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This research is to describe the interaction between students and teacher during teaching-learning process, and which one is more dominant in category of Flander’s interaction analysis. The researcher uses qualitative research approach. The observation, field note, video recording are done to collect the data. The participants are one teacher and students in one specific class. The teacher and the students are observed in their interaction in the English class. The data are presented in the form of descriptive and narrative report. This research found that the teacher interacted with the whole class which is included in Teacher Talk (59.8%). The student(s) interact with the teacher which is included in Student Talk (35.5%). Moreover, the Students Silence often happened when the students are asked by the teacher, but they do not directly answer or respond to the teacher’s questions (6.9%). The interaction between students and teacher is dominated by the teacher. It means that teacher must change the way of teaching to make their students active. At least, through Flander’s system analysis we can describe the interaction between students and teacher in teaching-learning process. It is beneficial to improve teacher’s method to make students more active in classroom.
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1. **Background of The Study**

Nowadays English is considered as a global language. It has great roles as means of communication in the world. English teaching in schools seems to be the main means in learning English for most Indonesians. There are a lot of English teaching and learning problems. One of the common problems for English teacher is dealing with a passive class, where students are unresponsive and avoid interaction with the teacher. It happens because English is considered as a difficult subject. Classroom interaction is a very important element to develop students’ communicative competence. If the classroom interaction does not run smoothly, teacher cannot conduct the effective communicative classroom.

As Porter (2000: 21) said, the assertive teacher has a right and a duty to enforce order so that teaching and learning can be accomplished. To encourage their cooperation, the teacher will develop warm relationship with students. By knowing the form of the interaction, hopefully teachers can increase the interaction activities in the English classroom. It is important to do because the English classroom is the place for learners to practice their English. Learners, who actively interact with other learners and teachers, hopefully will be able to interact with others in the real world.

The researcher sees that Flander’s interaction analysis technique was designed to categorize the types and quantity of verbal interaction in the classroom and to plot the information on a matrix so that it could be analyzed and interpreted. For these reasons, the researcher wants to describe the interaction between students and teacher during teaching-learning process. The categories in Flander’s interaction analysis system will show which one is more dominant in the classroom interaction.

1. **Research Method**

The design of the research is using descriptive qualitative. This research was conducted at SMAN 11 Purworejo. It was done on May 11th, 2013. The subject of this research consists of one class. It is class II IPA of SMA N 11 Purworejo which consists of 32 students. The students and their English teacher become the subjects of the study. The researcher analyzed this research by observing the utterance or the activity of the teacher and the students at the eleventh grade of SMA N 11 Purworejo in the academic year of 2012/2013, which is included in categories of Flanders system analysis. The researcher took the data by using instruments that have been prepared. Inside the instrument contained categories in Flander's system analysis which includes the activities of students and teachers in the classroom. Researcher invited her two friends in order to make this observation valid. One friend observed the process occured in the classroom by putting it in the categories that is available in the instrument, while another friend recorded the learning process so that the researcher could replay the video later at any time if needs.

Table 1.

**Flander’s Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Teacher talk****\*Indirect influence** |  | **Category** | **Activity** |
| **Response** | **1.** | **Accepts feeling:**Accepts and clarifies an attitude or the feeling tone of a student in a non-threatening manner. Feeling may be positive or negative. Predicting and recalling feelings are included. |
| **2.** | **Praises or encourages:** Praises or encourages student action or behavior. Jokes that release tension, but not at the expense of another individual; nodding head, or saying “Um hm?” or “go on” and included. |
| **3.** | **Accepts or uses ideas of students:**Clarifying or building or developing ideas suggested by a student. Teacher extensions of student ideas are included but as the teacher brings more of his own ideas into play, shift to category five. |
| **4.** | **Asks questions:** Asking question about content to procedure, based on teacher ideas, with the intent that a student will answer. |
| **\*Direct influence** | **Initiation** | **5.** | **Lecturing:** Giving facts or opinions about content or procedures; expressing his own ideas, giving his own explanation, or citing an authority other than a student. |
| **6.** | **Giving directions:**Directions, commands or orders to which a student is expected to comply. |
| **7.** | **Criticising or justifying authority:**Statements intended to change student behavior from non-acceptable to acceptable pattern; bawling someone out; stating why the teacher is doing what he is during; extreme self-reliance. |
| **Student Talk** | **Response** | **8.** | **Student-talk response:** Talk by students in response to teacher. Teacher initiates the contact or solicits student statement or structures the situation. Freedom to express own ideas is limited. |
| **Initiation** | **9.** | **Student-talk Initiation:**Talk by students, which they initiate. Expressing own ideas; initiating a new topic; freedom to develop opinions and a line of thought, asking thoughtful questions; going beyond the existing structure. |
| **Silence** |  | **10.** | **Silence or confusion:**Pauses, short periods of confusion in which communication cannot be understood by the observer. |

1. **Finding and Discussion**

Table 2.

The Percentage of Each Flander’s Interaction Analysis Categories

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Category | Total | Percentage |
| Teacher Talk\*Indirect influence | 1. Accepts feeling
 | 3 | 2.3 |
| 1. Praises or encourages
 | 1 | 3.4 |
| 1. Accepts or uses ideas of students
 | 5 | 3.8 |
| 1. Asks questions
 | 40 | 31,0 |
| \*Direct influence | 1. Lecturing
 | 9 | 6.9 |
| 1. Giving direction
 | 12 | 9.3 |
| 1. Criticizing or justifying authority
 | 4 | 3.1 |
| Student Talk | 1. Student-talk response
 | 33 | 25.5 |
| 1. Student-talk initiation
 | 13 | 10.0 |
| Silence | 1. Silence or confusion
 | 9 | 6.9 |
| Total | 129 | 100% |

From the table above, we can see that Teacher Talk, indirect influence, had 40.5%, whereas direct influence had 19.3%. Total percentage of Teacher Talk is 59.8%. Then, the Student Talk had 35.5%, and students Silence or confusion had 6.9%. Thus, the total percentage of all categories is 100%. From the data above, the researcher sees that total percentage of Teacher Talk is more than Student Talk. It shows us that Teacher Talk is still dominant. That is why the teacher must change the way of teaching to make students more active in classroom.

1. **Conclusion**

From the discussion about the result of the research, some points about the pattern of the classroom interaction can be concluded.

In making the students more active in class activity, the teacher points to/calls certain student(s). Time for voluntary students to participate in class activity is also given. The teacher interacts with the whole class by greeting, giving encouragement, inviting to participate in class discussion, asking questions, presenting or explaining the material, discussing material, and giving directions.

The teacher interacts with individual student by greeting, checking the student’s attendance, giving praise, accepting ideas or answers in class discussion, asking questions, giving directions, and helping the students’ work. The student(s) interact with the teacher by greeting, answering the teacher’s questions, responding to the teacher’s directions, and asking questions. The students’ silence is often happened when the students are asked by the teacher. The students do not directly answer or respond to the teacher’s questions.

The interaction among the students happens when doing class discussion. The students do not make a lot of noise, so it makes the situation in classroom controllable. The students interact with their friends by talking about the activity asked by the teacher, discussing the teacher’s questions, and asking about difficult words or expressions.
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