A SOCIOLINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF CLASSROOM INTERACTIONAL PATTERNS IN FEDERAL COLLEGE OF FORESTRY MECHANIZATION, AFAKA-KADUNA

BY

RUTH MIADE ANAMAYI
MA/ARTS/52780/05/06

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH AND LITERARY STUDIES, FACULTY OF ARTS

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF MASTER DEGREE IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE

AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY,
ZARIA,

FEBRUARY, 2014

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this work, entitled "**A Sociolinguistic Analysis of Classroom Interactional Patterns in Federal College of Forestry Mechanization, Afaka - Kaduna**" was carried out by me and that it is a record of my own research work. The information derived from literature has been duly acknowledged in the text and a list of references provided. No part of this work was previously presented for another degree or diploma at any University.

_____

Ruth Miade Anamayi

CERTIFICATION

This work entitled "**A Sociolinguistic Analysis of Classroom Interactional Patterns in Federal College of Forestry Mechanization, Afaka - Kaduna"** by Ruth Miade Anamayi meets the regulations governing the award of Master Degree of Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria and is approved for its contribution to knowledge.

_____ _____

Dr Mrs Folashade Frank-Akale **Date**
Supervisor I

_____ _____

Prof J.S Aliyu **Date**
Supervisor II

_____ _____

Dr A.A Liman **Date**
Head of Department

_____ _____

Dean, Postgraduate School **Date**

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated with gratitude to God Almighty, to my loving parents Dr and Mrs N.N Shidali, my beloved husband Dr Ezra Anamayi, my three lovely and hardworking children – Dorcas Mono, David Sokomba and Daniel Ayemlo and my late father in-law Pa Levi Anamayi.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my profound gratitude first to God Almighty who is able to make a way where there seems to be no way. Without Him this work would have been futile.

A special thank you goes to my supervisor Dr. Folashade Frank-Akale, who was patient, meticulous and thorough with this work, she gave the much needed direction. Words alone cannot express how indebted I am to her. The encouragement went a long way. Thank you ma.

I also want to thank my second supervisor Prof J.S. Aliyufor his time. My unreserved appreciation goes to my Former Provost Dr. O.O Akinyemi for his interest and encouragement to see that this work is completed. Also, my thanks go to the Pre-ND students 2011/2012 set of department of Basic Sciences and General Studies of Federal College of Forestry Mechanization, Afaka.

I cannot finish with this without appreciating the following people, who saw to it that this work is completed through their prayers and encouragement, Rev. Dayo Fagbamila, Rev. Goke Ologenla, Mr. A Bamikole, Mrs M. Ariyo, Mrs. K. Olabode and a host of others. My in-laws and my brothers and sisters are not left out especially Mr. And Mrs. Sunny Dangana.

And last but not the least, I want to give a big thanks to my husband, who was by my side throughout. Thank you sir, your labour of love will surely be rewarded.

Finally, I acknowledge everyone who has contributed one way or the other in making this work a success, God bless you all.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

This study is titled a *Sociolinguistic Analysis of Classroom Interactional Patterns in Federal College of Forestry Mechanization Afaka*. The data was collected through the use of questionnaires and tape recordings of classroom interactions, which were analyzed using Huge Mehan's Initiation-reply-evaluation (IRE) Sequence and John Gumperz Contextualization cues. The study revealed that there are two basic hindrances to comprehension in the College. First the respondents find the differences in their culture and English Language as a hindrance. Secondly, the respondents who are of the youth age bracket of between 16-30yrs, and engage mostly in the use of substandard English or Broken English, also find the use of this social behaviour as a hindrance. However, this research sees hope and a positive step toward better comprehension for the respondents through the use of John Gumperz's contextualization cues and Hugh Mehan's IRE Sequence. The study finally recommends the study of Oral English as a core subject on its own from the junior secondary level. Also the use of IRE sequence by lecturers is recommended. This can be done through refresher courses which the lecturers can attend from time to time.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Language is one of the outstanding features that differentiate man from other creatures. It is of much higher complexity as it is based on a complex system or rules relating symbols to their meanings. This results in an indefinite number of possible innovative utterances from a finite number of elements. Humans acquire language through social interaction, which makes the use of language to become deeply entrenched in human culture. Apart from being used to communicate and share information, it also has social and cultural uses, such as signifying group identity and social stratification. It can also be looked at as a set of utterances that can be produced from a set of rules.

When the way language is used is affected by the society in which it is used, especially in areas relating to cultural norms, expectation and context, it becomes the study of sociolinguistics. This is a term which embraces the aspects of linguistics that evaluate the connection between language and society, and the way we use it in different social situations. Sociolinguistics often shows the humorous relations of human speech and how the dialect of a given language describes the age, sex and social class of the speaker. In essence, it codes the social function of language.

It has always been assumed that language plays a major role in formal education. Most of what is taught in school is transmitted through either the

teacher's moral presentation, or textbooks and reference materials. Consequently, when assessments relating to the teaching are made, such assessments are typically through the medium of questions and answers in either the spoken or written mode. It seems self-evident therefore that to succeed in school, a pupil must have an adequate command of the linguistic skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing.

True as the foregoing is, however, such a concept of the role of language in education is seriously misleading, as it leaves out of account the essentially interactive nature of linguistic communication. What students learn from what is presented to them depends not only on what they bring to the learning encounter in the form of their linguistic repertoire and associated knowledge of the world, but also on the content and form of what is presented to them. Even more importantly, the opportunity they are given to enter into negotiation with the teacher determines the meaning and significance of what they are expected to learn. This is what the current study sets out to investigate, especially as it pertains to the language of academic discourse vis a vis the level of comprehension of the student.

1.0 Background of the Study

How language users make sense of the particular way in which language is used is of utmost importance. There is a departure from the normal concern of the use of accurate representation of the forms and structures used in a

language to the way language is being used. A close observation shows that academic language is a compilation of unique language functions and structures that are often difficult for second language learners of English to master. For example, a handful of academic language functions are characteristic of classrooms in general; seeking information, informing, analysing, comparing, classifying, predicting, hypothesizing, justifying, persuading, solving problems, synthesizing and evaluating (O'Malley, 1992; Valdez Pierce and O'Malley, 1992).

The interaction between the student and the teacher, when put into consideration raises concern in the sense that the number of second language learners of English language has continued to grow at a steady rate in our nation's institutions and the debate on how best to serve these students has become very urgent. There is a general agreement that the lack of competence in the distinct variety of English used in classrooms which is referred to as 'academic language' is a variable that often hinders the academic performance of some second language learners of English language, even though such students might be proficient in varieties of English used in non-academic contexts (Cummins, 1981; Spanos, Rhodes, Dele and Crandall, 1988).

Within the context of the teacher – student exchange, it is necessary to examine language as indexical to a social world, and discuss it in relation to interactional sociolinguistics. The importance of revealing the social

meaning of conduct in the particular context of the interaction between the teacher and student, connecting it with the sociological and cultural influences that surface in language and how it affects meaning cannot be over-emphasized. In addition, it has also been observed that people from different cultures may share grammatical knowledge of a language, but differently contextualize what is said so that different messages are produced, as is the case with the study area of the current research.

The students of Federal College of Forestry Mechanisation are students from different cultural backgrounds with different language upbringing. They are also all second language learners of English. This of course is why the comprehension of what is being taught does not only depend on how it is being taught, but also on the individual involved in the learning process. This study is a research on academic language, and will examine the social world of language in relation to interactional sociolinguistics.

Academic language as conceptualized in this study is an interactional language, which requires basic interpersonal communicative skills where meaning is obtained among those communicating through the aid of various situational and paralinguistic cues. This means that students do not have to rely exclusively on language in order to comprehend meaning; they draw on a variety of cues such as body language, speech intonation and sequence of events to understand language.

1.1 Statement of the Research Problem

Inappropriate use of English in the classroom has the tendency of hindering the academic achievement of students. This is more prevalent among second language learners of English as the case is with the students of Federal College of Forestry Mechanisation, who constitute the focus of this study. There is the tendency for the teacher to use highly academic speech forms and structures during classroom interaction, consequently making it difficult for some of the students to comprehend what he/she is trying to pass across. The question then is, how does the organisation of discourse, meaning, and the use of particular expressions and constructions within classroom situation allow the teacher to convey an intended meaning and the student to interpret the communicative content of what the teacher says?

The student on his own part has certain problems that might hinder his comprehension of what the teacher is saying, because he/she may have been brought up in a different culture or linguistic background and may have learnt or is still learning English as a second language. Consequently, the student is likely to encounter great difficulty in fully engaging in academic exercises for high level of performance. It is how to resolve this difficulty that raises the need for a study of this nature.

1.2 Aim and Objectives of the Study

The aim of this study is to carry out a sociolinguistic analysis of the language of classroom interactional patterns among students of Federal College of Forestry Mechanisation, Afaka. The objectives of this study are to:

(1) Identify the features of academic discourse of students and teachers of Federal College of Forestry Mechanisation, Afaka.

(2) Highlight the differences and similarities between academic language and normal everyday conversational language at the Federal College of Forestry Mechanisation, Afaka.

(3) Examine how cultural differences especially the mother tongue interference affect the comprehension and interpretation of academic language among students of Federal College of Forestry Mechanisation, Afaka.

(4) Analyse the impact of social behaviours on the comprehension and interpretation of academic language among students of Federal College of Forestry Mechanisation, Afaka.

(5) analyse the impact of Hugh Mehan's initiation- reply-evaluation(IRE) sequence and John Gumperz's contextualization cues on comprehension of academic language among students of Federal College of Forestry Mechanisation, Afaka.

1.3 Research Questions

Against the backdrop of the foregoing, the study sets out to answer the following questions:

(1) What are the features of the academic discourse of students and teachers of Federal College of Forestry Mechanisation, Afaka?

(2) Does the language of academic discourse differ from the normal everyday conversational language among students of Federal College of Forestry Mechanisation, Afaka?

(3) Do cultural differences especially mother tongue interference on English language affect the comprehension and interpretation of language among students of Federal College Forestry Mechanisation, Afaka?

(4) What impact do the social behaviours of students of Federal College Forestry Mechanisation who are second language learners of English have on the comprehension and interpretation of academic language?

(5) What impact does Hugh Mehan's IRE sequence and John Gumperz contextualization cues have on the comprehension and interpretation of academic language?

1.4 Significance of the Study

The significance for this study hinges on its uniqueness in being the first of its kind to be carried out in Federal College of Forestry Mechanisation Afaka, Kaduna. It is hoped that the result of the study will benefit the management of the college who will get to know the effect academic discourse has on the overall performance of students. Especially being that the Pre –ND student needs to pass the five basic science courses listed below;

English Language, Mathematics, Chemistry, Biology, Physics as a prerequisite to being admitted into the ND programme. Also, the study will create awareness among lecturers and students alike, of the teaching style that is most convenient for the comprehension of the students . The study is also significant as its findings could form the basis for further work in this area.

1.5 Scope of the Study

The study focuses on classroom interact ional patterns. Especially on how academic language differs from the ordinary everyday conversational language. It also looks at how culture and social behaviours affect the comprehension and interpretation of language learners of English. The data used for the study were classified into two major types: data from the questionnaire and tape recordings. The study was narrowed to the class of about eighty Pre-ND students and ten lecturers from the department of Basic Sciences and General Studies, while three tape recordings of classroom interactions, which comprise various lectures, were taken from the Pre-ND class on which the study was narrowed.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Interactional Sociolinguistics and Speech Act Theory

Interactional Sociolinguistics (IS) is concerned with how speakers signal and interpret meaning in social interaction. The term and the perspective are grounded in the work of John Gumperz (1982a, 1982b), who blended insights and tools from anthropology, linguistics, pragmatics, and conversation analysis into an interpretive framework for analyzing such meanings. Interactional Sociolinguistics attempts to bridge the gulf between empirical communicative forms – e.g., words, prosody, register shifts – and what speakers and listeners take themselves to be doing with these forms. Methodologically, Interactional sociolinguistics relies on close discourse analysis of audio- or video-recorded interaction. Such methodology according to John Gumperz is central to uncovering meaning-making processes because many conventions for signalling and interpreting meaning in talk are fleeting, unconscious, and culturally variable.

Interactional Sociolinguistics was developed in an anthropological context of crosscultural comparison and the seminal work that defined it focused largely on contexts of intercultural miscommunication (Intercultural and Intergroup Communication; Comparative Research) it is in such contexts – where unconscious cultural expectations and practices are not shared – that the perspective has the most salient explanatory value. The perspective has

been extended to cross-gender communication, most notably by Deborah Tannen (1990), and it has also been applied to the performance of social identity through talk.

The framework can be applied to any interaction and much of the empirical work that falls under the rubric “discourse Analysis” in communication, linguistic anthropology, sociology, discursive psychology. In addition, socially oriented linguistics also owes a debt to this perspective. The key *theoretical contribution* of Interactional Sociolinguistics is to illustrate the way in which social background knowledge is implicated in the signalling and interpreting of meaning. While ethnographers of communication have long emphasized that talk is contextually and culturally embedded, they have not specified how sociocultural and linguistic knowledge are systematically linked in the communication of meaning (Ethnography of Communication). Gumperz’s Interactional Sociolinguistics operationalizes a dimension of this relationship. His programme shows that socio-cultural knowledge is not just beliefs and judgments external to interaction, but is rather embedded within the talk and behaviour of interaction itself. At a theoretical level, this undermines a “Conduit metaphor” or “information theory” notion of communication, in which context is presumed to be discrete and separate from communicative content.

Gumperz(1982) argued that humans communicate rapidly, shifting interpretive frames through conventionalized surface forms, which he calls *contextualization cues*. These contextualization cues – "constellations of surface features of message form" – are "the means by which speakers signal and listeners interpret what the activity is, how semantic content is to be understood and *how* each sentence relates to what precedes or follows" (John Gumperz1982a, 131).

These surface forms range across semiotic modes, including such varied phenomena as prosody, code and lexical choice, formulaic expressions, sequencing choices, and visual.

In addition, according to Gumperz(1982) gestural phenomena are united in a common, functional category by their use, commonly in constellations of multiple features. They cue interpretive frameworks in which to interpret the propositional content of utterances, which can otherwise be ambiguous.

An example can illustrate the dual functioning of the communicative stream as both referential content and a context in which to interpret that very referential content. In American English, the utterance "Nice tie!" can represent a sincere compliment, or it can represent a joking insult, i.e., that the speaker finds the tie somehow inappropriate. Contextualization cues within the performance of the utterance can suggest the frame in which the utterance is to be interpreted. A broad smile and marked intonation accompanying the words "Nice tie!" can serve as contextualization cues that

channel inferential processes toward a particular interpretation. Contextualization cues do not *directly* index or refer to a specific interpretive frame, but rather serve as prods to inferential processes. A smile, for example, does not always indicate a joking insult frame for the talk that it accompanies. The functioning of a given cue is made even more ambiguous by the fact that such cues typically occur in constellations of features, e.g., a smile *and* a marked intonation contour, in which the constellation of features channels inferential processes differently than any one feature, in isolation, might.

Gumperz (1982) sees the functioning of such cues also depends on the broader *socio-cultural context*. A "joking insult frame" is more likely to occur in some US settings than in others, e.g., in informal interaction between male friends. Inferring a "joking insult" meaning of the utterance "Nice tie!" thus involves interpreting both the external, socio-cultural context of the interaction and the moment-to-moment interpretive contexts created within the stream of communicative behavior itself. Such cues and inferential patterns are acquired through prolonged and intensive face-to-face interaction in particular cultural settings, typically as part of one's primary language socialization. Contextualization conventions according to John Gumperz(1982) vary across cultures and sub-cultures, just as languages and accents vary across social groupings. They thus form part of

one's socio-cultural background, just as other cultural practices and beliefs do.

Cultural differences in contextualization conventions can undermine intergroup communication insidiously because individuals tend to be unconscious of this dimension of interaction. Contextualization cues have several characteristics that make them difficult to recognize. They tend to be scalar, that is, they vary along a continuum, such as pitch, rather than existing as discrete forms, such as individual lexical items. Most such cues are non-referential; that is, they carry no direct propositional information, but rather serve metacommunicative framing functions. Finally, their meanings are a function of the context of their use, so that individual cues cannot be analyzed in isolation from their use or assigned a single, stable function or meaning. It is thus very difficult for individuals to recognize these cues or the roles that they are playing in communication. While individuals from different cultures may well be aware of speaking different languages or dressing differently, they are seldom aware of the ways in which slight differences in contextualization conventions can create interactional difficulties.

Gumperz (1982a, 173) reports, for example, how intonation in uttering a single word led to misunderstandings that damaged relations between South Asian immigrant cafeteria workers and Anglo British workers at a British airport. When an Anglo British cafeteria server in this workplace offered

gravy to a person in line, she would say “Gravy?” with a rising intonation contour. Anglo British workers used this prosodic information to interpret the utterance as an offer or question: “Would you like gravy?” In contrast, when recently-immigrated South Asian cafeteria workers asked employees if they wanted gravy, they said “Gravy” with falling intonation. Anglo British workers interpreted the falling intonation as contextualizing a statement (akin to “This is gravy – take it or leave it”), which they found redundant and rude. Neither Anglo British nor South Asian workers were able to articulate the role that intonation played in their problematic interactions until it was pointed out by outside trainers. Thus, while two groups may “speak the same language,” that is, share syntax, phonology, and vocabulary, they may differ in the ways they meta-communicatively define the moment-to-moment activities in which they are engaging because socio-cultural differences in contextualization conventions are unconscious; they are not a readily available explanation to participants for breakdowns in communication or stilted, asynchronous interactions. When a person recognizes an apparent communicative breakdown or disjuncture in interaction, a psychological idiom is readily available to explain an interlocutor’s behaviour; that is to say that the other’s behaviour can be accounted for in terms of rudeness, insensitivity, selfishness, or some other personality trait. When such problematic interactions come to be associated with interaction across ethnic or cultural lines, it can result in pejorative

stereotyping of entire groups and the reinforcement of intergroup boundaries. Interactional Sociolinguistics is a qualitative, interpretative approach to the analysis of social interaction that developed at the intersection of linguistics, anthropology and sociology.

Furthermore, Interactional Sociolinguistics offers a linguistic approach to the contemporary, constructionist understanding of identity put forth by researchers from a range of disciplinary perspectives (Goffman, 1959; Berger and Luckmann, 1966; Ochs, 1993; Holstein and Gubrium, 2007). It has also made important contributions to the social scientific study of language in general, complementing other approaches aimed at understanding language from both structural and functional perspectives, such as Conversation Analysis and Linguistic Pragmatics. Additionally, Interactional Sociolinguistics has reached beyond the ivory tower to offer non-academics a means of understanding the role of language in social relationships, ways of identifying causes of miscommunication, and strategies for improving communication. Gumperz, for instance, served as a consultant for an educational B.B.C. television programme called *Crosstalk* (Twitchin, 1979) which addressed the subtleties of intercultural communication in multicultural workplaces in London. In addition, his work inspired other scholars to share, with non-academic audiences, sociolinguistic insights into everyday interactional dynamics.

Interactional Sociolinguistics according to Schiffrin (1994) takes from Gumperz (1982) a focus on how people from different cultures may share grammatical knowledge of a language, but differently contextualize what is said such that very different messages are produced. Gumperz (1982) aims to develop interpretative sociolinguistic approaches to the analysis of real time processes in face-to-face encounters. He uses contextualization cues, which he describes as signalling mechanisms of language and behaviour that relate what is said to the contextual knowledge.

Schiffrin (1994) uses the teacher-pupil exchange to demonstrate how Gumperz contextual cues can affect the interpretation of a message. Consider the pupil-teacher exchange and its analysis by Hoenisch (2006)

(1) Teacher: James, what does this word say?

(2) James: I don't know. (with final rising intonation)

(3) Teacher: Well if you don't want to try, someone else will. Freddy?

(4) Freddy: Is that a 'p' or a 'b'

5) Teacher: (encouragingly) It's a 'p'

(6) Freddy: pen.

A few assumptions can be made about the exchange. First, the teacher has been teaching these children long enough to be a little familiar with their routine habits, behaviours, and tendencies. Secondly, the teacher is speaking and acting in accordance with either cultural conventions or her familiarity with the students' behavioural patterns. Schiffrin (1994) noted that in

James's African American community, a rising intonation conveys a desire for encouragement.

The teacher's response above might therefore indicate that the teacher is interpreting James's "I don't know" not only according to it's literal meaning but also as suggesting that James does not want to try to answer the question. Yet in James's African-American community, rising intonation conveys the desire for encouragement. Thus, the teacher, in Gumperz's view did not interpret Freddy's message from his use of rising intonation. In this way, contextualization cues can affect the meaning of message. The consequence therefore is that one can discover shared meaning by using the reaction that an utterance evokes as evidence of whether interpretive conventions were shared.

In the pupil-teacher exchange, there may be a misinterpretation between the pupil's remark and the teacher's reply, as the speech act theory analysis showed, depending of course, on what James actually means. Interactional Sociolinguistics also exposes this disjunction: the meaning of James's utterance, except if viewed as avoidance, does not seem to be shared by both the teacher and him.

The untenable nature of speech act theory's felicity condition C renders that theory's description power unproductive; allowing no feasible way to calculate the meaning of an utterance even after it is reduced to a speech act. On the other hand, interactional sociolinguistics especially when

complemented by elements from other approaches to discourse, begins to provide a method, by which an utterance's meaning can be analyzed and interpreted.

In conclusion, the identification of meaning in a given context, even when much is known about the participants, remains an interpretation and that meaning is often indeterminate(Deborah Schriffin 1994).

Steve Hoenisch (2006) has argued that the exact meaning of a speaker's utterance in a contextualized exchange is often indeterminate. He argued for the superiority of Interactional Linguistics over Speech Act Theory stating that it reduces the indeterminacy and yields a more principled interpretation, especially when the interactional approach is complemented by elements from other sociologically influenced methods, namely the ethnography of communication and Labovian sociolinguistics.

The objectives of Interactional Sociolinguistics, for example, seem more clearly defined than those of Speech Act Theory (Hoenisch 2006). Broadly construed, Interactional Sociolinguistics views "language as indexical to a social world". By analyzing discourse, Interactional Sociolinguistics aims to reveal the social meaning of conduct in a particular context and of the interaction between self and others associated with the conduct. On the other hand, the Speech Act Theory, though not initially formulated as an approach to discourse, concerns itself with what people do with language. Schiffrin (1994) looks at this concern of the Speech Act Theory as a threat

to submerge Discourse Analysis within the broader and more general analyses of language function, without leaving a space within which discourse analysts can formulate a clear set of principles, goals, topics and methods specific to their own enterprise.

She focuses on speech act theory as an approach that takes language use as its central domain. Thus, the focus of the speech act theory may address only the surface characteristics of the language used in a sentence within a wider discourse, providing little more than a sophisticated taxonomy of the obvious. As such, a Speech Act Theory analysis may provide only superficial description of the functions of words or sentences in a discourse while lacking the machinery to connect these functions with not only the rest of the discourse, but also with the sociological and cultural influences that surface in language often decisively affecting meaning. Interactional Sociolinguistics may be better positioned than Speech Act Theory to reveal these cultural influences and their effect upon meaning.

To identify some strengths and weakness of each theory the question arises: how does the organisation of discourse, and the meaning and use of particular expressions and constructions within certain contexts, allow people to convey and interpret the communicative content of what is said?

In using the pupil-teacher exchange above by Hoenisch (2006) to compare Speech Act Theory and Interaction Linguistics, two points of interest arise from the above discourse.

(1) What does James mean when he utters “I don’t know” in (2)?

(2) Why does the teacher respond the way she does in (3)?

The Speech Act Theory focuses upon the knowledge of underlying condition for production and interpretation of acts though words, and this will be helpful in discovering the underlying condition of the production of (2) and its interpretation as borne out by the response in (3). At the core, Speech Act Theory are performatives sentences that are not used just to say things describe state of affairs, but rather actively to do things. To succeed, performatives must meet certain felicity conditions:

(A) 1 There must be a conventional procedure having a conventional effect.

2 The circumstances and persons must be appropriate as specified in the procedure.

(B) The procedure must be executed (1) correctly and (2) completely.

(C) Often, (1) the person must have the requisite thoughts, feeling, and intention, as specified in the procedure, and (2) if consequent conduct is specified, then the relevant parties must do so. (Levinson, 1983). Considering these felicity conditions in reaction to the teacher-pupil exchange, there is no useful criteria for determining whether James’s utterance is in fact a speech act or merely a report. If we concede that the

Speech Act Theory ends up as a general theory that pertains to all kinds of utterances not just explicit and implicit performatives, then we can at least say that all three of the utterances are speech acts. However, this gets us nowhere: we are left with three alternative acts and no criteria, perhaps save felicity condition C above, for determining which procedure is actually being undertaken by James. This condition is of no help, not only because we do not even know the procedure he is undertaking but also because we cannot know what he is thinking, feeling or intending.

In summary, the Speech Act Theory provides only possible descriptions of the meaning of the pupil-teacher exchange with no criteria other than C, which is empirically unacceptable, for choosing among the alternative interpretations. Beyond trying to interpret James' thoughts, feelings and intentions by interviewing him or experimenting on him, this may be impractical. Applying speech act theory to the pupil- teacher example shows that what X counts in context Y is often indeterminable because the "requisite thoughts, feelings and intentions" of the speaker are often neither known nor ascertainable. The connection to conventions that the speech act theory establishes in felicity condition A begins to shed some light on the matter but fails to provide the necessary connection to culture that could help determine whether James' rising intonation indicates a noncontrastive element of the utterance.

The view that a strong connection to culture could advance the interpretation of James's remarks is supported by the would-be failure of applying a Gricean pragmatic analysis to his utterance, (Hoesnisch, 2006). However, the speech act theory does have a certain utility. The approach reveals disjunction between two of the three possible interpretations of James' utterance and the teacher's response, although the theory falls short of providing a principled method by which to identify the nature of the utterance and to pinpoint the reason for the disjunction where it arises. The views above have revealed the importance of Interactional Sociolinguistic to classroom discourse which is what the current study focuses on.

2.2 Academic Language And Classroom Interaction

Two distinct hypotheses dominate the relatively small body of research literature on academic language. The first proposes that academic language is a compilation of unique language functions and structures that are difficult for second language learner of English to master (Hamayan and Perlman 1990). O'mally (1992) and Valdez Pierce and O'mally (1991) hypothesize, for example, that a handful of academic language functions are characteristic of classrooms in general; seeking information, informing, analysing, comparing, classifying, predicting, hypothesizing, justifying, persuading, solving problems, synthesizing and evaluating.

Spannos et al (1988) apply this perspective on academic language to Mathematics. Basing their findings on simulated Mathematics problem-solving sessions among community college students in algebra classes, Spanos and his colleagues argue that syntactic features such as comparatives (greater than/less than), logical connectors (if----- then, given that),reliance on the passive voice and various uses of prepositions are particular to the language used in Mathematics classes. They also identified several semantic features of the language of Mathematics; technical vocabulary (e.g. additive inverse, coefficient), ordinary vocabulary that has different meaning in mathematics, (square, power) complex string of words (least common denominator, negative exponent), synonymous words and phrases (add, plus, and combine) and various mathematical symbols and notations.

The National Science Teachers Association(1991) and Chamot and O'mally (1986) describe the functions of scientific academic language as formulating hypothesis, proposing alternative solutions, describing, classifying, using time and special relations, inferring, interpreting data, predicting, generalizing and communicating findings. Chamot and O'mally further note that science utilizes certain non-technical terms that have unique meanings in a scientific context (e.g. tables energy). Moreover, they also noted that scientific discourse is characterized by a particular sequence of steps and a heavy reliance on the use of the passive voice and long noun phrases. Lemke (1990) also notes a preference for the passive voice in science.

Halliday (1989) suggests that science uses the following academic features: interlocking definitions, technical taxonomies, special expressions, lexical density, syntactic ambiguity, grammatical metaphor and semantic discontinuity. These features, Halliday stressed do not occur in isolation; rather, they overlap with one another, particularly in text passages.

Short (1994) notes that students must be able to use the following language functions effectively in American History classes: explaining, describing, defining, justifying, giving examples, sequencing, comparing, and evaluating. According to Short, History texts employ a variety of syntax types, including simple past, historical present, sequence words, active voice, temporal signals and causative signals. She pointed out that although these language functions are not exclusive to American history, they do play an important role in the language learning and content comprehension of students.

In the second hypothesis dominating academic language research, advanced by Cummins (1981), scholars attempt to distinguish academic language (which Cummins called Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency, or ALP from conversational language (which Cummins called Basic Inter Personal Communicative Skills or BICS) in terms of the contextual support available for expressing or receiving meaning. Cummins and those who have built upon his model (chamot and O'mally, 1988; Valdez Pierce and O'mally, 1992) argue that BICS are more context embedded in nature than academic

language. That is, in BICS, meaning is obtained among those communicating through the aid of situational and paralinguistic cues. This means that students do not have to rely exclusively on language in order to comprehend meaning; students draw on a variety of cues, such as body language, speech intonation, and sequence of events, to understand language.

In contrast, these scholars claim that academic language is context- reduced in nature, meaning that students do not have abundance of situational and paralinguistic cues at their disposal to obtain meaning (Cummins, 1981). This means that students must rely, in the extreme cases, solely on verbal and spoken language for comprehension. The degree to which academic language is context- reduced varies, however, according to the situation.

Cummins further distinguished academic language according to its cognitive demands. As he explained, the less automatized a language task is the more cognitively demanding it becomes. Academic language is most difficult for second language learners of English, because they are required to carry out cognitively demanding tasks in context-reduced situations. Research on classroom discourse has been concerned with turn-taking and participation patterns rather than describing the features of academic language, it is important to review this body of research literature. This study therefore focuses on the students of Federal College of Forestry Mechanisation who are all second language learners of English. The study

looks at how the use of situational and paralinguistic cues and participation patterns affects the comprehension of lectures in the classroom.

There have been various researches on the description of the structure of one form of spoken discourse – that is the way in which units above the rank of clauses are related and patterned. Halliday's (1967) discussion of the information structure of the clause and Hasan's (1968) discussion of such cohesion features as anaphora and exophora do depend on the concept of a contextualized clause, but are not concerned with the structure of the text.

There was an attempt in Sociolinguistics to describe the structure of spoken text by Mitchell (1957) who described the language of buying and selling in Cyrenaica. He characterised the structure by the kind of phrase and clause, often ritual, which occur within them. Hymes (1964) attempted to outline a programme for the integrated study of language use, the ethnography of speaking, and further gives a description of communicative competence – how does a member of community know when to speak and when to remain silent, which code to use when, where and how.

Since the late 1940s, there have been growing interests in the study of language interaction inside the classroom. Sinclair (1975) and Flanders (1965) focused on what teachers say in the classroom and the consequences for pupil achievement and involvement. Flanders' system has been criticised from a number of different viewpoints. Barnes (1969) on his own part made detailed and interesting observations on the kind of questions teachers ask

and the way in which these constrain pupil-thinking and participation. Ballack et al (1966) proposed a structure for lessons with four units: game, sub-game, cycle and move, arranged in a consist of relations. While the two higher units; game and sub-game were pedagogically defined, the two lower units; cycle and move were defined in discourse terms. The lowest unit move is sub-divided into four types, soliciting, responding, structuring and reacting, each of which has a different discourse function. They are defined as follows:

(1) Soliciting moves are intended to elicit an active verbal response on the part of the persons addressed, a cognitive response and physical response.

(2) Responding moves bear reciprocal relationship to soliciting moves.

(3) Structuring moves serve the pedagogical function of setting the context for subsequent behaviour by either launching or halting-excluding interaction between students and teacher.

This research which is focused on classroom interaction has a lot to do with these three discourse function. Where the soliciting and responding move is a move intended to get an active response from the students, and the structuring move is where a structure is set by the teacher for better comprehension.

2.3 Culture and Academic Discourse

To adopt a cultural view of language is to explore the ways in which forms of language form individual words to complete discourse structures, encode something of the beliefs and values held by the language user. This is entirely in keeping with a discourse-based view of language. Basically, we will discuss the relationship between culture and context and evaluate the relevance of such understanding for the nature of the learning of a second or foreign language.

Culture can be generally defined as the set of values and beliefs which are prevalent within a given society or section of a given society. In the practice of language teaching, however, more specific definitions can be discerned. McCarthy and Carter(1991) obtained three main meanings of culture.

1. Culture with capital C- refers to the most prestigious artistic achievement of a society: its art, music, theatre and especially its literature.
2. Culture with a small c- refers to habits, customs and social behaviours and assumptions about the world of a group of people. Although this is a vast area, some textbooks attempt to provide some coverage either integrated into the main course material or as a supplement. Such coverage can range from family eating habits to the institutions of the society. Other relevant cultural forms within this definition include: adverts and magazine stories.

3. Culture as Social Discourse refers to social knowledge and interactive skills, which are required in addition to knowledge of the language system. There may be marked difference here with learners' own cultural norm. For example, part of a learner's communicative competence involves a familiarity with generic and rhetorical convention in writing as well as conventions of politeness, uses of silence, repetition and appropriate discourse markers.

   Language users, therefore, can be sensitive to cultural divides and may try to bridge them when feasible. Communicative competence of this kind may also include sensitivity to paralinguistic codes such as use of eye contact, intonation, gesture and interpersonal distance.

   The students of Federal college of Forestry Mechanization are from different cultural backgrounds and therefore may have different customs, social behaviours, social knowledge and interactive skills. This study will also look at how such differences affect their communicative competence as discussed above.

2.4 Language Functions

Traditionally, three major language functions or contextual types have been identified as statement, question and command, having their typical realizations in declaratives, interrogative and imperative forms. However, the relationship between these functions and forms in actual language use is more flexible. We can, for instance, use a declarative form to give a

command or make a request. Linguists have reacted differently to language functions.

Bloomfield (1933) observed that the statement of meaning is the weak point in language study, and would remain so until human knowledge advances far beyond its present state.

The question “why do we use language” hardly requires an answer, although the usual answer to this question might tend to be “to communicate ideas” and, indeed, this must surely be the most widely recognised function of language. Whenever we tell people about ourselves or our circumstances we are using language in order to exchange facts and opinions. This use of language is often called referential, propositional or ideational. But it would be wrong to think of it as the only way in which we use language. Language scholars have identified several other functions where the communication of ideas is a marginally irrelevant consideration.

One of the commonest uses of language is for emotional expression which is a means of getting rid of our nervous energy when we are under stress. It is the clearest case of what is often called an emotive function of language. Emotive language can be used whether or not we are alone. The most common linguistic expressions of emotion consist of conventional words or phrases (gosh, my, what a sight.) and interjections such as ooh, ouch, wow, etc. It also provides an outlet for our attitudes while we speak.

Another function of language which hardly seems to be a case of language being used to communicate ideas is that it serves as a means of social interaction, which goes a long way to maintain a comfortable relationship between people. Its sole function is to provide a means of avoiding a situation which both parties might otherwise find embarrassing. No factual content is involved. Sentences in this function are usually produced and stereotyped in structure; they often state the obvious and have no content at all, some examples are, “Lovely day”, “Hello”, “Good day”. Such expressions certainly require a special kind of explanation, and this is found in the idea that language is here being used for the purpose of maintaining a rapport between people. The anthropologist Bronislaw Malinowski (1884-1942) coined the phrase “phatic communion” to refer to this social function of language, which arises out of basic human need to signal friendship or at least lack of enmity. For someone to withhold these sentences when they are expected, by staying silent is a sure sign of distance, alienation, even danger.

People often feel the need to speak their thoughts aloud. If asked why they do it they reply that it helps their concentration, and this brings us to another function of language which is that it serves as an instrument of thought. Authors often make similar remarks about the need to get a first draft on paper in order to see whether what they have written corresponds to what they had in mind. The French thinker Joseph Joubert (1754-1824), once

said; “we only know just what we meant to say after we have said it”. Perhaps the most common use of language as an instrument of thought is found when people perform mathematical calculations in their head. Very often, this supposedly mental act is accompanied by a verbal commentary. However, it is not essential that language used in this way should always be spoken aloud or written down. Often people can be seen moving their lips while they are thinking, but no actual sound emerges. Language is evidently present but in a sub-vocal form.

Language can also be used as an expression of identity. Our use of language can tell our listener or reader a great deal about ourselves in particular, about our regional origins, social background, level of education, occupation, age, sex and personality. The way language is used to express these variables is so complex that it requires separate discussion. However, the general point can be made here that a major function of language is the expression of personal identity, signalling whom we are and where we belong. It is on this basis that this study looks at how the use of language in the classroom affects the comprehension of what is being taught.

2.5 Language Interference

Language transfer (also known as L1 interference, linguistic interference, and cross meaning) refers to speakers or writers applying k knowledge from their native language to a second language. Dulay et al (1982) define

interference as the automatic transfer, due to habit, of the surface structure of the first language onto the surface of the target language. Lott (1983, 256) defines interference as 'errors in the leaner's use of the foreign language that can be traced back to the mother tongue'. Ellis (1997:51) refers to interference as 'transfer', which he says is the influence that the learner's L1 exerts over the acquisition of an L2'. He argues that transfer is governed by leaning. In learning a target language, learners construct their own interim rules (Selinker, 1971, Seligar, 1988 and Ellis, 1997) with the use of their L1 knowledge , but only when they believe it will help them in learning task or when they have become sufficiently proficient in the L2 for transfer to be possible.

When an individual's understanding of one language has an impact on his or her understanding of another language, that individual is experiencing language transfer. There can be negative transfers, otherwise known as interference, when the understanding of one language complicates the understanding of another language. Alternatively, there can be positive transfers such that knowing one language can aid in developing skills for a second language. Language interference is the effect of language learners' first language on their production of the language they are learning. It means that the speaker's first language influences his/her second or and his/her foreign language.

The effect can be on any aspect of language: grammar, vocabulary, accent, spelling and so on. Language interference is considered as one of error sources (negative transfer), although where the relevant feature of both languages is the same it results in correct language production (positive transfer). The greater the differences between the two languages, the more negative the effects of interference are likely to be. It will inevitably occur in any situation where someone has not mastered a second language.

Corder outlines one way in which interference can be recast as a learner strategy. He suggests that the learner's L1 may facilitate the development process of learning an L2, by helping him to progress m ore rapidly along the universal route when the L1 is similar to the L2. Krashen when he suggest that the learners can use the L1 to initiate utterances when they do not have sufficient acquired knowledge of the target language for this purpose.

The relationship between the two languages must then be considered. The Albert and Obler (1978) claim that people show more lexical interference on similar items. So it may follow that languages with more similar structures (e.g. English and French) are more susceptible to mutual interference than languages with fewer similar features (e.g. English Japanese). On the other hand, we might also expect more learning difficulties, and thus more likelihood of performance interference at those points in L2 which are m ore distant from L1, as the learner would find it

difficult to learn and understand a completely new and different usage. Hence the learner would resort to L1 structures for help (Selinker, 1979; Dulay et al, 1982; Blum-Kulka & Levension, 1983; Faerch & Kasper, 1983, Bialystok, 1994 and Dordick, 1996).

Factors That Cause Language Interference

Interference is a general problem that occurs in bilingualism. There are many factors that contribute interference (Weinrich, 1970:64-65):

First, speaker bilingualism background. Bilingualism is the major factor of interference as the speaker is influe3nced by both of the source and the target language. Indonesia's student who is Javanese and is studying good Bahasa tends to put his Javanese language into Indonesia Look the example, 'Andi apakah kamu bias mengerjakan soal matematika ini?" Tanya guru. Then Andi ans wered, "Tidak bias, Bu Guru, Iha wong itu angel." The impression of 'Iha wong' is usual in Javanese cultural insight. The word 'angel' means difficult in Bahasa, the student should reply his teacher with "tidak bias, Bu Guru, soalnya sulit'. Regarding this condition, the student is a second grade of elementary school.

Second, disloyalty to target language. Disloyalty to target language will cause negative attitude. This will lead to disobedience to target language structure and further force the bilingualism to put uncontrolled structure of his first language elements to output in practicing words utterances both oral and written. Students whose language background of TL is limited

tend to put words in sentences or oral in structure and sense of first language. For example is occurred in Facebook status made by an Indonesian, “So must to spirit.” While the correct sentence is “I must keep spirit.”

Third, the limited vocabularies of TL mastered by a learner. Vocabularies of certain language mostly are about words of surroundings connected to life. Thus, a learner who is willing to master another language will meet new words differ from his native words. In order to be able to speak as natives of TL, vocabularies take a big role. The more vocabularies someone has, the better he masters TL. Foreign language learner will try to put deliberately his native word to state some points when he cannot find the best words of TL. For example, when an Indonesian wants to mention ‘rambutan’, he stills mention ‘rambutan’ when he speaks in English. Since there is no English word for ‘rambutan’.

Fourth, needs of synonym. Synonym in language usage plays an important role as word chosen variation in order not to repeat similar word during the communication process (redundancy). Implementing synonym in a language contact will contribute to interference in the form of adoption and borrowing of new words from SL to TL. Thus, need of synonym for certain word from SL to TL is seemingly aimed to intensify meaning.

Fifth, prestige and style . Applying unfamiliar words (foreign words) during a communication practice which dominant words are languages of

both speaker and receiver is something else. Those unfamiliar words usage is aimed to get a pride. Interference will appear as there are certain words even though the receiver probably cannot catch the real idea of the speech. The usual unfamiliar words usage will become a style of the user. Unfortunately , the user sometimes does not understand the real meaning whether the meaning is denotative or connotative. The common feature is that man language users put derivational affix-ization in every word. To note, affix-ization is an adopting and borrowing process from English to state nouns.

According to Lott (1983:258-259), there are three factors that cause the interference.

The Interlingual Factor

Interlingual transfer is a significant source for language learners. This concept comes from contrastive analysis of behaviouristic school of learning. It stresses upon the negative interference of mother tongue as the only source of errors. The construction – "i like to read' is uttered as ' i read to like' by many Hindi speakers. In Hindi, the verb is pre-positioned while in English it is post positioned. This type of error is the result of negative transfer of L1 and L2 system.

Commonly, errors are caused by the differences between the first and the second language. Such a contrastive analysis hypothesis occurs where

structures in the first language which are different from those in the second language produce the errors reflecting the structure of first language. Such errors were said to be due to the influence of learners' first language habits on second language production (Dulay et.al, 1982:97).

Corder in Richard (1967:19) says that errors are the result of interference in learning a second language from the habits of the first language. Because of the difference in system especially grammar, the students will transfer their first language into the second language by using their mother tongue system.

Effects of Language Interference

The background of L1 for learning L2 has both advantages and disadvantages. The factor of 'language universal' helps in learning. All languages have tense system, number, gender, plural etc. This helps the learner in identifying these areas in the target language. But the interference of L1 and L2 leads to errors. One of the assumptions of the contrastive analysis hypothesis was that learners with difference L1s would learn a L2 in different ways, as a result of negative transfer imposing different kinds of difficulty.

Interference may be viewed as the transference of elements of one language to another at various levels including phonological, grammatical, lexical and orthographical (Berthold, Mangubhai & Batorowicz, 1997). Berthold et

al (1997) define phonological interference as items including foreign accent such as stress, rhyme, intonation and speech sounds from the first language influencing the second. Grammatical interference is defined as the first language influencing the second. Grammatical interference is defined as the first language influencing the second in terms of word order, use of pronouns and determinants, tense and mood. Interference at a lexical level provides for the borrowing of words from one language and converting them to sound more natural in another orthographic interference includes the spelling of one language altering another.

The most common source of error is in the process of learning a foreign language, where the native tongue interferes; but interference may occur in the other contact situations (as in multilingualism). In learning L1 certain habits of perceiving and performing have to be established and the old habits tend to intrude and interfere with the learning, so that the students may speak L2 (or FL) with the intonation of his L1 or the word order of his L1 and so on.

Language interference influences in learning language target. It has positive and negative effects. The greater the differences between the two languages, the more negative the effects of interference are likely to be.

2.6 Theoretical Framework

This study is based on Hugh Mehan's IRE sequence, and Gumperz's contextualization cues. Earlier research on student-teacher interaction focused on describing the patterns typical of interactions found in classrooms (Barnes,1992; Cazden,1988; Mehan,1979). Findings from these studies revealed that although student populations may vary from classroom to classroom and school to school, one particular pattern of interaction, the teacher led three part sequence of Initiation-Response-Evaluation exist. Mehan (1979) pioneered research in this field by demonstrating that classroom lessons are not arbitrarily structured, but are governed by unique interactional sequences which he calls the initiation, reply, evaluation (IRE) pattern. The initiation phase of IRE refers to a communicative act on the part of the teacher, usually in the form of a verbalized question that sets the discourse structure in motion. Teacher- questions can be addressed to individual students, group of students, or the class as a whole. The second phase of the sequence is comprised of a reply to the teacher initiation by a student or group of students. In the evaluation phase of IRE, the teacher indicates to the students whether the reply phase is right or wrong.

In the IRE pattern of interaction, the teacher plays the role of expert whose primary instructional task is to elicit information from the students in order to ascertain whether they know the material or not. He or she also serves as gatekeeper to learning opportunities. The teacher decides who will

participate, when students can take a turn, how much they can contribute and whether their contributions are worthy or appropriate. This pattern facilitates teacher control of the interaction.

Mehan provided the following examples from his research to illustrate basic IRE interactional sequences (1979, pp 52-53). Note that in each case the teacher begins the interactional sequence with a question. A student then offers a reply. In the third and final phase of the sequence, the teacher evaluates the students' responses, thereby bringing to a close the IRE structure. While Mehan stated that there are more complex variations on the IRE structure, he noted that it is important to remember that the majority of classroom interactions are constrained by the IRE sequence.

INITIATION	**REPLY**	**EVALUATION**
T: And whose is this?	L: Veronica	T: Oh lots of people knew that
T: Um, whose name is this?	A: Mercedes	T: Mercedes, right.
T: Now who knows what this one says (Holds up new cards)? This is the long word. Who knows what this says?	A: Cafeteria	T: Cafeteria, Audrey, good for you.

Since Mehan's study, other scholars have advanced research in this area by suggesting that there is a relationship between various classroom discourse

structures and the academic outcomes of second language learners of English, which they have come to view as a classic ethnography. (Au,1980; Cazden,1988; Macias, 1990; Michaels 1983 and Collins, 1984; McCollum, 1989; Philips, 1983; Ripich & Spinelli, 1985). In this vein Philips (1983), explores the negative effects of mainstream classroom participation structures on the academic achievement of warm spring Indians whom he discovered talked less than their Anglo peers during official classroom discourse structures; teachers negatively evaluate warm springs Indians with greater frequency than they do Anglo students. Such disparities between warm springs Indian and Anglo students, Philips argued, can be traced to culturally incompatible styles of communications (1983). This can also be traced to the kind of students in the study area, who find it easier to talk more outside the classroom with their peers than when they are in class. This could be due to their cultural backgrounds.

In a more recent study, McCollum (1989) compared the lesson structure in third-grade classrooms in Puerto Rico and Chicago. The IRE structure of the Puerto Rican classroom, is according to her, much more fluid and open-ended than the IRE of the Chicago classroom. That is, although the Puerto Rican classroom is characterised by the initiation-reply-evaluation sequence, there is much more informal give and take between student and teacher than in Chicago classroom. This according to McCollum explains why Puerto Rican students have difficulties adapting to the IRE discourse

structure of the Chicago school. She argued that educators should take native discourse structures into account when dealing with students from cultures that use more fluid IRE sequences**.**

Interactional Sociolinguistics on the other hand is concerned with how speakers signal and interpret meaning in social interaction. This theory was developed by John Gumperz (1982ab) and it bridges the gulf between empirical communicative forms, which could be words or prosy and what the speaker and listener take themselves to be doing with these forms. Gumperz focuses on conventional surface forms which he calls contextualization cues. Cultural differences in contextualization conventions can undermine intergroup communication insidiously because individuals tend to be unconscious of this dimension of interaction. Contextualization cues have several characteristics that make them difficult to recognize. They tend to be scalar, that is, they vary along a continuum, such as pitch, rather than existing as discrete forms, such as individual lexical items. Most such cues are non-referential; that is, they carry no direct propositional information, but rather serve metacommunicative framing functions. Finally, their meanings are a function of the context of their use, so that individual cues cannot be analyzed in isolation from their use or assigned a single, stable function or meaning. It is thus very difficult for individuals to recognize these cues or the roles that they are playing in communication. While individuals from different cultures may well be aware of speaking

different languages or dressing differently, they are seldom aware of the ways in which slight differences in contextualization conventions can create interactional difficulties.

Gumperz (1982a, 173) reports, for example, how intonation in uttering a single word led to misunderstandings that damaged relations between South Asian immigrant cafeteria workers and Anglo British workers at a British airport. When an Anglo British cafeteria server in this workplace offered gravy to a person in line, she would say "Gravy?" with a rising intonation contour. Anglo British workers used this prosodic information to interpret the utterance as an offer or question: "Would you like gravy?" In contrast, when recently-immigrated South Asian cafeteria workers asked employees if they wanted gravy, they said "Gravy" with falling intonation. Anglo British workers interpreted the falling intonation as contextualizing a statement (akin to "This is gravy – take it or leave it"), which they found redundant and rude. Neither Anglo British nor South Asian workers were able to articulate the role that intonation played in their problematic interactions until it was pointed out by outside trainers. Thus, while two groups may "speak the same language," that is, share syntax, phonology, and vocabulary, they may differ in the ways they meta-communicatively define the moment-to-moment activities in which they are engaging because socio-cultural differences in contextualization conventions are unconscious; they are not a readily available explanation to participants for breakdowns in

communication or stilted, asynchronous interactions. When a person recognizes an apparent communicative breakdown or disjuncture in interaction, a psychological idiom is readily available to explain an interlocutor's behaviour; that is to say that the other's behavior can be accounted for in terms of rudeness, insensitivity, selfishness, or some other personality trait. When such problematic interactions come to be associated with interaction across ethnic or cultural lines, it can result in pejorative stereotyping of entire groups and the reinforcement of intergroup boundaries. Interactional Sociolinguistics is a qualitative, interpretative approach to the analysis of social interaction that developed at the intersection of linguistics, anthropology and sociology.

Hugh Mehan's IRE Sequence and the use of Gumperz's contextualization cues in Interactional Sociolinguistics focused mainly on classroom interaction in a second language leaner's setting. This therefore formed the basis of the selection of these theories as the framework for the current study.

2.7 Summary

This chapter has been able to discuss extensively a review of literature which are related to this study. The review on Interactional sociolinguistics and Speech Act theory is timely in this study, because, though Gumperz observed that people from different cultures may share grammatical knowledge of a language, they differently contextualise what is said in such

a way that different messages are produced in a social interaction (Gumperz, 1982). This study brings it closer to the classroom setting, and among second language users of English, as done by Schiffrin (1994).

Various scholars view academic language as a compilation of unique language functions and structure which are difficult for second language learners of English to master (Hamayan and Perlman(1990), O'mally(1992) and Valdez Pierce and O'mally(1991). This is also a major focus of this study in order to verify if the students find academic language so difficult to understand that it affects their comprehension of what they are being taught. Also Cummins(1981) views academic language as context-reduced in nature, thereby making students to rely more on solely verbal and spoken language for comprehension, while he views conversational language as being context embedded in nature, where meaning could be obtained through the aid of situational and paralinguistic cues like body language, speech intonations etc. This study which is focused on classroom interaction looks at how the use of these situational and paralinguistic cues and participation patterns affects comprehension, by using the John Gumperz contextualization cue in a classroom setting of second language users of English Language, who are from different cultural backgrounds.

Barnes (1969) on his own part, views comprehension of students in classroom as depending on the kind of questions teachers ask, and the way

in which these constrain pupil-thinking and participation. This is not too far from the theoretical framework used in this study. The Huge Mehan's initiation-reply – evaluation (IRE) sequence seeks to explain the students comprehension in class when the teacher takes the lead and this is also examined in the course of the analysis of data collected.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Sources of Data

This study relied on both Primary and Secondary data. The primary data for this study were collected from the Pre-ND students of the Department of Basic Sciences and General Studies of the Federal College of Forestry Mechanization Afaka.

The Department is made up of eighty students and fifteen lecturers in various fields. The courses being taken are:

1.	Introduction to Biology	CBB010
2.	Flowering Plant, Soil Science & Ecology	CBB011
3.	General and Inorganic Chemistry	CBC011
4.	Mechanics, Properties of Matter & Heat	CBP011
5.	English Language and communication	PEL011
6.	Animal Biology and Ecology	CBB012
7.	Additional Mathematics	MTH012
8.	General Mathematics	MTH011
9.	Optics, Wave & Sound, Electricity, Magnetism and Modern Physics	CPB012
10.	Physical and Organic Chemistry	CBC012
11.	Technical Drawing	PTD012

Data were collected from 5 of the eleven courses listed above which are as follows;

1.	English Language and Communication	PEL011
2.	Animal Biology and Ecology	CBB012
3.	Physical and Organic Chemistry	CBC012
4.	Optics, Wave & Sound, Electricity Magnetism and Modern Physics	CBP012
5.	Additional Mathematics	MTH012

3.2 Instruments for Data Collection

This study adopted the questionnaire method of survey research. Data were collected through structured questionnaires administered on eighty Pre-ND students of the Department of Basic Sciences and General Studies of Federal College of Forestry Mechanisation, Afaka.

The questionnaire distributed comprised two sections: Sections A and B. Section A was aimed at establishing the social characteristics of the respondents to enable appropriate categorization, whereas section B aimed at carrying out a sociolinguistic analysis of classroom interactional patterns among the and students and features of academic language of Federal College Forestry Mechanization, Afaka- Kaduna. The tape recording was of classroom interaction between the students and lecturers in three courses namely; Mathematics, English language and Chemistry.

Data was also recovered using a tape recorder. Three courses of the five selected were recording, to capture the style of teaching by the lecturer and the level of comprehension of the students. The questionnaires were distributed immediately after the tape recordings were done.

3.3 Method of Data Analysis

The data collected from students and lecturers through the questionnaires were collated and analysed separately using both quantitative and qualitative approaches. The quantitative method of analysis, which includes descriptive statistical tools such as frequency distribution, tables, and percentages method, was adopted in order to determine accurately the responses of the students to the different questions asked. Decimals were also used to avoid the dangers in rounding percentages, which may distort results. The aim of using decimal was to present the results as truly as they are.

Tape recorded data were qualitatively analysed by carefully playing the tapes repeatedly in order to obtain adequate transcript. Attention was also paid to phonological features such as those of pitch and voice quality. The data were analysed using the Mehan IRE sequence as explained in the theoretical framework, while a transcript of the data sample is included as appendixes.

3.4 Population , Sample Size and Sampling Technique

This research has as its study area the Federal College of Forestry Mechanization, Afaka, in Igabi Local Government Area of Kaduna State, which is a monotechnic that basically focuses on Agro-Forestry studies. It was established in 1985 and awards both the Ordinary and Higher National Diploma in the following courses;

National Diploma:

(1) Agricultural Engineering Technology

(2) Agricultural Technology

(3) Forestry Technology

Higher National Diploma:

(1) Agricultural Extension and Management

(2) Horticulture and Landscaping

(3) Crop Production Technology

(4) Forestry Technology

There is also a Pre-National Diploma in Basic Science and General Studies. The philosophy of these courses includes:

(a) To inculcate national consciousness and unity

(b) The provision of qualified and well-equipped personnel to apply scientific knowledge to the improvement and solution to Agricultural Forestry and environmental problems.

(c) The acquisition of necessary skills, abilities and competence, both metal and physical, as equipment for the individual to live and contribute to the development of Forestry and general Agriculture.

The mandate of the College is to provide training at all sub-professional levels with special reference to mechanized agricultural farm and forest plantation operations, with the choice of working techniques and maintenance of tools and equipment as well as the need to keep to all levels of safety rules. As a federal institution, the school has brought together people from various parts of this country either as staff members or as students.

The college has a population of about six hundred and eighty four (684) students in all the courses.

Sample size

The sample of the entire population selected for this study, were the Pre-ND students of the Department of Basic Sciences and General studies. These students were purposively selected, because they are the largest class in the entire college. The Pre-ND class has a total number of one hundred and three (103) students, compared to other department with not more than sixty five (65) students.

Sampling Procedure

At the time of data collection, a total number of Ninety two questionnaires were distributed and only eighty four was retrieved with four of the questionnaires not fully filled which narrowed down the study to a total of eighty respondents.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

4.0 Data Presentation

The data collected for this study were collected through questionnaire and recordings of classroom interaction. See Appendix for the complete data.

The questionnaire contained a total number of ten questions that were analysed as responded to by students offering the five courses selected for the study.

4.1 Analysis of Data

The analyses were carried out at two levels; analysis of data collected through questionnaires and analysis of data collected through tape recording of Classroom discourse.

4.1.1 Analysis of Data Collected Through The Questionnaire

Demographic characteristics of respondents.

This part of the work looks at the demographic distribution of the respondents. Demographic characteristics considered include age and sex of the respondents is reflected in tables 4.1 and 4.2 below.

Responses of students on age distribution

Table 4.1: Age Distribution of Respondents

Age Range	Frequency	Percentage
16-25yrs	55	68.7
26-30yrs	19	23.8
31-35yrs	6	7.5
36 – above	-	-
Total	**80**	**100.0**

Result in table 4.1 shows that majority (68.7%) of the respondents fall within the age bracket of 16-25 years. This is followed by those between the ages of 26-30yrs constituting 23.8% of respondents, while 7.5% of the respondents belong to the age group of 31-35years. This implies that the respondents are predominantly young people in pursuit of education at their early in life.

Table 4.2; Sex Distribution of Respondents

Sex Distribution	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Male	56	70.0
Female	24	30.0
Total	**80**	**100.0**

The table above looked at the distribution of respondents by sex. This became vital because of assertions in some quarters of the neglect of a particular sex in educational pursuit.

Results in Table 4.2 show that greater proportions (70%) of the respondents are male, while the remaining 30% are females. This means that there are more male students in this class compared to their female counterparts. The probable reason for this could be that this level of study is a preparatory level of students for forestry related programmes of the College, which are predominated by males.

Analysis of Responses to Research Questions

The analysis in this section is centred on the basic questions in the questionnaire which border on differences and similarities in classroom and everyday conversational language with regard to features and use of academic language, effect of mother tongue on understanding of academic language and comprehension, social behaviours and their impact on comprehension.

The analysis carried out in this section was based on questions responded to by students after lectures in each of the five courses. The presentation of results and their interpretations are pooled together since it is the same sample population that was used in the five courses.

Features of Academic Language

Table 4.3 shows the analysis of responses in all five courses to the questionnaire item “What are the features of academic language among students and lecturers in your college? Which is also the first research question of the study.

Table 4.3 Features of Academic Language

Features of Academic Language	Frequency	Percentage
English Language		
Informal (use of register)	15	18.8
Strictly formal	10	12.6
All of the above	55	68.8
Total	**80**	**100.0**
Chemistry		
Informal (use of register)	30	37.5
Strictly formal	5	6.3
All of the above	45	56.2
Total	**80**	**100.0**
Physics		
Informal (use of register)	10	12.5
Strictly formal	6	7.5
All of the above	64	80.0
Total	**80**	**100.0**
Biology		
Informal (use of register)	24	30.0
Strictly formal	6	7.5
All of the above	50	62.5
Total	**80**	**100.0**

Mathematics		
Informal (use of register)	25	31.3
Strictly formal	32	40.0
All of the above	23	28.7
Total	**80**	**100.0**

From the results in Table 4.3 majority of the respondents viewed academic language in the college as both informal, constituting the use of registers and strictly formal in all the courses except in Mathematics. This is shown in the percentage of respondent that opted for "All of the above" ranging from 80% in physics to 56.2% in chemistry. However the case in Mathematics is different as majority of respondents (40%) asserted that academic language use among students and lecturers is strictly formal. This simply implies that in Mathematics class there are scarcely alternative terms that can be used different from everyday use of conversational English Language. For instance there is no other term that can convey the meaning of proof an equation in everyday language from its use in Mathematics classroom discourse.

Differences and similarities in classroom and everyday conversational language

Table 4.4 shows the responses of the respondents to the question "Would you say the language used in the classroom (Academic language) is different from everyday conversational language? This analysis also answers the second research question of this study and fulfils the second objective of this study, which is to highlight the differences and similarities between academic language and normal everyday conversational language at the Federal College of Forestry Mechanisation, Afaka.

Table 4.4: Differences and similarities between classroom and everyday conversational language

Differences and Similarities	Frequency	Percentage
English Language		
Agree	55	68.7
Disagree	25	31.3
Total	**80**	**100.0**
Chemistry		
Agree	54	67.5
Disagree	26	32.5
Total	**80**	**100.0**

Physics		
Agree	58	72.5
Disagree	22	27.5
Total	**80**	**100.0**
Biology		
Agree	45	56.3
Disagree	35	43.7
Total	**80**	**100.0**
Mathematics		
Agree	67	83.75
Disagree	13	16.25
Total	**80**	**100.0**

Table 4.4 reveals that in all the five courses respondents affirmed that there exist significant differences in the use of classroom language and everyday conversational languages. Mathematics, has the highest percentage of 83.8% which could be due to the fact that Mathematics classroom is mostly characterised by justifying, hypothesising solving problems synthesizing and evaluating as submitted by Valdez piece and O'mally (1991). Responses got from the Physics class indicate that 72% agree that there exist remarkable differences in the use of academic language and everyday conversational language. The same position was held by respondents in

English language, Chemistry and Biology with 68.7%, 67.5% and 56.3% respectively. However, the result also shows that lower percentage of respondents in all the five courses indicated that there exist similarities in the use of classroom language and everyday conversational language. This position is most prominently held by respondents in Biology class with 43.7% while respondents in Mathematics class had the least respondents (16.25%) who were of the opinion that there exist similarities in language used in the classroom and everyday conversation.

Use of Academic Language and Comprehension Among Students

Comprehension in every learning condition is very vital in the acquisition and impartation of knowledge, and the realization of this in the use of language is also very important.

Table 4. 5 shows the result of analysis of responses in all five course, to the question ;"Does the use of academic language enable you to comprehend what is being taught?

Table 4.5: Use of Academic language and comprehension

Academic Language	Frequency	Percentage
English Language		
It does	52	65.0
It doesn't	28	35.0
Total	**80**	**100.0**

Chemistry		
It does	66	82.5
It doesn't	14	17.5
Total	**80**	**100.0**
Physics		
It does	48	60.0
It doesn't	32	40.0
Total	**80**	**100.0**
Biology		
It does	74	92.5
It doesn't	6	7.5
Total	**80**	**100.0**
Mathematics		
It does	67	83.7
It doesn't	13	16.3
Total	**80**	**100.0**

The result in Table 4.5 shows that majority of the respondents in the five courses agreed that the use of academic language, though both comprising the use of registers and strictly formal from results in Table 4.3, and also different from everyday conversational language from Table 4.4, does not hinder their comprehension of what is being taught. This is evident from the

responses in all courses, that the use of academic language plays a significant role in the comprehension of what they are being taught. Worthy of note among them is Biology, which has the highest percentage of affirmation (92.5%). This is not surprising as Biology has the lowest percentage of those who agree that academic language is different from everyday conversational language as seen in Table 4.4. Physics, however, has the highest percentage of respondents who view the use of academic language as a hindrance to comprehension. In all, the results, confirm that the use of academic language does not hinder comprehension in the classroom.

Effect of Mother Tongue on Understanding and Comprehension of Academic Language

The mother tongue is the language that a child acquires from birth; it is the first language, which the child grows up to learn from the environment. In most cases, the mother tongue is usually related to the culture of the individual. The child acquires this first language, thinks and dreams in this language, identifies with it in almost every aspect. Then, the child begins school where he now learns the second language, which is English Language, and there is every tendency for the first language to interfere with the second language. The mother tongue in this section is used to represent the culture of the respondents. This also answers the third research question and also helps to achieve the third objective of this study which is to examine how cultural differences especially the mother tongue affects the comprehension and interpretation of academic language among students of Federal College of Forestry Mechanisation, Afaka.

TABLE 4.6: The Effect of Mother Tongue on Understanding of Academic Language and comprehension

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
English Language		
They do	58	72.5
They don't	22	27.5
Total	**80**	**100.0**
Chemistry		
They do	62	77.5
They don't	18	22.5
Total	**80**	**100.0**
Physics		
They do	56	70.0
They don't	24	30.0
Total	**80**	**100.0**
Biology		
They do	45	56.3
They don't	35	43.7
Total	**80**	**100.0**

Mathematics		
They do	17	21.3
They don't	63	78.7
Total	**80**	**100.0**

This is because all the respondents are second language learners and users of English language. From the responses obtained as analysed in Table 4.6, majority of the respondents in four of the courses affirmed that differences between their mother tongue and English language have significant impact on their understanding of the language used in the classroom. In other words, culture serves as a hindrance to the comprehension of academic language. However, this may be because they are all second language learners. The finding in the Mathematics class that is a significant percentage (78.7%) of the respondents are of the view that culture is not a hindrance to comprehension. This may be because of the use of symbols and figures in the classroom. However, a lower percentage 21.3 of respondents in the Mathematics class, view differences in both languages as a hindrance to comprehension. The result from the four courses however affirms that the differences between the mother tongue and English language serves as a hindrance to the comprehension of academic language.

Social Behaviour and its Impact on Comprehension of Students in the College.

The social behaviours of the students are simply the social activities which the students engage in outside their classroom setting, with other students. The question in this section is to know the kind of social activities which the respondents engage in as it pertains language. This is necessary because the students spend more time with their colleagues outside the classroom, and so there is the tendency that what they do outside the classroom would have an effect on what happens in the classroom. This is also to answer the fourth researchquestion of this study and also to fulfil the fourth objective of this study which is to analyse the impact of social behaviours on the comprehension and interpretation of academic language among students of Federal College of Forestry Mechanisation, Afaka.

TABLE 4.7: Social behaviour of students of the College and Language use.

Responses	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
English Language		
Use of substandard English	44	55.0
Use of Vernaculars	16	20.0
All of the above	20	25.0
Total	**80**	**100.0**

Chemistry		
Use of substandard English	41	51.2
Use of Vernaculars	6	7.5
All of the above	33	41.3
Total	**80**	**100.0**
Physics		
Use of substandard English	28	35.0
Use of Vernaculars	4	5.0
All of the above	48	60.0
Total	**80**	**100.0**
Biology		
Use of substandard English	61	76.2
Use of Vernaculars	13	16.3
All of the above	6	7.5
Total	**80**	**100.0**
Mathematics		
Use of substandard English	58	72.5
Use of Vernaculars	18	22.5
All of the above	4	5.0
Total	**80**	**100.0**

Results in Table 4.7 indicate that a large proportion of respondents in all the courses agree that the use of substandard English commonly called the "Broken English" is the most prevalent social behaviour, which the students indulge in, in relation to language use. This is seen in the results of the analyses as it is in the four out of the five courses with the highest percentages except for Physics students with 35%. Sixty percent (60%) of respondents in the Physics class assert that students indulge in both the use of substandard English and use of vernacular. From the results, it can be observed that in relation to the language use, students of the college engage mostly in the use of substandard English as a social behaviour. This is not strange as all respondents are youths of between the ages of 16-30 years, among who such behaviour is prevalent.

Table 4.8: The impact of social behaviour on comprehension and interpretation of academic language

Responses	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
English Language		
Yes	58	72.5
No	22	27.5
Total	**80**	**100.0**

Chemistry		
Yes	45	56.2
No	35	43.8
Total	**80**	**100.0**
Physics		
Yes	62	77.5
No	18	22.5
Total	**80**	**100.0**
Biology		
Yes	56	70.0
No	24	30.0
Total	**80**	**100.0**
Mathematics		
Yes	72	90.0
No	8	10.0
Total	**80**	**100.0**

Based on the analysis of responses in Table 4.8, significant percentage of respondents affirmed that social behaviours have negative impact on the comprehension and interpretation of academic language. This position attracted the highest percentage of 90% in Mathematics and the lowest (56.2%) chemistry. This is to confirm that the social behaviour that the

students of the college engage in relation to language use, which was established to be the use of substandard or broken English in Table 4.7 has a negative impact on the comprehension and interpretation of language used in the classroom.

Establishment of Impact of the IRE Sequence and Contextualization Cues in FCFM, Kaduna.

Tables 4.9 to 4.12 shows the responses of respondents to the fifth research question and also achieves the fifth objective of this study which is to analyse the impact of Hugh Mehan's IRE sequence and John Gumperz contextualisation cues on comprehension among students. Table 4.9 shows responses of students in the five courses to the question: "Would you feel better if a teacher is more informal in class?"

TABLE 4.9: The use of IRE and contextualization cues in FCFM, Kaduna

Responses	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
English Language		
Yes	58	72.5
No	22	27.5
Total	**80**	**100.0**

Chemistry		
Yes	48	60.0
No	32	40.0
Total	**80**	**100.0**
Physics		
Yes	50	60.0
No	30	40.0
Total	**80**	**100.0**
Biology		
Yes	76	95.0
No	4	5.0
Total	**80**	**100.0**
Mathematics		
Yes	61	76.3
No	19	23.7
Total	**80**	**100.0**

Table 4.9 reveals that a highly significant proportion of respondents in all the courses affirmed that they would be more comfortable when a lecturer is more informal in class. This gives the highest percentage of 95 in the Biology class followed by 76.3% Mathematics class, while Chemistry had the lowest percentage of 60. Notwithstanding, there is a lower percent of the

respondents who don't mind a lecturer being formal in class as reflected by students in the Chemistry class with a higher percentage of 40 in other courses. From the result, a lecturer's informality in class can set a comfortable atmosphere for comprehension.

TABLE 4.10. The impact of classroom participation on learning

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
English Language		
Yes	65	81.3
No	15	18.7
Total	**80**	**100.0**
Chemistry		
Yes	76	95.0
No	4	5.0
Total	**80**	**100.0**
Physics		
Yes	76	95.0
No	4	5.0
Total	**80**	**100.0**
Biology		
Yes	74	92.5
No	6	7.5
Total	**80**	**100.0**
Mathematics		
Yes	67	83.7
No	13	16.3
Total	**80**	**100.0**

A greater percentage in all courses with Chemistry and Physics having the highest of 95% each agree that full participation in class enhances comprehension as against a lower percentage who do not feel so. This confirms that when students are allowed full participation during lectures it enables them to learn more. The aim of question 9 is to establish Mehan's interactional sequence where the teacher plays the role of the expert whose primary instructional task is to elicit information from the student in order to ascertain that the student comprehend what is being taught.

Table 4.11: Responses on the relationship between when asked question and participation in class

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
English Language		
Yes	65	81.3
No	15	18.7
Total	**80**	**100.0**
Chemistry		
Yes	66	82.5
No	14	17.5
Total	**80**	**100.0**

Physics		
Yes	77	96.3
No	3	3.7
Total	**80**	**100.0**
Biology		
Yes	77	96.3
No	3	3.7
Total	**80**	**100.0**
Mathematics		
Yes	79	98.7
No	1	1.3
Total	**80**	**100.0**

From Table 4.11 a highly significant proportion of respondents agreed that they are motivated to participate more when they are asked questions in class. This is evident from the response in the Mathematics class that had the highest percentage of 98.7% to 81.3% of respondents with English language as the lowest that aligned with the position.

Table 4.12 shows the responses of the respondents in all courses on the question “When your lecturer uses contextualization cues like body language speech intonation etc do these help you to understand more of what he/she is trying to pass across”?.mThe aim of this question is to

establish Gumperz (1982), signalling mechanism of language and behaviour, which relate what is said to the contextual knowledge, which he called contextualization cues

Table 4.12: Impact of the use of contextualization

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
English Language		
Yes	65	81.3
No	15	18.7
Total	**80**	**100.0**
Chemistry		
Yes	76	95.0
No	4	5.0
Total	**80**	**100.0**
Physics		
Yes	64	80.0
No	16	20.0
Total	**80**	**100.0**
Biology		
Yes	68	85.0
No	12	15.0
Total	**80**	**100.0**

Mathematics		
Yes	77	96.3
No	3	3.7
Total	**80**	**100.0**

The responses obtained above prove that students comprehend more when the lecturer, as reflected by the high positive response by respondents in all courses with mathematics having the highest percentage of 96.3 uses contextualization cues. This result confirms that the use of contextualization cues by the lecturer is a motivation for comprehension in class.

4.1.2 ANALYSIS OF DATA COLLECTED THROUGH TAPE RECORDINGS

A total number of three tape recordings were analysed using Huge Mahan's IRE sequence. The tape recordings are for the following courses:

1. English Language and communication – PEL 012
2. Chemistry – CBC 012
3. Mathematics – Mth 012

Table 4.13: Analysis of classroom interaction in English language and communication – PEL 012

INITIATION	REPLY	EVALUATION
T: I want you to tell me the vowel sound in the following words then we can locate the word with the same sound alright? Okay pronounce the given word please?	Coup	-
T: Again?	S: Coup	T: Good
T: Now should that word have a short vowel sound or a long one?	S: Short!	T: I don't think so
	S: Long	T: That's what I think
T: So can you pronounce it with a long vowels sound now	S: Coup	T: So Coup!
T: Any Other option?	S: It's B	-
T: Okay pronounce the given word again	S: Coup	T: Excellent! Coup that correct!
T: Now pronounce option A	S: Book	
T: Does that have a short or long vowel?	S: Short!	
T: So does it have the same sound with the given word?	S: No!	T: Excellent
T: Pronounce Option B	S: CUP	

INITIATION	REPLY	EVALUATION
T: Again	S: Cup	T: Beautiful! Wow, I am really proud of you, you are getting it
T: Alright, does it have the same sound with the given word?	S:No	T: Okay
T: Let's go to C	S: (Murmuring)	
T: Try again	S: Curve	T:mmh try again
	S: Curve	-
T: I want to hear the 131 sound	S: Curve	T: That's better Curve

T: Okay does coup and curve have the same vowel sound?	S: No	
T: What do you think	S: It's not the answer	
T: How about D?	S: Bull	
T: Does Bull and coup have the same vowel sound?	S: yes	T: Yeah!
T: So what's the correct option?	S:D	T:Good!

Table 4.14: Analysis of Classroom interaction in Chemistry CBC 012

Initiation	Reply	Evaluation
T: Now Silicon, the word silicon belongs to what group	S: Group three S: Group Four	T: Justify that answer
T: Group three or four?	S: Three, Four (Chorus answer) S: (Comes to white board)	T: Now she has said it belongs to group four, come and use this method to prove it
T: Hadiza, come and prove it to us		T: Correct!
T: Yes can you justify it?	S: Using electronic configuration it belongs to group four	
T: Yes Hadiza, you known you have to prove everything to justify your answer	S: (Proves it on the board)	
T: But why group 4	S: Because of the valancy method	T: Hadiza you have tried, that is good

Table 4.15: Analysis of tape recording of classroom interactions in Additional Mathematics. MTH 012

Initiation	Reply	Evaluation
T: Now, the question says the ratio of the sizes are made on the strings is 3.4. Three ... is the same thing as saying 3/4 , am I not correct	S: mmh	
T: Now it now said in 4 months, in four months time the ratio of their size is 4:5. What you do is just change it into an equation	S: Ma, the last 25 is not ...	
T: What did you say?	S: You know it was... S: The nature of the price was given 3:4	
T: As how?	S: Then it is now said in 4 months the ratio of their prices would be 4:5 S: Then still you now have 3x + 44x + 5...	

	S: that's what I'm saying, the first month is unspecified	T: mmh
T: You want then to specify the first month?	S: Ma, the 4 months is for 4 month is for 4:5	T: 4/5 mmh...
		T: Yes this takes care of 4 months, 4 months on both sides, 4 here and 4 there

INITIATION	REPLY	EVALUATION
T: Now, it is said in 4 months, the ratio of their sizes in this, so you are just simply saying that in 4 months, taking this ratio is equal to this ratio, then you just cross multiply	S: Me, I don't understand oh	
T: Now are you saying that it's ratio 3:4	S: Ehn	T: Right
T: Now be cause you are looking for future value, it means you are saying in four months time, 4 months time for this and that	S: Where did the X come from S: eh-hen	T: the X?
T: X, you are having x because you are looking for a value at the end, when you have an equation, you put x because you want to find the value at the end	S: What is the answer?	
	S: ma let's resolve it	T: Ehn! you cross multiply
	S: Ma i didn't get you	T: Collect like terms that's all

From the above tables the English Language lecturer followed the Mehan's IRE sequence more and was able to arrive at a conclusion where the students understood clearly what the teacher was passing across. The lecturer took the time to monitor the student, and it was evident that the students needed the motivation to get to the evaluation stage. This is further strengthened by responses of respondent to the questions 7, 8, & 9 of the questionnaire, as analysed in tables 9, 10 and 11. The English teacher's goal in the interaction was to know if the students understood what they had already been taught by asking them to identify the word that had the same vowel sound as the word "goal". So she followed the students up gradually until they were able to get the correct answer.

The Chemistry lecturer also followed the IRE sequence by monitoring the students until he was able to establish that the students could identify the grouping and justify it. At the end of the lecture this was established.

The Mathematics teacher however, was not able to reach a conclusive answer with the students. The students did more of the initiation and that did not lead to a good conclusion.

4.2 Findings

From the presentation and discussion of the results above, this study has been able to address the set objectives. The respondents for this study were mainly of the male sex and fall within the age bracket of 16-30 years.

The study has also been able to establish that there is a significant difference between the academic language and the everyday conversational language, which the students engage in outside the classroom. However, some respondents still view the academic language and everyday conversational language a being similar.

Despite the significant difference between academic language and everyday conversational language, and the view of academic language being both informal and strictly formal, the respondents do not see the use of academic language as a hindrance to comprehension in the classroom. This result may be because the college is a science-based institution where the use of scientific registers is prevalent. Students are admitted into the college based on a good background in science courses at the secondary level. The students therefore at this stage are familiar and proficient in the use of science registers.

Another finding of this study, is that culture which plays an important role in the life of the respondents who are all second language learners and users of English language serves as a hindrance to comprehension in the classroom, as is seen in the high percentage of responses. Another hindrance as revealed by this study is the social behaviours, which students engage in relation to language use. It was established from the study that the students engage mostly in the use of substandard English, also known as Broken English. This

was affirmed to have a negative influence on the comprehension of academic language.

The use of the IRE sequence by the lecturer goes a long way in motivating the students to participate fully in class, which in turn enables the lecturer to detect the students' weakness in order to assist the student towards comprehension.

Finally, the use of Gumperz's contextualization cues also serve as a great motivation, as indicated by the positive response of a large number of the respondents. The goal of the lecturer as he/she teaches is to be able to impart knowledge that is why comprehension has become pertinent in the classroom.

The findings above have been able to refute the theory and findings of various scholars like Hamayan and Perlman (1990), O'Mally (1992), Valdez Pierce and O'mally (1991) who view academic language for second language users of English Language as a compilation of unique language functions and structures which are difficult to understand, thereby hindering comprehension. From the result of the analysis, though the students find academic language as being different from their everyday conversational language, it does not hinder their comprehension in class as seen from the results. This study corroborates Cummins (1981) view that students rely move on verbal and spoken language in class, as there is less use of situational and paralinguistic cues in class, compared to outside the class.

This is seen from responses in table 4.12 where a high percentage of students agree that where there is the use of contextualization cues the students comprehend more.

The study also corroborates Barnes (1969) assertion that the students comprehension in class depends on the kind of questions the teacher asks in class. This is ascertained from the analysis of the tape recordings of classroom interaction using Huge Mehan's IRE sequence. Here the teachers questions spur the students to participate more in class which in turn helps the teacher to ascertain the level of the students' comprehension.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

5.0 SUMMARY

This work focused on a sociolinguistic analysis of classroom interactional patterns in Federal College of Forestry Mechanization Afaka, Kaduna. Chapter one centred on the background of the study, the aims and objectives of the study, statement of the research problem, presentation of the research questions and the significance of the study. Chapter two reviewed related literature to the work, focusing on areas such as Interactional Sociolinguistics and the speech act theory, academic language and classroom interaction, culture and academic discourse, language function, and the theoretical framework. Chapter three, presented the methodology adopted in the study, with particular attention on sources of data, method of data collection and method of data analysis. Chapter four centred on analysis of data collected through the tape recordings of classroom interaction using Hugh Mahan's IRE sequence and questionnaire administered and analysed using simple statistical methods.

This study has been able to ascertain that there is a significant difference between Academic Language and everyday conversational language. This difference however does not hinder comprehension as seen from the results of the analysis, the basic hindrances to communication as the analysis shows are culture and social behaviours of students outside the classroom. Also

from the study, the students find motivation towards comprehension from the use of contextualization cues and adhering to the IRE sequence as founded by Huge Mehan (1971)

5.1 CONCLUSION

In the analysis of the data collected through the questionnaires administered, it was found that the basic hindrances to comprehension in the College are cultural. This is because being second language learners of English Language and coming from different cultural background, the respondents find the differences in their culture and English language as a hindrance. Secondly, the respondents are of the youthful age bracket of between 16-30yrs, and they engage in the use of substandard English or Broken English as it is commonly called. This, from the results obtained, serve as a hindrance to their comprehension of academic language

The results of analyses of the data collected through the tape recordings using Hugh Mehan's IRE Sequence, shows that for the students of Federal College of Forestry Mechanization, who are second language learners of English, this sequence serves as a motivator towards comprehension, and this was confirmed by the results in the analysis of English Language and Chemistry. However, in the Mathematics classroom, the IRE sequence was not adhered to. Hence, the result shows that the students ended up being confused and therefore could not comprehend adequately.

However, based on John Gumperz contextualization cues and Hugh Mehan's IRE sequence, there is hope. The use of the above methods shows a positive step towards better comprehension of the academic language for students of Federal College of Forestry Mechanization, Afaka, who are all second language learners and users of English language.

5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

From the result of analysis of data obtained from this research, the researcher wishes to proffer the following recommendations:

1. Students should have a sound background of English language before being admitted into institutions of higher learning. This should be ascertained not only through their West African School Certificate results and JAMB results, but also through oral interviews conducted before admissions.
2. Oral English should be a core subject in its own right from the Junior Secondary Level.
3. Students should be taught the importance of engaging in correct English, even outside their classrooms.
4. Lecturers should be sent on refresher courses on the basics of classroom interaction, especially lecturers who do not have a background in education.
5. Lectures should adhere as much as possible to the IRE sequence, as it enhances comprehension.

5.3 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

This study cannot be said to be conclusive, there are basic aspects in it which could still be looked into. The research therefore wish to suggest that further research could still be carried out on classroom interactional patterns. Other theories not used in this work could be adopted as models for better comprehension, especially by second language users of English Language, where it is the medium of transmitting knowledge.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abedris, D and Roux, M (2006) Vous Tutoie-tu. Retrieved, July 25, 2010 From http://carrieve

Albert, M and Obler, L.K (1978) The Bilingual Brain, New York: Academic Press. Cited in Challnell (1988)

Allard, D, Bourdeau, J, and Mizoguchi, R (2011) Addressing Cross Linguistic Influence and Related Cultural factors Using Computer Assisted Language Learning. In E. Blanchard & D. Allard (Eds) Handbook of Research on Culturally-aware Information technology: Perspectives and Models. (PP 582-589)
Hershey PA: IGI Global

Ballack, A.A, Idiebard, H.M, Hyman, R.T and Smith, F.L (1966). *The language of the Classroom*. New York: teachers College Press

Barnes, D (1969) "Language in the Secondary Classroom'. In SD. Barnes, J
Britton and H. Rosen, *Language, the Learner and the School*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books

Berger, P.L. and Luckmann, T. (1966). *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge* Garden city NY: Doubleday

Bialystok, E (1994) Analysis and Contrd in Development of Second Language
Proficiency Studies in Second Language Acquisition 16.2:157-168

Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language.* New York Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
Blum-Kulka, S and Levenston, E (1983) *Universals of Lexical Simplification in Strategies in Inter Language Communication*, London Longman

Cazden, CB (1988). *Classroom Discourse: The language of Teaching and Learning*. Portsmouth NH: Heinemann.

Chamot, A and O'mally, M.J (1986). "A Cognitive Academic Learning Approach:
An ESL content based curriculum" Wheaton MD: National clearinghouse for Bilingua Education.

Colpaert, J (2006) Pedagogy-driven Design for Online Language Teaching and
Learning. Colico Journal, 23 (3) 477-498

Cummins, J. (1981). "The Role of Primary Language Development in Promoting Educational Success for Language Minority Students. In schooling and language Minority Students" A theoretical framework (pp 3-50), Los Angeles; California State University

Dwinastiti, Marlin (2013). *Language Interference* London and New York . Guilford Press

Ellis, Rod (1986). *Understanding Second Language Acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Faerch, C and Kasper, G (1983) Cognitive Dimensions of Language Transfer in Kellerman, E and Sharwood-Smith, M (eds) 1983: *Crosslinguistic influence in Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press

Flanders, N.A. (1965) "Teacher Influence, Pupil Attitude and Achievement". *Co-operative Research Monographs* No 12 US Office of Education. U.S. Government Printing Offices

Goffman, E. (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Anchor Books

Gumperz, J. J (1982A). *Discourse Strategies* Cambridge and New York; Cambridge University Press

Gumperz, J.J (1982B). *Language and Social Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Halliday, M.A.K (1989). Some Grammatical Problems in Scientific English. Paper presented to the Society of Pakistani English Language Teachers, Karachi, Pakistan.

Halliday, M.A.K., Mc Intosh, A and Strevens P. (1964). *The Linguistic Science and Language Teaching.* London; Longman

Hamayan, E and Perlman, R (1990). "Helping language minority students after they exist from bilingual/ESL programs", Washington, DC: National clearinghouse for Bilingual Education

Hasan, R (1968) "Grammatical Cohesion in Spoken and Written English". Part 1. Schools Council Programme in *Linguistics and English teaching*. Paper 7. London: Longman

Holstein, J.A. and Gumbrium, J. F (eds) (2007). *Handbook of Constructionist Research.* London and New York; Guilford press.

Hymes, D (1964) *Introduction: Towards Ethnographies of Communication*. In J.J. Gumpers and D. Hymes (eds)

Lemke, J (1990) *Talking Science; Language learning and Values*. New York: Ablex

Lemke, J. L. (1985). "Using language in the Classroom Knowledge: Reading Lessons". *Curriculum Inquiry*. 15, 247 – 279

Levinson, S. (1983) *Pragmatics* Cambridge University Press

Lott, D. (1983) Analysing and counteracting interference Errors. ELT Journal, 37 (3), 256 - 261

Macias, J. (1990). "Scholastic antecedents of immigrant students: Schooling in a Mexican immigrant-sending community". *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 21, 291-318

McCarthy, M. (1991). *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge University Press

McCollum, P. (1989) "Turn-allocation in lessons with North American and Puerto Rican Students: A comparative study". Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 20, 133-156

Mehan H. (1979). *Learning Lessons: Social organization in the classroom.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Michaels, S. and Collins, J (1984). "Oral discourse styles: Classroom interaction and the acquisition of literacy". In D. Tannen (Ed*), Cohesion in Spoken and Written discourse* Norwood, NJ: Ablex

Mitchell, T.F (1957). The language of Buying and selling in Cyrenaica' *Hespens* 44. 1 and 2

National Science Teachers Association (1991) "Scope, sequence and coordination of secondary school science". Washington

Ochs, E. (1993) "Constructing social identify: A language socialization perspective), Research on language and social interaction", 26 (3): 287-306

O'Mally, J. M. (1992). Response to Jack Domicos's Presentation. In Proceedings of the Second National Research Symposium on Limited English Proficient Student. Issues (Pp 173-182) Washington DC: US Department of Education

Philips, S. (1983). "The invisible Culture: Communication in Classroom and Community on the Warm Spring Indian reservations". Prospect heights: Waveland

Ripich, D and Spinelli F. (1985). “Discourse and Education”. In D. Ripich and F Spindli (Eds), *School discourse problems*. San Diego, College Hill

Schifrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to Discourse.* Malden, MA, Blackwell.

Selinker, L (1992) *Language transfer in Language Learning*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia

Shastic, P (2010) *Communicative Approach to the teaching of English as A Second Language.* Mumbal: Himalaya Publishing House

Shastri, Pratima Dave (2010). *Communicative Approach To The Teaching of English as A Second Language*. Mumnai: Himalaya Publishing House

Short, D (1994). “Expanding Middle School Horizons: Integrating language culture and social studies”. Tesol Quarterly, 28, 581 – 608

Sinclair, J. MCH and Coulthard, T. (1975). *Towards an Analysis of Discourse, The English used by teachers and pupils*. London: Oxford University press

Spanos, G. Rhodes, N. Dale, T and Crandall, J (1988). “Linguistic features of Mathematical Problem solving: Insights and applications” In R.R Cocking and J.P. Metre (Eds), *Linguistic and cultural influences on mathematics learning.* Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erbaum

Surono, A (2013). *Guidelines on Applied Linguistics*. Yogyakarta

Surono (2013). *Guidelines on Applied Linguistics*. Yogyakarta

Tannen, D (1990). *You just don’t understand: Women and men in conversation.* New York: Morrow

Twitchin, J (Director) (1979). “Crosstalk”. (Film/Video) B.B.C

Valdez Pierce, L and O’mally, J.M (1992). “Performance and portfolio assessment for language Minority students”. Washington D.C: National clearing house for Bilingual Education

APPENDIX I

This questionnaire is for Research and Academic Purpose, all responses would be treated confidentially.

Research Topic: A Sociolinguistic Analysis of the language of Academic Discourse

SECTION A:

1. AGE: 16-25yrs [ ] 26-30yrs [ ] 31-35yrs [ ] 36 & above [ ]
2. SEX: Male [ ] Female [ ]
3. COURSE CODE:
4. COURSE TITLE:

SECTION B:

1. The Language used in the classroom (Academic Language) is different from everyday conversational language

   Agreed [ ] Disagree [ ]

2. There are similarities between the language used in the classroom and everyday conversational language

   Agreed [ ] Disagree [ ]

3. What are the features of academic language among students and lecturers in your college?

a. Informal (Use of Registers)

b. Strictly formal

c. All of the above

4. To what extent does the use of academic language enable you to comprehend what is being taught?

   They do [ ] They don't [ ]

5. Differences between your mother tongue and English Language affect the understanding of the English Language used in the classroom in your College?

   Agreed [ ] Disagree [ ]

6. Would you feel better if a lecturer is more informal in class?

   Yes [ ] No [ ]

7. Would you learn more when you participate fully in class?

   Yes [ ] No [ ]

8. Do you feel motivated to participate when you are asked questions in class?

   Yes [ ] No [ ]

9. When your lecturer uses contextualization cues like body language, speech intonation, do these help you to understand more of what he/she is trying to pass across?

   Yes [ ] No [ ]

10. When the lecturer takes the lead in asking questions in class, does it help you to understand more of what he/she is teaching?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

11. What are the social behaviours of students in your college pertaining language?

a. Use of substandard English (Broken English)

b. Use of Pidgin English

c. Use of Vernaculars

d. All of the above

12. Do the social behaviours mentioned in 11 above have any impact on the comprehension and interpretation of academic language?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

APPENDIX II

MATHEMATIC, MTH 012

T: Now the question says the ratio of the sizes are moved on the strings is 3:4. Three.... is the same thing as saying ¾, am i not correct

S: mmh

T: Now, it now said in months in four months time the ratio of their size is 4:5. What you do is just change it into an equation

S: Ma, the last 25 is not...

T: What did you say?

S: You know it was...

T: As how?

S: The nature of the price was given 3:4

T: mmh

S: Then it is not said in 4 months the ratio of their prices would be 4:5

T: 4/5mmh

S: The still you now have 3x + 4, 4x + 5...

T: Yes this take care of 4 months, 4 months on both sides, 4 here and 4 there

S: That's what I'm saying, the first month is unspecified

T: You want them to specify the first month?

S: Ma the 4 months is for 4:5

T: Now, it is said in 4 months, the ratio of their sizes in this, so you are just simply saying that in 4 months, taking this ratio is equal to this ratio, then you just cross multiply...

S: Me, i don't understand oh

T: Now are you saying that it's ratio, 3:4

S: Ehn

T: Right

T: Now because you are looking for future value, it means you are saying in four months time, 4 months time for this and that

S: Where did the X come from

T: The X?

S: Eh-hen

T: X, you are having x because you are looking for a value at the end, when you have an equation, you put X because you want to find the value at the end

S: Ma have you solve?

T: Yes i have

S: What is the Answer?

T: Ehn! You cross multiply

S: Ma I didn’t get you

T: Collect like terms that’s all

S: We see that one element falls in the same group and at the same time has a different period is there any relationship

T: This element

S: Yes sir, what I'm trying to say is, like sodium which you just explained Sir, is in this group and in this period, so this period does it have any relationship with this group

T: What I've said is that you look as it from 2 perspectives either you look at it from the columns or from the horizontal

S: Thank you

T: Now justify your answer, using electronic configuration or... do you understand the question?

T: Now silicon, the word silicon belong to what group

S: Group three!

T: Group Three or group four

S: Three, four (Chorus answer)

T: Justify that statement with electronic configuration

T: ... come and prove it to us

S: Using electronic cont it belongs to group 4

T: Now she has said it belong to group four, how come and use this same method to proof it

T: Yes Hadiza, you know you have to rove everything to justify your answer

S: (Prove it on the board)

T: Correct! But why is it group 4

S: Because.....

T: Hadiza you have tired, so the answer is group 4, period 3, the simple reason why it is so is because using the electronic cont by valency method and valency electron is the number of electron a particular energy can hold.

ORAL ENGLISH PEL 015

T: Can you all say book?

S: Book

T: Book

S: Book

T: Please give me that book! Can you repeat after me?

S: Please give me that book

T: Who took my book?

S: Who took my book

T: I looking for my book

S: I'm looking for my book

T: Where's my book?

S: Repeat

T: So this is the (u) sound, and its shout (u)

T: Okay so what the correct answer now

S: B

T: Okay no I want you to remember that this sound (O) is in this other word... and it's the same sound as that in put but the spelling input is U while its double O in hook, look, book etc. However you should remember that it's not a rule that all OO should I mean all words that have OO in them are pronounced (U) e.g. pool is pronounced with d long vowel sound.

T: Good, what did i just say?

S: Good

T: What vowel sound is in that word?

S: Short (U)

T: Pronounce d sound

S: (U)

T: Is it long or short?

U: Short

T: Pronounce it again

S: (U)

T: Okay good lets continue shall we?

S: Yes

T: I want you to tell me am the vowel sound in these following words and then we can locate the word... alright? Okay pronounce these given words please?

S: Coup

T: Again?

S: Repeat

T: Now should that word have a short sound or a long one

S: Short!

T: I don’t think so

S: Long

T: That's what I think, so can you pronounce it with a long vowel sound now

S: Coup

T: Repeat after me coup

S: Coup

T: A coup d'etat

S: Coup d'etat

T: There was a coup d'etat in Niger last week

T: I want you to tell me the vowel sound in these following words and then we can locate the word with the same sound alright? Okay pronounce these given word please – I

S: Coup – R

T: Again? – I

S: Coup – R

T: Good now should that word have a short vowel sound to a long one? E & I

S: Short? – R

T: I don't think so – E

S: Long – R

T: That's what I think, so can you pronounce it with a long vowel sound now? – E

S: Coup

T: So coup, now tell me, looking at the options what do you think is the correct answer? A B C or D?

S: C

T: Any other option?

S: Its B

T: Okay, pronounce the given word again

S: Coup

T: Excellent, coup that's correct, now pronounce option A

S: Book

T: Does that have a short or a long vowel?

S: Short

T: So does it have the same sound with the given word?

S: No

T: Excellent pronounce option B

S: Cup

T: Again

S: Cup

T: Beautiful, now I'm really proud of you, you are getting it. Almighty, does it have the same sound with the given word?

S: No

T: Okay let's go to C

S: (inaudible)

T: mmh try again

S: Curve

T: mmh try again

S: Curve

T: I want to hear the (S) sound

S: Curve (Pronounced correctly)

T: That’s better curve

S: Curve

T: Okay does coup and curve have the same vowel sound?

S: No

T: What do you think?

S: It’s not the answer

T: How about D

S: Bull

T: Does Bull and coup have the same vowel sound

S: Yes

T: Yeah, so what is the correct option?

S: D

T: Good