

Teacher-Student Classroom Verbal Interaction in Intensive Course Classes of An English Department Student.

Vincentia S.H.S
Johanes Leonardi Taloko

Abstract. *An English education should be delivered using English to form an English atmosphere. In teaching-learning activity, so many interactions happen in the classroom, for example teacher-students, students-students, etc. Since Intensive Course becomes the foundation of the English Department students, how the interaction should be conducted, especially the verbal interaction should get a high attention. Realizing that classroom verbal interaction is important, the writers decided to do a study in it. In line with the introduction, the research questions raised in this study are: What forms of classroom verbal interactions were found in IC classes? Which form of classroom verbal interactions was most commonly used in IC classes? This research was a classroom ethnographic research applying a nonparticipant observation. The data of this study are gained by doing observations. Sitting at the back of the classroom observing the learning-teaching activities, recording the teachers' and students' talk secretly, and noting down and analyzing the classroom interaction were done to observe the classroom. Using the theory by Ur (1991), the writers found two forms of classroom interaction in Intensive Course; those were teacher active, students mainly receptive and student active, teacher mainly receptive. The most commonly used form was teacher active, students mainly receptive.*

Key terms: *classroom verbal interaction, patterns, forms*

Introduction

English is an international language and the most popular language used by almost all the people in the world to communicate with others in so many fields, for example in education, travel, correspondence, and the internet. So, English becomes one of the essential languages that have to be studied to broaden our mind and knowledge about anything.

In Indonesia nowadays, English has been taught to the children in their early years of education that is in the age of 3 or 4 using simple English until the complicated one in the higher level of education. In fact, there are so many students who have already passed those grades are still unable to use and communicate in English well. According to Putri (2002), there are so many English courses in this country which aim at making their students able to communicate actively in English because English education that is given in schools result a low ability in using English communicatively.

English in its development has so many kinds of sources to learn it well. One of the sources to learn it is in an English Department. Inside the English Department, there are so many exposures that help the students in learning something new. The exposures can be got from the teacher, student, or the environment.

An English education should be carried out using English and this design has already found in this department because in the daily life of this department, English is used to communicate among the teachers and the students. The students of English department have to study English well and learn deeper about it to teach our future students well. That also can be found in the aim of English Education Study Program (EESP) that is to produce qualified English teachers (Pedoman Akademik, 2007: 3). In this university, Intensive Course or also known as IC, is the foundation to prepare the students to participate in other higher subjects. All the students of the English get the IC class in semester I (24 credits). They will get all the basics of four language skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) and also language components (grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation).

Based on the standard competence of IC, it is said that students are able to use their survival English in oral and written communications (Pedoman Akademik, 2007: 101). It serves as a foundation to prepare students to participate actively in other subjects taught in English. From the statements above, it can be said that IC is the most important basic course that is learned by the beginners because in the basic competence of IC stated that students are able to express ideas both in controlled and freer communicative practices on variety of topics and functions involving skills and components (Pedoman Akademik, 2007: 101). All of those statements that strongly said that Intensive course are an essential course that must be taken by the students in the first semester.

In teaching learning activity, there are so many interactions happened in the classroom, for example teacher – students, student – student, etc. Classroom is a place where comprehensible input and modified interaction are available, what goes on inside the language classroom is very important (Krashen 1980, 1982 in Tsu Bik-may, 1985). It is simply said that classroom, for English Department students, is a place for them to absorb the knowledge to be applied in the real classroom and everything which is happened inside the classroom is really important for the students' development.

Since IC becomes the foundation of the English department students, how the interaction should be conducted, especially the verbal interaction should get a high attention. Besides that, since IC was established, there has not been any research to acknowledge what actually happens in IC classrooms, even from the teacher talk, student talk, and also in the classroom interactions. Those statements became the reasons why this research was conducted. The research questions are as follows:

- What forms of classroom verbal interactions were found in IC classes?

- Which form of classroom verbal interactions was most commonly used in IC classes?

Theoretical frameworks

- Classroom verbal interaction

Brown (2001: 165) defines interaction as the collaborative exchange of thoughts, feelings, or ideas between two or more people, resulting in a reciprocal effect on each other. Interaction happens when there is understanding between two or more people then giving responds. In learning the second language, this is the most important aspect that must be achieved by the learners.
- Teacher and student talk

Amy Tsu Bik-may (1985) suggested the ESL teachers to analyze what actually has gone on their own language classroom. She made the Seventeen-Category System is easy to be applied because the category identification is really simple and the category number is manageable.
- Verbal input in second language classroom

Language input has an important effect on learner's acquisition of the target language (Tsu Bik-may, 1985). It is one of the important things in second language classroom. In line with it, Krashen (1982) said that the most important, the input hypothesis predicts that the classroom may be an excellent place for second language acquisition, at least up to the "intermediate" level.

Research Method

This research was a classroom ethnographic research (Chaudron, 1988), applying a non-participant observation. Using this kind of research, the writers did a continuous record keeping, an extensive participatory involvement of the researcher in the classroom, and a careful interpretation of the multifaceted data.

Although the writers were in the classroom, they did not get involved in the learning-teaching activities of Intensive Course classrooms. Sitting at the back of the classroom observing the learning-teaching activities, recording the teachers' and students' talk secretly, and noting down and analyzing the classroom interaction were done to observe the classroom.

To ensure that the presence of the writers would not disturb the learning-teaching process, they asked the teachers not to involve them in the activities and told the students to pretend that they were not there.

The subjects of the study were the teacher and students of IC classes 2010/2011. Four teachers of IC had been chosen for the observation. They were chosen based on their teaching experience. And for the students, all of the IC students from IC A (30 students), IC B (23

students), and also IC C (26 students) were chosen. They came from so many school backgrounds with various English competences.

The Findings

After doing the eight times observations, the writers analyzed the data to find the forms and patterns of classroom interaction. The data consist of transcriptions of teacher I, teacher II, teacher III, and teacher IV which were chosen based on the naturalism. It means that the behaviors which are done by the teacher and students were natural or were not affected by the presence of the observers.

Forms of Classroom Interaction

Forms of classroom interaction are the conditions during the teaching learning activities among the teacher and students run. The findings of the forms of classroom interaction were got from the calculation of the number of each teacher talk and student talk. Using the combination of the Tsu Bik-may (1985) and Ur (1991) theories, the writers found two types of forms of classroom interaction that exist in this study. The first one is teacher active, students mainly receptive and the second one is students active, teacher mainly receptive.

Teacher I Forms of Classroom Interaction

Here was the result of forms of classroom interaction in the observation in teacher one class that the writers found.

Table 1. The Number of Teacher #1 Talk

Categories			Frequency	
Initiate	Elicit	Display Qs	Factual Q	38
			Yes-No Q	72
			Reasoning Q	9
			Explanation Q	0
		Genuine Qs	Opining Q	4
			Information Q	0
	Re-stating Elicit		26	
	Direct		59	
	Nominate		96	
	Inform		277	
	Recapitulate		74	
Frame		6		
Starter		0		
Check		9		
Respond	Evaluate	Encouraging/Positive	10	
		Negative	2	
	Accept		106	
	Comment		0	
Clue		44		
TOTAL			832	

Table 2. The Number of Student Talk of Teacher #1

Categories			Frequency
Respond	Reply	Restricted	203
		Expanded	134
	Apologize		2
Initiate	Request		0
	Elicit		28
	Interrupt		0
TOTAL			367

From the table above, the writer concluded those numbers with a calculation. The result was **teacher active, students mainly receptive (T)**. It happened because at that time the material which was discussed are reading and grammar and the students seemed not very active, so the teacher had to do a lot of talks to make the students involved actively in the discussion. Actually the students in that class were very active, but because of the material and the way the teacher taught them, make them felt reluctant to be active as usual. Besides that, because of the teaching-learning time that had already been in the afternoon made the students felt tired and others wanted to go home as soon as possible, so that was why the students were not active in responding the teacher talks.

Teacher II Forms of Classroom Interaction

Here was the result of forms of classroom interaction in the observation in teacher two classes that the writer found.

Table 3. The Number of Teacher #2 Talk

Categories			Frequency	
Initiate	Elicit	Display Qs	Factual Q	47
			Yes-No Q	32
			Reasoning Q	5
			Explanation Q	0
		Genuine Qs	Opining Q	1
			Information Q	0
	Re-stating Elicit		12	
	Direct		30	
	Nominate		0	
	Inform		0	
	Recapitulate		0	
	Frame		0	
	Starter		0	
Check		0		
Respond	Evaluate	Encouraging/Positive	6	
		Negative	3	
	Accept		54	
	Comment		0	
Clue		41		
TOTAL			231	

Table 4. The Number of Student Talk of Teacher #2

Categories		Frequency	
Respond	Reply	Restricted	274
		Expanded	133
	Apologize		1
Initiate	Request		
	Elicit		
	Interrupt		
		TOTAL	408

From the table above, the writer concluded those numbers with a calculation. The result was **students active, teacher mainly receptive (S)**. It happened because the students were active; they did all of the activities actively. Starting from the discussion about the possessive pronoun up to the role play, the students felt happy in doing those activities without filling bored. The teacher could blend the material into something that made the students became very active. Besides that, there was a role play activity that forced the students to talk more than the teacher. Sometimes that kind of class situation makes the students uncontrolled, but fortunately the teacher could calm the students down. And because of the time of the class was still in the morning, so the students still had a lot of energy in doing those activities.

Teacher III Forms of Classroom Interaction

Here was the result of forms of classroom interaction in the observation in teacher three class that the writer found.

Table 5. The Number of Teacher #3 Talk

Categories			Frequency	
Initiate	Elicit	Display Qs	Factual Q	86
			Yes-No Q	47
			Reasoning Q	1
			Explanation Q	0
		Genuine Qs	Opining Q	2
			Information Q	1
	Re-stating Elicit		38	
	Direct		94	
	Nominate		49	
	Inform		126	
	Recapitulate		29	
	Frame		7	
	Starter		0	
Check		0		
Respond	Evaluate	Encouraging/Positive	19	
		Negative	0	
	Accept		114	
	Comment		0	
	Clue		32	
TOTAL			645	

Table 6. The Number of Student Talk of Teacher #3

Categories		Frequency	
Respond	Reply	Restricted	248
		Expanded	79
	Apologize		1
Initiate	Request		0
	Elicit		27
	Interrupt		7
TOTAL		362	

From the table above, the writer concluded those numbers with a calculation. The result was **teacher active, students mainly receptive (T)**. In this teacher class, the students were not as active as the previous teacher class, but they were still active enough in involving in the teaching learning activity. The students tended to talk less than the teacher because of the high amount of the materials that had to be done in that 100 minutes, so the teacher tended to talk more to stimulate the students to respond him or answer the questions from the book. Even the students were active enough in joining the teacher's class; they could not talk a lot. The students felt enjoy enough with the teacher's class because the teacher could explain all the material well and of course with his patience.

Teacher IV Forms of Classroom Interaction

Here was the result of forms of classroom interaction in the observation in teacher four class that the writer found.

Table 7. The Number of Teacher #4 Talk

Categories			Frequency	
Initiate	Elicit	Display Qs	Factual Q	38
			Yes-No Q	63
			Reasoning Q	6
			Explanation Q	1
		Genuine Qs	Opining Q	0
			Information Q	0
	Re-stating Elicit		19	
	Direct		23	
	Nominate		27	
	Inform		86	
	Recapitulate		5	
	Frame		2	
	Starter		0	
Check		2		
Respond	Evaluate	Encouraging/Positive	10	
		Negative	2	
	Accept		16	
	Comment		0	
	Clue		15	
TOTAL			315	

Table 8. The Number of Student Talk of Teacher #4

Categories			Frequency
Respond	Reply	Restricted	201
		Expanded	116
	Apologize		9
Initiate	Request		2
	Elicit		62
	Interrupt		2
TOTAL			392

From the table above, the writer concluded those numbers with a calculation. The result was **students active, teacher mainly receptive (S)**. It happened because almost $\frac{3}{4}$ times in that meeting was used to do a peer teaching. In every meeting in that class, there was always one of the students who was chosen to be the presenter and had to present a material in front of the class, answered the questions from his/her friends, and also led a discussion about the materials in the book. This way of teaching learning activity forced the students to talk a lot by presenting something, asking questions, helping their friends in explaining something, etc. And the students felt quite enjoy the teaching learning activity.

Commonly Used Form of Classroom Interaction

After looking at the findings above, the writer wanted to make a conclusion about the form which was commonly used during the interaction in the classroom.

Table 9. Recapitulation of All Teacher Talk

Categories				T1	T2	T3	T4	TOTAL
Initiate	Elicit	Display Qs	Factual Q	38		86	38	162
			Yes-No Q	72		47	63	182
			Reasoning Q	9		1	6	16
			Explanation Q	0		0	1	1
		Genuine Qs	Opining Q	4		2	0	6
			Information Q	0		1	0	1
	Re-stating Elicit		26		38	19	83	
	Direct		59		94	23	176	
	Nominate		96		49	27	172	
	Inform		277		126	86	489	
Recapitulate		74		29	5	108		
Frame		6		7	2	15		
Starter		0		0	0	0		
Check		9		0	2	11		
Respond	Evaluate	Encouraging/ Positive	10		19	10	39	
		Negative	2		0	2	4	
	Accept	106		114	16	236		
	Comment	0		0	0	0		
	Clue	44		32	15	91		
TOTAL				1792				

Table 10 Recapitulation of All Student Talk

Categories		T1	T2	T3	T4	TOTAL	
Respond	Reply	Restricted	203	274	248	201	652
		Expanded	134	133	79	116	329
	Apologize	2	1	1	9	12	
Initiate	Request	0		0	2	2	
	Elicit	28		27	62	117	
	Interrupt	0		7	2	9	
		TOTAL				1121	

The writer found there were two types of forms of interaction in those teachers' classes. The first one was teacher active, students mainly receptive (T) and the second one was students active, teacher mainly receptive (S).

From the recapitulation above, the writer conclude those numbers with a calculation. Based on the ratio that was got from the calculation, the most commonly used form of the classroom interaction was categorized in **teacher active, students mainly receptive (T)** because the percentage of the teachers talks was higher than the student talk. It appears from the ratio teacher and students is 62% : 38%. It happened because there were several reasons, the materials, the grade of the students or the students themselves and also the time.

The first one was because of the materials. The materials demanded the teachers to talk more than the students because when the teacher wanted to discuss about the material, the teacher always stimulated the students by asking questions or giving information related to the material.

The second one was because of the grade of the students or the students themselves. Generally, the students in this grade needed a lot of assistance or stimulants from the teacher so that they could actively participate in the teaching learning activity. In line with it, Krashen (1982) stated that input is the most important thing in the second language classroom which is given by the teacher. So the teacher had to give as much as possible input so that the students could absorb higher knowledge about the second language itself, for example vocabulary. Sometimes in one class, the students were very active, so the students and the teacher had the same amount of talks. In the other hand, the students were not really active, so the teachers had to talk a lot to make the class alive.

The last was about the time. Sometimes there was no balance amount between the time and the material. The high amount of materials that should be done in one meeting (100 minutes) sometimes made the teacher find so many ways they could do like minimize the students talk, to manage the time so that all the materials could be conveyed. All of those reasons were still acceptable based on the input theory (Krashen, 1982) as long as the teacher still gave a great amount of input that really helped the students in learning the language and also be a good model.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- . (2007). *Pedoman Akademik Tahun Akademik 2007/2008*. Surabaya: Universitas Katolik Widya Mandala Surabaya.
- Bik-may, A. T. (1985). Analyzing Input and Interaction in Second Language Classrooms. *RELC Journal* , 8-32.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching* . New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.
- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second Language Classrooms: Research on teaching and learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Denzin, N. K. (1978). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding second language acquisition*. UK: Oxford University Press.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. USA: Pearson - Longman.
- Keller, S. (1995). *Verbal Input and Classroom Interaction in Teaching English at SD Katolik Xaverius II*. Surabaya: Universitas Katolik Widya Mandala.
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. UK: Pergamon Press Inc.
- McMillan, J. H. (1992). *Educational Research: Fundamental for the Consumer*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers Inc.
- Putri, D. A. (2002, March 2). Bagaimana Meningkatkan Mutu Hasil Pelajaran Bahasa Inggris di Sekolah. *Pendidikan Network*.
- Ur, P. (1991). *A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ur, P. (1996). *A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Wajnryb, R. (1992). *Classroom Observation Tasks: A resource book for language teachers and trainers*. New York: Cambridge University Press.