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**Abstract**

The objective of the study is intended to know how interaction in reading comprehension class of sixth semester of English Department of Muhammadiyah University of Purworejo in the academic year of 2012/2013. In this research, the researcher focused of interaction characteristic on teacher and students talk in classroom interaction and the activity going inside the classroom. The data of this study are the teacher’s talk and sixth-semester English students’ talk in reading comprehension course activity at Muhammadiyah University of Purworejo in the academic year of 2012/2013. The researcher uses only one class; class VI A which consist of 29 students. To analyze the data, researcher used an instrument, Flander interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC). The results of the analysis showed that the percentage of content cross’ characteristics was 37.19% of the whole class time; teacher control’s characteristic was 15.37%, whereas teacher support’s characteristic was 19.91%. The rest 24.84% of the class time was student participation’s characteristics.
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1. **Background**

According to Wragg (1999:117), has noted that classroom is a place where students learn and practice a wide variety of forms of expression, some of which are highly stylized exchanges and rarely occur outside education, like the rapid drilling and closed questioning which only happens during schooling and the interrogation of suspects by the police. Brown (2000:165) state that interaction is the collaboration exchange of though, feeling or ideas between two or more people, resulting in a reciprocal effect on teach other. Classroom interaction is the way that teacher talk to student, the manner in which they interact with them. 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 learners when they communicate without using words. These two kinds of talk are important; they dominate the classroom events and influence students' foreign language acquisition. The active role of both the teacher and students is absolutely needed to create a good interaction because everyone will learn something better if the experiences it by himself.

1. **Research Method**

To conduct this study, the researcher used qualitative which means that the data were analyzed qualitatively. This method is usually used to make a description of the fact. the researcher decides to use the descriptive-qualitative approach to the study. In this approach, the researcher uses naturalistic enquiry method; seeing what happens. The data of the study are collected in the form of recorded classroom interaction and the observer's field notes. In collecting the data for this research, the researcher uses observation. Observation was conducted at class VI.A in reading comprehension class of sixth semester of English Department of Muhammadiyah University of Purworejo on Saturday, 18th May 2013 at 10.20 a.m. -11.58 a.m. The teacher's name is Drs. Sigit Jauhari, M.Pd. There were 29 students who attended the class, and two students were absent. The data collection activity is conducted through several steps. Steps of this research procedure are as follows; first, Recording and observing all of the classroom activities. Second, Making a transcript of recording, they are they are coded using Flanders' Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC). Third, they are entered into matrix and they are analyzed.

1. **Research Finding and Discussion**

The summary count of recording interaction analysis

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | Categories | Observation | Percent |
|  | Teacher-talk |  |  |
| 1 | Accepts feeling | 7 | 0.47% |
| 2 | Praises or encourages | 136 | 9.21% |
| 3 | Accepts or uses students' idea | 151 | 10.23% |
| 4 | Asks questions | 242 | 16.40% |
| 5 | Lecturing | 307 | 20.80% |
| 6 | Giving directions | 122 | 8.26% |
| 7 | Criticizing or justifying authority | 105 | 7.11% |
|  | Student-talk |  |  |
| 8 | Student-talk's response | 301 | 20.39% |
| 9 | Student-talk's initiation | 66 | 4.74% |
|  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Silence or confusion | 39 | 2.64% |

The summary count of recording interaction characteristics analysis

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | Characteristic | Observation | Percentage |
| 1 | Content Cross | 594 | 37.19% |
| 2 | Teacher Control | 227 | 15.37% |
| 3 | Teacher Support | 294 | 19.91% |
| 4 | Student Participation | 367 | 24.84% |

Based on the previous explanation, the reseacher got the differences between experimental group and control group.

from the whole class time, it was mostly spent for content cross characteristics. A heavy concentration in a column 4 and 5 and row 4 and 5 indicates teacher dependence on questions and lectures. It was caused by the teacher, in reading comprehension lesson, mostly gave facts or opinions about content or procedure. In giving fact, teacher tended to express his own ideas which consumed much time of speech in order to make students clear in understanding the content of reading and by the teacher, in reading comprehension lesson, tended to give students questions to elicit students’ response.

The second most spent time of interaction was student participation characteristic. A concentration of tallies in column 8 and 9 reflects student responses to the teacher’s behavior. The students talk response, including the students talk in response to teacher’s talk; students answer to the teacher’s question; and the students talk initiation. The student talk initiation was mostly used by students to respond questions asked by the teacher. There is an indication that the interaction was not monotonous. It indicates that the teacher gave students high opportunity to produce the target language in their own ideas.

The third most spent time for teacher support characteristics. A heavy concentration of tallies in column and row 1, 2, and 3 indicates that the teacher is reinforcing and encouraging students’ participation. It was caused by the teacher, in reading comprehension lesson, tended to accepts or uses ideas of student, and teacher accepts the feeling of the students and sometime teacher praises or encourages students’ action or behavior.

The last, teacher control characteristic took 15.37% from the whole class time. A concentration on column and row 6 and 7 indicates extensive commands and reprimands by the teacher. It was caused in reading comprehension lesson, the teacher making statements intended to change students from non-acceptable to acceptable pattern, bawling someone out, starting why the teacher is doing what he was doing, and extreme self-reference, and the teacher giving directions was spent for giving commands.

1. **Conclusion and Suggestion**

Based on the research finding which has been discussed in the previous chapter, the result of observation shows that the percentage of content cross’ characteristics was 37.19% of the whole class time; teacher control’s characteristic was 15.37%, whereas teacher support’s characteristic was 19.91%. The rest 24.84% of the class time was student participation’s characteristics.

The teacher should choose another method in teaching and arrange the classroom to enhance classroom learning and to avoid disruption, so that the class can more interactive.

The student should not be ashamed for having discussion and asking the material which cannot be understood, because the language used in classroom affects the nature of the interaction, which reveals the available opportunities for learning. The students should train to contribute ideas and become more active participants in the learning process.
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