PATTERNS OF TEACHER – STUDENTS INTERACTION
A Case Study of Classroom Interaction in Eleventh Grade of Senior High School in Cimahi

Anisah Rizkiani Amin
anisah.rizkiani@gmail.com
Department of English Education, Indonesia University of Education

Abstract: This paper presents the results of an investigation of teacher –students interaction (classroom interaction) patterns and the influence of Teacher Talk to the classroom interaction patterns in Eleventh grade of Senior High School in Cimahi. The data were analyzed by using Suherdi's (2010) framework as a part of classroom discourse analysis (CLDA) and Foreign Language Interaction Analysis (FLINT) system as proposed by Moskowitz (1971). The findings show that there are various types of classroom interaction patterns occur in the classroom. From those various patterns, simple non –anomalous K1 –initiated patterns dominate the interaction between teacher and students in the classroom. Whereas, the dominant categories of Teacher Talk are giving information and asking questions. Moreover, the occurance of classroom interaction patterns are related to the dominance of Teacher Talk which includes the types of questions given during the lesson.

Keywords: *Classroom Interaction Patterns, Teacher Talk, Student Talk, Types of Questions*

Introduction

Interaction, as a part of communicative language teaching, is the heart of communication (Brown, 2001). Interaction between teacher and students in the language classroom are bounded with each other.

In line with this, Chaudron (1988), states that interaction in the classroom also relates with classroom instruction in order to convey information from the knowledgeable teacher to the "empty" and passive students. Therefore, the interaction between teacher and students can also be said as classoom interaction.

Classroom interaction includes verbal and non-verbal language which they become important in mantaining

communication between teacher and students. Teacher has ways in delivering the knowledge to the students which can be said as teacher talk, while the way of students delivering their ideas or taking part in teacher-students interaction is called student talk.

Even though the Teacher Talk contributes to students' participations in the classroom, the balance of the amount between Teacher Talk and Student Talk is important, so they can get more opportunities in improving their knowledge and their English language competences (Liu & Le, 2012, p.2). As a part of Teacher Talk, questioning becomes one of ways in triggering interaction in the classroom. These questions more or less give contribution in creating teacher-students' interaction in the classroom which have certain pattern of exchanges which can also be called as classroom interaction patterns.

Some approaches have developed as the ways or methods in order to analyze the interaction happens in the L2 classrooms; the

psychometric approach, the interaction analysis approach, the discourse analysis approach, and the ethnographic approach (Coulthard, 1977). This study is intended to analyze the classroom interaction patterns based on the framework developed by Suherdi (2010) which occur in classroom interaction as a part of discourse analysis approach. Besides, this study also tends to find the influence of Teacher Talk in classroom interaction.

Literature Review

There are several underlying principles that are relevant to the present study such as classroom interaction, classroom discourse and classroom discourse analysis. The principles will be explicated as follow.

- **Classroom Interaction**

Interaction implies an action-reaction or a two way influence which may be between individuals or between an individual and a group or between materials and individuals (Biddle, 1967 as cited in Sadeghi et

al., 2012, p.167). However, the interactions which include certain people in certain places and occasions have its own name, and one of them is the interaction which happens in the classroom and involves teacher and students which can be called as classroom interaction.

Classroom interaction is a condition in which there is reciprocally action between teacher and students; the teacher action is influenced by students reaction (Malamah & Thomas, 1987, p. 7). In line with this, Shomoosshi (1997:3) stated that classroom interaction is interaction which happens in the classroom including teacher-student, student-student discussions, group discussion and all classroom participations and it also can be initiated by both teacher and students. Moreover, Through interaction, mutual understanding of the relationships and roles of teacher and students is created (Hall & Walsh, 2002, p.187).

- **Teacher Talk and Student Talk**

Teacher Talk cannot be separated from foreign language teaching. Sinclair and Brazil (1982 as cited in Yanfen & Yuqin, 2010, p.77), stated that Teacher Talk is "The language in the classroom that takes up a major portion of class time employed to give directions, explain activities and check students' understanding.". In addition, Yanfen & Yuqin (2010:76) said that Teacher Talk can also guarantee the students learning quality in the classroom. Whereas, Student Talk or learner's language can be considered as student's responses toward Teacher Talk or the language of second language learners in the classroom (Shomoossi, 1997, p.24). The language used by the students usually comes as the response of teacher's questions and sometimes occur in the discussion between student-student. Question is one of teacher's stimuli in the classroom for continued interaction and classroom interaction management (Brown, 2001; Liu & Le, 2012).

- **Classroom Discourse**

Talking about classroom discourse, it refers to classroom setting context which represents a form of one of social situations which exist among society. According to Suherdi (2010, p.5), classroom discourse refers classroom interaction as a part of social interaction which includes certain routines in classroom interactions based on certain sociopolitical, including pedagogical beliefs". Classroom discourse is related to the interaction between teacher and students in the classroom which includes the language used. Thus, classroom discourse can be said as language used in the classroom where the meaning is negotiated.

- **Classroom Interaction Patterns (Categories of Exchanges)**

In the categories of exchanges as proposed by Suherdi (2010), there are two main categories namely non anomalous and anomalous exchanges.

Non-anomalous exchange is divided into two categories namely simple and complex exchanges (Suherdi, 2010). Whereas, complex exchange is divided into three sub-categories namely pre-inform extended, post-inform extended, and pre & post inform extended (Suherdi, 2010). On the other hand, anomalous exchange is divided into elliptical, defective, and broken exchanges (Suherdi, 2010).

Methodology

- **Research Design**

This study is qualitative and descriptive in nature since it focused on finding the teacher-students interaction patterns in the classroom and how does the teacher talk as a part of teacher-students interaction affect the teacher-students interaction patterns in the classroom.

- **Participant of the Research**

This study involves one pre-service teacher and an eleventh grade class. The pre-service teacher is chosen because of the consideration as a new sample in this field, since in some previous research, they used English teachers as their samples.

The video-recordings are taken on 3rd April 2014, 7th April 2014, and 10th April 2014. 2-hour lesson (90 minutes) is recorded for each lesson.

- **Data Collection**

    This research employs three instruments, which are video-recording the classroom activities (transcription), note taking, and interview.

- **Video-Recording The Classroom Activities (Transcription)**

    Considering the naturalness of interaction between teacher and students, the video-recording was chosen as the technique of gaining the interaction between teacher and students in the classroom.

- **Classroom Observation (Note Taking)**

    Besides video-recording, classroom observation (note taking) is used in this research to support the data in order to make data analysis more objective.

- **Interview**

    The interview is chosen as one of ways of collecting the data. The interview is used for crosschecking the data from classroom observation and supporting the data.

Data Analysis and Discussion

- **Classroom Interaction Patterns**

    In this study, the data are analyzed using Categories of Exchange Structure proposed by Suherdi (2010) in order to see the classroom interaction patterns which occur in the eleventh grade classroom.

- **Types of Classroom Interaction Patterns**

    The distribution of types of classroom interaction patterns have been summarized in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Distribution of Types of Classroom Interaction Patterns

No	Term	Types of Patterns		Total %
		Non-Anomalous %	Anomalous %	
1	1st Meeting	92.98	7.02	100
2	2nd Meeting	87.83	12.17	100
3	3rd Meeting	91.79	8.21	100

Based on the Table 1, the non – anomalous exchanges are found more greatly than anomalous exchanges from the first meeting to the third meeting. On the first meeting, the percentage for non – anomalous exchanges is 92.98% and it decreases on the second meeting into 87.83% and then it increases again to 91.79% on the third meeting.

In contrast, anomalous exchanges are found rather low compared to non –anomalous exchanges during teaching and learning process in the first meeting to the third meeting. In the first meeting, the percentage is only 7.02% and it is shown as the lowest percentage of anomalous exchanges. However, it greatly increases into 12.17% or can be said as the highest

percentage of it, and it decreases to 8.21% in the third meeting.

- **Variations of Classroom Interaction Patterns**

The distributions between anomalous exchanges and non-anomalous exchanges are completely different (see appendix, Table 1). Moreover, there are dominant patterns occur in each exchange. In non –anomalous exchange, the dominant pattern is simple knowledge oriented K1 –initiated pattern. Though simple knowledge oriented K1 –initiated pattern percentage decreases from first meeting to third meeting; it still becomes the dominant pattern of non –anomalous exchange.

However, in anomalous exchange, the dominant patterns come from different exchanges in each meeting. In the first meeting, the dominant exchanges are defective and broken exchanges because the percentages are same for both of them. In the second meeting, the percentage for elliptical exchange is the highest which makes it as the

dominant exchange. And in the third meeting, defective exchange's percentage puts itself as the dominant exchange.

Moreover, simple K1 –initiated patterns are confirmed as the non – anomalous dominant patterns from the first to the third meeting. It can be seen from its percentage which is 40.35% in the first meeting, it decreases into 29.57% in the second meeting, and it decreases again into 25.37% in the third meeting.

The following excerpt will show how the teacher use explanation to make the students get the information.

Excerpt 1 (1st Meeting)

(232) K1   T : Okay. This is how you should prepare your survey. First of all, you need to choose a topic. What survey that you want to conduct. For example, in the book it is about the TV program, or you can also read my example, right there, the favorite food and many others. Anything that you want.

The excerpt above indicates that the teacher gave the information to the students without giving them an opportunity to give feedback to teacher's information. This pattern occurs as a result of the primary

knower directly delivers the knowledge or message within the realization of non-negotiated A-events (Suherdi, 2010, p.96).Though, the information is given to make it clear for the students regarding the material of the lesson.

- **Teacher Talk and Student Talk**

The distribution of Teacher Talk and Student Talk will be depicted as follows.

Table 2 Distribution of Teacher Talk and Student Talk

No	Term	TT %	ST %	Nor TT or ST %	Total
1	1st Meeting	76.85	19.68	3.47	100
2	2nd Meeting	64.16	29.55	6.29	100
3	3rd Meeting	52.56	22.92	24.52	100

Based on the Table 2, it can be seen that the percentages of Teacher Talk is greater than Student Talk. Even though the percentages of Teacher Talk gradually decrease, they still become the highest ones. In the first meeting, its percentage is 76.85% which makes it as the highest Teacher Talk percentage.

However, it keeps decreasing in the second and third meeting. In the second meeting, it was 64.16%, and it decreases into 52.56% in the third meeting. From those meetings, it is found that the highest percentages come from category number 4 and 5 of Teacher Talk which are asking questions and giving information (see appendix, Table 2).

Asking questions become the one of dominant parts of Teacher Talk used by the teacher during the teaching and learning activity.

The percentages are also higher than the other, which is 19.44% in the first meeting, then it decreases into 18.18% in the second meeting, and it slightly increases into18.22% in the third meeting (see appendix, Table 2). The following excerpt shows the instance of asking questions during the lesson.

Excerpt 2 (1st Meeting)

(154) DK1   T : **Who watches more TV at the weekend? Men or women? (4)**
      K2   Ss : Women **(8)**
      K1   T : Women **(3a)**

Asking questions about the materials given helped the teacher to make interaction with the students in the classroom which influenced the students' participation. It is in line with Brown (2001) and Liu & Le (2012) who stated that question is one of teacher's stimuli in the classroom for continued interaction and classroom interaction management.

Whereas, the most dominant category of Teacher Talk that occurs from the first to third meeting is giving information (see appendix, Table 2). Its percentages gradually decrease from the first to third meeting, but still in high numbers. In the first meeting, it is 45.37%, and it decreases into 29.72% in the second meeting, then it decreases again into 21.66% in the third meeting. The following excerpt illustrates how this category occurs in the lesson.

Excerpt 3 (3rd Meeting)

(490) K1   T : Terus continents, lakes, individual islands and mountains and most countries. **For instance, like Indonesian not the Indonesia. Australi not the Australi gitu. Kecuali United States, karena dia dari sananya**. **(5, 13)**

The explanation was needed for the students in order to make them understood about the lesson.

This phenomenon takes place because mostly in the teaching and learning process, giving information to the students is needed.

On the other hand, the table also shows that the students' participation in the classroom are not as great as the teacher. It is shown by the percentages of Student Talk in all meetings. In the first meeting, its percentage is 19.68%, and then it increases into 29.55% in the second meeting, and it slightly decreases into 22.92% in the third meeting. The highest percentages of Student Talk are from category number 8 and 9 which are student response: specific and student response: open-ended or student-initiated (see appendix, Table 2). Those responses ensue to be the highest since their responses are related to teacher's questions given during the teaching and learning activity.

The first highest percentage of Student Talk is student response: specific. Students' response can come in a specific form which is related to limited knowledge given by the teacher. The table 4.2 shows that specific response from the

students gradually decreases from the first to third meeting. In the first meeting, it is 6.25%, and it decreases into 4.37% in the second meeting, then it slightly decreases into 3.36% in the third meeting. The instance of this category can be seen from the following excerpt.

Excerpt 4 (2nd Meeting)

(38)	DK1	T : And then? (**4**)
	K2	S21: **Conclusion (8)**
	K2	S13: Result (**8**)
	K1	T : And you have to analyze the data. (**5, 5a**)

The students specified their answer to the related materials and did not improvise their answer since they knew the limitation of the answer.

Based on the data, student response: open-ended or student-initiated has quite high percentages from all meetings which put it as the dominant category of Student Talk during the teaching and learning activity. In the first meeting, it is found 10.42%, then it greatly increases into 23.25% in the second meeting, and it decreases into 15.45% in the third meeting. The following excerpt will show how this category occurred in the lesson.

Excerpt 5 (3rd Meeting)

(491) DK1 T   : Talking about meal. Kayak gimana? **(4, 13)**
     K2 S16: **I had breakfast (9)**
     K1 T   : Ya, breakfast, lunch, dinner. **(3)**
         Not the breakfast atau... ya gitu. I have... ya gitu. **(5, 13)**

The student was triggered by the teacher to answer the question using their prior knowledge and put it into a sentence. The student did not limit the answer since the question demanded student's creativity in answering it.

Whereas, for the percentages of categories that are not parts of Teacher Talk or Student Talk, are found rather low than the percentage of Teacher Talk and Student Talk. The percentages gradually increase from the first meeting to the third meeting. In the first meeting, the percentage is found 3.47%, and it slightly increases into 6.29% in the second meeting, then it is greatly increased into 24.52% which surpasses the Student Talk in the third meeting. The highest percentage came from category number 13 or using the native language (see appendix, Table 2). It happens because the teacher tends to use native language when the students seemed not understand what he said. . The teacher uses native language during the teaching and learning activity to help the students understood the instructions or materials in the classroom, whereas the students use native language in conveying their ideas or asking something to the teacher. The following excerpt illustrates how the native language is used in the classroom interaction.

Excerpt 6 (2nd Meeting)

(108) K1 T : It's quite fun actually. you realize that it's your fault, but you want to complain. **Tapi ya ga apa-apa sih**, it sometimes happens **(5, 13)**
     K2f S21: **Pak, singkatnya** I complain to myself **(9, 13)**
     K1f T : Okay, you complain to yourself **(3, 5)**

Both teacher and student used native language in the middle of their explanations in order to make sure that the other parties did not get the wrong idea. Using native language could help both the teacher and students in reaching the same understanding of the idea.

- **Types of Questions Used by The Teacher in The Classroom**

To trigger students' participation during the lesson, teacher tends to use questions. According to Yanfen & Yuqin (2010), questions are more preferred by the teacher to be used in the classroom. Based on the analysis of classroom interaction, types of questions, which are used by the teacher during the lesson, influence the classroom interaction patterns. The types of questions were then analyzed using Ellis's (1994) framework including display questions and referential questions.

Table 3 Distribution of Types of Questions Used by The Teacher

No	Term	Types of Questions		Total %
		DQ %	RQ%	
1	1st Meeting	78.95	21.05	100
2	2nd Meeting	51.25	48.75	100
3	3rd Meeting	63.43	36.57	100

It can be observed that display questions were dominant from the first to third meeting. Its occurrences are constantly higher than referential questions. The percentages of display questions are constantly higher than referential questions in each meeting. In the first meeting, its percentage is 78.95%, and it greatly decreases into 51.25% in the second meeting, however, it increases again into 63.43% in the third meeting. The following excerpt will show how the display questions are used by the teacher in the classroom interaction.

Excerpt 7 (2nd Meeting)

(27) DK1   T : **What do you need to do to conduct a survey? (DQ)**
      K2   S6 : Questions
      Clue   T : First of all, you need to have a ...
      K2   S13 : Topic
      K1   T : Topic. Topic of the survey

The teacher uses display questions to make sure that the students understand about the lesson. Ellis (1994) stated that these types of questions are usually used by the teacher to check students' understanding and information about the matter.

On the other hand, referential questions' occurrences are much lower than display questions. Referential questions are supposed to

make the students speak more about their ideas of the lesson. Referential questions are to encourage the students to reach the higher-level thinking by giving long answers based on their own information and ideas for the questions (Liu & Le, 2012). However, not all referential questions can make the students pour their thoughts into words as the answers. The instance of referential questions used by the teacher in the classroom interaction will be shown in the following excerpt.

Excerpt 8 (3rd Meeting)

(125)	K2	T	: Why? Why do you want to live in that? **(RQ)**
	K1	S18	: Good
	K2f	T	: It looks good, okay.

The teacher tried to make the student's speak up their ideas and elaborate it into a reasonable opinion. However, the student responded it shortly and did not speak more about the reason why they wanted to live in that place. After the student gave a short answer towards the teacher's referential question, the teacher then could only accepted the answer by repeating it.

Conclusion

In conclusion, there is a relation between the occurrences of simple non anomalous K1 –initiated patterns with giving information as a part of Teacher Talk including the fact that display questions are also taken a part of it. The occurrence of simple non anomalous K1 –initiated patterns as the dominant patterns in all meetings proves that there are many explanations, knowledge, and information conveyed directly by the teacher to the students. Giving explanations, knowledge, and information as the cause of the classroom interaction patterns show that Teacher Talk had taken over the interaction between teacher and students in the classroom. According to Cullen (1998), a good teacher talk means little teacher talk so that the students will have the opportunities to speak. However, from those three meetings, Teacher Talk takes a greater part than the Student Talk. The students' participation in the classroom is still considered low. Even though the students already responded the teacher's questions, Student Talk is still lower than the Teacher Talk. Moreover, a great

number of display questions are used by the teacher in the classroom. Since giving question is a part of Teacher Talk, it also indicates that the Teacher Talk is dominant in all meetings.

References

Alwasilah, A. C. (2002). *Pokoknya Kualitatif : Dasar-Dasar Merancang Dan Melakukan Penelitian Kualitatif.* Jakarta: PT Dunia Pustaka Jaya dengan Pusat Studi Sunda

Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching in Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy.* (2nd Ed). New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.

Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second Language Classrooms: Research on Teaching and Learning (Cambridge Applied Linguistics).* United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Coulthard, M. (1977). *An Introduction To Discourse Analysis.* England: Longman Group Ltd.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, And Mixed Method Approaches.* (3rd Ed). United States of America: SAGE Publlications, Inc.

Hall, J.K. and Walsh, M. (2002). Teacher-Student Interaction and Language Learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 22,* 186-203. [Online].Retrieved from: http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=135903. [Dec, 2nd 2013].

Liu, J. and Le, T. (2012). A Case Study on College English Classroom Discourse. *International Journal of Innovative Interdisciplinary Research, 2,* 1-10. ISSN: 1839-9053

Shomoossi, N. (1997). *The Effect of Teacher's Questioning Behavioron EFL Classroom Interaction: a classroom-based research.* (Thesis). Faculty of Literature and Foreign Languages, University of Allameh Tabatabaee, Tehran.

Suherdi, D. (2010). Classroom Discourse Analysis: A Systemiotic Approach. (3rd Ed). Bandung: CELTICS Press.

APPENDIX

-Table 1- The Distribution of Classroom Intraction Patterns

(Patterns of Exchanges)

PATTERNS				1st Meeting F	1st Meeting %	2nd Meeting F	2nd Meeting %	3rd Meeting F	3rd Meeting %
NON-ANOMALOUS	SIMPLE	KNOWLEDGE ORIENTED	K1 –initiated	46	40.35	34	29.57	34	25.37
			DK1 –initiated	19	16.67	10	8.70	20	14.93
			K2 –initiated	15	13.16	19	16.52	32	23.88
		SKILL ORIENTED	A1 –initiated	3	2.63	2	1.74	8	5.97
			A2 –initiated	3	2.63	7	6.09	0	0
		NON -VERBAL	A1 –initiated	2	1.75	7	6.09	10	7.46
			A2 –initiated	10	8.77	9	7.83	3	2.24
			Total	98	85.96	88	76.52	107	79.85
	COMPLEX	PRE –INFORM EXTENDED — KNOWLEDGE ORIENTED	DK1 –initiated	2	1.75	4	3.48	9	6.72
			K2 –initiated	3	2.63	1	0.87	1	0.75
		PRE –INFORM EXTENDED — ACTION ORIENTED	dA1 –initiated	0	0	0	0	0	0
			A2 –initiated	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Total	5	4.39	5	4.38	10	7.46
		POST INFORM EXTENDED — KNOWLEDGE ORIENTED	K1 –initiated	1	0.88	3	2.61	1	0.75
			DK1 –initiated	0	0	1	0.87	2	1.49
			K2 –initiated	2	1.75	3	2.61	3	2.24
		POST INFORM EXTENDED — ACTION ORIENTED	A1 –initiated	0	0	1	0.87	0	0
			A2 –initiated	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Total	3	2.63	8	6.96	6	4.48
		PRE- AND POST –INFORM EXTENDED	DK1 –initiated	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Total	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Total	8	7.02	13	11.30	16	11.94
TOTAL				106	92.98	101	87.83	123	91.79
ANOMALOUS	ELLIPTICAL			2	1.75	10	8.70	1	0.75
	DEFECTIVE			3	2.63	2	1.74	7	5.22
	BROKEN			3	2.63	2	1.74	3	2.24
			Total	8	7.02	14	12.17	11	8.21
TOTAL				8	7.02	14	12.17	11	8.21

-Table 2- The Distribution of Teacher Talk and Student Talk

Categories			1st Lesson		2nd Lesson		3rd Lesson	
			F	%	F	%	F	%
TEACHER TALK	INDIRECT INFLUENCE	1. Deals with feelings	8	1.85	12	2.10	30	2.52
		2. Praises or encourages.	8	1.85	11	1.92	17	1.43
		2a. Jokes	1	0.23	5	0.87	18	1.51
		3. Uses ideas of students	2	0.46	10	1.75	16	1.34
		3a. Repeats student response verbatim	12	2.78	8	1.40	19	1.60
		4. Asks questions	84	19.44	104	18.18	217	18.22
	DIRECT INFLUENCE	5. Gives information	196	45.37	170	29.72	258	21.66
		5a. Corrects without rejection	1	0.23	4	0.70	10	0.84
		6. Gives directions	20	4.62	41	7.17	40	3.36
		7. Criticizes student behavior	-	-	2	0.35	1	0.08
		7a. Criticizes student response	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Total	332	76.85	367	64.16	626	52.56
STUDENT TALK		8. Student response, specific	27	6.25	25	4.37	40	3.36
		9. Student response, open-ended or student-initiated	45	10.42	133	23.25	184	15.45
		10. Silence	11	2.55	9	1.57	34	2.85
		10a. Silence-AV	-	-	2	0.35	-	-
		11. Confusion, work-oriented	2	0.46	-	-	11	0.92
		11a. Confusion, non-work-oriented	-	-	-	-	4	0.34
		Total	85	19.68	169	29.55	273	22.92
		12. Laughter	1	0.23	-		18	1.51
		13. Uses the native language	-	-	25	4.37	247	20.74
		14. Nonverbal	14	3.24	11	1.92	27	2.27
		Total	15	3.47	36	6.29	292	24.52
		TOTAL	**432**	**100**	**572**	**100**	**1191**	**100**

-Table 3- The Distribution of Types of Questions

Types of Questions	1st Meeting		2nd Meeting		3rd Meeting	
	F	%	F	%	F	%
Display Questions (DQ)	60	78.95	41	51.25	137	63.43
Referential Questions (RQ)	16	21.05	39	48.75	79	36.57