

# **The Analysis of Verbal Interaction Between Teacher and Students in The Classroom at SMA Negeri 1 Kampung Rakyat in Academic Year 2018-2019**

Muhammad Rusli<sup>1</sup>, Regina<sup>2</sup>, Annisa Siregar<sup>3</sup>, Sri rizki<sup>4</sup>

English Education Program Teacher Training and Education Faculty

Al-Washliyah Labuhanbatu University

Jl.H.Adam Malik / Jl.Sempurna Rantau Prapat

For these reasons, the interactions are supposed to be different from the general ones. This condition motivates the writer to focus the study on the classroom interaction. The objectives of this study are to explore the classroom interaction characteristics between teacher and student at SMA Negeri 1 Kampung Rakyat have met Walberg's teaching effectiveness. The subject of the study was 30 students and one teacher at year ten of immersion class at SMA Negeri 1 Kampung Rakyat. The results of the analysis showed that the most dominant characteristic in immersion classroom interaction was the content cross. It reflected that most of the teaching-learning time was devoted to questions and lectures by the teacher. The teacher spent 57.43% of the teaching-learning time, while the students spent 22.20% of the teaching-learning time. It showed that the students were active enough in the classroom interaction. The interaction in this immersion classroom was in three-way communication; there were interaction between teacher-students, students-teacher, and students-students. The immersion classroom interaction also met the requirements of teaching effectiveness elements made by Walberg (1986). Based on the students' opinion, the teaching-learning process in the classroom was good enough, however some students felt uncomfortable with the classroom atmosphere and the teacher's discipline of time.

## **INTRODUCTION**

The use of English language in classroom interaction is important for English Foreign Language (EFL) students. For EFL students, classroom is an educational institution where they can practice the language. In fact, practicing English as a foreign language usually occur inside the classroom. When they are outside the classroom, they are rare to practice the language since they

did not have partner to practice their English. Yuanfang (2009:1) states that English as a Foreign Language in the classroom do not have social function in EFL students' everyday life.

Moreover, the researcher decided to set English teachers at SMA Negeri 1 Kampung Rakyat Labuhanbatu Selatan in 2017/2018 academic year as the subject of this research. SMA Negeri 1 Kampung Rakyat was one of SMA in Labuhanbatu Selatan that were rare observed by researchers. Besides that, the school was recommended by one of English teacher of favorite SMA in Bengkulu. The school was interesting for the researcher since the school is rare observed by researchers.

English teaching and learning process in both senior high schools were teacher centered, 2) the general characteristics of classroom interaction encompassed content cross, student participation, student talking time (STT), indirect ratio which was differentiated by the different number of percentage, teacher talking time (TTT), teacher support, teacher control and period of silence, and 3) characteristic of classroom interaction was significantly influenced by the type of talking time performed by teachers and students during the interaction. Last, the research from Nurmasitah (2010) entitled the analysis of verbal interaction between teacher and students in the classroom at SMA Negeri 1 Kampung Rakyat in academic year 2017-2018 found that 1) the most dominant characteristic in immersion classroom interaction was the content cross (that most of the teaching-learning time was devoted to questions and lectures by the teacher), 2) the teacher spent 57.43% of the teaching-learning time, while the students spent 22.20% of the teaching-learning time that showed that the students were active enough in the classroom interaction, and 3) the teaching effectiveness elements used in the classroom were in the form of academic learning time, use of reinforcement, cues and feedback, co-operative learning, classroom atmosphere, higher order questions, advance organizers, direct instruction, indirect teaching, and the democratic classroom. Based on the explanation above, the researcher wanted to conduct a research entitled "An Analysis of of Verbal Interaction between Teacher and Students in the Classroom".

## **THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

Audi (2012:23) states that Analysis is the process of breaking up a concept, proposition, linguistic complex, or fact into its simple or ultimate constituents. It is not the same thing to take an argument in one's hand and then to see and solve its faults, as it is to be able to meet it

quickly while being subjected to questions; for what we know, we often do not know in a different context. Moreover, just as in other things speed or slowness is enhanced by training, so it is with arguments too, so that supposing we are unpractised, even though a point is clear to us, we are often too late for the right moment. Sometimes too it happens as with diagrams; for there we can sometimes analyse the figure, but not construct it again: so too in refutations, though we know on what the connexion of the argument depends, we still are at a loss to split the argument apart.

Hence there are two kinds of method, one for discovering the truth, which is known as *analysis*, or the *method of resolution*, and which can also be called the *method of discovery*. The other is for making the truth understood by others once it is found. This is known as *synthesis*, or the *method of composition*, and can also be called the *method of instruction*.

- Definition of Classroom Interaction

In Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), classroom interaction is really encouraged to occur in the EFL classroom. Classroom interaction will make the students interested in communicating at the classroom. Goronga (2013:34) asserts that classroom interaction makes the students participating in the teaching and learning process. It means that classroom interaction encourages students to involve.

- Types of Classroom Interaction

Classroom interaction will occur if teacher and students interact at each other. Interaction that occurs in the classroom will be described depending on the dominant types of interaction. According to Abarca (2004:121), there are three dominant types of classroom interaction including teacher-dominated, teacher-centered, and students-centered. In teacher-dominated, the teacher takes much time to talk and the students do not have more chance to talk in the classroom interaction. In teacher-centered, the teacher controls the student to participate at the classroom interaction. Meanwhile, in students-centered, the teacher is as facilitator and the students are more active in the classroom interaction.

- The Role of Teachers in the Classroom

Classroom interaction will depend on the dominant type of interaction that is from teacher and students talk. If the teacher gives chance to the students to talk, the classroom interaction will be dominant by students-students. Meanwhile, if the teacher always takes much time to talk in the classroom, the classroom interaction will be dominant by teacher. Ribas (2010:89) insists that

teacher has great influence to make the students involve in classroom interaction. It means that students who are active in the classroom interaction are determined by the teacher's role that give chance the students to talk in the classroom.

## **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

### Place and Time of Study

The research of this study will take the place at eleventh grade of SMA Negeri 1 Kampung Rakyat. This reserach will take the time on 12 January 2018.

### Subject of the Research

The subject of this study is the eleventh grade of SMA Negeri 1 Kampung Rakyat in the academic year of 2017-2018. The researcher will chooses students of the eleventh grade as the population because they have ever been taught English from junior high school; so they have had basic competence in learning English.

### Instrument of the Research

In this research, the researcher used two instruments that included observation tally sheet and recording (audio recording). Those instruments will be explained bellow:

#### Observation Tally Sheet

Through the observation tally sheet, the researcher will get expected data since the researcher will put out code on the particular teacher or students talk during the teaching and learning process.

Because at each three seconds might involve some categories both teacher and students talk, there were some rules for deciding which one the best category should be put out code consistencely. These rules are as recommended by Flander (1970 cited in Sigh et al. 2008).

#### Recording

The researcher used audio recording to make the data accurately. The recording helped the researcher to know types of the teachers and students talk during the learning and teaching process at the trait classroom.

### Techniques of Data Collection

The researcher collected the data of this research from January 2018. The data will be collected by observing seven times class meeting by using two methods in collecting the data including observation tally sheet, and recording (audio recording).

#### Observation Tally Sheet

The researcher put out code on the particular teachers and students talk during teaching and learning process after the researcher did plotting the coded data firstly. The researcher put out code at the end of each three seconds interval in order to get expected data. Here is an illustration of how to put a code of classroom verbal interaction based on the observation tally sheet's guidance and the rules of Flander's code system.

#### Recording

The researcher recorded the whole part of teaching and learning process in order to get the teacher and students talk during the process. In recording, the researcher was helped by a co-researcher to put code on the particular the teachers and students talk. The reliability of the observation tally sheet was calculated by using Pearson Product Moment Correlation.

Futhermore, in recording, the researcher recorded teacher's talk, students' talk, and silence that based on the observation tally sheet's guidance adapted from Flander (1970 cited in Hai and Bee 2006) as the follows:

Teacher's talk consists of direct and indirect talk. The indirect talk includes teacher accepts the students' feeling and ideas; praises or encourages student action or behavior; repeats, clarifies, builds or develops ideas or suggestions given by a student; asks question about content or procedures, based on the teacher ideas and expecting an answer from the students. Meanwhile, the direct talk includes the teacher gives facts or opinions about content or procedure expression of his own ideas, gives his own explanation or citing an authority other than a students; gives directions, commands or orders or initiation; and asks the students not to interrupt with foolish questions.

Students talk consist of direct talk that includes the students talk in responding to teacher's talk; and expressing their own ideas; initiating a new topic; freedom to develop opinions and a line of thought like asking thoughtful questions.

Silence includes pauses, short periods of silence and period of confusion in which communication cannot be understood by the observer.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

This research explored the classroom interaction, the teacher performance and the teaching effectiveness in teaching-learning process. In the following chapter the researcher tries to describe in detail the results of observation conducted in SMA Negeri 1 Kampung Rakyat

## Results

### Students and Teacher Verbal Interaction Characteristics

From the data collection, this research recorded four meetings of classroom interactions. Each meeting was observed in 30 minutes length. The observed behavior was translated into the descriptive codes. Conducting step 1 and step 2 of Flanders Interaction Analysis resulted in a matrix of classroom interaction. The matrix is presented in tables below. The matrix of 4 meetings was analyzed using step 3 and 4 to know the types of interaction characteristics, and then the results could be seen as follows.

### Content Cross

Content Cross profile indicates teacher dependence on questions and lectures. Teacher Control

Teacher Control profile indicates extensive commands and reprimands by the teacher. Teacher Support

Teacher Support profile indicates teacher's reinforcing and encouraging. Student Participation

Student Participation profile indicates students' responses to the teacher's behavior.

### Teacher Talk

Teacher Talk indicates teacher's verbal activities in teaching – learning process.

### Direct and Indirect Influence

In teacher talk, there are two teacher's influences; direct and indirect influence. Direct influence determines the degree of teacher direct teaching, while indirect influence determines the degree of teacher indirect teaching.

### Lecturing

Lecturing indicates teacher's activities in explaining, giving facts or opinion about content or procedure with his own ideas; asking rhetorical questions.

### Silent

Silent indicates pauses, short periods of silence, and periods of confusion in which communication can not be understood by the observer during teaching-learning process.

### Talking Time

### Classroom Interaction Analysis

The characteristics of classroom interaction of each meeting in Immersion Class have been presented on the data results in the previous part of this chapter. The interpretation of data results will be presented as follows;

#### The Characteristics of Classroom Interaction in the First Meeting

The content cross was the most dominant characteristic in the first meeting. The proportion (99.22%) showed that the teacher spent more time in teaching – learning process to ask questions and lecture.

The second dominant characteristic was the students' participation. The students participated in responding the teacher's question and talking initiation. The proportion of student's participation in the first meeting was 14.22%, it meant that the students were active enough in the classroom interaction.

The teacher control was the third dominant characteristic in the first meeting. It spent 1.50% of teaching – learning time. From the result, it showed that the teacher spent a little time in giving directions and criticizing or justifying activity. While in supporting the students, teacher only spent 0.44% of the teaching – learning time. It showed that the teacher was rarely in praising or encouraging the students.

From the additional data results, the other characteristics of classroom interaction could be interpreted. The characteristics of classroom interaction in the first meeting are summarized below;

The teacher spent more her talking time in lecturing (37.55%). She was giving facts or opinion about content or procedure with her own ideas and asking rhetorical questions to the students. It meant that lecturing was the dominant activity this teaching – learning time.

Teacher used more direct teaching (74.45%) than indirect teaching (25.54%) in her talking time. It meant that the teacher used more direct teaching in teaching her students; for example: lecturing, giving directions, and criticizing or justifying authority.

The proportion of silent time was still high in this classroom interaction. Silence or confusion in this classroom spent 27.28% of the teaching – learning time.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

## 5.1. Conclusions

Based on the data analysis and the results of the study, following conclusions were drawn.

The students were active enough in the classroom interaction. The results showed, in average, 22.20% from the total teaching-learning time was devoted to students' participation. The students participated in talk-response and talk-initiation.

The interaction in the classroom was in three-way communication; there were interaction between teacher-students, students-teacher, and students-students.

Based on the data results from the questionnaire, it could be concluded that the students responded positively to some extent in the teaching-learning process. However, there were some statements got a negative response from students. 40% of the students said that they didn't like the classroom atmosphere in their class and 43,33% of the students said that the teacher was not discipline.

## REFERENCES

- Amatiri, V. O. (2015). The Instructional: A Review of Flanders' Interaction Analysis in Classroom Interaction. *International Journal of Secondary Education*. Vol. 3(5): p. 43-49
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Teaching by Principle: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*, Second Edition. San Fransisco: Longman
- Brown, H. D. (2000).. (2007). *Principle of Language Learning and Teaching*, Fifth Edition. San Fransisco: Longman.
- Carter, R. and Nunan, D. (2001). *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages*. United States of America: Cambridge
- Cashdan, A. (1979). *Language Reading and Learning*. Great Britain: Oxford.
- Cohen, L. M, L. Morrison, K. (2007). *Research Method in Education*. New York: Routledge
- Fatimah, M. A. 2013. A Study of Teacher Talk and Students Talk in Verbal Classroom Interaction to Develop Speaking Skill for Young Learner. *Journal of English and Education*. Vol. 1(1), p. 1-10.
- Garrett, T. (2008). Student-Centered and Teacher-Centered Classroom Management: A Case Study of Three Elementary Teachers. *Journal of Classroom Interaction*. Vol 43(1): p. 34-47

Hornby, A.S. (2000). Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary: Oxford University Press.

Houwer, J. D. Barnes, H. D. Moors, A. (2013). What is Teaching? On the Nature and Merits of a Functional Definition of Learning. Accessed on April, 10th2016.

Jarolimek, J. and Foster C. (1976). Teaching and Learning in the Elementary School. United States of America: Macmillan Publishing.

Kumpulainen, K. and Wray, D. (2002). Classroom Interaction and Social Learning: From Theory to Practice. New York: Routledge Falmer.

Lubis, Y. (1988). Developing Communicative Proficiency in the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) Class. Indonesia.

Nunan, D. (1999). Second Language Teaching & Learning. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Raths, J. P, Raths J. and Van, N. J. (1970). Studying Teaching. United State of America.

Smith, H. L. (1968). Language and the Total System of Communication in Archibald A. Hill. (Ed) Linguistic (p.103). United States.

Sugiyono. (2011). Metode Penelitian Pendidikan (Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D). Badung: Alfabeta

Suherdi, D. (2009). Classroom Discourse Analysis: A System Approach. Bandung: Celtics Press.

Triani, P. R. 2013. Classroom Interaction: An Analysis of Teacher Talk and Students Talk in English Young Learners (EYL). Journal of English and Education. Vol. 1(1), p. 163-172.

Tsegaye, A,G. and Davidson, L.M. (2014). The Ratio of Teacher Talking Time to Students Talking Time in EFL Classroom: A Case in Six Partner Preparatory School of Haramaya University Ethiopia. Visakhapatnam: India. Vol.3 no.5

Tsui, A.B.M. (1995). Introducing Classroom Interaction. London: Penguin.

Xiao, Y. (2006). Teacher Talk and EFL in University Classroom. China: Chongqing Normal University & Yangtze Normal University.

Yuanfang, Yu. (2009). A Study of Foreign Language Learning Motivation and Achievement: From A Perspective of Sociocultural Theory. CERELA Journal, vol.32 no.3.

