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Abstract

This thesis is a descriptive qualitative study on the teacher and students talk in classroom interaction of class VIII.G SMP N 18 Purworejo. The aims of the research are to know how is the interaction; to know what kinds of interaction are; and to identify what languages used in the classroom interaction.The data was taken by recording the classroom interaction two meetings (2x40 minutes). The subject in this research was in class VIII.G, there were 40 students and one English teacher. To analyze the data, the researcher used Flanders Interaction Analysis. The result of the study showed that the tacher talk was 78.15%, students’ participation was 21.16% and the silent was 0.69%. It means the teacher is superior and the students are inferior. The teacher used more direct in teaching her students. The comparison of language used in classroom interaction is English 38% and Indonesian 62%.
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1. **Introduction**

Language is a means of communication, which plays a very important role in social relationship among human beings. English is an international language. It has the status of foreign language in Indonesia and plays an important role in international world. Only few Indonesians speak English in their daily conversation. The use of English is limited in schools, courses, foreign companies and some other limited places. Most Indonesian has their local languages as their mother tongue (referred as L1) and Bahasa Indonesia as the second language (called L2).

The classroom interaction includes all of the classroom events, both verbal interaction and non-verbal interaction. The verbal interaction takes place because of the teacher and students talk, while non-verbal interaction covers gestures or facial expression by the teacher and students when they communicate without using words. These two kinds of talk are important; they dominate the classroom events and influence students’ foreign language acquisition. Students learn not only through comprehensible input but also their own output. But a good lesson is not one in which students do all or even most of the talking. Some lesson may be good if they are carefully structured in such away that students do a good deal of talking and at the same time get a lot of feedback from the teacher, both formally and informally. But this is by no means true for all lessons.

Based on the FIAC, there are three categories in the classroom interaction, they are: teacher talk, students talk, and no/all talk. Teacher talk includes accept feeling, praises, accept/ uses ideas of students, ask question, lecturing, giving direction and criticizing. Student talk includes student talk response and student talk initiation. And no/all talk is the situation which is in silence. (Allwright and Bailey, 1991: 202)

1. **Research Method**

The goal of the study is to get a clear description of interaction between teacher and students for the teaching-learning process in an English classroom, to know the kinds of interaction based on the characteristics of the teacher-students’ interaction in the classroom and to identify Indonesian or English language used in the classroom interaction by knowing the percentage of English and Indonesian language used for teaching-learning process. Since the interaction is a process which involved human behavior in its natural setting the researcher decided to make use of the qualitative approach to the study. As Nunan (1992:4) suggests, qualitative methods, concern with the understanding of human behaviour from the actor’s own frame of reference, exploratory, descriptive and process-oriented. So, this research is designed as descriptive qualitative.

Observation is the act of collecting data about the performance of a subject through the five senses; sight, smelling, hearing, touching and taste. (Arikunto, 2010:199). The observation was conducted twice in the classroom. Each observation lasted eghty minutes. It was done on April 12th, 2013; the observation was from 07.00 a.m until 08.20 a.m. and the second day, April 13th 2013was from 08.20 a.m. until 09.55 a.m. The observer directly observed in the classroom, and took notes on the relevant events while the teaching-learning process was going on as Chaterine Marshall, Gretchen B, Rossman said in Sugiyono (2010: 309) the fundamental methods relied on by qualitative researcher for gathering information are participation in the setting, direct observation, in-depth interviewing, document review. In the meantime, audio recording of the whole proceeding was also made to acquire more complete data about the classroom process.

The data collection activity was conducted through several steps. First, the researcher fulfilled some formal administrative procedure including getting the school principal’s permission to collect data, that is doing observation in the school classrooms. As soon as the permission was given, the reearcher met the English teacher to make an appointment for doing the observation.

On the appointed date, that was April 12th, 2013 at 07.00 a.m, as the observer, the researcher came into classroom to conduct the observation. Steps of this research procedure were as followed;

1. Recording & observing all of the classroom activities.

2. Make a transcript of recording in every minutes lecturing.

3. Determining the early data from field notes & transcript.

4. Categorizing the data.

5. Determining the focus of data categorization

6. Strengthening the focus of data categorization.

7. Formulating Flanders theory by using a table.

The instrument for collecting the data was the researcher herself. The second observation was on April 13th, 2013.

There are some steps to analyze the data using Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC), they are:

Step 1is coding the verbal interaction

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Verbal Interaction** | | **Code** |
| T | : ........ Finish, everybody? | 4 |
| S | : Not yet. | 8 |
| **T** | : *Ada yang tidak jelas instruksinya?* | 4 |

Step 2 is plotting the code of the data into the matrix.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | 4 |  |
| 1st pair |  |  |
|  | 8 |  |
|  |  | 2nd pair |
|  | 4 |  |
| 3rd pair |  |  |
|  | 8 |  |
|  | Etc |  |

Step 3 is analyzing the matrix

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. **Research Finding**

The following table shows the result of percentage of classroom interaction:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Categories** | **Amount** | **Percentage (%)** |
| 1. | Accepts feeling | 10 | 2.33 |
| 2. | Praises or encourages | 10 | 2.33 |
| 3. | Accepts or uses ideas of students | 29 | 6.74 |
| 4. | Asks questions | 82 | 19.07 |
| 5. | Lecturing | 93 | 21.63 |
| 6. | Giving directions | 86 | 20.00 |
| 7. | Criticising or justifying authority | 26 | 6.05 |
| 8. | Students-talk response | 86 | 20.00 |
| 9. | Students-talk inititiation | 5 | 1.16 |
| 10. | Silence | 3 | 0.69 |
| **TOTAL** | | **430** | **100 %** |

According to Mohan, Radha (2011) we can see whether the teacher is more indirect or direct on her teaching by comparing between indirect influence and direct influence. To calculate the ratio is by dividing the amount of the category 1-4 and the amount of category 5-7 (based on the table 6). If the ratio is 1 or more than 1, the teacher is classified to be indirect in her teaching. While the ratio is less than 1, the teacher is said to be direct in her teaching. The result is 131 : 205 = 0.64 ; it means the teacher is more direct on her teaching. The activities of direct influence in teaching are lecturing and giving directions to the students for teaching learning process.

The information about the use of language in the classroom interaction was also gathered. The table below shows the language used in the classroom interaction.The following table shows the language used in classroom interaction:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Language** | **Speaker** | **Observation** | |
| **Numbers** | **%** |
| **English** | Teacher | 120 | 27% |
| Students | 48 | 11% |
| **Total** | **168** | **38%** |
| **Indonesia** | Teacher | 226 | 52% |
| Students | 44 | 10% |
| **Total** | **270** | **62%** |
| **Total** | **Overall** | **438** | **100%** |

1. **Conclusion**

The teacher talk is 78.15%, the students talk is 21.16%, and the silence is 0.69%. It means that the teacher dominates the class. The teacher is more active (superior) and the students are less active (inferior). The students talking time is used largely for responding to the teacher’s questions or lecture.

The teacher is more direct in teaching her students because the ratio between direct and indirect influence is less than 1. The activities of direct influence in teaching are lecturing and giving directions to the students for teaching learning process.

The use of Indonesian languange is 62% while English language is 38%. It shows that the teacher used much more Indonesian than English when she lectures the material. The teacher speaks Indonesian more than English in order to make students understand well.
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