

## The Reality Construction of Teachers' Texts in Class

Anita Purba<sup>1</sup>

Eddy Setia<sup>2</sup>

Amrin Saragih<sup>3</sup>

Busmin Gurning<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup> Post-Graduate Department of Linguistics  
Faculty of Cultural Sciences University of Sumatera Utara  
Jl. dr. Mansoer No. 1 Medan 20155 (Indonesia)

<sup>3,4</sup> Faculty of Language and Art Universitas Negeri Medan  
Jl. Willem Iskandar, Pasar V Medan Estate 20221 (Indonesia)

### Abstract

*The attention towards the teachers' texts (TTs) which are viewed from the reality construction can actually assist the teachers to evaluate both the teaching materials and their students' capabilities after they teach their students. This study tries to examine the teachers' power and ideology which are seen from the use of the teachers' texts in the classrooms. This study employed the qualitative-descriptive method. Fairclough's concept of teacher text vocabulary (TTV) which is part of the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) was mainly used; TTV has three dimensional models, i.e., dimension 1: vocabulary description of TTs, dimension 2: interpretation of TTs, and dimension 3: explanation. The data was taken from texts spoken by four teachers. The preliminary results showed that the vocabularies in personal pronouns were proved to show the distance between the teachers and their students and to indicate the teachers' inconsistency in identifying themselves and their students; those in expressives consisted of negative resentment, anger, sarcasm, underestimate, urge, and railing. Vocabularies in ideology always exhibited students' impatience, lack of confidence, and in a hurry in completing their tasks. The strategies in the ideology development in TTs were influenced by two factors: (a) the reinforcement of students' negative characters and (b) the reduction of students' positive values. Teachers' ideology in TTs brought the negative image to the students and the unequal relationships among teachers and students. The conclusion can be drawn that the teachers' power, authority, and domination became the dominant factors in their texts.*

**Key Words:** reality construction, power, ideology, teachers' text, vocabulary.

### 1. Introduction

In the state budget, fund allocation for education sector is aimed at improving the quality of education. With this allocation, in fact, Indonesian education level or quality can be increased and Indonesia becomes competitive among other countries either in Southeast Asia or in Asia. However, this level is more or less achievable and achievement is influenced by some factors.

One of the factors is that Indonesian students are not at ease to understand the teachers' texts although hard efforts have been applied to stimulate them grasp the texts. Teachers as the center of figures in the classrooms feel wonder about these conditions. The teachers' attitudes in the production of texts become the reflection of their ideology which can cover their minds and belief systems and their viewson students' position. Some questions can be raised: Do teachers look at themselves and their students in the superior-subordinate relation? or Can teachersbe motivators and facilitators among their students who should be placed as partners? In addition, do teachers play dominant positions in the classrooms? All these questions will be seen from two aspects of relationship between language and power as it is proposed by Fairclough (1989). What needs to know is that power sits behind the language and it works with language. Thus, the texts here are the uses of language in the real form of social practice although discourse analysis is always relevant with sociocultural practices.

## **2. Review of Related Literature**

The Undang-Undang No. 14 In 2005 stated that teachers are professionals who are obligated to always uphold the Code Master, so that the honor and dignity of teachers in the discharge of professionalism can be maintained. The main task of the teacher is trying to develop all potential students optimally, so that they can be independent and develop into intelligent human beings, good, smart physically, intellectually, socially, emotionally, morally and spiritually. As a logical consequence of the task in hand, the teacher continues to interact and communicate with their students. When carrying out research on fifth year students at SD Jatinegara Kaum 05 Pagi Pulo Gadung, East Jakarta.

Nurhayati (2010) argues that there are a number of social practices that carry teachers' hegemony to their students. Some factors, she adds, in the teachers' hegemony are related to the teachers' authority as regulators of the class discipline, material givers, actors with dominant roles, and as human beings who know all. She also argues there are inconsistencies in the practice of teachers' behavior in class. She found in her research that teachers showed their impatience when students were still thinking to give responses. What is also interesting during her study is that a change of behavior among teachers happened in the middle of learning process. This was marked by a change of function from conventional paradigm to nonconventional one.

When doing research on two TV stations (Metro TV and TV One) which broadcasted news about Sidoarjo mudflow in the case of Lumpur Lapindo Fauzan (2014) brought the news in the perspectives of structure of the text, grammar, and vocabulary. He concluded there were different ideology and strategy between the two stations. TV One more focused on the case but Metro TV did the opposite. Temple (2008) explored the application of model-based competence in mathematics learning in classroom at a high school in northwestern Romania. She noted how teachers gave instruction in the classroom.

The results she got from this research was that the use of competency-based approach to mathematics could not only engage students in ways that corresponded to mathematics but teachers more focused on language instruction. They hoped this form of instruction could attract students and they would get potential students in mathematics. Reece (2009) investigated the students' participation in ELL (English Language Learning). Teachers asked their students to understand texts academically and socially. The results of this study indicated that teachers helped students' participation in constructing the meaning of the texts under the condition that the teachers were available in the class or not. Moreover, students liked to choose dialogue in order they were more involved in the meaning construction of the texts.

## **3. Research Method**

This study is qualitative and was carried out to seek data from TTs when the teachers taught Bahasa Indonesia at Junior High School. There were four TTs; each of them was taught for 40 minutes. The processes of data collection involved the choosing of location, subjects (teachers), recording the TTs from the beginning up to the end of the lesson, listening and transcribing the records, and classifying the forms of clauses. The data were then analyzed by using CDA by focusing on three dimensional patterns: initially, the linguistic vocabulary (personal pronoun, expressive vocabulary and vocabulary of ideology), the dimension of interpretation on the level of producers (teachers) and consumers (students), and lastly, the level of explanation to the text which was based on the TTs real environment.

## **4. Results and Discussion**

### **4.1. Results**

Language description of TTs include vocabulary of personal pronouns, expressive vocabulary and ideological vocabulary.

#### **4.1.1 Vocabulary of personal pronouns**

#### **4.1.1.1 Personal pronouns in TT1**

Vocabulary of personal pronouns in TT1 was marked by the uses of 'we' with reference to teachers as well as to his subject and of 'you' which was addressed to their students, to the teacher himself, and to the teachers themselves. Teachers mentioned their names twice but the use of personal pronouns to refer to teachers were not found.

#### **4.1.1.2 Personal pronouns in TT2**

In TT2 vocabulary of personal pronouns could be summarized that teachers used the pronouns 'I' to call themselves, 'you' (PL) to refer to their students, 'we' to themselves and their disciple, 'you' to students, 'little brother/sister' to students, 'you' to refer to students, and teachers call their names seven times.

#### **4.1.1.3 Personal pronouns in TT3**

Vocabulary of personal pronouns in TT3 is characterized by the use of 'mam' or 'bu' (mother/mam) to refer to teachers, 'I' to refer to themselves, 'we' to themselves and their subjects, 'you' to themselves, and to mention teachers' names for fifteen times.

#### **4.1.1.4 Personal pronouns in TT4**

In TT4 the vocabulary of personal pronouns can be indicated by the use of 'I' to attribute teachers' themselves, 'we' to assign to teachers and their disciples, 'you' to refer to their students, 'children' to mention their students, and teachers call their names four times.

#### **4.1.2 Expressive Vocabulary of TT**

About this section the data can be seen in Appendix 1.

#### **4.1.3 Ideological vocabulary of TT**

Ideological vocabularies are used in indicating the way people think or belief that has become the basis for determining its position. In the words of Ideological there are certain words that fought through an ideological and often appears, specific words dominant and naturalized to the reader/listener. The word has been repeated in various speech events. These are general characteristics of certain institutions and vocabularies that are ideologically inappropriate or appropriate. The whole data can be found in Appendix 2.

### **4.2 Discussion**

As stated above discussion is primarily based on three dimensional model as proposed by Fairclough, namely, vocabulary description, interpretation, and relationship.

#### **4.2.1. Vocabulary Description of TT.**

This section covers the personal pronouns, expressive, and ideological vocabularies.

##### **4.2.1.1 Vocabularies of Personal Pronominals in TT**

The vocabularies of personal pronominals in TT referred to teachers, teachers as well as their students and to students in single or plural forms. Vocabularies which were used by teachers varied greatly with nature and amount. There were ten types of pronominals, such as, kita (III PL), kalian (II PL), kamu (II SG/PL), kau (II SG/PL), saya (I SG), anda (II SG/PL), dek/adek (little brother/sister), aku (I), ibu (mam), and nama diri (self-reference). Teachers used pronominals ibu, aku and saya as self-reference. However, there was a teacher who did not use pronominals to refer him/her self. To call students teachers were accustomed to saying kalian, kamu, kau, anda, and dek.

To make equal relationship between teachers and students, teachers should mention the pronominal *kita*. All teachers were happy to use pronominals *kami/kita*, *kau*, and students' names. The dominant vocabularies were *kalian*, *kau* dan *kita*. The pronominals *ibu*, *aku* and *saya* were addressed to selves or teachers. This means there was a good relation between teachers and students. The pronominal *ibu* means that the teachers placed students as their sons and daughters, while the pronominals *aku* and *saya* to refer to respectively informal but intimate and formal with distance. In some TTs there were teachers who did not use pronominals at all to refer to themselves; this shows that the teachers tried to hide their identity or to camouflage themselves among students.

Meanwhile, the pronominals *kalian*, *kamu*, *kau*, *anda*, *dek* were uttered to refer to students. This condition reflected the teachers' inconsistency to call students either in singular or plural forms. The use of informal pronominal *kita* was addressed to selves and students and this means that teachers made equal position with students and no distance between the teachers and the students. This condition occurred because teachers wanted themselves to cooperate with students in carrying out activities in the class.

#### **4.2.1.2 Expressive Vocabulary in TT**

All teachers in TT were recognized to produce expressive vocabularies or negative and emotional words as shown in (1) to (17). These vocabularies are expressed when teachers experienced some bad moods, such as, annoyed, angry, sarcastic with smooth, as well as underestimated, urged, imposed the will, and railed the students' conducts in the class. All these vocabularies were actually negative and were not appropriate to be used for students in the class. See also examples in (18)-(26)

#### **4.2.1.3 Ideological vocabulary in TT**

All teachers produced ideological vocabularies, such as, *kalian*, *cepat*, *nanti aja*, *perhatikan apa itu?*, *kau bilang tau*, *kau dari dulu suaramu paling kuat*, *mengerti maksudnya?*, *ayo*, *namanya*, *kamu*, *woi*, *kita*, *membaca indeks itu gunanya*, *membantu siapa?*, *satu kelompok*, *dua puluh menit*, *waktu masih ada sepuluh menit lagi*, *sudah?*, *terus*, *makna konotasi*, *apa artinya?*, *maknanya menyempit*, *gila*, *contoh*, *oke iya*, *kau*, *cepat*, and *ya*. All these vocabularies indicated inner atmospheres, for example, impatient to wait, lack of confidence, in a hurry and willingness to finish his teaching duties quickly. Teachers also liked to emphasize the ideological vocabularies to embarrass a student in front of other students. Normally, teachers should be more patient when students still thought to say their answers and by repeating questions the teachers forced the students to respond quickly. Teachers were seen not so smart in dividing time in the class; as a result, they were judged not capable in teaching and in class management. These proofs were relevant with what Halliday and Matthiesen (2004) said "expressing the speaker's subjective attitude to the thing, or else; as a marker of the quality; opinion of the speaker about something".

#### **4.2.2 Interpretation of TT**

The second dimension is to interpret the relationship between TT and intertextual context or discourse practice of TT. Discourse analysis focuses on how the production and consumption of text. Text is formed through a practice of discourse which determine how the text is formed. All practices during the process of text production and consumption are considered the practices of discourses (Eryanto, 2001: 317). The relationship between text and context of situation and intertextual context can then be waived as it was stated by Fairclough (1989: 147) "text interpreter comes to conclusion to interpret the discourse constructed in the text. The interpretation was influenced by four dimensions: what happened, who were involved, what relationship was available in the issues and what was the role of language in the text."

##### **4.2.2.1 What happened?**

Master texts are texts produced by a teacher when he/she delivers lesson in the classroom for 40 minutes. Teacher texts here were produced in Bahasa Indonesia covering the following topics, such as, TT1 with 'official letter' as the topic, TT2 'the important things when storytelling', TT3 'reading index' and TT4 'meaning'. Teachers in their

TTs took their role to convey verbal information to his students and the information was hoped to be understood by by students. The teachers in this research were interpreted to only deliver information without caring whether or not students caught it well. When the subject matter was finished taught in the specified time in 45 minutes so the teachers' duty was over. In the classroom teachers not only taught but also motivated, encouraged, and gave other positive advices to their students. However, in this research, teachers actually did inappropriate things, such as, ridicule, insult, discredit, rail and so on.

#### **4.2.2.2 Who were involved?**

Teachers who produced texts are called the producers. In this case, the producers were all the teachers teaching Bahasa Indonesian in different classes and in different topics. The consumers were all the junior high school students at two different schools and in four different classes. The interaction between teachers and students was tied by their formal involvement in schools but not by individual choice or by the act of choosing each other among students. Teachers carried out their duties and the students performed their duties.

#### **4.2.2.3 What relationship was available in the issues?**

The relationship between teachers and students is in a mutual demand and they were directly involved in one location, namely, a class or a school. Teachers played an important role and had good strategies; they were also expected to be able to communicate, to possess good capabilities at parenting and to become study fellows among students. The establishment of communication among teachers, or between teachers and students, or among students can not be separated from the way teachers teach in the classrooms; they should create effective learning atmosphere. Teachers should be able to motivate students by involving them in the teaching process as well as in the creation of students' interests. All teachers carried out one-way communication by completely controlling the flow of information. The teachers were not able to establish mutual communication or bidirectional.

They failed to build two-way communication and they did not give enough time for students to answer questions from teachers. Unluckily, teachers even answered their questions. Teachers seemed to act in a hurry, that is, how to pursue only one goal how to finish teaching material as soon as possible. Teachers did not also pay attention to students whether or not they understood the materials. Teachers did not try to develop potential students to perform optimally independent and to make them good and smart physically, intellectually, socially, emotionally, morally and spiritually.

#### **4.2.2.4 What was the role of language in the text?**

The role of language in TT was very dominant because language could determine the teachers' presence in the class. Language could be used as a means of transforming ideology and teachers' identity. Students as listeners in the class were requested to obey teachers although they did not have the time to argue their opinions.

### **4.2.3 Explanation**

Explanation of TT was related to sociocultural practices which was defined as the relationship between interaction and social context and between social context of production and social context of interpretation. Analysis of sociocultural practices were based on the assumption that the social context outside the text affected the discourse appearing in the text. This practice was not directly related to the production of texts but to how the text was produced. Explanation consisted of three levels of analysis, namely, situational, institutional, and social aspects. In this section the researchers analyzed those aspects with regard to the process of TT in the classroom.

#### **4.2.3.1 Situational**

Teaching can be defined as the class situation fulfilled by the activities which are carried by teachers who deliver materials to students in a classroom. In this research, in teaching teachers use language as a medium of communication. While teaching they spoke dominantly while students were less active or even had no chance to speak. The teachers' role in the teaching process was to move freely to and fro in the classroom--standing, sitting and sometimes writing--while students just sat, heard and did what they were told to do. In one classroom teacher divided the students into groups; each group was instructed to find the index of a textbook. Unfortunately, teachers kept talking without giving opportunities to students to work in their groups.

Some students were often felt interrupted due to finish the task and to hear teachers talking. This situation showed that teachers dominated almost all activities in the classroom.

#### **4.2.3.2 Institutional**

School is an institution designed for student learning under the supervision of teachers. School becomes formal educational institution where students and teachers interact, where teachers give lessons and students receive lessons. Then, teachers and students are two main components as well as other secondary components. These two components have important role in the process of learning and teaching. Activities between teachers and students should be complementary based on mutual relationship. The fact was, during the research, that such activities could not be fulfilled. Only very few students looked to study and received lessons well. Teachers seemed to just finish their materials by following the schedules in the school curriculum; this means that teachers did not have specific programs to run the materials perfectly.

#### **4.2.3.3 Social**

The social context in discourse is considered primary over written or spoken language. Therefore, discourse can be influenced by social or community groups but it can also influence such social discourse. The process of discourse production is marked by the availability of text when teachers teach in the classroom. In this project, relationship between teachers and students seemed unintimate. Teachers and students did not build their relationship in close, comfortable and familiar manners. The language used by teachers were filled by professional language but not by cultural context. As a result, teachers failed to maintain relationships with students professionally and culturally and they could not become real teachers.

#### **4.3. Findings**

Some interesting findings can be summarized. There were 257 clauses in TT1, 283 in TT2, 423 in TT3, and 358 in TGT. TTs dominated (90-95%) the discourse in the classroom while students only responded 5-7% by saying yes, no, already, yet, know, understand etc. Teachers felt impatient to wait for students' answers and this condition let teachers make answers. All TTs were produced by teachers and this indicated the teachers' power. All these are in accordance with Fairclough (1989), Mill (1995), Van Dijk (2000) and Santoso (2012) that a person's ideology is filled by the use of vocabulary either formal or expressive and as Van Dijk (1991, 1998) argued that "Ideology is the basis of the social representations shared by members of a group." This research was not in line with Van Leeuwen (2008) and Widowson's (2004) CDA. This research indicated "hidden message" in the TTs as argued by Fairclough (1989). The study was relevant with Mills (1997) and Van Dijk (2006).

#### **5. Conclusion**

The vocabularies in personal pronominals indicate teachers' inconsistency in calling themselves and students; as a result, there was less closed relationship between teachers and students. Expressive vocabularies in TTs tend to be negative, for instance, upset, angry, sarcastic, underestimate, urge, impose, and rail. Negative expressive vocabularies are potential to cause students fearful, irritable, and not be eager to learn. Ideological vocabularies are the same and repeated all the times. This indicates that teachers are impatient, authoritarians, lack of confidence, in a hurry and want to finish their materials quickly. Students become inconvenient. The strategies used by teachers are to reinforce negative talents, to reduce positive ones from his students. Teachers have negative image and unintimate relationship to students. The uses of pronominal, expressive, and ideological vocabularies designate the teachers' authority, domination, and enormous power. We suggest some researches on AWK can be carried out by paying attention on linguistic features such as nominalizations, positive and sentences and metaphors. We also advice that intonation, stress, pause can be studied.

#### **Acknowledgement**

Great thanks are especially addressed to Muhammad Ali Pawiro for his help in editing on the first draft of this manuscript. This manuscript also appears in its current shape because of his valuable feedback and critical commentary. Nevertheless, we are entirely responsible for any mistakes that might be found in this article.

## References

- Eriyanto. 2001. *Analisis Wacana: Pengantar Analisis Teks Media*. Yogyakarta: LKiS.
- Fairclough, Norman. 1989. *Language and Power*. New York: Longman .
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1995. *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. New York : Longman .
- Fauzan, Umar. 2014. *Analisis Wacana Kritis Teks Berita Metro TV dan TV One Mengenai "Luapan Lumpur Lapindo"*. Program Pascasarjana Universitas Sebelas Maret Surakarta.
- Halliday, M.A.K., and Matthiessen, C.M.I.M. (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. (3rd Ed.). London, UK: Hodder Arnold.
- Merrill, Mary Ellen Raniloff. 2001. *Using Critical Discourse Analysis to Analyze a Basic Writing Workbook. Doctor of Philosophy Thesis*. West Lafayette-Indiana: Purdue University.
- Mills, Sara. 1995. *Feminist Stylistics*. London . Routledge.
- Mills, Sara. 1997. *Discourse*. London . Routledge
- Nurhayati. 2010. *Wacana Interaksi Kelas: Analisis Kritis dari Aspek Dimensi Sosial*. Jurnal Forum Kependidikan, 27 (2). ISSN 0215-9392. Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Indonesia FKIP Unsri.
- Reece, Anna Maria. 2009. *A Critical Discourse Analysis of ELL Student and Teacher Interactions During Reading Comprehension Literacy Events in a Multilingual Classroom*. Doctor of Philosophy Thesis. University of Washington. USA
- Temple, Codruta. 2008 . *Teaching and Learning Mathematical discourse in a Romanian classroom: A Critical Discourse Analysis. Doctor of Philosophy Thesis*. Romania: Syracuse University.
- Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 14 Tahun 2005 Tentang Guru dan Dosen.
- Van Dijk, T A. 1991 *Racism and the Press*. London: Routledge.
- Van Dijk, T A. 1998 . *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London: Sage Publication.
- Van Dijk, T A. 2006. *Discourse and Manipulation*. Discourse & Society. London: Sage Publications.
- Van Leeuwen, Theo. 2008. *Discourse and Practice: New Tools for Critical Analysis*. (Online) Publisher: Oxford University Press.
- Widdowson, Henry G. 2004. *Text, Context, Pretext: Critical Issues in Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.

## Appendices

### Appendix 1. Expressive Vocabulary of TTs

#### TT1:

1. Cobalah! Kapur begitu banyak, kalian patah-patahin! Yang mau dipakai sekarang, nggak ada lagi kan? 'Look! There were many chalks but you broke them into pieces. Nothing left can be used?'
2. Ya, Razali, semua bilang kamu yang suka matahin kapur! 'Yes, Razali, all said you always broke the chalks!'
3. Kau buang sampahnya ke Sibiak sana, ya? 'You throw the rubbish to Sibiak overthere, ok?'
4. Lama kali pun kau. 'It takes too long for you.'
5. Kalian bisa menulis surat dinas? Bisa atau tidak? Tidak bisa? 'Are you able to write formal letter? yes or not? No?'
6. Tadi Saiful bilang, tahu? Apa itu? Menurutmu, apa itu majalah dinding? Tadi bilang tahu, bu. Kalau bilang tahu, suaramu paling kuat. Kau dari dulu begitu terus; dari kelas satu paling cepat menjawab tapi tak bertanggung-jawab atas pa yang dijawabnya. Ya bagusan nggak usah menjawab kalau memang nggak tahu! 'A moment ago, Saiful told me. You know? What is it? As you know what is bulletin board? He said he knew, mam. When knowing you said loudly. You did not change; from first year you responded quickly but you were not responsible of what you answered. You would rather not responded when you did not know exactly.'

#### TT2:

7. Udah dengar in kupingnya, saya akan ceritakan dongeng. Hei, Kamu yang di sebelah sana, kamu gak tulus itu ya? 'Look. Keep your ears. I'll tell you a tale. Hey, you over there, you're not sincere, right?'

8. Ulangi. Belajar baca di rumah ya tolong. Anda bagaimana sih. Dek. Bacakan sekali lagi. Siapa namanya?  
'Repeat. Learn how to read at home. Ok? What's wrong with you, brother? Read it again. What's your name?'
9. Dion, bukan begitu, begini. Ayo, enggak usah mulutmu hei. Ayo, ikutin sapa teman-temannya, Dion.  
'Dion, not like that but like this. Come on, keep your mouth. Como on, greet your friends, Dion.'
10. Wakatok. Makasih ya, Dio, ya. Ini jagonya di ruangan. Silahkan Wakatok, sapa teman-temannya.  
'Wakatok. Thank you, Dio. He is the smartest in this room. Wakatok, please greet your friends.'
11. Ya, itu juga gak jelas. Yang di belakang sana pasti bingung. Apa sih yang diceritakan? Itu gak dengar, gitu ya.  
'Yes, it is also not clear. Those behind must be confused. What did you tell? It was not heard, was it?'
12. Nggak kan. Kamu kira ngapain saya. Itu cerita atau buang angin? Mimpi kali, gitu ya.  
'Not heard, right? What you think I am doing? Is it a tale or a dream? It must be a dream, right?'

TT3:

13. Haa? Apa kau pegang pegang di rambutmu? Berhutan rupanya rambutmu, ya? apa? Iya  
'Huhh? What are you holding in your hair? Your hair looks like woods, right? What? Yes.'
14. Kau Daniel, jangan ributmu aja yang ada. Cepat Daniel. Ya udah yang lain.  
'You Daniel! Do not make noise. Hurry up Daniel. Forget it. Now, another student.'
15. Terus iya. Kau apa cepat cepat.  
'Keep going. Why are you in a hurry?'
16. Haa negara iya, terus, haa ihhh negara kau pun kau nggak tau.  
'Huuu! A state, ok? Go ahead. What? You don't know your own state?'
17. Jadi, sudah jelas. Makna umum dengan makna khusus semuanya sudah paham. Paham kan? Oke. Sekarang, ambil buku.  
'So, it's clear now. Everybody knows general and special meanings. You have understood, right? Okay. Now, take out your books.'

TT4:

18. Tahibonar, baik kalau Tahibonar, sudah langganan ini kan?  
'Tahibonar, well if Tahibonar, already this subscription right?'
19. Sudah? Saya tugas kau mencari empat indeks. Sebutkan dengan secara cepat.  
'Already? I assign you to find the four indices. Mention with quickly.'
20. Kelompok satu, mari saya tentukan kata-katanya. Cari dengan cepat nanti ya.  
'Group one, let me define the words. Search quickly ya later.'
21. Cari informasinya, tulis ke bukumu, kalau ada kesulitan biar saya bantu selagi tidak ada kesulitan lanjutkan.  
'Search for information, write them in book, if there is problem let me help. While no difficulties, continue.'
22. Kata-kata yang sudah saya tentukan di setiap kelompok, simpulkanlah, lalu tuliskan ke bukumu.  
'The words that I specify in each group, summarize them then write them in your book.'
23. Lama sekali. Jangan lambat. Emosi belajar. Sudah bisa tadi disimpulkan kelompok belajar itu?  
Too long. Don't be slow. Emotional learning. Can you conclude?
24. Coba dulu Eva. Menurut kau apa simpulannya emosi belajar itu. Halaman berapa tadi?  
'Eva, please try. What did you conclude about emotional learning? In what page was it written?'
25. Saya kira ini sudah bisa kita tinggalkan. Kita akan selanjutnya ulangan harian yang ke ke dua ya? bulan ini ya?  
'I think we can leave this lesson. We will have the second daily exam. Was it true? This month, right?'

## **Appendix 2. Ideological vocabularies of TT**

TT1:

26. Kita mau belajar surat dinas. Cepat, cepat cepat cepat.  
'We are going to learn official letters. Quick, quick, quick, quick.'
27. Halaman dua puluh tujuh. Ya nanti aja, nanti.  
'Page 27. Yes later on, later.'



28. Yang terhormat bapak Erwin Jasman SMP Negeri 2 Lampung. Perhatikan ya, perhatikan betul.  
'Dear Mr. Erwin Jasman of SMP Negeri 2 Lampung. Pay attention, pay attention carefully'.
29. Tau majalah dinding? Apa itu? Apa coba. Apa itu majalah dinding? Apa?  
'Do you know wall bulletin? Please try. What is it? What is wall bulletin? What is it?'
30. Tadi Saiful bilang tau, apa itu? Menurutmu apa itu majalah dinding? Kau bilang tau, kalau bilang tau. Suaramu paling kuat. Kau dari dulu suaramu paling kuat.  
'Saiful, you said you know. What is it? What do you think of wall bulletin? You said you know. You said you know. You have loud voice. Since in the past you always said loudly'.
31. Kalian mengerti maksudnya? Mengerti maksudnya? Aduh kenapa diam. Ngantuk semua ya?  
'You get his point? Get his point? Ouch, why are you silent? Are you sleepy, huh?'
32. Coba. Ayo coba. Kalian buat masing-masing ya surat. Nah, surat dinas. Ayo, ayo. Ambil buku latihannya.  
'Try. Please try. You make your own letter. Official letter, okay? Try, try. Take out your exercise book'.
33. Siapa yang mengirim? Namanya. Namanya jelas. Tanda tangannya terus  
'Who sent this? Your name. Your name should be clear. Then sign'.

TT2:

34. Hei. Kamu yang di sebelah sana. Kamu gak tulus itu ya. Itu terpaksa. Terpaksa?  
'Hey. You over there. You're not sincere, right? Forced. You feel forced?'
35. Tolong yang di luar, woi, woi. Tolong jangan bikin ribut.  
'Excuse me, kids outside. Please do not make noise.'
36. Tadi di awal, tadi saya ceritakan. Oke, ayo berlatih. Ini, ayo ayo.  
'Just a moment ago, I told you. Okay, let us do the exercises. This one, hurry up.'

TT3:

37. Apa itu makna konotasi? Apa itu yang dimaksud dengan makna konotasi? Apa makna konotasi?  
'What is the meaning of connotation? What was meant by the connotation? What is connotation?'
38. Sedangkan kalau dikatakan makan tangan, apa artinya? Apa arti makan tangan? Apa arti makan tangan?  
'When I say "makan tangan" (eat your hand), what does it mean? What is the meaning of "makan tangan"? What is the meaning of "makan tangan"?''
39. Ini sama dengan makna menyempit. Jelas sampai di situ yang maknanya menyempit? Jelas Dedi makna menyempit? Jelas makna menyempit? Udah jelas Rina makna menyempit?  
'It's same as narrow meaning. You understand the narrow meaning? Do you understand the narrow meaning, Dedi? Is narrow meaning understood? Do you understand the narrow meaning, Rina?'
40. Atau dikatakan ee gila si Kori. Gila si Kori. Kau marah enggak?  
'Or when I say Kori is crazy. Kori is crazy. Do you get angry?'
41. Masing-masing buat satu makna umum. Amelia contoh, contoh ya, contoh.  
'Each of you makes general meaning. For example, Amelia. It's an example, okay?'
42. Ok Taufik, tumbuhan, ok iya iya iya ok, Sardona, hutan. Hu hutan iya terus haa?  
'What about you, Taufik? Plants, Okay? Yes, yes, yes, okay. Sardona talks about forest. Go ahead, okay?'
43. Terus iya. Kau kau ee apa cepat cepat haa?  
'Go ahead. You, be quick, huh'.
44. Ok, kau Noni, sepatu. Iya ha iya logo. Kau penyanyi, iya iya.  
'Ok, you talk about shoes, Noni. Yes, about the logo. You're a singer, right?'

TT4:

45. Membaca indeks itu gunanya apa? Membaca indeks gunanya apa?  
'What is the function of reading index? What is the function of reading index?'
46. Membantu siapa? Membantu pembaca untuk apa? Membantu  
'Help who? Help readers to what? Help...'
47. Satu kelompok, satu kelompok, satu kelompok, satu kelompok pindah yang dua di sini  
'In one group, in one group, in one group, one group moves. The rest over here'.
48. Waktu hanya dua puluh menit. Setelah kau temukan, cari informasinya, catat dengan cepat. Waktu hanya dua puluh menit.  
'You have 20 minutes. After you find, seek the information, note quickly. You have only 20 minutes'.

49. Waktu masih ada sepuluh menit lagi. Informasi yang berkaitan dengan kata-kata yang sudah saya tentukan tadi, tulis saja. Masih ada waktu sepuluh menit lagi.  
'10 minutes left. Information relating to words I determined, write them. 10 minutes left'.
50. Kelompok empat sudah selesai? Sudah? Sudah?  
'Group 4, Have you already finished? Already? Already?'
51. Apa yang terdapat di halaman indeks, terus. Atau tulis apa yang terdapat di halaman indeks. Terus, terus, Eva.  
'Whatever you find in the index page, continue. Or, write whatever available in the index page? Continue, continue, Eva'.

Tabel 1: Vocabularies in TTs

TTs	Pronominals*	Exspressives	Ideology
TT1	Kita, <b>kalian</b> , kamu, kau, nama diri	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- kalian patah-patahin 'You broke them all'</li> <li>- kamu yang suka matahin kapur 'You always broke the chalks'</li> <li>- kau bilang tau 'You said you know'</li> <li>- suaramu paling kuat 'Your voice is the loudest'</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- kalian 'all of you'</li> <li>- cepat 'hurry up'</li> <li>- nanti aja 'later on'</li> <li>- perhatikan apa itu? 'Look! What is that?'</li> <li>- mengerti maksudnya? 'You understand'</li> </ul>
TT2	Saya, kalian, kita, anda, dek, <b>kamu</b> , nama diri	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- andab agaimana sih (what's wrong with you)</li> <li>- ini jagonya di ruangan ini (this is the cleverest)</li> <li>- sana pasti bingung (you overthere must be confused)</li> <li>- kamu kira ngapain saya? (what do you think I am doing?)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- kamu 'you'</li> <li>- woi 'wow'</li> <li>- ayo 'go ahead'</li> </ul>
TT3	<b>Kita</b> , kamu, saya, <b>kalian</b> , kau, nama diri	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- saya tentukan 'I have decided'</li> <li>- cari dengan cepat 'look for quickly'</li> <li>- kalau ada kesulitan biar saya bantu 'let me help you when you have problem'</li> <li>- menurut kau apa? 'what do you think?'</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- kita 'we'</li> <li>- membantu siapa? 'help whom'</li> <li>- satu kelompok 'in one group'</li> <li>- dua puluh menit '20 minutes'</li> <li>- sudah? 'already finished?'</li> <li>- terus? 'then?'</li> </ul>
TT4	Kita, aku, ibu, <b>kau</b> , saya, kamu, nama diri	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- berhutan rupanya rambutmu. 'your hair looks like forest'</li> <li>- cepat, haa? 'Hurry up'</li> <li>- ihh negara pun kau nggak tau ya? 'Oh my God. You don't understand your state?'</li> <li>- pahami? 'understand'</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- makna konotasi 'connotative meaning'</li> <li>- apa artinya? 'what does it mean'</li> <li>- gila 'crazy'</li> <li>- contoh 'example'</li> <li>- oke iya 'okay'</li> <li>- cepat 'hurry up'</li> <li>- ya 'yes'</li> </ul>

\* Note: saya I SG; kau II SG; kalian II PL; kita I PL; anda II SG/PL; dek 'brother/ sister'; kamu II SG/PL; nama diri 'identity'; ibu 'mother/mam'