

# REALIZATION OF LINGUISTIC AND FORMULAIC COMPETENCES IN CLASSROOM INTERACTION

**Sekar Meifi Andari, Widhiyanto**

*English Education Department  
Faculty of Languages and Arts, Universitas Negeri Semarang  
Semarang, Indonesia*

*Email: [karmef23@gmail.com](mailto:karmef23@gmail.com)  
[pakwidhi\\_english@mail.unnes.ac.id](mailto:pakwidhi_english@mail.unnes.ac.id)*

**Abstract:** *This study aimed to investigate the types and the most dominant type of formulaic competence, how teacher and students differ in using the expressions, and how is the relationship between linguistic and formulaic competence in classroom interactions. The subjects of this study were one English teacher and 36 students of tenth grade in the academic year of 2020/2021. This study used a qualitative method. The data were collected through observation and documentation. In order to analyse the data, the theory proposed by Biber et al. (1999) and Celce-Murcia (2007) were used. The study revealed that there were five types of formulaic competence used in classroom interactions as Biber et al. (1999) proposed. They were collocations, idiomatic phrases, lexical bundles, binominal expressions, and inserts. The most dominant type used was inserts with 70% and followed by lexical bundles with 19%, collocations (5%), idiomatic phrases with 3%, and binominal expressions with 3%. In the differences between the teacher and students used of the expressions, the teacher used all five types of formulaic competence, while the students only used four types of formulaic competence and disregarding the use of idiomatic phrases. During the interactions, the teacher used more varies expressions than the students. Then, the findings also showed that there was a relationship between linguistic and formulaic competence.*

**Keywords:** *Classroom Interaction, Communicative Competence, Linguistic Competence, Formulaic Competence*

## 1 INTRODUCTION

The main goal of teaching and learning language is to make the students able to use the target language as means of communication both in spoken and written by applying existing competencies of the language. According to Bagarić & Djigunović (2007) communicative competence is a set of required competencies when using the language in real communication. Hymes (1972) defined communicative competence as the competence of language use corresponding

to the given context and situation. The types of communicative competence have been developed and shifted throughout the years. However, in 2007, Celce-Murcia proposed updated types of communicative competence. There are six types of communicative competence: sociocultural, discourse, linguistic, formulaic, interactional, and strategic.

According to Chomsky (1965), linguistic competence primarily concerns an idea between speaker and listener in applying the language in actual communication. Moreover, Celce-Murcia et al. (1995)

proposed that linguistic competence includes four types of knowledge. They are phonological (consists of both segmental and supra-segmental), lexical (knowledge of both content and function words), morphological, and syntactic knowledge. Fernández & Cairns (2011) wrote that linguistic competence constitutes knowledge of the language, which is implicit. Meaning that people do not have conscious access to the principles and rules that govern the combination of sounds, words, and sentences; however, they do recognize those rules and regulations have been violated. Moreover, linguistic competence plays an essential aspect for language teachers to gain language learning goals and teaching (Tahir, 2018).

Besides linguistic competence, formulaic competence, as a new component of communicative competence proposed by Celce-Murcia, is also one of the communicative components that can develop communicative competence (Celce-Murcia, 2007). She added that formulaic competence refers to fixed and prefabricated chunks of language that speakers use heavily in everyday interaction. In addition, Wray & Perkins (2000) defined formulaic expressions as a sequence of words or other meaning elements, which is, or appears to be, prefabricated. The expression is stored and retrieved from memory at the time of use than being subject to generation or analysis by the language grammar.

The application of formulaic expressions in daily conversation can help speakers to communicate naturally and fluently. According to Boers & Lindstromberg (2009), using the predictable and fixed word is a helpful way to show how competent and fluent native speakers communicate (Schmitt et al., 2011). Moreover, Shin & Nation (2008) asserted that formulaic expressions make non-native students speak

English fluently and native-likely. Formulaic language facilitates fluent communication by allowing speaker to produce and comprehend chunks with particular meanings or functions, helping with fluent and accepted use of language (Wood, 2015).

According to Lewis (2008), language consists of grammar and vocabulary, and formulaic expressions can produce a coherent text when combined. Therefore, the use of formulaic expressions is inseparable from linguistic competence. Knowing the importance of linguistic competence as the essential aspect of language learning and formulaic competence to help speakers use the language naturally and fluently, realizing those competencies are crucial during the teaching and learning process to help students improve their communicative competence.

Sundari (2017) wrote that classroom interaction has been a central issue in teaching and learning English in communicative language teaching. Pramudita (2018) asserted that interaction was an essential issue in implementing the teaching-learning process in language. Language learners develop their competencies in social interactions and relationships via communication with more experienced, knowledgeable, and competent participants, such as teachers and/or peers (Thoms, 2012). In addition, Walsh (2006) asserted that class-based L2 improved when the teachers have a good understanding about the relationship between teacher's talk, interaction, and learning chance. The process of interaction between teacher and students can be in many forms (2006).

Previously, there have been many research concerning with the effect of formulaic competence in ESL and EFL learners in their English skill achievements. Those studies were conducted in various

education levels in various countries with different aims and results. Neno & Agustien (2016), Bumbak (2018), and Sarani & Najjarbaghseyah (2019) held a study aiming at investigating the types and frequency of formulaic expressions in EFL learners. However, their study revealed different results. In Neno & Agustien's study, the students mostly used collocations, and followed by lexical bundles, inserts, idioms, and binominal expressions. In Bumbak's study, the students mostly rely on lexical bundles, followed by collocations and inserts. However, in Sarani & Najjarbaghseyah's study, EFL learners produced types of formulaic expressions called a list of pragmatic routines: thanking, requesting, offering, and apologizing. Moreover, Neno & Agustien (2016) also stated that in students' interactions, there were many unnatural expressions and students had more confidence in using literal expressions than idiomatic meaning (Bumbak, 2018).

Related to the learners' perceptions of formulaic expressions, Khusnita & Rukmini (2016) in their study wrote that learners have positive perceptions of formulaic sequences which related to its realizations in terms of the problems they faced in using formulaic sequences in casual conversation. Moreover, da Silva (2020) wrote that learners' oral production improved by applying oral interaction between young learners since it was essential for their development in producing formulaic language. In addition, learners enjoyed working with peers and felt more confident (da Silva, 2020).

If formulaic expressions are neglected in classroom interactions, it will make students find it hard to improve their English skills. Sukur (2020) conducted a study about the impact of disregarding the application of formulaic expressions in English textbooks. The results showed that disregarding

formulaic expressions made the language learners unable to learn such formulaic-competence-related materials. Lacked topics of formulaic expressions can lead them to find it hard to improve their communicative competence and reading comprehension skill (2020). Ding & Chen (2019) in their study also suggest that formulaic language should be attached and be more flexible rather than a fixed answer.

The study reviewed above indicated that formulaic competence is important to be applied in classroom be it through English textbooks or interactions to support learners' development in acquiring language skills, such as speaking and writing, and achieve their communicative competence. The number of researchers who focus on formulaic competence also shows that formulaic competence has an important role to help language learners have communicative competence ability. However, there are still limited studies focusing on formulaic competence in classroom interactions on senior high school students, specifically in online classroom interactions. Therefore, the writer wants to investigate the types and the most dominant types of formulaic competence, how teacher and students use formulaic competence, and how is the relationship between linguistic and formulaic competence. Moreover, this study is conducted through a video conferencing meeting platform called Google Meet.

## 2 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study belongs to qualitative research since it relies on text and image data, has unique steps in data analysis, and draws on diverse designs (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). However, this study also uses a simple calculation which is one of the

characteristics of quantitative research. Even so, the simple calculation used in this study is to show the most dominant types of formulaic competence used in classroom interaction by teacher and student. Therefore, this present study still belongs to qualitative research since the data will be presented by explaining formulaic competence types.

Under the framework of Cheek's, this study used discourse analysis as the qualitative research approach because this study uses spoken texts as the data. Discourse analysis involves more than analyzing the content of texts for how they have been structured in terms of syntax, semantics, and so forth (Cheek, 2004).

### **Participants**

The participants were one English teacher and 36 students of tenth grade in the academic year of 2020/2021 in SMA Negeri 05 Semarang. The participants chosen are Ma'am Greta and X IPA 2. Ma'am Greta (presudonym) was chosen due to her availability and willingness to take part in the research. Meanwhile, X IPA 2, which consists of 36 students, was chosen because the class fulfilled the study's purpose.

### **Instruments**

The writer used two types of instruments: observation and documentation. The observation was carried out entirely online using online video conferencing, namely Google Meet. Therefore, the writer recorded the interaction using an application called VLC Media Player and recorder to record their interactions. The documentation was done in order to make the observation result more credible. In this present study, the documentation was taken during the observation and in the form of interaction transcriptions and the screenshots of Google Meet during the teaching and learning process.

### **Data collection procedures**

In order to collect the data, the writer carried out the observation two times. The first observation was carried out on April 21, 2021, and it took about 25 minutes since it was Ramadhan, so there was limitation in time. The material was about figurative language (hyperbole and personification). The second observation was carried out on May 19, 2021, and it was conducted after Ramadhan so it took about 40 minutes. The students were reviewing the materials about figurative language and synonym and antonym.

During the observations, the writer used an application called VLC Media Player to record the classroom interaction and audio recorder to record the interactions. After that, the audio recorded was transcribed and analysed.

### **Data analysis**

In analysing the data, the writer used several steps, such as transcribing the interactions, identifying expressions which refer to formulaic competence, classifying the expressions into five types of formulaic competence, counting and tabulating the expressions to find out the most dominant types used, interpreting, and drawing a conclusion of the data found.

## **3 FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

After conducting the observations, the writer found that both the teacher and students applied the formulaic competence during the teaching and learning process. The writer analyzed the data by using the theory proposed by Biber et al. (1999) regarding the formulaic competence's types. This study found that the most dominant type used by the students was similar as the teacher's used, which is inserts with the percentage of 72.5%. However, the students

were never applied the idioms which resulting on 0 frequency out of 69 expressions with the percentage of 10%.

### **Collocations**

Teacher: ... The island of beauty *atau* the beautiful island...

The teacher used adjective + noun collocations when she was explaining about the material and she gave students understanding about the meaning of a song she explained.

Student: I couldn't sense the pain. Your bitter heart cold to the touch.

The utterance above is the sample of student's utterance in using collocations. The students used collocations when they were reading the questions given by the teacher

### **Idiomatic Phrases**

Teacher: Dea, do you understand? Dea? Do you understand? *Ki turu ki*, Dea is taking a nap, ya.

The teacher used idiomatic phrases *take a nap* to give statement about the students named Dea because she wasn't answering to the teacher.

### **Lexical Bundles**

Student: I couldn't sense the pain. Your bitter heart cold to the touch.

The students used three-word and four-word bundles in the same structure. They used the phrases when they read the song lyrics and answer the question by referring to the lyrics. Therefore, the students were not producing the phrases by themselves.

### **Binominal Expressions**

Teacher: Now, decide whether these lyrics use simile or metaphor. Yeah, simile or metaphor. Number one, please read.

The teacher used *simile or metaphor* to give instruction to the students before starting the quiz.

### **Inserts**

Student: You're welcome, Ma'am. Have a nice day.

The students used *have a nice day* to respond the teacher and to express farewells. Teacher: What is the synonym of shout? Hello? *Apa shout?* Can anybody answer it? Shout.

The teacher used *hello* to gain students' attention. She used the expressions because the students seemed ignoring her by not answering her questions or responding her.

### **Teacher's Use of Formulaic Competence**

In this study, the writer found that the total expressions the teacher's used are 392 expressions. The most dominant type the teacher used was inserts with the frequency of 275 out of 392 followed by lexical bundles with 20.4%. In contrast, binominal expression was being the less dominant used by the teacher since it only reached 2.8%.

The structural correlates of inserts that the teacher mostly used were response forms with 39.8% and various polite formulae with 11.7%. In addition, inserts were followed by lexical bundles as the dominant types of formulaic expressions employed by the teacher with the percentage of 20.4%. The teacher mostly used 47 out of 80 three-word lexical bundles and 7% of four-word lexical bundles. On the other hand, noun + noun collocations and attention signals in inserts were the least dominant type used by the teacher which showed the percentage of 0.5%.

### **Student's Use of Formulaic Competence**

Regarding the students used of formulaic expressions, the writer found 69 expressions. The expressions were much less than those used by teachers, 392 expressions. However, their utilization of the formulaic expressions' types was not much different as the teacher's. The most dominant type used by the students was similar as the teacher's

used, which is inserts with the percentage of 72.5%. However, the students were never applied the idioms which resulting on 0 frequency out of 69 expressions with the percentage of 10%.

The students mostly used response forms like the teacher did. It was followed by hesitators with frequency of 12 out of 69 expressions. In collocations adjective + noun are 3 expressions, noun + noun are 4. In lexical bundles, students mostly used three-word lexical bundles with the percentage of 7.2%, four-word lexical bundles are 3% and the least used is five-word lexical bundles, 1.4%. Students only used one binominal expressions in the form of verb and/or verb. In inserts, students used 5 expressions of interjections and various polite formulae, 3% of greetings and farewells and one expression of attention signals.

### **Linguistic Competence in Classroom Interaction**

The first linguistic knowledge found in this study was phonological which refers to segmental (vowels, consonants, syllable types) and supra-segmental (prominence/stress, intonation, and rhythm). In other words, phonological was the study of sound of a language.

#### **Phonological**

Teacher: *Alu? Do you have any ↑idea? Ada lagi yang sopan. Erm.. eufemisme. Gaya bahasa eufemisme. You have no ↑idea? Ndak tau?*

The utterance above was said by the teacher to ask the students. In the segmental component, the teacher used rising intonation at the end of her utterance because rising intonation was used for questions. Regarding the supra-segmental component, the teacher had put the stress properly when she said the utterance, which is in the second syllable of *idea*.

#### **Lexical**

Student: You are a falling star, you are the getaway car. You are the line in the sand when I go too far.

In sample above, it showed that the student able to use the lexical knowledge correctly. The utterance said by the student contained content words (e.g. *you, star, go, far, etc*) and function words (e.g. *a, the, in, are, etc*).

#### **Morphological**

Teacher: If you have understood what I have explained to you. Now it's your time to have some exercise about them. Please, take a look at the lyrics. These are taken from some of the song. Guess personification or hyperbole.

The utterance was spoken by the teacher and showed that she used her morphological knowledge by using words such as *explained* and *songs*. The word '*explained*' is from the base word *explain* and inflected by '-ed' which is the form of past tense. In addition, *songs* is from the base word *song* and inflected by 's' which showed plurality.

#### **Syntactic**

Student: I got that sunshine in my pocket.

The utterance was spoken by the student and it proved that they able to use their syntactic knowledge seen from the phrase structure which is subject followed by verb, object, and complement.

### **DISCUSSION**

In discussion section, the writer will be focusing on the discussion of the formulaic competence types, how teacher and students differ in their use of formulaic competence, and the relationship between linguistic and formulaic competence.

#### **The Types and Most Dominant Type of Formulaic Competence**

Biber et al. (1999) proposed five main types of formulaic competence. They are collocations, idiomatic phrases, lexical

bundles, binominal expressions, and inserts. The theory was used in this study to analyze the data and the findings showed that there were five types of formulaic competence applied in classroom interactions. This study found 461 expressions, which 24 of them are collocations, 12 are idioms, 88 are lexical bundles, 12 are binominal expressions, and 325 expressions are inserts. It means that collocation is 5%, idiomatic phrase is 3%, lexical bundle is 19%, binominal expression is 3%, and insert is 70%. From the total expressions, insert is the most dominant type used in classroom interactions and followed by lexical bundles. Insert as the most dominant type was also found in the study conducted by Mustapa & Agustien (2017). They found that the most frequent type of formulaic competence used was inserts with the percentage of 63% and followed by lexical bundle (18%). It means that the teacher and students were using simple and literal expressions in their interactions during the teaching and learning process.

### **Teacher and Students Differ in Their Use of Formulaic Competence**

#### ***Collocations***

Biber et al. (1999) stated that collocations associates with lexical words that establish the terms co-occur more frequently than expected by chance. In this study, there are 24 collocations found and among eight structures, only four structures were used in classroom interactions. In addition, mostly used structure is in the form of adjective + noun and followed by noun + noun.

The teacher used 14 expressions of collocations which most of them was in the form of adjective + noun such as '*last week*' and '*beautiful island*'. The teacher used collocations when she was explaining the materials to the students. Moreover, she sometimes also used the expressions to praise the students for their answers in the

form of adverb + adjective such as '*very good*'. the students used 10 expressions of collocations and they mostly used it in the form of noun + noun such as '*guardian angel*' and '*getaway car*'. In their use of collocations, students mostly rely on the teacher's questions. They didn't produce the expressions by themselves, yet they were only reading the song lyrics as questions from the teacher which contained collocations. As stated by Neno & Agustien (2016) in their study that native speakers were more able to produce collocations when communicating. The students were hardly produce collocations by themselves because they were not used to speaking in English.

#### ***Idiomatic Phrases***

Idiomatic phrases are expressions which meaning can't be predicted since they are relatively invariable (Biber et al., 1999). This present study employed two structural correlates of idiomatic phrases by Biber et al. (1999). They are idiomatic phrases across registers and verb + noun phrase combinations with have, make, and take. According to the finding, there were 12 expressions of idiomatic phrases and all of them are in the form of verb + noun phrase combinations with have, make, and take. The teacher produced idiomatic phrases by herself and the expressions such as 'have any idea', 'take a look', 'take a nap', and so on. She used idiomatic phrases to ask the students whether they know about the kind of figurative language and to ask them to look at the PowerPoint when she was about to explain the materials. Moreover, she also used the expressions to ask or to make a statement when the students didn't respond her.

However, the students didn't use idiomatic phrases in their interactions even though the teacher used the expressions several times so that the students must have

heard about the expressions a bit. This finding has similarity with the result of the study conducted by Neno & Agustien (2016) which showed that the students didn't use idiomatic phrases even though there were a number of idiomatic phrases in the dialogues.

### **Lexical Bundles**

In the usage of lexical bundle, the teacher used seven structure out of eight structure found in this study. The teacher mostly used yes-no question fragments lexical bundles in her utterances. The expressions she used were such as *'do you have'*, *'do you know about that'*, *'are you there'*, and more. The teacher used such expressions in order to ask the students about their understanding regarding the materials. Moreover, she also used the expressions to ask the students' presence when they weren't answering her call. Then, the teacher also used PP + lexical verb phrases in her utterances such as *'we are going to'*, *'I would like to'*, *'you see what I mean'*, and so on. In this structure, the teacher used it when she told the students about the agenda for that day and when she was explaining the materials and the instructions before doing the quiz. The next structure used was verb phrase with active verb, such as *'have explained to'*, *'let's have a look at'*, and more. The teacher used several expressions of wh-question fragments such *'who's going to'*, *'what is the'*, *'what are we'*, and so on. In lexical bundles with wh-clause fragments, the teacher only used one expression, *'what I have explained to'*. The last structure the teacher used was adverbial clause fragments and she used it to state such conditions of the students, *'if you are'* and *'if you have understood'*.

On the contrary, the students used four structures out of eight structures found. In this regard, the students only used eight expressions of lexical bundles. However,

similar as the teacher's, the students most used structure was also PP + lexical verb phrase, such as *'you are nothing'* and *'I couldn't sense the'*. The next structure used was verb phrase with active verb, *'got that sunshine in'* and *'let me take'*. In wh-question fragments, the students used two expressions such as *'what you are'* and *'how does it'*. And the last structure used was verb + that-clause fragments, *'think that it is'*. The students used such expressions when they were asked to answer the questions by reading the questions first. Hence, it can be said that the students used the expressions because they were reading the questions given by the teacher. Even so, the student produced one expressions by her own in the form of adverbial clause fragments, *'think that it is'*, when she was asked by the teacher about the reason why she chose the answer. However, the students mostly didn't produce the expressions by themselves, but relied on the texts. This might happen because when the teacher asked them to speak in English, they often refused since they were afraid and not having much vocabulary.

### **Binominal Expressions**

Biber et al. (1999) wrote that combination of words which coordinated by and/or of the same grammatical category is binominal expressions. The percentage of binominal expressions is 3%. It has 12 expressions out of 461 expressions. In this study, the writer divided binominal expressions into four categories and based on the finding, only two categories were applied: noun and/or noun and verb and/or verb. Moreover, binominal expressions was the least used type in this study. In the teacher utterances, there were 11 expressions and the students only used one expression. Therefore, binominal expression became the least used type by the teacher and students in classroom interactions. Neno & Agustien (2016) shared the same finding in this regard. In their

study, there were only three binominal expressions which resulting it became the least used type with the percentage of 1.6%.

The teacher mostly used binominal expressions in the form of noun and/or noun with total eight expressions out of 11. The expressions are such as '*personification and hyperbole*', '*synonym and metaphor*', and more. The teacher used those expressions when she told the students about the materials they were going to learn or when she told the students about the instruction before doing the exercise. Moreover, the teacher also used binominal expressions in the form of verb and/or verb, '*do or act*', when she explained the definition of non-living things.

On the contrary, the students only used one expression in the form of verb and/or verb, '*feel or do*'. They used the expression when they were asked to repeat the teacher's utterance regarding the definition of non-living things. Therefore, it can be said that the expressions used was not produced by the students, but they were relying on the teacher's.

### **Inserts**

In this study, the writer found 325 expressions of inserts out of 461 expressions found. Therefore, inserts were the most dominant type used in classroom interactions with the percentage of 70%. This finding has similarity with the study conducted by Mustapa & Agustien (2017) and Khusnita & Rukmini (2016). They found that insert was the mostly produced expressions.

The teacher and students were mostly produce inserts during their interactions. However, there was quite significant difference in the production of inserts between the teacher and students. In this regard, the teacher produced 275 expressions, meanwhile the students only used 50 expressions. The teacher used

inserts which functioned as interjections, greetings and farewells, discourse markers, attention signals, response forms, hesitators, and various polite speech-act formulae. The teacher mostly used response forms and followed by various polite formulae. Response forms the teacher used such as '*yeah*', '*okay*', '*yes*' and used it when responding to students' answer or response.

Similarly, response forms were also the most used expressions by the students. However, they only produced 25 expressions out of 50 expressions of inserts. The same as the teacher, they used response forms when the teacher called their name or when they were willing to answer the questions. On the other hand, response form was followed by hesitators. Students produced 12 expressions of hesitators in their interactions and they used it as pause filler in their speaking. During the interactions, they used hesitators when they were answering the questions because they were hesitated with their answer so they used pause fillers to think and to revise their answer.

### **Relationship between Linguistic and Formulaic Competence**

The findings of this study found many formulaic expressions used by the subject in classroom interactions. The expressions found are related to linguistic competence. Regarding phonological knowledge, both the teacher and students were able to interact by using the correct phonology. Related to the lexical knowledge, the subjects are able to speak using various both content and function words. In morphological knowledge, both the teacher and students also use this knowledge. The last one is syntactic knowledge, the teacher and students able to use their knowledge seen from the phrase structure.

Regarding the relationship between linguistic and formulaic competence, Celce-Murcia (2007) asserted that formulaic competence was the counterbalance to linguistic competence. Based on Lewis (2008), language consists of grammar and vocabulary, and formulaic expressions can produce a coherent text when combined. Moreover, formulaic expressions relate to linguistic competence and sociocultural competence. Linguistic competence is essential to be achieved, but it would be unbalanced without formulaic competence (Neno & Agustien, 2016). Students would speak grammatically correct, but it doesn't guarantee that they speak the same way as native speakers do (2016). Thus, formulaic competence is inseparable from linguistic competence. This study employed the theory by Celce-Murcia (2007) regarding linguistic competence: phonological, lexical, morphological, and syntactic.

Overall, the subjects of this study are able to use four types of linguistic knowledge, meaning that they already have the linguistic competence ability. In the same time, they are able to use the linguistic competence and formulaic competence's expressions in the same utterances. Related to the use of formulaic expressions, both the teacher and students are able to use the expressions in proper phonological, lexical, morphological, and syntactic, as Celce-Murcia (2007) stated. A good English speaker should be able to use English language in terms of linguistic competence and formulaic competence simultaneously. In addition, the finding also proved that linguistic competence is inseparable from formulaic competence because when the subjects used formulaic expressions, it also contained at least one linguistic knowledge, for example, 'take a look' is idiomatic phrase which contain lexical knowledge of function words, determiner 'a'. Thus, the

finding showed that there is a relationship between linguistic and formulaic competence in classroom interactions.

#### 4 CONCLUSIONS

This study was conducted to investigate the types and the most dominant type of formulaic competence used in classroom interactions using the theory from Biber et al. (1999). Based on the findings, there are five types of formulaic competence used in classroom interactions. They are collocations, idiomatic phrases, lexical bundles, binominal expressions, and inserts. The most dominant type used was inserts with 70% and followed by lexical bundles with 19%, collocations (5%), idiomatic phrases with 3%, and binominal expressions with 3%. The second objective conducted was to find out how the teacher and students differ in their use of formulaic competence in classroom interactions. The writer found 392 expressions used by the teacher and 69 expressions used by the students. In this regard, the teacher used all five types of formulaic competence, while the students only used four types of formulaic competence and disregarding the use of idiomatic phrases. Both the teacher and students mostly used inserts. During the interactions, the teacher used more varies expressions than the students. On top of that, the students didn't produce the expressions by themselves and rely on the teacher's sentences. The expressions used by the students are mostly literal meaning, which are usually simple and easy to use in interactions. The last objective conducted was to describe the relationship between linguistic and formulaic competence in classroom interactions. The findings showed that there is a relationship between linguistic and formulaic competence. The relationship

can be seen and proven from the utterances used by the teacher and students. When they produced formulaic expressions, there must be, at least, contain one type of linguistic knowledge.

## REFERENCES

- Bagarić, V., & Djigunović, J. M. (2007). Defining Communicative. *Metodika*, 8(1), 94–103. [file:///D:/Downloads/Bagaric\\_i\\_Mihaljevic\\_Djigunovic\\_ENG.pdf](file:///D:/Downloads/Bagaric_i_Mihaljevic_Djigunovic_ENG.pdf)
- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Longman.
- Boers, F., & Lindstromberg, S. (2009). *Optimizing a Lexical Approach to Instructed Second-Language Acquisition*. Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Bumbak, S. (2018). *The Use of Formulaic Language in EFL High School Classrooms*. <http://journal.stainkudus.ac.id/index.php/equilibrium/article/view/1268/1127> <http://publicacoes.cardiol.br/porta/ijcs/portugues/2018/v3103/pdf/310309.pdf> [http://www.scielo.org/scielo.php?script=sci\\_arttext&pid=S0121-75772018000200067&lng=en&tlng=](http://www.scielo.org/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0121-75772018000200067&lng=en&tlng=)
- Celce-Murcia, M. (2007). Rethinking the Role of Communicative Competence. In *Intercultural Language Use and Language Learning* (pp. 41–57). Springer.
- Celce-Murcia, M., Dornyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1995). Communicative Competence: A Pedagogically Motivated Model with Content Specifications. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6(2), 5–35.
- Cheek, J. (2004). At the Margins? Discourse Analysis and Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 14(8), 1140–1150. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732304266820>
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. M.I.T. Press.
- Creswell, W. J., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches* (5th ed). SAGE Publications.
- da Silva, L. G. (2020). *Formulaic Language Sequences and Oral Interaction in the Primary English Classroom* (Issue 1). Universidade NOVA de Lisboa.
- Ding, S.-Y., & Chen, J. (2019). Formulaic Language in Second Language Teaching—A Case Study of Situation-Bound Utterances in China’s EFL Textbooks. *4th International Conference on Education Science and Development (ICESD 2019)*. <https://doi.org/10.12783/dtssehs/icesd2019/28082>
- Fernández, E. M., & Cairns, H. S. (2011). *Fundamentals of Psycholinguistics*. Wiley.
- Hymes, D. H. (1972). On Communicative Competence. In *Sociolinguistics. Selected Readings* (pp. 269–293). University of Pennsylvania Press. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat06300a&AN=sibbila.22851&site=eds-live>
- Khusnita, D., & Rukmini, D. (2016). The EFL Learners’ Perceptions and Realizations of Formulaic Sequences in Casual Conversation. *English Education Journal (EJJ)*, 6(2), 68–78.
- Lewis, M. (2008). *Implementing the Lexical Approach. Putting Theory into Practice*. Heinle. <http://elt.heinle.com>
- Mustapa, Y., & Agustien, H. I. R. (2017). Formulaic Expressions Used in Conversational Texts of the Tenth Grade’s English Textbooks. *English Education Journal (EEJ)*, 7(1), 54–65. <https://doi.org/10.15294/eej.v7i1.14687>
- Neno, H., & Agustien, H. I. R. (2016). The Use of Formulaic Expressions in EFL Students’ Interactions. *English Education Journal (EEJ)*, 6(1), 39–44.
- Pramudita, E. (2018). *A Case Study of Classroom Interaction in Speaking Class at State Islamic Institute of Surakarta*. Universitas

- Muhammadiyah Surakarta.
- Sarani, A., & Najjarbaghseyah, R. (2019). Exploring EFL Learners' Use of Formulaic Sequences in Pragmatically Focused Role-play Tasks. *Journal of Teaching Language Skills (JTLS)*, 37(4), 141–163. <https://doi.org/10.22099/jtls.2019.33711.2694>
- Schmitt, N., Jiang, X., & Grabe, W. (2011). The Percentage of Words Known in a Text and Reading Comprehension. *Modern Language Journal*, 95(1), 26–43. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01146.x>
- Shin, D., & Nation, P. (2008). Beyond single words: the most frequent collocations in spoken English. *ELT Journal*, 62(4), 339–348. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccm091>
- Sukur, S. G. (2020). The Impact of Disregarding Formulaic Competence in Developing Senior High School English Textbooks in Indonesia. *Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, 8(2), 183. <https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v8i2.2521>
- Sundari, H. (2017). Classroom Interaction in Teaching English as Foreign Language at Lower Secondary Schools in Indonesia. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 8(6), 147. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.8n.6.p.147>
- Tahir, I. (2018). Teachers' Beliefs in Balancing Linguistic Competence and Teaching Performance in EFL Classrooms. *BRAIN. Broad Research in Artificial Intelligence and Neuroscience*, 9(1), 50–58.
- Thoms, J. J. (2012). Classroom Discourse in Foreign Language Classrooms: A Review of the Literature. *Foreign Language Annals*, 45(S1), 8–27. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2012.01177.x>. FOREIGN
- Walsh, S. (2006). Investigating Classroom Discourse. In *Investigating Classroom Discourse*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203015711-8>
- Wood, D. (2015). *Fundamentals of Formulaic Language: An Introduction*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Wray, A., & Perkins, M. R. (2000). The functions of formulaic language: An integrated model. *Language & Communication*, 20(1), 1–28. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0271-5309\(99\)00015-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0271-5309(99)00015-4)