

Classroom Interaction in English Language Class for Students of Economics Education

Ima Isnaini Taufiqur Rohmah

Post Graduate Program of Semarang State University
Semarang, Central Java, Indonesia

Abstract

This research is attempts to find out the types of teacher and students talk and also the patterns of teaching-learning interaction. This research was qualitative case study conducted in English Language 1 class Economics Education Study Program of Teacher Training and Education Institute Persatuan Guru Republik Indonesia Bojonegoro, East java. The participants were an English teacher and thirty four students. Observations were conducted twice in November 2016. The data were analysed by using the combination of interaction analysis system adapted from (Flanders, 1970; Moskowitz, 1971; Brown, 1975; Al-Otaibi, 2004; and Erling et al., 2012). The findings show that the teacher produced almost all types of teacher talk. They also produced almost all types of student talk in learning process. The teaching-learning activities used produced the patterns of group work, choral responses, closed-ended teacher questioning (IRF), individual work, student initiates-teacher answers, open-ended teacher questioning, and collaboration. Consider the result of this study. It is important for the teacher to build interactive and communicative teaching-learning activities involving more interaction and participation among the students. It is also advisable for the teacher to consider the factors that might affect the teaching-learning interaction in the classroom.

Keywords: classroom interaction, interaction pattern, student talk, teacher talk

Cite as: Rohmah, I. I.T. (2017). Classroom Interaction in English Language Class for Students of Economics Education . *Arab World English Journal*, 8 (2). DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol8no2.14>

Introduction

In classroom interaction, all the classroom events are included, both verbal interaction and non-verbal interaction. Meng (2011, p. 98) states that “teachers should include both verbal and non-verbal languages. Verbal interaction covers written interaction and oral interaction”. Meanwhile, non-verbal interaction refers to behavioral responses in classroom without using words such as head-nodding, hand-raising, and so on. Moreover, successful interaction may promote involvement between teacher and student or among students, enhance learning, and motivate students. Crago (1997) states that “teacher and students also build on each other’s communicative behavior as they work together to achieve goals, relate experiences, and meet curricular demands” (p. 246). Whatever purpose they bring into the classroom, the outcome is a co-production by both the teacher and the students who jointly manage interaction as well as learning (Allwright, 1984, as cited in Zhang 2012, p. 980).

In addition, when students are engaged in direct classroom activities, they will learn better. The students who are active in classroom through taking turns may develop their language. Meanwhile, those who are passive in classroom will have less opportunity to learn language. It is clear that the active role between teacher and students is needed to create a good interaction in the classroom. They should actively engage in the communication event or interaction in classroom. Therefore, the quality of teaching and learning process in the classroom is mainly determined by teacher and students in how they interact with each other actively. Brown (2000) explains that “interaction is the collaborative exchange of thoughts, feelings, or ideas between two or more people, resulting in a reciprocal effect on each other” (p. 165). Interaction occurs not only from one side but also from at least two people who give and receive messages in order to achieve communicative process. It is in line with Wagner (1994) who asserts that “interaction is reciprocal events that require at least two objects and two actions” (p. 8). Interaction occurs when these objects and events naturally influence one another.

In teaching process, the teacher may set a topic and material, give directions, give and take the responses, determine who contributes in teaching and learning activities, provide feedback to the students, and so forth in order to make the students get the output effectively. The teacher may share his/her own experiences with the students and encourage them to talk about their own ones. The teacher is supposed to elicit more student talk in a classroom conducted in such a manner. Therefore, the amount of teacher talk and student talk should be balanced or the amount of student talk should be more dominated because the good proportion of talk may facilitate interaction effectively and efficiently. Since teacher talk and student talk are the important parts that establish classroom interaction, teacher may not be allowed to dominate the class during teaching and learning process. The teacher should give the students more opportunities to initiate topics for interaction with others. According to Cullen (1998) “good teacher talk means little teacher talk” (p. 179) because too much talk by the teacher may deprive students’ opportunity to speak.

In this present research, the researcher analyzes the classroom interaction by using the combination of interaction analysis system from some experts (Flanders, 1970; Moskowitz, 1971; Brown, 1975; Al-Otaibi, 2004; and Erling et al., 2012). All of interaction categories by those experts divided into teacher talk and student talk categories and also the pattern of interaction. The teacher talk categories used are accepting student’s feelings, praising and

encouraging, joking, accepting or using student's ideas, asking questions, repeating student's response verbatim, lecturing or giving information, giving directions, criticizing or justifying student's behavior and response, and giving feedback. Meanwhile, the categories of student talk include student talk-response (specific), student talk-response (choral), student talk-initiation, student talk (inquiry), expressing lack of understanding verbally, student talk in single, student talk in pairs, student talk in groups, silence, silence-AV, confusion (work-oriented), confusion (non-work oriented), hand-raising participation, and laughing.

A number of studies had been conducted in the same field but most of them taken in regular and English classes. Then, to analyze teacher talk and student talk, most of some previous studies use Flanders' Interaction Analysis Categories (1970) and Foreign Language Interaction System (FLINT) by Moskowitz (1971). For example, the study conducted by Hussain & Bakhsh (2011) who investigated the effects of classroom interaction on students' academic achievement at secondary school level. Rashidi (2010) conducted classroom interaction analysis research in order to find out the pattern of classroom interaction in EFL classroom in Iran. Tsui (1994) to analyze the classroom interaction of English subject including the verbal and non-verbal interaction of teacher-students and among students. Pujiastuti (2013) conducted interaction analysis focusing on the investigation on the realization of verbal classroom interaction, types of teacher talk, teacher talk implication on student's motivation, student talk and teacher's roles in classroom interaction. Suryati (2015) reports a study on teachers' use of interaction strategies in English Language Teaching (ELT) in lower secondary level of education and Liu and Zhu (2012) conducted a research which attempted to investigate and analyze the phenomenon of teacher talk time, questioning pattern, and feedback pattern.

This present research intensively analyzed the type of teacher's talk and student's talk and also the pattern of interaction using the combination of some interaction analysis systems from (Flanders, 1970; Moskowitz, 1971; Brown, 1975; Al-Otaibi, 2004; and Erling et al., 2012). The researcher chooses English Language 1 class of Economics Education Program since the teacher did not has qualification requested, that is English background. It is expected that this research is able to be one of reflection and evaluation media for the teacher and students during the process of teaching and learning.

Methodology

The design of this research was a qualitative case study. The researcher used classroom interaction discourse analysis which focused on the interaction happened in the class. The unit of analysis are teacher and students utterances; phrases, words and sentences. The data were dig up from the teacher and the students in English language 1 class of Economics Education Study Program. Here, the data were obtained from observing two meetings in November 2016 .

The instrument that used in this study was the combination of interaction analysis system from (Flanders, 1970; Moskowitz, 1971; Brown, 1975; Al-Otaibi, 2004; and Erling et al., 2012). The researcher used an interactive model of analysis proposed by Miles and Huberman (1994: 10-12). In analyzing data, the three main components were data reduction, data display, conclusion drawing/ verification. In this research there were some strategies used to obtain trustworthiness of the data. Those strategies were used to check accuracy or validity the findings of the research. Creswell (2007, p. 207-209) mentions eight strategies of verifying the

trustworthiness of the research. From the eight strategies proposed, the researcher used three techniques. They were: triangulation, member checking, and rich and thick description.

Findings and Discussion

Types of Teacher Talk

From the two observations conducted, it showed that the teacher performed almost all types of teacher talk, except accepting student's feeling. It can be seen from the table 1:

Table 1. Teacher talk during two observations

Types of teacher talk	%		The example of utterances
Giving feedback	2.0		Sometimes-sometimes, in our lives-in our lives, we-we want to be someone who are ideal for us. OK! Who are ideal for us? For example, Felizia wanted to be architect. And then, Evan wanted to be—wants to be a doctor. OK. And I think that no one want to be a thief.
Criticizing or justifying behavior & response	2.0	T	Why do you choose to be a doctor?
		S	Because my parents is...
		T	My parents? ...
Giving directions	24.3		Well, first, you have to look at in the slide... expression intention. Expression intention!
			Oke, Naila, please read the text "pilot". Read louder ya mbak Naila!
			Now...open page nine ya...do the task with your group...
Lecturing or giving information	8.4		Although this one is not English language, OK, but you know from the subtitle
Repeating student's response verbatim	19.9		No...Ooo...No one...really...pilot is good lho...
Asking questions	23.9		Teacher want to know, who wants to be a pilot?
Accepting or using student's ideas	2.8	T	So, you, both of them, choose amusement park because the place is ...?
		S	Emm. Comfortable
		T	Comfortable to refresh our mind.
Joking	1.2		Kamu itu, Sisca itu the wrong person in the wrong place.
Praising & encouraging	15.5		Good answer mas arham....give applause to mas arham...
Accepting student's feeling	0.0		-

From the data in table 1, it can be seen that the types of teacher talk used by the teacher, from high percentage to low percentage, are giving directions, asking questions, repeating student's response verbatim, praising and encouraging, lecturing or giving information, accepting or using student's ideas, criticizing or justifying student's behavior and response, giving feedback, and joking. Meanwhile, accepting student's feeling is never used by the teacher.

During the observation in teaching and learning process, the teacher was always straight to the point to greet students then ask them to start the lesson. Without asking the student's feeling, teacher directly give directions to them to follow the learning activity such reading the text, playing game or watching the video related to the lesson material.

The teacher also tended to focus on the teaching and learning activities instead of asking and accepting what the student's feeling was. Giving directions takes up the higher percentage during teaching and learning process. The teacher often gave directions to the students. It occurred when the teacher gave instructions about the games that would be played by them or when the teacher asked them to do something like reading the text, opening the page of book, doing task with partner and asking students to come in front of the class.

Types of Students Talk

The first issue deals with the types of student talk used in the first grade students. From two observations, the students performed all types of teacher talk. It can be seen from the table 2.

Table 2. Students talk in two observations

Types of student talk	%	The example of utterances
Laughing	9.9	-
Hand-raising participation	0.5	-
Confusion (Non-work-oriented)	0.5	-
Confusion (Work-oriented)	2.8	-
Silence-AV	2.2	-
Silence	9.3	-
Student talk in groups	3.3	<i>(They discussed with his group to decide who will be the representative.)</i>
Student talk in pairs	2.8	(The students started to do their work in pair to make dialogue of conversation.)
Student talk in single	7.1	Oh iya ding sightsee, bener. Eye-catching.
Expressing lack of understanding verbally	2.2	-
Student talk, inquiry	2.8	Pak, pak, pak, tanya kalo misalnya sebelum selesai pak, terus udah... (Her word was cut by teacher because the teacher got the point from her question.)
Student talk, initiation	7.7	Because we can do (before completing it, the teacher cut his words.)
Student talk, response (Choral)	11.5	T OK, can you, can you tell what condition?
		S Thief. Child
		T A child
Student talk, response (Specific)	37.4	T The places?
		S Places. We prefer the mall
		T You prefer the mall.
		S eeee..I like to wear white dress

In two observations conducted, the types of students talk used by the students from high percentage to low percentage are student talk-response (specific), student talk-response (choral), silence, laughing, student talk-initiation, student talk in single, student talk in groups, student talk-inquiry, student talk in pairs, confusion (work-oriented), expressing lack of understanding verbally, silence-AV, confusion (non-work-oriented), and hand-raising participation.

First, Student talk-response (specific) gets the highest percentage in the two observations. It occurred when a student gave response to teacher's question and directions. The student responded directly and predictably with the specific answers. The second is student talk-response (choral). The students are speaking in chorus at the same time. This might be in response to teacher's question or reading in chorus. At the beginning of lesson, the students used this type to answer the greeting from the teacher. When the teacher greeted '*morning class!*', the students later responded chorally by saying '*morning!*'. The third and the fourth type of students' talk are silence and laughing. The condition of the classroom was not always noise. Sometimes, the students got silence too. The fifth and the sixth are student talk-initiation and student talk in single. The students used student-talk initiation when they initiated to participate and comment on the lesson content with their own ideas, opinions, and reactions.

Then, student talk in single occurred when the teacher asked one student to read aloud the text from the book. The next type of student talk is student talk in groups. When students got a task in group, they presented it and read it in front of the class. Next, the types of student talk that got the same percentage in 2.8% are student talk-inquiry and student talk in pairs. The students used student talk-inquiry when they asked for further information. Student talk in pairs is the next one. Here, the teacher gave the students peer task like making dialogue. They were also asked to present and read their work in front of the class.

Furthermore, the other types of student talk are confusion (work-oriented), expressing lack of understanding verbally, silence-AV, confusion (non-work-oriented), and hand-raising participation. Confusion (work-oriented) occurred when the teacher served them with a game and exercise, they all spoke at the same time and called out excitedly. Then, expressing lack of understanding verbally occurred when the students asked the teacher to explain something that they did not understand yet.

Next, silence-AV occurred when the teacher played a video or short movie. During watching that video, all the students got silence in a period of time. In confusion (non-work-oriented), the students were out-of-order. They might not be concerned with the task at hand. Lastly, the students could be said that they rarely used hand-raising participation. It was because they were not accustomed to use it. They never raised their hand to participate during teaching and learning process. Meanwhile, from two observations conducted, the students raised their hand when they knew sure about the answer. If they did not know, they would follow the other friends to answer together. It can be said that the type of student talk that is mostly used by students in the class is student talk-response (specific). It is followed by student talk-response (choral), student talk in single, silence, laughing, student talk-initiation, confusion (work-oriented), expressing lack of understanding verbally, student talk-inquiry, student talk in groups, silence-AV, student talk in pairs, confusion (non-work-oriented), and hand-raising participation.

The Pattern of Interactions

The patterns of interaction occurred in the teaching and learning are choral responses, closed-ended teacher questioning (IRF), collaboration, and student initiates-teacher answers. First, choral responses pattern occurred when the teacher greeted the students by saying 'morning class!' and the students responded 'morning'. After checking students' attendance, the teacher tells about today's teaching material. Here, choral responses pattern occurred when the teacher asked the students about what they wanted to be in the future. Another choral responses pattern occurred when the teacher asked the students whether they had finished their work. Secondly, closed-ended teacher questioning (IRF) pattern occurred when the teacher gave some reflections on the short movie that they watched.

This pattern showed how the teacher initiated the students to ask a question; the student responses to the teacher's question; and the teacher gave feedback. The third is collaboration pattern. It occurred when the teacher gave the students a warmer activity like a game. In expressing intention material, the students had to do a warmer activity to discuss the picture of four interesting places with their friends. The last pattern is student initiates-teacher answers. This pattern occurred when the student thought for questions and asked to teacher directly and then the teacher responses the student's question. The example of each pattern is figured out in the table 3.

Table 3. The example of pattern of interaction in two observations

The pattern	The example of utterances
choral responses pattern	Who wants to be a doctor? Mas reza....do you want
	No sir....
	Who... no one???
	Hahahahaha (<i>laughing</i>)
closed-ended teacher questioning (IRF)	I just want to knowkalau kalian semua do a good thing to your friend, kira kira ada yang akan ask the return nggak ya?
	No....!!!
	Yes good... don't ask the return lho ya.. Allah will give us later...
collaboration pattern	Good morning friends... we are from the first team will explain our picture.
	In the picture, many people go to the beach because they want to watch sunrise or sunset
student initiates-teacher answers	Read all...or.... Not teacher
	Read all ..

From the table 3, it is seen that the teacher dominated the classroom. The teacher frequently gave directions and asked question. Although the class was still dominated by the teacher, it did not mean that the students were passive. The students seemed to be active since the teacher sometimes used interactive and communicative activities such as game, exercises, and discussion to raise the students' interaction and participation. These activities can be done

individually, in pairs, or even in groups. These activities also refer to the student-centered because the students are forced to get involved actively.

Discussion

The teacher plays dominant roles in the classroom interaction because he used almost all types of teacher talk during teaching and learning process such as giving directions, asking questions, lecturing, repeating student's response verbatim, and praising and encouraging. This consistency of findings is similar to the previous research as mentioned by Nunan (1991) who states that "many language teachers were surprised by the amount of talk that they used in classroom" (p. 190). The dominance of teacher talk proportion in each meeting occurred since the teachers mainly explained grammatical rules and gave directions on learning activities.

The current research findings also revealed that the roles of the teacher which were mostly adopted by the teacher are controller, director, manager, facilitator, and resource. It can be shown from the high percentage of giving directions, asking questions, lecturing, repeating student's response verbatim, and praising and encouraging by which the teachers led the flow of interaction. The roles of teachers are supported by Brown (2000, pp. 166-168) & Dagarin (2004, p. 130) who stated that "teacher's directions is the highest percentage, it is needed since the students need guidance in their learning process". Without teacher's directions, the students might get confusion and doubt about what they do next. The most important point that determines how successfully students learn is the way instructions are formulated well by the teacher. It is line with Brown (2000, pp. 166-168) & Dagarin (2004, p. 130) in the previous chapter who mentioned that "the roles of teacher as controller, director, manager, facilitator, and resource". The teacher stated that directions were needed to invite the students to follow the teaching and learning activity.

The type of teacher talk that is rarely or never used by the teacher is accepting student's feeling. This type always gets the lower percentage from both observations. The teacher used this type depending on the student's feeling. If they were happy, the teacher would keep it on in order to make them more excited. Then, the teacher asked the students to be calm when they got nervous. Next, the teacher asked them personally when they look sad. There is need for teachers to be aware and appreciate the mood of the learners. In short, the teachers produce this type in order to help the students to understand the student's feelings and attitudes by letting them know that they will not be punished when they are expressing their emotions.

It can be stated that all types of teacher talk are the important part of classroom interaction for student's acquisition. It is supported by Nunan (1991) who argues that "teacher talk has crucial importance not only for the organization of the classroom but also for the process of the acquisition" (p. 189). The types of teacher talk used by the teacher are so far from the traditional classroom, the teacher only sits or stands behind a desk and spends a large amount of time giving lecturing and directions whereas the students' role are sitting, listening, and taking note passively. However, Brown (2001: 99) recommends that teacher talk should not occupy the major proportion of class hours, otherwise, the teachers are probably not giving students enough opportunity to talk.

From the research findings, it is also found that almost all the types of student talk are used by students in the class. Some types of student talk in the classroom might be intentionally used by the students as a learning strategy. Regarding student talk, this research has shown the types of student talk covering responses and initiation. Many directions, lectures, and questions posed by the teachers have motivated the students to give responses and initiation. Senowarsito (2013) supports it by stating that “the students tend to use some interpersonal function markers such as cooperation, agreement, disagreement, response, reaction, and confirmation during teaching and learning process” (p. 94).

Candela (1999) claims that “when the students get more engaged with the academic task, their participation in knowledge construction is more active and they can manage to make various discourse moves to use their power and yield it” (p. 157). Some types of student talk in the classroom might be intentionally used by the students as a learning strategy. Regarding student talk, this research has shown the types of student talk covering responses and initiation. Many directions, lectures, and questions posed by the teachers have motivated the students at giving responses and initiation. In conveying the responses, the students do not always do it individually. Sometimes, the students give response chorally. It is in line with Brock-Utne (2006) who says that “chorus answer is safe to talk for students” (p. 35).

The patterns of interaction during teaching and learning process is not fully dominated by the teacher because the students also actively participate in teaching and learning process. The teacher emphasizes student-centered, relying heavily on hands-on activities, group work, peer work, individual work, projects, and discussion to engage students and encourage active participation. The patterns of interaction during teaching and learning process in this research occur between teacher and student or student and student. This result is similar to Brown (2000) who states that “interaction is the collaborative exchange of thoughts, feelings, or ideas between two or more people, resulting in a reciprocal effect on each other” (p. 165). The term of interaction implies an action-reaction or a two-way influence which may be between individuals (e.g. student-student or teacher-student) or between an individual and a group (e.g. teacher-audience) or between materials and individuals (Biddle, 1967, as cited in Sadeghi et al., 2012, p. 167).

Learner-centered activity such as group work, which forces students to talk to each other spontaneously, ask each other questions, and respond in a natural way, is one of example how this might be practiced. In group work pattern, the students are given a group task in doing learning activities like playing game and doing a task from the book. To support it, Meng & Wang (2011) assert that “group work activity is a good way to change the traditional teacher talk that dominates the class” (p. 102). Besides, Jones (2007) states that “when students are working together in English, they talk more, share their ideas, learn from each other, get involved more, feel more secure and less anxious, and enjoy using English to communicate” (p. 3). It is in line with Lightbown & Spada (1999) who argue that “students produce not only a greater quantity but also a greater variety of language functions, for example, disagreeing, hypothesizing, requesting, clarifying, and defining” (p. 85).

The last pattern is collaboration. The collaboration pattern is also well-known as pair work pattern. It occurred when the students work in pair to do the activity or task given by the

teacher. The activity that is used by the teacher is in line with what Watcyn-Jones (2002) mentioned that “there are several types of activities for working in pairs such as ice-breaker or warm-up activities” (p.7). Wallace, Stariba, & Walberg (2004) note that “frequent collaboration gives chances to the students in communicating meaningful ideas one another and being active learners”(p. 14). To strengthen it, Storch (2001) argues that “collaboration pattern seems to be a good idea for teachers to give a communicative activities because it immediately develops the amount of student practice” (p. 53). In short, collaborative work often exerts a beneficial effect on task performance.

Conclusion and Suggestion

The findings of the research show that the teacher perform almost all types of teacher talk in order to make their students get involved and talk actively in teaching and learning process. They provide many communicative learning activities that make them use teacher talk continuously. Giving directions, asking questions, lecturing or giving information, praising and encouraging, and repeating student’s response verbatim are the most frequently used by both teachers during teaching and learning process. Meanwhile, criticizing or justifying student’s behavior and response, accepting or using student’s ideas, giving feedback, joking, and accepting student’s feeling are rarely used by them.

The students also perform almost all types of student talk in participating learning process in the classroom. They use the types of student talk continuously with different proportion because the teacher provide interactive learning activities. The use of each type of student talk depends on the learning activities given by the teacher. It is found that the students are often given individual task, peer task, and group task during teaching and learning process. The more interactive activities they get, the more talk they use.

The patterns of interaction are not fully dominated by the teacher because the students also actively participate in teaching and learning process. These patterns might increase talk and interaction both teacher and students. When the teachers use the learning activities like game, drills, individual task, peer task, and group task, the patterns of group work, choral responses, closed-ended teacher questioning (IRF), individual work, student initiates-teacher answers, open-ended teacher questioning, and collaboration emerge during teaching and learning process. These patterns occur between teacher and student(s) and between student(s) and student(s).

Based on the conclusion above, it is highly recommended that the teacher should decrease their proportion to give lecturing, asking questions, and giving directions by providing the students an interesting theme or the latest topic to be discussed in group work or in pair work, challenging questions as well to engage higher order thinking skills of the students. The teachers should also give a wait-time for them to think then convey what things are going on their mind, more creative in designing the teaching style, communicative activities, materials, and tasks in order to make students actively participate in the class. The students should be more actively engaged in the classroom interaction and braver to talk and interact with their teacher and students directly during teaching and learning process.

Acknowledgement: This paper is funded by Indonesian Education Scholarship (LPDP)

About the Author:

Ima Isnaini Taufiqur Rohmah is a Doctorate Student of English Education Study Program of Semarang State University, Semarang, Central Java, Indonesia. She has special interest in English Language Teaching Methodology. She has published some articles in journals in the area. She has also presented some of her research results in international seminar such as TEFLIN.

References

- Al-Otaibi, S. S. H. (2004). *The Effect of "Positive Teacher Talk" on Students' Performance, Interaction, and Attitudes: A Case Study of Female Students at the College of Languages & Translation at King Saud University*. Saudi Arabia: Thesis.
- Allwright, D. (1984). The Importance of Interaction in Classroom Language Learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 5(2), 156-171.
- Brock-Utne, (2006). Focus on Fresh Data on the Language of Instruction Debate in Tanzania and South Africa. Cape Town: African Minds
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy (2nd Edition)*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of Language Teaching and Learning (The 4th Edition)*. White Plains, New York: Longman.
- Brown, G. (1975). *Microteaching*. London: Methuen.
- Brown, J. D. (2001). *Using Surveys in Language Programs*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Candela, A. (1999). Students' Power in Classroom Discourse. *Linguistics & Education*, 10(2), 139-163.
- Crago, M. B., Eriks-Brophy, A., Pesco, D., & McAlpine, L. (1997). Culturally Based Miscommunication in Classroom Interaction. *Language, Speech & Hearing Services in Schools*, 23(3), 245-254.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among Five Approaches (2nd Edition)*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research (4th Edition)*. New Jersey: Pearson.
- Cullen, R. (1998). Teacher Talk and the Classroom Context. *ELT Journal*, 52(3), 179-187.
- Dagarin, M. (2004). *Classroom Interaction and Communicate Strategies in Learning English as a Foreign*. Ljubljana: Birografika Bori.
- Erling, E. J., Burton, S., & McCormick, R. (2012). *The Classroom Practices of Primary and Secondary School Teachers Participating in English in Action (Study 2a2)*. Dhaka, Bangladesh: English in Action (EIA).
- Flanders, N. 1970 *Analyzing Teacher Behavior*. Addison-Wesley. Reading, Mass: P.171.
- Hussain, L., Ameen, I., & Bakhsh, K. (2011). The Effect of Classroom Interaction on Students' Academic Achievement at Secondary School Level. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 2(3), 492-496
- Jones, L. (2007). *The Student-Centered Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Lightbown, P. & Spada, N. (1999). *How Languages are learned*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Liu, M. & Zhu, L. (2012). An Investigation and Analysis of Teacher Talk in College English Class. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 2(5), 117-121.
- Meng, X. & Wang, X. (2011). Action Study of Teacher's Language on EFL Classroom Interaction. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1(1), 98-104.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *An Expanded Sourcebook: Qualitative Data Analysis (2nd Edition)*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Moskowitz, G. (1971). Interaction analysis: A New Modern language for supervisors. *Foreign language Annals*, 5(2), 211-221.
- Nunan, D. (1991). *Language Teaching Methodology*. Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall International.
- Pujiastuti, (2013), *Classroom Interction: An Analysis of Teacher talk and Student talk in English for Young Learners (EYL)*, *Journal of English and Education*, 1(1), 163-172.
- Rashidi, (2010), *Analyzing Pattern of Classroom Interaction in EFL Classrooms in Iran*, *The Journal of Asia TEFL* 7, (3), 93-120 Autumn.
- Sadeghi, S., Ketabi, S., Tavakoli, M., & Sadeghi, M. (2012). Application of Critical Classroom Discourse Analysis (CCDA) in Analyzing Classroom Interaction. *English Language Teaching*, 5(1), 166-173).
- Senowarsito. (2013) Politeness Strategies in Teacher-Student Interaction in an EFL Classroom Context, *TEFLIN Journal*, 24, 1, January.82-96
- Setiawati, L. (2012). A Descriptive Study on the Teacher Talk at EYL Classroom. *Conaplin Journal, Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1(2), 33-48.
- Storch, N. (2001). How Collaborative is Pair Work? ESL Tertiary Students Composing in Pairs. *Language Teaching Research*, 5, 29-53.
- Suryati, (2015). Classroom Interaction Strategy Employed by English teacher at Lower Secondary School, *TEFLIN Journal*, 26, 2, July, 247-264
- Tuan, L. T. (2010). Theoretical Review on Oral Interaction in EFL Classrooms. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 1(4), 29-48.
- Wagner, E. D. (1994). In Support of a Functional Definition of Interaction. *The American Journal of Distance Education*, 8(2), 6-26.
- Wallace, T., Stariba, W.E., & Walberg, H.J. (2004). *Teaching Speaking, Listening, and Writing*. Brussels: International Academy of Education.
- Wacyn-Jones, P. (2002). *Pair Work 2*. Penguin Books.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Zhang, P. (2012). Interactive Patterns and Teacher Talk Features in an EFL Reading Class in a Chinese University-A Case Study with Communicative Teaching Method. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(5), 980-988.

Appendix A

The Interaction Analysis Systems from Flanders, 1970; Moskowitz, 1971; Brown, 1975; Al-Otaibi, 2004; and Erling et al., 2012

Flanders, 1970	Moskowitz, 1971	Brown, 1975	Al-Otaibi, 2004;	Erling et al., 2012
----------------	-----------------	-------------	------------------	---------------------

Accepting feeling	Deals with feelings	Teacher's responding	Accepting student's feeling	-
Praising or Encouraging	Praises or encourages	-	Encouragement and positive reinforcement, trusting, caring	-
	Joke	-	-	-
Accepting/using ideas of student	Uses idea of the student	-	-	-
-	Repeats student response verbatim	-	-	-
Asking question	Ask question	Teacher's questioning	Asking questions	Asking question
Lecturing	Gives information	Teacher's lecturing	Giving information	Presenting
-	Correct without rejecting	-	-	-
Giving direction	Gives direction	-	Giving direction	Organizing
Criticizing/justifying authority	Criticizes student behavior	-	Reaction	-
-	Criticizes student response	-	-	-
-	-	-	Expressing the teacher's own ideas	Giving feedback
Responding	Student response specific	Pupils responding	Student talk response specific	-
-	Student response choral	-	Student talk response non specific	Chorusing
Initiating	Student response open ended, or student-initiated	Pupil's volunteering	Student talk initiation	-
-	-	-	Student's talk inquiry	-
-	-	-	Expressing student's own ideas	-
-	-	-	Expressing lack of understanding verbally	-
-	-	-	-	In pairs
-	-	-	-	In group
Silence or confusion	Silence	Silence (S)	-	On their own (single)
-	-	-	Silence (work-oriented)	-
-	Silence A-V	-	Silence non (work-	-

			oriented)	
-	Confusion work-oriented	Unclassifiable (x)	Confusion work-oriented	-
-	Confusion non work-oriented	-	Confusion non work oriented	-
-	Laughter	-	-	-
-	Uses the native language	-	-	-
-	Non Verbal	-	-	-
-	-	-	Hand raising participation	-

Appendix B

RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

The combination of Interaction Analysis System from (Flanders, 1970; Moskowitz, 1971; Brown, 1975; Al-Otaibi, 2004; and Erling et al., 2012).
(Observation Categories and Definitions)

Teacher Talk	1. Accepting student's feelings (Accepting, discussing, referring to, understanding of past, present, or future feelings of students in a non-threatening way. Feelings may be positive or negative.)
	2. Praising and encouraging (Praising and encouraging student's action and behavior. Praising, complimenting, and telling students why what they have said or done is valued. Encouraging students to continue, trying to give them confidence, and confirming that answers are correct.)
	3. Joking (Intentional joking, kidding, making puns, attempting to be humorous, providing the joking is not at anyone's expense.)
	4. Accepting or using student's ideas (Clarifying, building or developing, using, interpreting, and summarizing the ideas or suggestions from a student. The ideas must be rephrased by the teacher but still recognized as being student's contributions.)
	5. Asking questions (Asking questions about content or procedure with the intent that a student should answer the question and an answer is anticipated.)
	6. Repeating student's response verbatim (Repeating the exact words of students after they participate.)
	7. Lecturing or giving information

	(Giving information, facts, own opinions, or own ideas, lecturing, explaining, narrating, reading the materials, or asking rhetorical questions.)
	8. Giving directions (Giving directions, requests, or commands that students are expected to follow; directing various drills; facilitating whole-class and small-group activity.)
	9. Criticizing or justifying student's behavior and response (Rejecting the behavior of student; trying to change student behavior from the non-acceptable to acceptable pattern; communicating anger, displeasure, annoyance, and dissatisfaction with what students are doing; Telling the student's response is not correct or acceptable and communicating criticism, displeasure, annoyance, rejection by words or intonation.)
	10. Giving feedback (Responding to something students have said or done, and evaluating or commenting on it.)
	11. Student talk, response (specific) <i>(It is talk by student in responding to the teacher within a specific and limited range of available answers. Student responds directly and predictably to teacher's question and directions.)</i>
	12. Student talk, response (choral) (One student or more attempting to give responses without being selected by the teacher or without raising their hands; All of the class is speaking in chorus at the same time. This may be in response to the teacher's questions, or reading in chorus.)
	13. Student talk, initiation (It is talk by student in responding to the teacher with students' own ideas, opinions, reactions, feelings. Initiating the participation or commenting on the lesson content.)
<i>Student talk</i>	14. Student talk, inquiry (Asking for further information, asking for clarification, for examples, asking about lesson content.)
	15. Expressing lack of understanding verbally (Asking the teacher to explain something or responding to a teacher's question by saying I don't know, for instance.)
	16. Student talk in single (One student is speaking at this particular moment. The student may be talking to the teacher or with another student, or s/he may be reading aloud.)
	17. Student talk in pairs

(All of the students are talking to each other in pairs.)

18. Student talk in groups

(All of the students are talking to each other in groups.)

19a.Silence

(Pauses in the interaction, periods of quiet during which there is no verbal interaction.)

19b.Silence-AV

(Silence in the interaction during which a piece of audiovisual equipment, e.g., a tape recorder, filmstrip projector, record player, etc., is being used to communicate.)

20a.Confusion (work-oriented)

(More than one person at a time talking. Students are calling out excitedly, eager to participate or respond, concerned with task at hand in which communication cannot be understood by the observer.)

21. Hand-raising participation

(Students raising their hands to participate and to answer the teacher's questions.)

22. Laughing

(Laughing and giggling by the class, individuals, and/or the teacher.)
