

# TEACHER-STUDENTS AND STUDENTS-TEACHER INTERACTION IN ENGLISH SPEAKING CLASS

Nanda Futia Safitri, Ujang Suparman, Ari Nurweni  
Email: nandafutiamc@gmail.com

## Abstract

Interaksi merupakan salahsatu kegiatan untuk memperkenalkan bahan ajar baru kepada siswa sehingga interaksi memegang peranan penting dalam proses belajar di kelas. Namun, di Wellington School ditemukan bahwa siswa tidak terlibat aktif dalam interaksi selama proses belajar mengajar, karena *Teacher's Talk Time* mendominasi. Seorang guru yang cakap mampu menerapkan konteks dalam kegiatan pembelajaran sehingga interaksi kelas menjadi sesuatu yang realistis dan bermakna. Namun demikian, para siswa masih membutuhkan dukungan untuk mampu menggunakan Bahasa Inggris dalam kegiatan belajar. Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk menganalisis jenis-jenis *Teacher's Talk* dan *Students' Talk* yang muncul di kelas berbahasa Inggris yang diamati. Selain itu, penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui apakah ada pengaruh *Communicative Language Teaching* (CLT) dalam interaksi di kelas. Dalam penelitian ini, yang menjadi target penelitian adalah guru dan para siswa kelas tiga sekolah dasar di kelas berbahasa Inggris. Peneliti menggunakan *Flanders Analysis Interaksi Kategori* (FIAC) sebagai pedoman untuk menganalisis data. Secara umum, hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa CLT memberikan efek positif bagi guru dan siswa dalam berinteraksi di kelas.

Interaction is an acivity to introduce a new teaching material to the students. Thus, interaction takes an important role in teaching learning process. However, there is a main problem at Wellington school: the students did not involve in the interaction during teaching learning process, because the teacher's talk time was dominant in the teaching learning process. Nevertheless, a proficient teacher will provide a context so that class interactions are realistic and meaningful but with the support needed to assist students to generate the target language. The objectives of the research are to analyze the types of teacher's talk and students' talk occurring in the observed English speaking classes. In addition, this research aimed to find out whether there is an effect of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) setting in the interaction. In this present study, the researcher took teacher and the young learners (third grade students of elementary school) in the English speaking classes as the target of the research. The researcher used Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC) as the guidelines to analyze the data. Generally, the result showed that CLT setting gives the positive effect for the teacher and student to have an interaction in the classroom.

**Key words:** CLT, FIAC, Interaction, Teacher's talk, Students' talk.

## INTRODUCTION

Language is best learned and taught through interaction. Interaction is the device to introduce a new teaching material to the students in their learning activities. For learners who are studying English in a non-English speaking setting, it is very important to experience real communicative situations in which they will learn how to express their own views and opinions, and to develop their target language which are very essential for the success of communication. Classroom Interaction then, is necessary and useful as an educational strategy to enhance learning. Classroom interaction is the action performed by the teacher and students in the process of teaching and learning in the classroom. Classroom interaction covers classroom behavior such as turn-taking, questioning and answering, negotiation of meaning and feedback.

Today, many researchers claim that through classroom interaction knowledge can be constructed and skills can be developed. But it is possible only if the teachers can facilitate in the classroom activities. It is also supported by the statement of Congmin (2013: 23) that Interaction plays a constructive role in the SLA. Furthermore, Chairani (2015: 57) stated that in English learning and teaching process, interaction between participants plays important roles to take and give inputs that emphasizes on the activeness of learners in acquiring the target language. It is generally accepted that classroom interaction can facilitate students' language development and communicative competence.

For that reason, nowadays, English teachers' roles and responsibilities are changed in the

direction of facilitators of the learning and teaching processes. In this context, learners are supposed to be given opportunities to use the language naturally other than only memorizing dialogues and pattern practices.

In this present study, the researcher observed the third grade classes of elementary school as the target of the research which was conducted in Wellington School Bandar Lampung. The researcher investigated that students did not involve in the interaction during teaching learning process because the teacher's talk time was dominant in the teaching learning process. It is supported with Davies conclusion (2011: 17), "I propose that a study of Student Talk Time (STT) based on student-centered questions (e.g. "How effectively do your students respond to TTT?", "How would you rate the quality of STT in your classroom?"), rather than a study of TTT with teacher-centered questions, could provide us with more beneficial information for increasing the effectiveness of the English speaking classroom."

Besides the Teacher Talk, class management in the classroom also affected the interaction the teaching learning process. As stated by Esmaili et. al (2015: 1) that the role of the teacher and its management style are highly important and essential for succeeding in educational objectives of students in proportion of today world. Based on the previous researchers, in Wellington school, especially third grade students' problem. The teacher used conventional way, teacher-centered management, the teacher talk was dominant, the students felt shy and unconfident to involve in the classroom (student's learning motivation), the

unenjoyable teaching method of the teacher, the limited authentic material, and the teaching material is not real life context/situation.

Meaningful context is one of the principles of CLT. Related to this statement, the previous researcher, Sundari (2017: 153) also stated that contexts in the classroom, school and neighbor can probably give indirect effect to how teachers build communication and interaction. Sundari (2017: 147) also stated that classroom interaction has been a central issue in teaching and learning English in the era of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). Domalewska (2015: 6) stated that successful language learning depends on classroom interaction, i.e interaction learners engage in with their teacher and other learners. In this present study, the researcher used CLT to create the interaction occurred.

One of the guidelines to observe and analyze the classroom interaction is by using Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC). FIAC is concept which states that teaching will be effective depending to a large degree on how directly and indirectly teachers influence the learners' behavior.

As a tool for analysis classroom interaction in the teaching and learning process, FIAC provides an objective method for distinguishing teacher-students verbal interaction and characteristic since it represents an effort to count teacher-students verbal interaction. There are ten categories of FIAC that represent teacher-students verbal interaction in classroom; accepts feeling, praises or encourages, accepts or uses ideas of student, asks questions, lecturing, giving directions, criticizing or justifying authority, students talk-response, student talk-initiation and

silence or confusion. Those ten categories of interaction analysis are also able to describe teaching and learning process occurs in classroom. It gives detail information about events happen during the learning process

Dealing with the interaction, the present study emphasized CLT based classes because the other researchers had not taken this term yet. So far, research on interaction that study deeper about types in English speaking class based on CLT has not been conducted yet. Therefore, this study aims at finding the nature and pattern of interaction in English speaking class, especially related to the exposure that enables students to develop the target language.

## **RESEARCH METHOD**

The design of this research was non-experimental descriptive study or qualitative research. Qualitative research is a form of social action that stresses on the way of people interpret and make sense of their experience to understand the social reality of individuals (Mohajan, 2018: 2).

Since this study had an attempt to find out the nature and pattern of English speaking class teacher's talk interaction, Student's talk (the interaction between teacher and student), and the effect of CLT setting on the interaction.

Seeing a fact that this study is intended merely to reveal the ongoing that will really occur inside the classrooms investigated, generating new theories and phenomenon that emerges or refining teacher-student interaction and classroom interaction pattern subsequently are not the focus of the study.

The researcher asked the teacher to teach by using CLT (Communicative

Language Teaching). Since this is a qualitative study, the researcher collected the data from observation, interview, and video recording.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

In response to the major question, the result of video recording analysis revealed to two main aspects: teacher talk and student response. The result of this research was analyzed based on the observation, interview and video recording. The following explanation will be in terms of types of teacher's talk interaction, types of students' talk interaction, and the effect of students' talk interaction.

### Types of Teacher's Talk Interaction

There were two settings in which the utterances were investigated in this class; the utterances in the regular setting and CLT setting. Regular setting means the teacher used her conventional way in teaching their students. Second, the teacher taught her students by using principles of CLT. In this phase, the researcher observed the teacher who taught direction topic. He taught about direction topic in two settings, regular and CLT setting. The result was in form of teacher's talk and student's talk.

#### a. Regular setting

Based on the result, it showed that the teacher gave the 52.8% with 817 utterances, 121 in form of indirect utterances. 696 is in form of direct utterances. These utterances represent the regular setting based on FIACS.

##### Indirect Utterances

- Accept feeling  
*Ok, I see.*
- Praise and Encouragement  
*Try again!*

- Accept Uses Ideas of Students

*What do you mean by turning on the left?*

##### Direct Utterances

- Asking questions  
*Any question so far?*
- Lecturing  
*Listen to me!*
- Giving direction  
*Open your book on page...*
- Criticizing or justifying authority  
*Coba lagi nak, masih kurang tepat.*

Commonly, in regular setting the teacher gave the direct utterances but it did not stimulate the students to take part in the teaching learning process, especially direction form.

**Table 1 Types of the Utterances based on FIAC (Regular Setting)**

No	Categories	Number of Utterances	Percen.
1	Accept Feeling	24	1.6%
2	Praise & Encouragement	74	4.8%
3	Accept or Uses Ideas of Students	23	1.5%
Indirect		121	7.9%
4	Asking Question	154	10.0%
5	Lecturing	236	15.3%
6	Giving Direction	157	10.2%
7	Criticizing or Justifying Authority	149	9.6%
Direct		696	45.1%
<b>TT</b>		<b>817</b>	<b>52.8%</b>

Based on Table 1. above, the data showed that there are 121 utterances

belong to indirect expression. Praise and encouragement are 74 utterances or 4.8% followed by accepting feeling 1.6% (24 utterances) and accepting or using ideas of students (23%). Direct utterances were dominated by lecturing the students (236 utterances, 15.3%). The second rank was giving direction (157 utterances or 10.2 %). The teacher asked the questions to the students consist of 154 utterance or 10%. The fourth rank is authority (149 utterances, 9.6 %).

### b. CLT setting

In contrast to regular setting, CLT setting make the teacher used various utterances to lead the student's response. Accepting or using ideas of the students become better than previous setting. He still praised and encouraged the students to involve in the teaching learning process. These utterances give the evidence of how the teacher's talk in CLT setting is better than in regular setting.

#### Indirect Utterances

- Accept feeling  
*Ok, Hillary. You may start..*
- Praise and Encouragement  
*Okay, good. Prepare it we wait for your friends.*
- Accept Uses Ideas of Students  
*Yes, for one group you only need to make one.*

#### Direct Utterances

- Asking questions  
*Have you all done doing it?*
- Lecturing  
*Okay, who can tell me the direction from here, from tis class..*
- Giving direction  
*Come on, move it. Why are you there?*
- Criticizing or justifying authority  
*From this room. I mean from this room. How do I get to parking area?*

**Table 2. Types of the Utterances based on FIAC (CLT Setting)**

No	Categories	Number of utterances	Percen.
1	Accept Feeling	29	1.9%
2	Praise & Encouragement	67	4.4%
3	Accept or Uses Ideas of Students	33	2.2%
Indirect		129	8.5%
4	Asking Question	106	7.0%
5	Lecturing	166	10.9%
6	Giving Direction	123	8.1%
7	Criticizing or Justifying Authority	86	5.6%
Direct		481	31.6%
<b>TT</b>		<b>610</b>	<b>40.0%</b>

In contrast to table 1, table 2 represents the utterances of the teacher focused on indirect utterances. Having CLT as the setting makes the teacher minimized the types in lecturing

the students and asking the questions.

### Types of Students' Talk Interaction

- a. **Regular Setting**  
 Students response  
*Yes,...*  
 Students initiation  
*Then?*  
 Silence/confusion  
*Silence*

Those utterances showed that students' respon was rather passive to take part in the conversation in the teaching learning process.

**Table 3**Types of the Utterances based on FIAC (Regular Setting)

1	Students' Response	253	16.4%
2	Students' Initiation	208	13.5%
<b>ST</b>		<b>461</b>	<b>29.8%</b>
3	Silence / Confusion	268	17.3%
<b>Total</b>		<b>1546</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

In regular setting, the total utterances of students response is 253. The total utterances of students' initiation is 208. Most of the students' utterances in regular setting are still dominated by silence/confusion which is at 268 or 17.3% of total.

#### b. CLT Setting

In the CLT setting, the students can

answer and response the teacher well and appropriate. CLT can stimulate students to deliver the utterances in the various ways. The examples can be seen below.

- Students response  
*What?*
- Students initiation  
*Why you say motorcycle?  
You say bike...*
- Silence/confusion  
*We get to canteen*

Insilence/confusion, the student still used an utterance whereas in regular setting she or he just keep silent when they did not know the teacher's talk.

**Table 4.**Types of the Utterances based on FIAC (CLT Setting)

1	Students Response	307	20.1%
2	Students Initiation	475	31.1%
<b>ST</b>		<b>782</b>	<b>51.3%</b>
3	Silence / Confusion	133	8.7%
<b>Total</b>		<b>1525</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

By applying CLT in the classroom, the researcher found that students response and students initiation improve their utterances (307 and 475 utterances). The silence and confusion decreased to 133 utterance (8.7%).

### The Effect of CLT on Students' Interaction

It affected the utterances of the students in the classroom. The observation also supported how the teacher applied the CLT principles to stimulate or elicit the data especially about the interaction (FIAC) from the students utterances.

### Teacher's Talk

In this section, the researcher focuses on the indirect and direct utterances.

**Table 5. The Types of Teacher Talk in the Regular Setting**

No	Categories	Number of Utterances	Percen.
1	Accept Feeling	24	1.6%
2	Praise & Encouragement	74	4.8%
3	Accept or Uses Ideas of Students	23	1.5%
Indirect		21	7.9%
4	Asking Question	154	10.0%
5	Lecturing	236	15.3%
6	Giving Direction	157	10.2%
7	Criticizing or Justifying Authority	149	9.6%
Direct		696	35.1%
<b>TT</b>		<b>817</b>	<b>52.8%</b>

Based on the table above in the regular class, the results showed that 15.3% teacher taught by using conventional way. Utterances of giving direction and asking question are at 10.2% and 10.0%. It indicates that the teaching learning process was teacher-centered. 4.8% of the total utterances were praises and encouragements.

**Table 6. The Types of Teacher Talk in the CLT Setting**

No	Categories	Number of utterances	Percen.
1	Accept Feeling	29	1.9%
2	Praise & Encouragement	67	4.4%
3	Accept or Uses Ideas of Students	33	2.2%
Indirect		129	8.5%
4	Asking Question	106	7.0%
5	Lecturing	166	10.9%
6	Giving Direction	123	8.1%
7	Criticizing or Justifying Authority	86	5.6%
Direct		481	31.6%
<b>TT</b>		<b>610</b>	<b>40.0%</b>

Table 6. above shows that the teacher's utterances were still dominated by lecturing (10.9%). In contrast, in the CLT setting the teacher used various utterances to lead the students. Accepting or using ideas of the students become better than previous setting. In the regular setting, the teacher used criticizing or justifying authority (9.6%).

For example, in this present study, the teacher offered simple sentence to make the students understand what she was talking about." Look at the transcription 1 below:

*T : Ok, as you know, ya. I always ride my bike to school, right? Yes or not?*  
*Ss :Ya...*  
*T : And I park my motorcycle at...?*

S : *Why you say motorcycle?  
You say bike..*  
T : *Yea, it's the same. So, I  
park my motorcycle at ...???*  
S : *In canteen..*  
T : *Yes, you mean in parking  
lot, ya.*  
Ss : *ya..*  
T : *and then, what I want to  
ask you.. Do you know  
where the parking area is?*  
Ss : *yes..yes.. yes..*

The regular setting reveals teacher talk as the most dominant aspect in terms of lecturing. The students' portion in engaging into the interaction is less dominance. (see page 38). Based on the theoretical assumption of the researcher before, the researcher found some problems of the students at the Wellington School though they used English as the first language in the classroom. The students still used Bahasa to ask or to clarify something to their teacher. It can happen because of the unenjoyable atmosphere of teacher's talk. However, young learner's classroom requests different kinds of treatment in which young learner's need to build more intimate and informal relationship with the children (Pujiastuti, 2013: 169). By applying FIAC, the teacher can evaluate and reflect how to manage or stimulate the students to involve in learning English. It also deals with Li Li et al (2011: 2) concluded that FIAC as the approach of helping teachers conduct self-evaluation and self improvement.

### Students' Talk

In this section, the researcher focused on the students response, students initiation, and silence/confusion.

**Table 7. The Results of Student Talk (Regular Setting)**

No	Categories	Number of utterances	Percen.
1	Students Response	253	16.4%
2	Students Initiation	208	13.5%
<b>ST</b>		<b>461</b>	<b>29.8%</b>
3	Silence / Confusion	268	17.3%

Table 7.above shows that most of the students posed in silence/confusion (17.3%). They constructed the initiation with only 13.5% of total utterances. It indicates that the teaching learning process was still dominated by teacher's talk. And students' response is higher at 16.4 %.

**Table 8. Result of Student Talk (CLT setting)**

No	Categories	Number of utterances	Percen.
1	Students Response	307	20.1%
2	Students Initiation	475	31.1%
<b>ST</b>		<b>782</b>	<b>51.3%</b>
3	Silence / Confusion	133	8.7%

In contrast to regular setting, students in CLT setting minimized the silence/confusion utterances at 8.7%. They did more initiation (31.1%) which meantthat the students felt more comfortable to communicate in English. It can be seen on this transcription 2 between 2 students:

S1 : *Finish?*  
S2 : *Not yet, Sam.*



In addition, Lestari had already concluded (2018:14) in her research that there is student-student interaction. She also (2018: 7) defined that “student-student interaction is a student communication in classroom with other student in group during teaching learning process. In this present study, the researcher also found this utterances as stated in the transcription above. The collaborative task in CLT attract them to engage in the classroom. Then, selecting the appropriate material for young learners also can be one of the factors that made the students involve in the teaching learning process.

Havingtaughtby CLT method, the students minimized the silence/confusion utterances. They begin to create initiation which means the students felt comfortable to communicate in English. They created 307 utterances or 20.1% to respond the teacher instruction. In this section (CLT setting), the researcher found some utterance which cannot be categorized through FIAC. The students sometimes communicated between themselves. The collaborative task in CLT attract them to engage in the classroom. Bhattacharyya describes the principles of CLT, one of the principle is (2016: 1): “In such an approach, classrooms are organized so that students work together in small cooperative teams, such as groups or pairs, to complete activities. In second language learning environments, students work cooperatively on a language-learning task or collaboratively by achieving the goal through communicative use of the target language. Particularly in the latter case, if the learning tasks are designed to require active and true communicative interaction among students in the target language.”

CLT setting creates some impacts to the research. They are in the aspect of teacher talk and students talk response. The effect of CLT setting on the TeacherTalk is the teacher focused on giving the direction and praising an encouragement to the student. This result deals with Daj luz conclusion on his research (2015:51), he asserts students feel that they perform better when the teacher holds a supportive relationship with them. He also applied CLT approach and Cooperative Learning method to elicit the data.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the result and discussion of the research, the writer draws the following conclusion: Teacher’s talk in the CLT setting is a good approach to make the student-centered learning able to be applied in the teaching learning process. Students’ talk in CLT setting minimized the silence/confusion utterances. The students can create initiation utterances which means the students felt comfortable to communicate in English. In this section (CLT setting), the teacher found some utterance which cannot be categorized through FIAC. The students can communicate between student to student. Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) can force the teacher talk, student’s talk occurred in the classroom. It also attracts the student-student interaction in the classroom.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Acar, Z.C. 2016. *Teaching English to young learners some challenges faced by pre-service teachers*. The Eurasia Proceedings of Educational and Social Sciences (EPESS), 2016.

- [2] Bhattacharyya, K. 2016. *Communicative language teaching (teaching changes time to time)*.2016.
- [3] Chairani, N. 2015. *Forms of English learning and teaching interactions*. March 2015.
- [4] Congmin, Z. 2013. *Classroom interaction and second language acquisition: the more interactions the better?*. CS Canada, Studies in Literature and Language. Vol 7, No 1, 2013, 22-26.
- [5] Da luz, F.S.D.R.D. 2015. *The Relationship between teachers and students in the classroom: communicative language teaching approach and cooperative learning strategy to improve learning*. Virtual Commons – Bridgewater State University.
- [6] Davies, M.J. 2011. *Increasing students l2 usage: an analysis of teacher talk time and student talk time*. University of Birmingham.MA TEFL/TESL, Centre for English language Studies.
- [7] Domalewska, D. 2015. *Classroom discourse analysis in EFL elementary lessons*. International Journal of Languages, Literature and Linguistics, Vol 1 No 1, March 2015.
- [8] Esmaeili, Z, et al. 2015. *The roles of teacher's authority in students' learning*. 2015.
- [9] Flanders, N. In Smith, E.C (Eds). *A latitudinal study of pre-service instruction in Flanders' interaction (DHEW)*. Washington, D.C. 1976.
- [10] Lestari, R.Y. 2018. *Classroom interaction in English speaking class: a naturalistic study at Madrasah Aliyah Negeri 1 Batang*. Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta.
- [11] Li Li,et. al. 2011. *Beyond research classroom interaction analysis techniques for classroom teachers*. 4th Redesigning Pedagogy International Conference, Singapore, 30 May to 1 June 2011.
- [12] Pujiastuti, R.T. 2013. *Classroom interaction: an analysis of teacher talk and student talk in English young learners (EYL)*. Journal of English and Education, 2013, Vol 1, No1, 163-172.
- [13] 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) 147-154.