

The Classroom Interaction Patterns among Lecturer and Students of Pronunciation Class in English Department

Yeyisha Shellayukti

Universitas Diponegoro, Semarang, Indonesia

Email: yeyishashellayukti@yahoo.co.id

Available Online:

<http://www.jurnal.unublitar.ac.id/index.php/briliant>

History of the Article:

Received on 8 July 2020

Accepted on 27 August 2020

Published on 31 August 2020

Page 540-548

Keywords:

Classroom Interaction Analysis; Speech Functions; Code-mixing and code-switching

DOI:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.28926/briliant.v3i4.506>

Abstrak: This study was aimed to investigate classroom interaction with regard to the patterns of classroom interaction, speech functions and code-mixing and code switching among the lecturer and students in Pronunciation class of UNNES as well as the implications. The data were collected from the classroom observation and the recording of teaching and learning process. The method carried out in this study were using Walsh (2012) about Classroom Interaction Analysis, Eggins and Slade (1997) about Speech Functions and code-mixing and code-switching (Hymes, 1974). The descriptive qualitative approach was used to carry out this study. The result of the study showed the patterns of interaction among lecturer and students in pronunciation class of English Department in UNNES was quite dynamic, since the patterns of classroom interaction shift during the learning process from IRF and IRE vice versa. Since, the materials are mostly about pronouncing the words, the students never asked to work in a group to do a

discussion. The speech functions also showed variety of moves carried out by the lecturer and students. The speech functions carried out by the lecturer are always followed by the students. Hence, the moves almost have the same portions among lecturer and students. It indicated that the process of exchange between lecturer and students was well maintained. Meanwhile, the lecturer used so many code-switching and code-mixing in the teaching and learning process which represents the efforts to abridge the students' understanding in mastering the materials.

INTRODUCTION

Language holds the important part in human life. As a means of communication, people communicate among others in order to carry out interpersonal and transactional communication. As Eggins (2004: 4) said that people constantly used language in the ordinary life of human beings. It can be seen from daily life phenomena which belong to activities involving language, such as chatting to family members, organizing students in school environment, handling customers, following instructions in a manual instruction and etc. Through language, communication creates interaction in all contexts.

In the context of education, a communication employs complex structures of interaction among teacher and students because it is bounded to each other. This interaction associates with the transferring knowledge by teacher to students by means of classroom instructions. The interaction includes verbal and non-verbal language used both by teacher in delivering knowledge and students in

sharing their ideas as a part of teacher-student interaction. Through this interaction in the classroom, teacher and students build a common body of knowledge (Hall & Walsh, 2002). Furthermore, the classroom interaction could lead to the successful teaching and learning.

The successful learning process in a classroom, especially language learning depends on the communication among the teacher and students. Through this kind of communication, the interaction in classroom creates classroom interaction discourse in which the communication among the teacher and students becomes the central part of language learning. Besides, the classroom interaction discourse contextualizes learning experiences that encourage active participation among the students in the process of learning. Moreover, it also helps define the students' standard achievement to be assessed.

The classroom interaction usually follows a typical pattern of interaction. It includes teacher's instructions and students' turns to talk. There should be an equal portion among the teacher and student's interaction in order to achieve the successful learning. However, Walsh (2012) said that the roles of students in communication with the role of teacher in managing the conversation and turn-taking is unequal which associates to the domination of the teacher. On the other hand, it leads to limited learning in which there is no place for students to improve themselves in meaningful, spontaneous and natural interaction in the classroom. In previous research in the field of classroom interaction, it revealed that the pattern of classroom in western countries is IRE (Initiate – Response – Evaluation) as cited from Barnes 1992 and Cazden 1988 in Karjo (2015). The main purpose of IRE pattern is to elicit information from the students in order to ascertain whether they have understood the materials. However, this pattern was considered insufficient to be used anymore, thus, Wells (1993) substituted the IRE into IRF (Initiate – Response – Follow-up). By following up the response, this pattern allows the students to expand on their thinking, justify or clarify their opinions. The follow up (F) move in the IRF pattern can be done by providing the appropriate feedback to the students which usually takes the form of error correction.

The interaction of classroom consists of conversation / dialogue in which the speakers are taking one another. The students and teacher carried out various kinds of speech functions in their dialogue. Halliday (1984: 11) called dialogue as a 'process of exchange' which involved: information/good/services to exchange and giving or demanding. Furthermore, every speech function as an act of something which is called speech function. In conversation, the speaker might choose the speech functions which depend on their intention, such as choosing speech function which keep the conversation going in order to explore their interpersonal relation.

In case of teaching English as second or foreign language, the classroom interaction among teacher and students shows unique phenomena in which it consists of language variation (Margana, 2013). Moreover, the phenomena of code-mixing and code-switching enrich the complexity of the patterns as well as the structures of classroom interaction. Since English is the foreign language to be taught in Indonesia, especially in classroom context, the teachers who teach English are mostly non-native English speaker. Consequently, there are subsequent phenomena of language contact, such as code-mixing and code-

switching. The use of code mixing and also code-switching sometimes is intentionally carried out by the teacher sometimes not. Among multitude of those phenomena, there are some questions emerged which relate to the reasons, motivation as well as the functions of the use of code-mixing and code-switching.

In this study, the pattern of classroom interaction among lecturer and students was interesting to be examined and also the speech functions produced in their utterances.

METHOD

This study used descriptive qualitative approach in which revealing phenomena as clear as possible without any special treatment. The analysis covered the patterns of interaction in the classroom proposed by (Walsh, 2011). Moreover, the speech functions (Eggins and Slade, 1997) are examined in order to explore the attitude toward in the interaction and the interpersonal relationship among lecturer and students. Besides, the code-mixing and code switching (Hymes, 1974) were analysed in order to explain the reason behind the use of it. The object of the study was Pronunciation class in English Department. The unit of analysis was the exchanges among lecturer and students in the classroom during teaching and learning process.

FINDINGS

The result of the study showed that the classroom interaction in the Pronunciation class of English Department in UNNES was dynamic. It could be seen from the shifting of the classroom interaction patterns. These following shifts were the patterns of classroom interaction found in the Pronunciation class:

1. The pattern of IRF (initiation, response, and follow up)

Speaker	Utterances	Exchange
Lecturer	How do you pronounce this?	I
Student	[diagnosed]	R
Lecturer	[diagnozd], ya?	F
Students	[diagnozd]	R

Table of Data 1

From the data 1, it could be seen that at first the lecturer initiates the question to the students by stating “*how do you pronounce this?*”. This question was addressed to the students to check the students’ understanding to apply the formula which had been given to them. The students, then, respond the question by pronouncing the word “*diagnosed*”. However, the sound of the word seemed incorrect. Eventually, the teacher followed up the students’ response by saying

“*diagnosed, ya?*” as a feedback to the students’ response in order to ensure the students pronounce it correctly. It also encourages the students to deepen their learning. At the end of the students’ response, it showed how they try to answer the question correctly by using second chance and clue given by the lecturer. This pattern shows that the lecturer realizes the importance of feedback to the students’ response. It gives not only the correction, but also it encourages students to learn more.

2. The pattern of IRE

Another pattern found in the classroom interaction among lecturer and students in the pronunciation class of English Department is IRE (initiate, response and evaluate) in which the lecturer evaluates the students’ response. This following example was the proof:

Speaker	Utterances	Exchange
Lecturer	Rini, coba kamu ucapkan kata ini dengan benar (pointing word <i>leg</i>)	I
Student	[lek]	R
Lecturer	Incorrect. Yani, please	E
Students	[leg]	R
Lecturer	Great	E

Table of Data 2

Based on data 2, it could be seen the pattern of interaction where the lecturer preferred to judge the students’ response which made the students afraid to try another possible answer. In data 2, the lecturer asked a question to one of the students in class by saying “*Rini, coba kamu ucapkan kata ini dengan benar*”. This question, however, was answered incorrectly by the student pointed by the lecturer. The student mispronounced the word by saying ‘*lek*’ instead of ‘*leg*’. Knowing the student did not answer it correctly, the lecturer responds it by judging the answer incorrect by saying “*Incorrect, Yani please*”. The lecturer preferred to ask other students to answer the question rather than give second chance or encourage the former students to answer it for the second time. Similarly, when the second student answered the question correctly, the lecturer congratulated her without giving any advice or feedback which can encourage other students to learn something. Hence, it did not allow the students to express their idea to the lecturer.

Those two patterns of classroom interaction showed quite equal portion. It represented the dynamic interaction among lecturer and students in the classroom. With regard to the speech functions occurred in the classroom interaction among students and lecturer in pronunciation class of English department of UNNES, there had been some speech functions occurred in their interaction. Here were the findings about the number of moves carried out by lecturer and the students:

Speech Function	Lecturer	L (%)	Students	S (%)
Opening	76	100%	28	0%
Continuing	18	38%	21	62%
React: Responding	28	39%	76	51%
React: Rejoinder	34	53%	30	47%
TOTAL	156		155	

Table of Move distribution

Based on the table of move distribution, it could be seen that both lecturer and students shared almost the same portions of moves. It could be seen from the findings that the lecturer had 156 moves as speech functions, while students had 155 moves as speech functions. It could be said that the moves among lecturer and students is dynamic in which they carried out all kinds of speech function in their interactions. This following numbers are the examples of speech functions carried out in the classroom interaction in English department of UNNES:

1. Attending and engage

This opening speech function occurred in order to ask the students' attention toward the class. Here was the example found:

Speaker	Utterances	Speech function
Lecturer	Come on everyone, lihat ke sini	Attending (opening)
Students	Yes mam	Engage (<i>reacting</i>)

Table of Data 3

Based on data 3 above, it could be seen the way the lecturer tried to get the students attention by saying "*Come on everyone, lihat ke sini*", and responded by the students by saying "*yes mam*". It showed that the way the lecturer gets the students attention succeeded.

2. Offer and accept

This speech function allows someone to receive the things offered by someone else. This following example was found in this study

Speaker	Utterances	Speech function
Student	Mam, shall i clean the whiteboard?	offer (opening)
Lecturer	Yes please. Thank you	Accept (<i>reacting</i>)

Table of Data 4

Based on data 4, it could be seen that the student tried to offer his help to clean the white board to the lecturer by saying "*Mam, shall i clean the whiteboard?*". This utterance of speech function was reacted by the lecturer by saying "*Yes please. Thank you*" as reacting speech function toward the offer.

3. Command and comply

This is the command and comply speech function found in this study:

Speaker	Utterances	Speech function
Lecturer	Please take the remote of AC in the office. This one does not work.	Command (opening)
Student	Yes Mam	Comply (<i>reacting</i>)

Table of Data 5

Based on data 5, it could be seen the way the lecturer asks the student to look for the new remote of AC in the office by commanding “*Please take the remote of AC in the office. This one does not work.*” This command was responded by the student with comply speech function by saying “*yes Mam*”.

4. Statement and agree

The opening speech function in a form of statement also occurred in this study. Here was the example:

Speaker	Utterances	Speech function
Lecturer	It is easy for those who come from Tegal and nearby towns, since they have the sound [g].	Statement (opening)
Students	It is quite difficult for us who are not from Tegal and nearby towns to pronounce [g]	Agree (<i>reacting</i>)

Table of Data 6

Based on data 6, it could be seen the way the lecturer stated something and was agreed by the students, because they didn't have any other possible answer to react.

With regard to those examples of speech functions occurred in the classroom interaction among lecturer and students, every speech uttered by one of them is always followed by another speech. That's the reason why the lecturer and students share almost the same portion of moves with regard to the speech function carried out by them.

There have been also some phenomena occurred in this study with regards to code-mixing and code-switching carried out by the lecturer and students in

classroom interaction. It was mostly carried out by the lecturer rather than the students in its interaction. Here was the example:

1. Code-mixing

Code mixing refers to the embedding of various linguistic units such as affixes (bound morphemes), words (unbound morphemes), phrases and clauses from a co-operative activity where the participants, in order to infer what is intended, must reconcile what they hear with what they understand. Here is the example found in this study:

Speaker	Utterances	Code
Lecturer	Ok, now, selain those sounds, problems apa that you may face	Code-mixing
Students	This word is hard to pronounce	One code

Table of Data 7

Based on data 7 above, it could be seen how the lecturer used code-mixing in her way explaining the materials to the students. The lecturer tried to substitute some English words into Bahasa Indonesia words.

2. Code-switching

Code-switching refers to the mixing of words, phrases and sentences from two distinct grammatical (sub) systems across sentence boundaries within the same speech event. Here was the example found in this study:

Speaker	Utterances	Code
Lecturer	So far did you get some difficult things regarding to voiced sounds? Bagaimana? Apakah ada pertanyaan mengenai voiced sounds?	Code-switching
Students	No Mam	One code

Table of Data 8

Based on data 8, it could be seen the code-switching carried out by the lecturer. She did it in reason in which she tried to elevate students' diffidence in answering the lecturer's question.

DISCUSSION

Classroom interaction refers to collaborative exchange of thoughts, feelings or ideas between two or more people, resulting in a reciprocal effect on each other in the context of classroom (Brown, 2000). It covers the use of language through which the students access new knowledge, acquire and develop new skills, identify new problems of understanding, deal with communication breakdowns establish and maintain relationships and so on Walsh (2011). Teaching and learning process in Pronunciation class in English Department of UNNES consists of interaction among lecturer and students in which the pattern is quite dynamic. It has IRE (Initiation, Respond and Evaluate) and IRF (Initiation, Respond and Follow Up) patterns. The use of IRF pattern showed that the lecturer

tries to encourage the students to understand the materials, while the use of IRE pattern showed the lecturer judgment toward the students' response which prevent the students to express more. Moreover, the pattern is mostly dominated by the lecturer because the materials given to the students is about pronunciation practice in which the lecturer mostly explain few formulas how to pronounce the words and give the example of it. The students tend to be passive instead of collaborate with lecturer in the teaching and learning process. Besides, the use of games, questions, individual works, student initiates-teacher answers, open-ended teacher questioning, and collaboration are rarely used.

With regard to speech functions, there have been many occurrences of opening, reacting, responding and continuing speech functions. When the lecturer carried out certain speech functions, it was always followed by the other speech function from the students. On the analysis, the moves carried out by the lecturer and students are almost the same numbers. According to Eggins and Slades (1997) every time speakers take a role; they assign to the listeners a role as well. However, in the classroom interaction of pronunciation class, the speech function is solely proposed by the lecturer which eventually responded by the students.

With regard to the code-mixing and code-switching, there are a lot of occurrences carried out by both lecturer and students. However, the lecturer has higher portion compared to the students. It is in line with Margana (2013) that code-swathing and code-mixing in the context of English language learning are important as it is used to satisfy the academic purposes. The lecturer tends to use code-mixing and code-switching to explain the materials in understandable ways in order to achieve the learning objectives.

With regard to the implication toward the English teaching and learning, the patterns of classroom interaction can be managed in order to achieve the teaching and learning objectives where the students also contribute in their learning development. The various patterns may be used because every pattern has its own function. The more students are given more chance to contribute, the more skill development increase.

CONCLUSION

The result of the study showed the patterns of interaction among lecturer and students in pronunciation class of English Department in UNNES was quite dynamic, since the patterns of classroom interaction shift during the learning process from IRF and IRE vice versa. Since, the materials are mostly about pronouncing the words, the students never asked to work in a group to do a discussion. The speech functions also showed variety of moves carried out by the lecturer and students. The speech functions carried out by the lecturer are always followed by the students. Hence, the moves almost have the same portions among lecturer and students. It indicated that the process of exchange between lecturer and students was well maintained. Meanwhile, the lecturer used so many code-switching and code-mixing in the teaching and learning process which represents the efforts to abridge the students' understanding in mastering the materials. From the analysis, it implies that the pattern of classroom interaction really affects the students' contribution in which it encourages the opportunity to receive comprehensible input as well as feedback. It is also suggested that the further

study might examine the students' achievement which is affected by pattern of interaction to measure the precise impacts.

SUGGESTION

Based on the result of the study, it is suggested that the lecturer have to utilize various pattern of interaction in EFL or ESL classroom in order to boost the students learning such as giving them chance to do more tasks both independtly and in a group. It is also suggested that the students have to be given more chances to initiate the interaction in classroom interaction. By doing that, the students will not be too dependent toward the lecturer. Furthermore, the use of code-mixing and code-switching should be minimize since the context of learning is English Department where English should be the medium of learning.

For further study, tt is suggested that the further study might examine the students' achievement which is affected by pattern of interaction to measure the precise impacts in order to give the valid contribution toward the result of the study.

REFERENCES

- Eggins, S. (2004). *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. London: Printer Publishers, Ltd.
- Hall, J.K. and Walsh, M. (2002). Teacher-Student Interaction and Language Learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22,186-203. Retrieved from: <http://journals.cambridge.org/>
- Hymes, Dell. (1974). *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. University of Pennsylvania Press: Philadelphia.
- Margana. (2013). Alih Kode Dalam Proses Pembelajaran Bahasa Inggris di SMA. *LITERA 12 (1)*
- Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring Classroom Discourse: Language in Action*. London and New York: Routledge.