

Teacher Talk and Learner Talk in The Classroom Interaction  
(An Interaction Analysis to an English Language Class at SMP N 2 Sindang)

Ivon Sagita

**Abstract**

The purpose of this research was to know what teacher talk constitute in classroom interaction, what learner talk constitute in classroom interaction and what percentages of the teacher and learner talk in classroom interaction. The methodology of research used in this research is interaction analysis. An English teacher and whole learners of VII A grade class at SMP N 2 Sindang were chosen as the sample in this research. The class is in the second semester in academic year 2009-2010. In this research the writer applied interview questions for teacher and learners and FIAC (Flanders Interaction Analysis Category). The result of this research showed that teacher more active than learner in the interaction. The teacher generally did most of talking during the lesson. In the available data showed that the teacher used more in indirect influence of FIAC category, they are; accepting feeling, encouragement, accepting or using idea of the learner, and asking question) rather than direct influence (lecturing, giving direction, and criticizing). It is about 49.6% / 16.4 %. Thus the total of teacher talk is 56.4% of the class time. Meanwhile the learners did more response rather than initiation with percentage 30.4% / 12.4% from the total learner talk is 42.8%.

**Keywords:** *FIAC, Interaction Analysis, Teacher Talk, Student Talk.*

**INTRODUCTION**

Teaching and learning process is an essential communication process between teacher and learner. For the message, like information or material to be accepted well by learner, the use of effective approach is suggested. The approach must involving teacher and learner interaction.

Based on the principle of teaching a language, the main objective of all language learning is the ability of using the target language (Azie and Alwasilah: 1996). This objective can be achieved by means of following various teaching methods among others by using different kinds of learning approach and technique.

In English foreign Language (EFL) class, learners are still not familiar with English in daily conversation, except several learners who have background in using English in their home or environments. Because of that reason, teacher has some rule as facilitator to introduce them into new language especially as a model. To implement those functions teacher need to create an interactive climate in language classroom. Interaction is key word for language teachers.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **Interaction**

“Interaction is a collaborative exchange of ideas between a teacher and learners or a learner and other learners resulting in reciprocal effect on each other” (Brown: 1994). As cited in Husnaini (2005), interaction in language class is different from other interaction. In language classroom, interaction is a process of language learning.

Brown (1994) also explains that:

Though interaction, students can increase their language store as they listen to or read authentic language material, or even the output of their fellow students in discussion, skits, join problem-solving task, or dialogue journals. In interaction, students can use all they possess of the language—all they have learned of casually absorbed-in real-life exchange....Even at an elementary stages, they learn in this way to exploit the elasticity of language.

In a classroom interaction, ‘talk’ serve many important functions. By using oral language the teacher and learners can exchange knowledge, feelings, attitudes, and maintain social relationships. Cazden, as quoted by Kumpulainen (1994:6) mentions: “Talk can thus be regarded as serving both cognitive and social functions in classroom interaction”. From the teacher’s point of view ‘talk’ is a valuable tool in gaining the teacher to investigate the learning environment itself, for example, what kind of teacher talk does it foster in pupils.

Observations of many different classes, both in content area subject and in language interaction, consistently show that teachers typically do between one half and three quarter of talking done in classrooms (Allwright and Bailey: 1991). Although teacher talk has its place in providing a model for students, it is clear that the principal objective of most students is to able use English verbally. And it’s equally clear that without the opportunity to practices unaided talking, a student can only make little progress in this area.

In addition, Gibb (1999) says that teacher talk is often viewed suspiciously as “Teacher Talk Time” (TTT), rather than as valuable “language modeling”. The more teacher talks, the less opportunity is for learners. In means that TTT can decreases opportunity for Student Talking Time (STT). Based on the observation and experience, the practice of teaching English in Indonesia tends to be teacher centered. It’s often associated with TTT.

In conducting the observation, the writer uses an observational instrument that is called as interaction analysis. As Hitchcock and Hughes (1984: 134), state, “Interaction analysis as a technique used to investigate classroom interaction grew up out of a concern with the improvement of classroom teaching”. The best-know example of interaction analysis is contained in Ned Flanders’ coding scheme known as FIAC, the Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories.

“Classroom interaction analysis refers not to one system, but to many systems for coding spontaneous verbal communication, arranging the data in a useful display, and then analyzing the results in order to study patterns of teaching

and learning. Each system is essentially a process of encoding and decoding, i.e., categories for classifying statements are established, a code symbol is assigned to each category, and a trained observer records data by jotting down code symbols. Decoding is the reverse process: a trained analyst interprets the display of coded data in order to make appropriate statements about the original events which were encoded” (Flanders, 1970: 28-29).

Thus, the writer identifies several problems relate to the explanation above, the first is about the way of teaching English in Junior High School, the second is whether or not the students accept the English well, the third is about the teacher talk in the classroom interaction, the fourth is about the learner talk in the classroom interaction and the fifth is about the percentage of teacher talk and learner talk time classroom interaction.

The writer limits the investigation on how the teacher manages the interaction with learners in the classroom context. The investigation is focuses on: what teacher talk constitute in classroom interaction, what learner talk constitute in classroom interaction and what percentages of the teacher and learner talk in classroom interaction.

The study of classroom interaction is the study about communication system. In the classroom research case, interaction analysis usually involves the analysis of spoken language as it’s used in a classroom between teacher and learners. Spoken language is also an important part of the identities of all participants (Allwright and Bailey, 1991).

Moreover, according to Allwright and Bailey (1991), research in classroom interactions is distinct from, for example, research that concentrates on the inputs to the classroom (the syllabus, the teaching material, etc.) or on the outputs from the classroom (learner test scores). The concept research in classroom interaction is focused on classroom language learning in many different ways, such as how interaction occurs in classroom. Therefore, the purpose of this study is trying to examine how interactions between teacher and learners actually happen.

## **RESEARCH METHOD**

This research applied interaction analysis as the method of research. Interaction analysis is one of method for an analyzing classroom interaction involves the discursive analysis of classroom talk. Long as cited in Murcia (2001:489) define classroom research as “research on second language teaching and learning, all or part of whose data are derived from observation or measurement of the classroom performance of teacher and students.” This research was directed in investigating and analyzing teacher talk and learner talk in classroom interaction with 28 students of VIII A of Junior High school In SMP N 2 Sindang Indramayu as the subject. The instrumentation implemented in this research was Flanders Interaction Analysis Category (FIAC) and interview. Those instruments then were analyzed. The data analysis is divided into two, they were Qualitative data analysis and Quantitative data analysis.

a. Qualitative Data Analysis

**1. Transcribing**

All episodes of recorded interactions were transcribed down in the form of written transcripts. These transcripts have been main data sources, while data from interviews were as additional data. Then, the observer labeled each utterance with 'T', 'S', and 'Ss'. T refers to the utterance expressed by teacher, S refers to those from individual learner, and Ss is belong to a group of learners.

**2. Coding**

Interaction analysis system involves the identification of analysis of talk in the classroom in terms of coding and categorizing of utterances according to ten pre-arranged. After completing the transcription, the writer coded each number of utterances into the category based Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC). As mentioned before, the coding process involved two coders besides the observer. Each coder then independently coded the transcripts based on following procedures;

Coding Procedures FIAC

**General**

- Whenever there is an elements of doubt code the prevailing balance of teacher initiation and response
- Rare events should be coded wherever possible
- Categories 1, 2, 3 & 9 are exacted much less than 5, 6, 7, & 8

**Category 1: Accept Feelings**

This is rare event the teacher must actually label the feeling to obtain this code.

**Category 2: Praises or Encourages**

- Avoid using to code habitually routine superficial exclamations of praise.
- Code more than once if extended praise is given.

**Category 3: Accepts/uses idea of student**

- Teacher can respond to pupil's ideas in a number of ways:
  - Acknowledge-creating a number of ways
  - Modify, rephrase
  - Apply it to solve a problem or make inference
  - Compare it with other ideas
  - Summarize what is said
- Code 3 more than once if extended responses given
- Restrained use in coding 3 appears to enhance its diagnostic utility
- Beware of teacher making too bigger abstraction from pupils statement (code 5)
- Beware of teacher ignoring pupils suggestion and asking for another (code 4)

**Category 4: Asks Questions**

- Teacher must act as if expects an answer not rhetorical question)
- If teacher talk is to bring others into discussion e.g. what do you think Joe, no need to code 4.

**Category 5: Lecture**

- Lecturing, expressing opinions, giving facts, interjecting thoughts and off handed comments included
- In traditional teaching approach category 5 will be most common catchall category and incorrect tally for this category unlikely to distort teacher's profile

**Category 6&7: Gives direction or criticizes or justifies authority**

- Used to indicate close supervision and direction by teacher
- Used for statement intended to produce compliance. To recognize during coding ask whether compliance will be the result of statement
- Avoid confusion announcements (code 5)
- Questions during teacher directed drill can be coded 6

**Category 8&9: Students Response and students initiated**

- Making a choice between codes 8 & 9 should relate to the teachers preceding question.  
Pupil response to a closed teacher questions e.g. should we use validate or Not = code 8  
Pupil response to open teacher question e.g. what type of dressing should we use = code 9
- Students response 8 can turn into 9 if the student embellishes or adds voluntary information or makes an independent judgment
- Use 8 in all cases where there is doubt about 9
- Category 9 also used for students making of target remarks (resistance to compliance)

**Analyzing**

Finally, the result of coding or categorizing was analyzed based on the research questions. These coding, then have been main data resources, while data from interviewer as additional data.

b. Quantitative Data Analysis

Even though this research belongs to qualitative study, but it's possible for writer to describe the quantitative data. Chaudron (1988) mentions that interaction analysis have not pursued quantitative analysis, although measurement of the frequency specific behaviors implied a quantitative data. In getting the percentages of teacher talk and learner talk in the classroom, the writer followed two steps as mentioned above, transcribing and coding. The next steps are:

### 1. Comparing

This step was used for determining reliability of the coding transcripts of classroom lesson. The results of categorizing were compared between coders. Then the coders discussed about the differences in coding. Finally, the writer must make decision about the unit of analysis after having same agreement with other coders.

### 2. Tallying

To obtain a complete descriptive picture of what behaviors occurred during the lesson, the writer tallied every time of category into tally sheet. When the tally sheet has completed, the writer then found the percentages of each category.

### 3. Calculating

In describing the quantitative data, Hatch and Lazaraton (1991 : 136) says that:

“...when numbers are large and or when there are many categories, it’s often more informative to show the relative frequency of each category as proportion or percent.” Therefore the calculation teacher talk and learner talk can be shown in table 1 :

Type of ratio	Symbol	Calculation
% Teacher talk	TT	$100/\text{total tallies} * \sum (\text{Cat.} 1+2+3+4+5+6+7)$
% Learner talk	LT	$100/\text{total tallies} * \sum (\text{Cat.} 8+9)$

*table 1: Measures of teacher talk and learner*

## FINDING AND DISCUSSION

The findings of this study on teacher talk can be summed up as follows:

1. She accepted and clarified an attitude of the feeling tone of learners in no threatening manner.
2. She realized that praises are powerful determinant behavior. Therefore along the teaching and learning activities she provided reward to encourage learners verbally.
3. Accepting and using idea of the learners are often used by teacher.
4. In asking questions, the teacher used both open and closed questions. Anyway, open questions are dominant used by teacher. This pattern is intended to make learners attentive on the subject of discussion.
5. The teacher seldom used lecturing as a method in presenting the lesson. She realized that the concept of communicative approach requires the teacher as negotiator not as transmitter of knowledge.
6. Teacher usually gives direction in every period of lesson.

7. The teacher's intention made learners comfortable. This way is sustained to make classroom atmosphere as friendly as possible.

### **1. Learner Talk**

The result of this research on learner talk can be summed up as follow:

1. The learners always give response to every questions or directions from the teacher.
2. The learner's response can give contribution in building the classroom interaction.
3. The quantity of learner-response is in proration of teacher's questions. If teacher ask more question learners will response more.
4. The learners made many initiations during classroom interaction.

### **2. The percentages of Teacher Talk and Learner Talk**

Referring to the findings of the research, it can be concluded as follow;

1. The teacher did most of talking (56.4%) of the class time, which indirect influence is dominant that direct influence.
2. The learners did most of response than initiation during classroom interaction.
3. In reducing TTT, the teacher asked a lot of questions rather that explanation.
4. The used interactive methods (games, asking-answering, quiz, study group discussion, etc.) influenced the proration of TTT and STT.

## **CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION**

The implication of this research about interaction in classroom between teacher and learner as an essential one of teaching learning process which can influence for the achievement English learning. But there are still any strength and weakness of this research.

### **The Strength**

1. By knowing the interaction between teacher and learner, it can be an evaluation for English teaching learning progress.
2. From the research we can know that the percentage of talking between the teacher and learner can influence for the achievement English learning.
3. The students are active enough in classroom interaction.

### **The weakness**

1. Learning English through English is sometimes too difficult for the Junior High School students. It needs a lot of efforts from the teacher and students to sustain teaching learning process.

2. Sometimes the teacher talks too much in the class and gives a little opportunity to students to speak up.
3. The teacher is demanded to have a wide range of vocabulary and do not give up easily when the activity does not work as she expected.
4. The teacher still translate her statement of English into bahasa Indonesia so it can make interaction in English less.

In line with conclusion stated above, the following suggestions are proposed for better teaching and learning language.

1. The first principle and most important, to keep in mind is that the learners want to speak English. The teacher's role is to facilitate and lead them in conversation.
2. In order to encourage learner's response or initiation, the teacher should give reward for them not only use verbally like; good or thanks you but also other various like excellent, you're right, great, etc. and it's needed non verbally reward.
3. Using variety. The lesson should be interesting. Doing the same thing for too long time will make boring.
4. Teacher should try to use English more in interaction not always translate it into bahasa Indonesia.
5. Create and maintain a relaxed and friendly environment.

## **REFERENCE**

- Allwright, D and Bailey. 1991. *Focus on the Language Classroom: An Introduction to Classroom Research for language Teachers*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Anonymous. PEBL: Methodology working aer 6: Falnders Intearction Analysis. [Online]. Available at:  
<http://www.hebes.mdx.ac.uk/teaching/Research/PELB/methpapa6.pdf>
- Brown, H. Douglas. 1994. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to language Pedagogy*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Chaudron, Craig. 1988. *Second Language Classrooms: Research on Teaching and Learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Dellar, Hugh. *Putting Our Words to Work: Rethinking Teacher Talking Time*. [online]. Available at:  
<http://www.tesol-spain.org/newsletter/hughdellar/html>
- Ellis, R. 1988. *Classroom Second Language Development*. London: Prentice Hall International (UK) Ltd.
- Gibb, Micheal. 1999. *Using Classroom English*. [online]. Available at:  
<http://www.kotesol.org.publications/journal/1999/>
- Hitchcock and Hughes. 1989. *Research and Teacher: A Qualitative Introduction to School-Based Research*. London: Rout ledge.



- Hatch and Farhaday. 1982. *Research Design and Statistics for Applied Linguistics*. Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.
- Hornby, A.S. 2002. *Oxford Advanced Lerner's Dictionary of Current English*. Oxford: Oxford University.
- Husnaeni, 2005. *Teacher Talk and Learner Talk in Classroom Interaction (An Analysis to an English language Class at SMP N 29 Bandung)*. Bandung: UPI Bandung
- Harmer Jeremy. 2001. *How to Teach English*, Cambridge : Longman Group Ltd.
- Kumpulainen, Kristiina. 1994. *Children's Talk During Collaborative Writing at Computer*. Reading Magazine. Volume 28. London: Blackwell Publishers.
- Nafrina, Ajeng. 2007. *The Teacher Talk and Learner Talk in the Classroom Interaction of Grade VIII.A SMP N 2 Kempiring Kendal*. Semarang: UNNES.
- Nunan, David. 1992. *Research Method in Language Learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, David. 1989. *Undersatnding Language Classroom: A guide for Teacher Initiated Action*. London: rentice Hall International (UK) Ltd.
- Prabhu, N. S.1991. *The Learner's Effort in the Language Classroom*. In Eugenius Sadtono (Ed.). *Language Acquisition and the Second/ Foreign Language classroom* ( pp 49 – 58).Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
- Sharea, Sarah. 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). Saud Arabian: a thesis
- Willson, Julie. *High and Low Achievers' Classroom Interaction Patterns in an Upper Primary Classroom*.
- <http://www.aare.edu.au/ggpap/Will99741.htm>.