Humaniora, 10(2), July 2019, 145-152
DOI: 10.21512/humaniora.v10i2.5531

P-ISSN: 2087-1236
E-ISSN: 2476-9061

TEACHER`S CONTROL ON STUDENTS: REPRESENTATION OF ANTISOCIAL COMMUNICATION IN AN INDONESIAN LANGUAGE LEARNING CONTEXT

Sultan[1]; Jufri[2]

[1] Department of Indonesian Language, Faculty of Languages and Literature, Universitas Negeri Makassar
[2] Fakultas Bahasa dan Sastra, Universitas Negeri Makassar
Jl. A. P. Pettarani, Tidung, Makassar, Sulawesi Selatan 90222, Indonesia
[1]sultan@unm.ac.id; [2]jufri@unm.ac.id

Received: 18th March 2019/ **Revised:** 10th June 2019/ **Accepted:** 18th June 2019

How to Cite: Sultan., & Jufri. (2019). Teacher`s control on students: Representation of antisocial communication in an Indonesian language learning context. *Humaniora, 10*(2), 145-152. https://doi.org/10.21512/humaniora.v10i2.5531

ABSTRACT

The research examined teacher's control of classroom interaction. Studying teachers' controlling behaviors as a form of antisocial communication was necessary to develop teachers' pedagogical competence and teacher-student relationships that were empowering and equitable. It employed a qualitative approach to critical discourse analysis. The respondents were six Indonesian Language teachers. Data collection was conducted by video recording, observation, and interview. Data were analyzed at the micro (text) and macro (social context) level. Research findings show that teacher's control of classroom interaction might be realized in the acts of interrupting students, enforcing explicitness, controlling topic, formulating, restricting students' contribution, asking close-ended questions, and ignoring students' contribution. Teacher's antisocial communication represented through various types of controls which can hinder the development of students' language skills and adversely affect learning climates and students' psychological aspects. Teacher's beliefs and perspectives, teacher's social status, and teacher's pedagogical competence can be considered as factors that is able to contribute to practice of teacher's control of students in classroom interaction.

Keywords: *teacher`s control, antisocial communication, classroom interaction, teacher-student relationship*

INTRODUCTION

Schools play a major role in producing and reproducing unequal cultures. Schools are a social institution in which domination and resistance practices exist (Lundstrøm & Øygard, 2015). Classroom interaction represents an asymmetric teacher-student relationship. The teacher has a dominant position in controlling students in the interaction. The teacher's controlling behavior is reflected by his/her authority in having charge of communication. Power and authority make the teacher able to organize classroom procedures, determine learning materials, and control students' behaviors (Walsh, 2011). The teacher, thus, is able to decide who can speak, when to speak, and what to speak. The teacher can also determine students' speaking partner and command them to stop speaking.

Teachers' dominant roles in controlling students in classroom interaction are sourced from the authority they have. Teachers' authority may fall into five categories; coercive, reward, legitimate, referent, and expert (Macleod, MacAllister, & Pirrie, 2012; McCroskey & Richmond, 1983; Schrodt, Witt, & Turman, 2007). Coercive power refers to the teachers' authority to discipline students based on his/her standard. Reward power is defined as the teachers' authority to give a reward to students who can meet his/her expectation or rules. Legitimate power is the authority of the teachers to perform an action to confirm his/her position as a teacher. Referent power means that the teachers have a stronger position as a reference. Finally, expert power makes the teachers respected due to his/her higher level of competence and knowledge. Teachers may use his/her authority or power to empower or oppress students. Reward, expert, and referent power belong to the pro-social communicative group; meanwhile, legitimate and coercive power can be categorized as antisocial communication (Finn, 2012). Teachers' communicative conducts imply the teacher-student relationship in classroom interaction. Pro-social communicative actions construct a collaborative relation, while the antisocial actions lead to a competitive relation (Cummins, 2009; Karlberg, 2005).

Classroom interaction describes the teacher-student power relation. Domination roles of each participant are presented in two interaction principles; turn-taking and control of participants. Participants control is a communicative interactions control performed by the dominant participant. Teachers who hold control can interrupt, enforce turn-taking and explicitness, control topics, and formulate students' speech acts (Fairclough, 1989). In a classroom which submits to an authority or hierarchical system, teachers control the turn-taking in order to limit opportunities for students to share information and make them obey a discourse structure which has been set by the teachers themselves (Lee & Kim, 2017).

Previous research findings have revealed a number of teacher's domination practice in learning. Teacher's power in a learning discourse is represented by a turn-taking system, types of questions, teacher's control of topics, and the discourse structure (Aman and Mustaffa, 2006). Teachers may dominate learning activities by asking closed questions and speak twice more than students (Reinsvold & Cochran, 2012). An unequal relationship between teacher and students is shown by teacher's domination in classroom interaction, teacher's control of the turn-taking system, teacher-based modes of meaning-construction, and elicitation strategies which restrict students' ideas expression (Abdullah & Hosseini, 2012). Teacher's domination in classroom interaction is exhibited in verbal abuse, including bad labeling, threatening, mocking, underestimating, and bristling students (Sultan, 2016). The teacher also uses his/her power to organize, manage, discipline, and control students' behaviors as well as to establish his/her authority (Milal, 2011; Pane et al., 2014).

The present research is conducted on a strongly hierarchical and primordial Indonesian cultural background. In Indonesian society, teacher belongs to an occupation which has high social status. As a result, the teacher's profession is highly respected by the community members. Teachers should maintain physical and psychological distance with the students, look authoritative in the presence of students (Maulana et al., 2011). Institutionally, Indonesia education system is well known for the top-down culture, which means that the learning process is more likely to be teacher-centered (Zulfikar, 2010). The high social status and teacher-centered learning inspire an unequal teacher-student relationship.

Some previous findings have indicated the teacher's domination in classroom interaction in Indonesia. Lukmana, Azis, and Kosasih (2006) have found that classroom interaction tends to go in one direction where the teacher plays a role as the dominant party. Speech function in the classroom is more dominated by the teacher (84,8%), while only some involved students (15,2%). Similarly, Maulana et al. (2011) have revealed that despite their cooperative behaviors, Indonesian teachers still maintain their authoritative attitude in the classrooms. The percentage of students who perceive teachers as strict is still categorized high.

Research on teacher's control of students as participants in Indonesian learning context is rare since previous researches are mostly focused on teacher-student interpersonal relationships (Lukmana, Azis, & Kosasih, 2006; Maulana et al., 2011); ideology and symbolic violence (Eriyanti, 2014, 2018; Sultan, 2016); and learning interaction strategies and management (Rido, Ibrahim, & Nambiar, 2015; Rido, Nambiar, & Ibrahim, 2016). The current research is conducted within a language learning context. Teacher's domination act represented through control of research participants would provide an implication in language learning.

This research attempts to reveal teachers' control in classroom interaction. The focus of the research is investigating the forms of teachers' control, which represents antisocial communication. It is manifested in teachers' verbal expressions, including the act of dominating, controlling, coercive, and other verbal expressions that cause students to lose the opportunity to express ideas freely. Antisocial communication places the teacher and the students in an unequal relationship. The results of the present research could hopefully contribute to the development of empowered teacher-student interactions. Teven and Herring (2005) have proven that antisocial power has a negative correlation with students' satisfaction level. Then, Abdullah and Hosseini (2012) have discovered that the unequal relationship between the teacher and the students could bring a negative impact on language learning. The students participation is only 40% of classroom interaction, and they rarely ask questions. Learning that occurred within this situation results in the inability of students to show their intellectual capacity and creativity in language learning. Rahimi and Karkami (2015) have argued that involving students in learning is more effective than giving punishment to them.

The conducted research plays important role in the development of teacher pedagogical competence. Good communication skills benefit teachers and students. Communication skills that are realized through teacher-student interactions determine the quality of learning process and student achievement. The results of the research that portray the use of antisocial communication in Indonesian language classrooms can be used to design pedagogical-competence development models, especially learning communication. In the end, the results of the research will benefit teachers, students, and the quality of education in general.

METHODS

This research is designed using a qualitative approach focusing on the way teacher positions students and restrict students' access (Hanrahan, 2005, 2006; Lee & Kim, 2017; Reagan, 2006). Six junior high school teachers are involved in this research as the respondents. All of them have earned a bachelor degree with more than five years of teaching experience, and they are certified teachers. The respondents consist of two males and four females aged around 37-45 years old. They are teaching Indonesian language three private schools and three public schools in rural areas. Each classroom consists of 23 to 31 students.

Data collection is conducted by video recording, observation, and interview. The researchers' presence is regarded as the non-participant observer. There are 32 videos learning activities which last for 80 minutes. Students' behaviors are observed during the process of learning, especially when they interact with the teacher and record on the observation sheet. These behaviors include being silent, stuttering, or being scared. The students are interviewed to double-check the observation data; whether they feel dominated or not, for example, by showing them some video clips. The students are questioned on how they feel about a statement (while showing a certain controlling act), how they feel when expressing their ideas, or why they

feel comfortable or uncomfortable.

Data analysis is begun with video transcription. Data is analyzed using micro (textual) and macro (socio-cultural) level analyses (Hanrahan, 2006). Teacher's control of classroom interaction is identified by referring to the concept of participants control suggested by Fairclough (1989). Participants control is defined as the use of power to limit a participant's chance to deliver his/her ideas. Teacher's control is identified through language features and text structures. Teacher's control acts are coded and presented in excerpts, followed by the discourse context. The socio-cultural analysis is included in the discussion.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Research findings suggest that teacher's control over students in classroom interaction is represented through interrupting, enforcing explicitness, formulating, controlling topics, asking closed questions, and limiting students' contribution. Interruption is one of the teacher's control forms performed by interrupting students while they are speaking to deliver their ideas/give an explanation. Interruption is shown by excerpt [1]; the author's translation from the Indonesian language. S is a student, while T is a teacher.

S : Good morning! I am going to explain the direction to my house. Turn left, and…
T : on what street?
S : Jalan (street) Hasanuddin, Mam!
S : Then, we
T : [From Jalan Hasanuddin on to which street?
Through which gate?

Excerpt [1] shows a student describing direction. Symbol '[' shows the teacher interrupted the student. The student attempts to describe how to get to his house, but the teacher interrupts him twice (line 3 and line 6) to lead the student's answer. However, this act makes the student discontinued his own description. Instead, he is only focused on answering the teacher's questions. Students need the discretion to express their thoughts freely, but the example of the student's answer showed the other way around.

Teacher's interruption also indicates that the teacher wants students to provide information exactly like what his/her instruction. An example of the teacher's interruption is shown by excerpt [2].

S : From SMP Yapman, turn left on Jalan Ahmad Yani. Next to Transisco, beside Masjid Nurul Ilmi
T : [Jalan Ahmad Yani, Do you find Transisco there?
S : Yes, Mam!
T : [Where?
S : on the right!
T : *Okay*, any additional information?

Excerpt [2] shows that the teacher interrupts the student twice to direct the student's answer. This action makes the student lose an opportunity to deliver his thoughts. Also, the situation changes from storytelling into interview/question and answer session. The teacher could actually give the student a chance to freely express his ideas by letting him finish his story first and ask some questions in the end if there are things that could not be understood.

Enforcing explicitness is one of the teacher's control forms performed by interrupting students to clarify their statements. Control through enforcing explicitness is presented by excerpt [3].

S : First, we go out of the gate,
And face south
T : [We face south?
S : Yes, Mam!
T : A few steps to the south, then face east towards which street?
S : To Soputan, then turn to face north!
T : [Turn to face north, where should we turn?
S : Jalan (street) Soputan, Mam!

Excerpt [3] shows a student explaining a map. In that excerpt, the teacher asks for the student's assurance twice by repeating the student's statement. When the teacher attempts to make emphasis, the student finds difficulties in continuing his speech. He lost his concentration and could not give an explanation based on what he thinks. Teacher's emphasis on the point is perceived by the student as a form of teacher's disbelief in the information provided by him. Control through emphasizing a point could affect students' confidence.

Then, controlling topic is one of the teacher's control forms, which is done by leading students to a certain concept desirable to the teacher. An example of this control is shown by excerpt [4].

T : What information have you obtained?
S : (silence)
T : Style?
S : Speech style
T : Speech style. The first one is about style?
T : Inductive.
T : Then?
S : Deductive.
T : Then?
S : Analogy.

Excerpt [4] indicates a teacher-student discussion after reading a speech script. The teacher asks the student about the information he gets from the script. The student's answer is directed to speech styles. In fact, if the student is given the freedom to disclose their findings, he could probably convey a variety of information. The excerpt shows that all information provided by the student is controlled fully by the teacher.

Through topic controlling, the teacher directs the student's answer. An instance of this action is presented in excerpt [5].

T : What is your opinion about the letter written by Deden? What should be corrected? What should be added? Does anyone want to give suggestions or comments? [ ]?

T : Sul, Please!

S : The composition, Sir!

T : Which part? The address and the date or which part?

S : The content, Sir!

T : The content? What is the content? He wrote down his feelings!

T : Let me add. It would be better if you can add the address in the composition, such as Sumasang, 17 November 2016. That is the correction. You can rewrite the letter and submit it in the next meeting.

Excerpt [5] indicates that the teacher controls the student's answer and tries to lead it to a certain direction. The "Which part? The address and the date or which part?" statement restricts the access for the student to provide more alternatives to the question. It results in the fact that the student finally agrees with the teacher. In a language learning context, controlling topic is one of the forms of domination that will make students less autonomous and less creative in expressing their opinions.

The next kind of control that is done by the teacher to students is controlling by formulating students' answer. Formulating is done by the teacher by providing syllables so that students could form a word from them. Excerpt [6] presents how the teacher formulated the students' answer.

T : If we analyze this story, we will find out that the story was set in?

T : in a vi [...]

S : Village! (simultaneously)

T : The situation?

S : [silence]

T : co [...]

S : cool!

Excerpt [6] is part of teacher-students discussion on a story's setting (symbol [...] indicates pause). How the teacher formulated the answer could be seen in line two and six. The teacher controls the students' answer so that they are not given freedom in elaborating their answer. Analyzing a literary work means appreciating in. Therefore, the interpretation could vary based on the students' perspectives.

The next a control by asking close-ended questions. Closed questions are answered by 'yes' or 'no'. Thus, asking these questions also close an opportunity for an individual to construct his/her thoughts. Teacher's control through asking closed questions is shown by excerpt [7].

T : You can observe how a journalist records news, right?

T : What language does he use?

T : Standardized or on-standardized

T : Standardized, right?

S : Standardized.

T : Formal, right?

S : Yes.

T : You often see it on the TV, don't you?

Excerpt [7] shows that the teacher and the students are discussing language use in a news report. In the speech act, the students are only given a chance to answer 'yes' or 'no'. Close-ended questions obviously inhibit the development of students' thinking ability and argumentative skills. On the other hand, open-ended questions will provide an opportunity for students to improve their reasoning skills. In language learning, open-ended questions are useful in assisting students to perform their language skills.

Close-ended questions never allow students to choose another alternative to the question, but to follow the speaker's direction. As a result, students are unable to construct their thoughts. An example of the act of controlling students with close-ended questions is presented in the excerpt [8].

T : Alright students! There are some interesting things in your submitted work. We will discuss them now. We are still talking about intrinsic elements of prose. The first short story and the second short story have many similarities, don't they?

S : Yes, they do!

T : They have a lot of similarities, such as the theme: going on a holiday, telling experiences, and other moral themes with background. The setting is similar. The characterization is similar as well. The main characters are the same, only the supporting characters are different.

Excerpt [8] shows an interaction between a teacher and students discussing the similarities and differences between two short stories. In the excerpt, the teacher asks the students a close-ended question of which answer should be yes/no. This type of question is also called a yes/no question. Students are only required to choose between yes or no. In a language learning context, open-ended questions are considered more effective in developing students' intellectual capacity and thinking creatively.

Next control that is done by the teacher to his/her students is by limiting students' contribution. The teacher is also able to close an opportunity for students to ask. An instance of the teacher's control by limiting students' contribution is presented by excerpt [9].

S : Sir, how many headlines should we write?

T : *Eh*, look, I remind you once more! Do not ask me how many headlines you should write!

T : Is it answered?

S : (silence)

T : *No more questions then!*

Excerpt [9] shows that the teacher does not want to provide answers to the student's question (line 2). In the dominating position, the teacher limits the student's opportunities to ask (line 6). In fact, students' active participation, including in asking questions, is an indicator of active learning. Prohibiting students to ask questions is contradictory to the active learning principles.

The teacher can also dominate classroom interaction by ignoring students' contribution. The contribution here may refer to taking no notice of students' participation in

answering questions given by the teacher. An example of this ignoring act is shown by excerpt [10].

S : Was it 350, Mam?
T : Listen, I'll read the instructions and you will start reading!
S : Should we do it individually, Mam?
T : Where have you been? (talking with another student)
S : Individually?
T : Wait. Listen to my instructions first!

Excerpt [10] indicates that the teacher ignores the student two times and does not provide any appropriate responses to his questions. The first line of the excerpt shows that the student is trying to clarify the number of words that he has successfully read. However, instead of responding to the student, the teacher asks the student to keep quiet. Also, the third and the fifth line of the excerpt indicate that the student asks about the procedures, but the teacher does not respond to it. The teacher keeps talking with another student and gives a command to follow her instructions.

Excerpt [10] provides proof that the teacher is dominating the classroom interaction. Many times, it is shown that the teacher ignores the student's contribution. This condition could, needless to say, affect students' mental condition and motivation. Students may think that they do not get any attention from the teacher. When the student asks about the procedures, and the teacher does not answer, it is possible that the student might make mistakes in doing the activity because he does not understand how to do it.

Research findings suggest that teacher's control of classroom interaction can be realized in many forms. Interrupting, enforcing explicitness, formulating, controlling topics, ignoring students' contribution, asking closed questions, and ignoring students' contribution are some forms of restriction on students who are under the control of teachers. Control represented in teacher-student interaction shows that the teacher has a dominant position. This finding confirms that teacher prioritizes competitive antisocial learning instead of implementing cooperative pro-social learning (Finn, 2012; Karlberg, 2005). Antisocial communication is characterized by a vertical relationship. It is, thus, against the intimate and horizontal pro-social communication.

Antisocial and pro-social communication may implicate on the teacher-student relationship and students' learning acquisition. Findings by Maulana et al. (2011) have revealed that the use of antisocial power can be perceived negatively by students. On the other hand, the use of pro-social power is considered positive. Students' positive perception of teacher and learning process is useful in establishing a conducive learning climate which promotes students' motivation. Therefore, the performance of controlling acts shown in this research should be minimized.

In a language learning context, teacher's antisocial communication depicted through various acts of controlling are able to become an obstacle to the development of students' language skills. According to Walsh (2011), in language learning, students need space and support to express ideas and thoughts, including their new knowledge and language skills. Language learning will be optimized only if language concepts and language skills can be put into practice. Thus, the use of any form of restricting acts, such as interrupting, formulating, controlling topics, and others in learning should be reduced because they can only prevent the students from practicing their language skills.

Teacher's control practices have impacted students psychologically. An authoritative style of controlling students' behaviors results in students being insecure, feeling inferior, and failing in improving their academic performance (Ivankova et al., 2016). In language learning, it has been found out that the teacher's authoritarian style creates a group of students who have low self-esteem, motivation, and achievement (Rahimi & Karkami, 2015). Teacher's negative behaviors are marked by the low intensity of the teacher to respect students' work and opinions (Meškauskienė, 2017). Some teacher's control forms of classroom interaction indicate the teacher's low appreciation and respect. In teacher-students relation, a good teacher is characterized as being tolerant, emphatic, warm, trusting, and encouraging (Juszczyk & Kim, 2015).

Domination through control of participants revealed in this research indicates the influence has been used by the teacher as an interrelationship approach to building a relationship with the students. A teacher's interpersonal relationship is characterized by strict behavior and is manifested in directive and aggressive. The results of this research indicate that students receive dominance as fairness. Student acceptance is a manifestation of respect for teachers.

Controlling students as participants in classroom interaction is an example of the teacher's antisocial communication, which is sourced from the teacher's belief of teacher-students relation. The teacher positions himself/herself as the main source and control of information, while the students are mere information receivers. This research finding is similar to the results of the research conducted by Bossér and Lindahl (2017), which have revealed teacher-students contrast position in classroom interaction; students are dependent and follow the teacher who is in charge of controlling and determining. Teacher's dominant position in the information transfer represents referent and expert power, which places the teacher as the one with authority. In this context, Pirrie and Rafanell (2017) have suggested a negotiation in classroom interaction so that teacher-students dynamic relation can be realized.

Teacher's domination acts performed in Indonesian classrooms cannot be separated from the teacher's belief and perception of students. This finding is confirmed by Eriyanti (2014), who have found various forms of ideologies constructed by teachers in learning. These forms include; (1) teacher plays a role as the students' controller in learning; (2) to stay quiet while paying attention to the teacher is the best way of learning; (3) making a mistake is not allowed so that sanctions should be given to students who do it; (4) obedience to rules is an indicator of success; (5) students are dependent individuals who are not able to take hold of a responsibility; (6) students have to serve the teacher during learning; (7) fear makes students want to study hard; and (8) students are liars. Furthermore, the teacher's ideologies give an implication on teacher's behaviors and attitude towards students. Eriyanti (2018) has revealed that teachers may verbally insult students in the classroom by accusing students, rejecting their opinions, underestimating their status, forcing, threatening, and scolding them.

Unlike previous researches by Abdullah and Hosseini (2012); Aman and Mustaffa (2006), the results of this research can be viewed from a broader perspective, particularly on sociocultural effects on teacher's behaviors. Even though teachers in Indonesia have been raised in a

culture through which kinship, high collectivity, friendly, and courteous attitude to others are taught, the domination practice does still exist in learning interaction. An important aspect that needs to be highlighted in this context is the high appreciation put for the teacher's profession, which is widely accepted by society. In turn, it makes the teachers feel that they can have control and show power over the students.

Antisocial communication shown through the practice of controlling participants is sourced from teacher's belief that is shaped by his/her cultural background. The social and cultural environment which places the teacher in high social status in the society has formed a perspective that students must obey, submit to, and follow teacher's desires. Teacher's control in classroom interaction is considered natural. Therefore, transforming teacher-students, the relation cannot only be done through personal mindset transformation but must be started institutionally. Changes in teacher's culture in educating students must start by changing the society's mindset of education culture (Szczurek-Boruta, 2017).

Another factor indicated by the use of this antisocial communication is the teacher's competence. Antisocial communication represented in this research is the teacher's actions to uphold typical learning in the past that is to discipline students. The teacher maintains traditional approaches to teaching students, which, therefore, could reflect the teacher's pedagogical competences. The characteristics of remote areas where this research is conducted, and non-optimized teacher's professional development may contribute to the utilization of antisocial communication in the classroom. This finding is corroborated with recent researches that have proven that there is no strong evidence that can indicate the effectiveness of the teacher's professional certification in improving students' learning achievement and teacher performance (Chang et al., 2014; Kusumawardhani, 2017). Related to this, Makovec (2018) has concluded that teacher quality is a complex problem, so it must be approached in a variety of ways and broad contexts.

The results of the research imply that it is necessary to develop an equal teacher-students relation. Antisocial communication of teachers is closely related to social and pedagogical competencies. Teacher's control is a realization of the teacher's low pedagogical ability. Nemet (2018) has found that good social and pedagogical competencies can help teachers create a positive influence on students' development. Socio-communicative skill and personality components are two aspects of teacher professional competence needed to transform a hegemonic teacher-student relation (Symanyuk & Pecherkina, 2016). The results of the present research show that in language learning, the teacher's personality and students' communicative competence have a direct connection (Hashim, Alam, & Yusoff, 2014). Therefore, pedagogical communication becomes an important aspect in developing a teacher's competence.

CONCLUSIONS

Research findings indicate that the teacher's control of language classroom interaction varies greatly. Teacher control of students is done through interrupting, enforcing explicitness, formulating, controlling topics, asking closed questions, and limiting students' contribution. Control represents the use of competitive power, which reflects an unequal teacher-students relation. Classroom interaction puts the teacher as the center of learning, so that s/he has any authority to control knowledge transfer. Teacher's control implies that students are limited, and this contradicts the purpose of communicative language learning. Teacher's antisocial communication represented in controlling/restricting acts can be an obstacle to the development of students' language skills because the students are not given an opportunity to express their ideas, thoughts, and new knowledge as it is. Even, it can bring an impact to the formation of a conducive learning climate and students' psychological aspects.

It can be concluded that the use of antisocial power in classroom interaction is sourced from teacher's belief and perspective in relation to students; teacher's high and honorable profession status, which is formed by the social and cultural structures; and teacher's pedagogical competencies. This research, therefore, recommends the importance of teacher's professional development, particularly of empowering and equal communication practices. The higher education institutions that educate prospective teachers need to include prosocial communication as a field of research in the curriculum on pedagogical aspects. This needs to be done to produce prospective teachers who are able to develop teacher-student communication with equal positions. The education office and training institutes also need to train this prosocial communicative competence.

This research is limited to Indonesian Language teachers at the junior high school level. Further research is needed by involving more teachers with a variety of subjects. Research also needs to be done on progressive young teachers to reveal the tendency of their communication model. This research is also limited to the form of teacher control. In the future, research is needed that links between the forms of control and student learning outcomes. The reasons underlying the teacher doing various controls also need to be explored.

REFERENCES

Abdullah, F. S., & Hosseini, K. (2012). Discursive enactment of power in Iranian high school EFL classrooms. *GEMA: Online Journal of Language Studies, 12*(2), 375–392.

Aman, I., & Mustaffa, R. (2006). Classroom discourse of Malay language lesson: A critical analysis. *e-BANGI: Jurnal Sains Sosial dan Kemanusiaan, 1*(1), 1–24.

Bossér, U., & Lindahl, M. (2017). Students' positioning in the classroom: A study of teacher-student interactions in a socioscientific issue context. *Research in Science Education, 49*(2), 371-390. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-017-9627-1.

Chang, M. C., Shaeffer, S., Ragatz, A. B., & Stevenson, R. (2014). *Teacher reform in Indonesia: The rule of politics and evidence in policy making*. Washington DC: The World Bank.

Cummins, J. (2009). Pedagogies of choice: Challenging coercive relations of power in classrooms and communities. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 12*(3), 261–271. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050903003751.

Eriyanti, R. W. (2014). Konstruksi ideologis bahasa guru

dalam interaksi pembelajaran di kelas. *Litera, 13*(1), 53–66.

Eriyanti, R. W. (2018). Power gap as one of the trigger of verbal abuses committed by teachers in schools. *International Journal of Instruction, 11*(1), 363–378. https://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2018.11125a.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. New York: Longman Inc.

Finn, A. N. (2012). Teacher use of prosocial and antisocial power bases and students' perceived instructor understanding and misunderstanding in the college classroom. *Communication Education, 61*(1), 67–79. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2011.636450.

Hanrahan, M. (2005). Engaging with difference in science classrooms: Using CDA to identify interpersonal aspects of inclusive pedagogy. *Melbourne Studies in Education, 46*(2), 107–127. https://doi.org/10.1080/17508480509556427.

Hanrahan, M. U. (2006). Highlighting hybridity: A critical discourse analysis of teacher talk in science classrooms. *Science Education, 90*(1), 8–43. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.20087.

Hashim, N. M. H. N., Alam, S. S., & Yusoff, N. M. (2014). Relationship between teacher's personality, monitoring, learning environment, and students' EFL performance. *GEMA: Online Journal of Language Studies, 14*(1), 101–116. https://doi.org/10.17576/gema–2014-1401-07.

Ivankova, N., Zhumagulova, N., Povstjan, L., Bekenova, D. U., Mukhamedina, A., Alkhatov, T., & Sakenov, J. Z. (2016). Studying teachers' and parents' attitudes towards educationally underperforming adolescents-students of general education schools. *New Educational Review, 44*(2), 62–71. https://doi.org/10.15804/tner.2016.44.2.05.

Juszczyk, S., & Kim, Y. (2015). Social roles and competences of the teacher in a virtual classroom in Poland and Korea. *New Educational Review, 42*(4), 153–164. https://doi.org/10.15804/tner.2015.42.4.13.

Karlberg, M. (2005). The power of discourse and the discourse of power: Pursuing peace through discourse intervention. *International Journal of Peace Studies, 10*(1), 1–25.

Kusumawardhani, P. N. (2017). Does teacher certification program lead to better quality teachers? Evidence from Indonesia. *Education Economics, 25*(6), 590–618. https://doi.org/10.1080/09645292.2017.1329405.

Lee, J. A., & Kim, C. J. (2017). Teaching and learning science in authoritative classrooms: Teachers' power and students' approval in Korean elementary classrooms. *Research in Science Education, 49*(1), 1-27. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-017-9659-6.

Lukmana, I., Azis, E., & Kosasih, D. (2006). Makna interpersonal dalam interaksi guru-murid: Sebuah kajian wacana kritis. *Linguistik Indonesia, 24*(1), 11–22.

Lundstrøm, L., & Øygard, L. (2015). Domination and resistance in school-the alternative school day for 'at-risk students': What does it mean for them to be there, and to what extent do they benefit? *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth, 20*(1), 17–31. https://doi.org/10.1080/02673843.2014.948019.

Macleod, G., MacAllister, J., & Pirrie, A. (2012). Towards a broader understanding of authority in student–teacher relationships. *Oxford Review of Education, 38*(4), 493–508. https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2012.716006

Makovec, D. (2018). The dimensions of teacher's professional development. *Sodobna Pedagogika: Journal of Contemporary Educational Studies, 69*(135), 106–125.

Maulana, R., Opdenakker, M. C., Brok, P., & Bosker, R. (2011). Teacher–student interpersonal relationships in Indonesia: Profiles and importance to student motivation. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 31*(1), 33–49. https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2011.544061.

McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1983). Power in the classroom I: Teacher and student perceptions. *Communication Education, 32*(2), 175–184. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634528309378527.

Meškauskienė, A. (2017). The influence of educational teacher-learner interaction on adolescent self-esteem. *Pedagogika, 126*, 115–125.

Milal, A. D. (2011). Indicators of the practice of power in language classrooms. *TEFLIN Journal, 22*(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v22i1/1-15.

Nemet, M. B. (2018). A correlation between teachers' social and pedagogical competences and school culture. *Sodobna Pedagogika: Journal of Contemporary Educational Studies, 69*(135), 142–155.

Pane, D. M., Rocco, T. S., Miller, L. D., & Salmon, A. K. (2014). How teachers use power in the classroom to avoid or support exclusionary School discipline practices. *Urban Education 49*(3), 297–328. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085913478620.

Pirrie, A., & Rafanell, I. (2017). Re-conceptualising authority relations in education: A micro-situational approach. *Critical Studies in Education*, 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2017.1343198.

Rahimi, M., & Karkami, F. H. (2015). The role of teachers' classroom discipline in their teaching effectiveness and students' language learning motivation and achievement: A path method. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research, 3*(1), 57–82.

Reagan, T. (2006). The explanatory power of critical language studies: Linguistics with an attitude. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 3*(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15427595cils0301_1.

Reinsvold, L. A., & Cochran, K. F. (2012). Power dynamics and questioning in elementary science classrooms. *Journal of Science Teacher Education, 23*(7), 745–768. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10972-011-9235-2.

Rido, A., Ibrahim, N., & Nambiar, R. M. K. (2015). Interaction strategies of master teachers in Indonesian vocational classroom: A case study. *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature, 21*(3), 85–98.

Rido, A., Nambiar, R. M. K., & Ibrahim, N. (2016). Teaching and classroom management strategies of Indonesian master teachers: Investigating a vocational English

classroom. *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature, 22*(3), 93–109.

Schrodt, P., Witt, P. L., & Turman, P. D. (2007). Reconsidering the measurement of teacher power use in the college classroom. *Communication Education, 56*(3), 308–332. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634520701256062.

Sultan. (2016). Teacher's domination in classroom interactions: A critical analysis for developing a qualified teacher-students relationship. *Proceeding of International Conference on Teacher Training and Education, 1*(1), 987–998.

Symanyuk, E. E., & Pecherkina, A. A. (2016). A study on the components of teachers' professional competence. *New Educational Review, 44*(2), 198–201. https://doi.org/10.15804/tner.2016.44.2.16.

Szczurek-Boruta, A. (2017). Teachers and their habitus: A few reflections on educational activity. *New Educational Review, 48*(2), 190–200. https://doi.org/10.15804/tner.2017.48.2.15.

Teven, J. J., & Herring, J. E. (2005). Teacher influence in the classroom: A preliminary investigation of perceived instructor power, credibility, and student satisfaction. *Communication Research Reports, 22*(3), 235–246, https://doi.org/10.1080/00036810500230685.

Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse: Language in action*. New York: Routledge.

Zulfikar, T. (2010). The making of Indonesian education: An overview on empowering Indonesian teachers. *Journal of Indonesian Social Sciences and Humanities, 2*, 13–39.