previous one.

Responding: Engaging Speech Function

Engaging speech function is one which is exchange-compliant reaction to attending moves. It includes responses to attention-getting attending moves. From

the data analysis, there was not any engaging speech function produced by the children.

Responding: Register Speech Function

Registering speech function is reaction which provides supportive encouragement for the other speaker to take another turn. It does not introduce any new material for negotiation, and it carries the strong expectation that the immediately prior speaker will be the next speaker (Egins and Slade, 1997:204).

From the analysis, it was only Bela who made registering speech function. In addition, the register Bela made is a non verbal reaction to Ken-ken's speech.

O: I: command	250	Bela	(i) Ken-ken, say.
R: responding	251	Ken-ken	(i) Nursery RHYME.
reply: comply			
R: responding:	252	Bela	<LAUGH>
register			

In turn 251, Ken-ken said *Nursery RHYME* as a compliment on Bela's command in the previous turn. Ken-ken said the word with emphatic stress and increased volume. It made Bela laugh because it was funny on Bela's ear. Bela perceived it as something funny, comical, but she liked that. She did not say anything else besides laughing, hoping that Ken-ken would ask her why she was laughing or ask her to stop laughing at her.

Responding: Replying Speech Function

Reply is the most negotiatory of the responding reactions, although it negotiates the proposition given by a prior speaker. Replying speech function can be further classified into supporting and confronting. All initiations can be matched with supporting replies which cover comply, accept, agree, acknowledge, answer, and affirm. Supporting replies indicate a willingness to accept the propositions or proposals of the other speakers.

From the characteristics, it is not surprising, therefore, to find many kinds of this speech functions in the data produced by the children. Among his friends, Anthony produced the highest number of replying (13), followed by Bela (8), Albert and Ken-ken (7), and the least is Satria (3).

R: rejoinder:	14/a	Teacher	(i) Why don't you have 2 ...2 pages?
challenge:			
rebounding			
C: monitor	14/b		(ii) two or one two, OK?
R: responding:	15	Anthony	(i) <i>Because I lost one.</i>
reply: answer			

The excerpt above gives one of the examples of replying speech function. Anthony's speech in turn number 15 is considered as replying speech function in which it gives answer to the teacher's question on the prior turn. Giving an answer is one of replying speech functions.

Responding: Confronting Speech Function

Confronting responses range from either disengaging or by offering a confronting reply. A range of confronting replies can be paired with the typical initiations.

From the analysis, besides producing supportive response, the children also give confronting response even though the number of the later is smaller than the former. Albert produced 4 confronting speech functions; Anthony, Bela, and Satria, each made 2 confronting speech functions; Ken-ken only made 1 confronting speech function.

O: I: question 38 Anthony (i) Where is my glue?
open: fact
R: responding: 39/a Bela (i) *I don't know.*
reply: disavow

In the excerpt above, Anthony asked Bela whether she knew about his glue or not. Since she did not Anthony's glue, Bela gave a respond by saying *I don't know*. It is a confronting responding speech function which is called disavow.

Number of Reacting: Rejoinder Speech Functions

Rejoinder speech functions are those which tend to set underway sequences of talk that interrupt, postpone, abort or suspend the initial speech function sequence (Egins and Slade, 1997:207).

From the data analysis, it can be seen that the children produced this kind of speech function even though only a few of them. There are three categories of rejoinder speech function that the children produced: tracking, responding, and challenging.

Rejoinder: Tracking Speech Function

Tracking moves are moves which check, confirm, clarify or probe the content of the prior moves. From the analysis, Albert produced 2 checking speech functions, 2 confirming, 1 clarifying but no probing speech function. Anthony only made one checking speech function; Bela made 1 checking and 4 probing speech functions; Ken-ken produced 1 checking, 1 confirming, and 2 probing speech functions. Satria is the only child that did not produce tracking speech function.

R: responding: 65 Anthony (i) (I'm) six.
reply:
answer
R: rejoinder: 66 Albert (i) *You're five, six already?*
confirming

Albert's speech in turn 66 is produced to verify information he heard. He tried to confirm that what he heard is the right one that Anthony already came to cut number six. It is a confirming speech function.

Rejoinder: Response Speech Function

Tracking moves call more or less directly for further talk from the prior speaker. The responses may be supporting, as when a tracking request is resolved or a challenge acquiesced. Tracking moves may also be responded to with repair moves. (Eggins and Slade, 1997)

From the analysis, there are only 3 children producing response to tracking moves. The responses produced are resolve and repair.

O: I: statement	93	Satria	(i) I get confused with it – with this opinion
R: rejoinder:	94	Teacher	(i) You what?
Track: check			
R: rejoinder	95/a	Satria	(i) <i>Confused and messed.</i>
track: resolve			

Satria's speech in turn 95/a provide clarification to the teacher question in the previous turn. Satria acquiesced with the information he had produced in turn 93. It is a resolving speech function.

Rejoinder: Challenge Speech Function

Challenging speech function is one which confronts prior talk by attacking it on one of several fronts: e.g. by actively rejecting negotiation or by querying the veracity of what has been said or the speaker's right to say it (Eggins and Slade, 1997:211).

From the analysis, children produced challenging speech functions by detaching (1), rebounding (1), countering (5), refuting (4). No children produced re-challenging speech function.

R: responding:	109	Teacher	(i) The recorder – it works.
reply: answer			
R: rejoinder:	110	Albert	(i) <i>Is it on or off?</i>
challenging:			
rebounding			

In turn 110, Albert directly questioned the veracity of the prior information given by the teacher. He asked whether the recorder was on or off. This kind of challenging speech function is called rebounding.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings and discussions of the data, it can be concluded that:

- (1) In a classroom spoken interaction, children have almost equal opportunity to take floor, even though if it is seen individually there are quite significant differences in taking the floor from one child to another child. The teacher takes fewer floors than the children and plays her role as a supportive partner in the interaction.
- (2) The classroom interaction is one of information negotiation rather than goods and services negotiation, which is signed by the dominance production of declaratives both by the children and the teacher.

- (3) The children prefer to give reaction to others either by responding or rejoinding than starting or continuing the moves. However, to start an exchange, children are fond of giving statement rather than asking question.
- (4) All children favor of continuing their speech by elaboration, extension and enhancement. Only a few of them like to get the floor back after other speakers take the turn.
- (5) The children show egocentricity in the interaction from their *I* subject and subjective modalizations. In taking the floor, children tend to convey their messages in long utterances signed by full declaratives they produce. In addition, they use less minor clause than the major ones.

REFERENCES

- Bruner, J.S. 1978. Learning How to Do Things with Words. In Bruner, J., Garton, A. (eds) *Human Growth and Development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Butt, D. et al. 1995. *Using Functional Grammar: An Explorer's Guide*. Sydney: Macquire University Press.
- Cameron, L. 2001. *Teaching Languages to Young Children*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Celce-Murcia, M. and E. Olshtain. 2000. *Discourse and Context in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chapelle, C. A. *Some Notes on Systemic Functional Linguistics*. In www.public.iastate.edu/~carolc/LING511/sfl.html (Retrieved October 2005)
- Dulay, H., M. Burt, and S. Krashen. 1982. *Language Two*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Egins, S. 1994. *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. London: Pinter Publisher.
- Egins, S. and D. Slade. 1997. *Analysing Casual Conversation*. London: Cassel.
- Ellis, R. 1985. *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 1994. *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Foster, S. H. 1990. *The Communicative Competence of Young Children*. Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Gerot, L. and P. Wignel. 1994. *Making Sense of Functional Grammar*. Cammeray, New South Wales: Antipodean Educational Enterprises.

*Ningrum, Realization of Speech Functions by Primary School Learners of*121
English as a Foreign Language

- Goh, C.C.M. and R.E. Silver. 2004. Singapore: Pearson Education South Asia Pte. Ltd.
- Halliday, M.A.K. 1975. *Learning How to Mean*. London: Edward Arnold Ltd.
- _____. 1978. *Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*. London: Edward Arnold.
- _____. 1985. *Spoken and Written Language*. Geelong, Victoria: Deakin University Press.
- _____. 1994. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M.A.K. and C.M.I.M. Matthiessen. 1999. *Construing Experience Through Meaning: A Language-based Approach to Cognition*. London: Continuum.
- Johnson, M. 2004. *A Philosophy of Second Language Acquisition*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Klein, W. 1986. *Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Krashen, S.D. 1987. *Principles and Practice in 2nd Language Acquisition*. Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall Int. G.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. and M.H. Long. 1991. *An Introduction to Second Language Acquisition Research*. London: Longman Group UK Limited.
- Lindfors, W.J. 1980. *Children's Language and Learning*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Martin, J.R., C.M.I.M. Matthiessen, C. Painter. 1997. *Working with Functional Grammar*. London: Arnold.
- Matthiessen, C.M.I.M. 1995. *Lexicogrammatical Cartography: English Systems*. Tokyo: International Language Sciences Series.
- McCarthy, M. 1991. *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Paul, D. 2003. *Teaching English to Children in Asia*. Hongkong: Longman Asia ELT.
- Salkind, N.J. 1985. *Theories of Human Development*. 2nd Edition. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Vygotsky, L.S. 1962. *Thought and Language*. Cambridge: MIT Press.