

An analysis of classroom interaction in speaking class

Eka Lestari¹, Hery Yufrizal², Gita Hilmi Prakoso³

English Education Study Program, University of Lampung^{1,2,3}

¹Ekalstri13@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to find out the dominant category used by the teacher and the student during classroom interaction and to investigate which task that require the student to talk more. The study used a qualitative approach which included a case study. Naturalistic observation and encoding matrix were used to obtain the data. The data were examined using the FIACS (Flanders Interaction Analysis Category System) approach proposed by Flanders (1970) frameworks for forms of classroom interaction. The data demonstrated that both the teacher and the students used all of the FIACS system of interaction categories. The result of this study revealed that the dominant category applied by the teacher was Ask Question with the percentage 18.03% in the first meeting and 20.15% in the second meeting. In the other hand the dominant category used by students in the first and second meeting was Students-Talk Initiation with the percentage 38.52% and 49.71%. In addition, the classroom interaction is dominantly made by the students in the second meeting supported by discussion task. The percentage of Students Talk in the second meeting was 59.68%.

Keyword: *classroom interaction, FIACS (Flanders Interaction Analysis Category System), speaking class*

I. INTRODUCTION

Classroom interaction is the action that performed by the teacher and the students in the process of teaching and learning in the classroom. Radford (2011) maintains that through the classroom interaction, the learning process among students will occur since they will exchange their knowledge or understanding from each other. It means that classroom interaction makes the students brave to share what they have known and learn from each other.

In addition, according to Chaudron (1998) stated that Classroom interaction covers classroom behaviors such as turn-taking, questioning and answering, negotiation of meaning and feedback. While Dagarin (2004) argues that classroom interaction is two ways process between the participants in the language process, the teacher influences the learners and vice versa. In fact, according to Kundu (1993), Musumeci (1996), and Chaudron (1988) cited in Tuan and Nhu (2010), teacher talk is dominant in classroom interaction. It means the teacher too active in the classroom, should the student who active more than teacher. Therefore, the researcher would like to analyze classroom interaction. Through the classroom interaction, the researcher would know the category of classroom interaction between teacher and students.

Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories System (FIACS) Technique is an observational tool used to classify the verbal behavior of teachers and students as they interact in the classroom. Flanders' instrument was designed for observing only the verbal communication in the classroom and

nonverbal gestures are not taken into account. Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC) is a ten Category System of communication possibilities. There are seven categories used when the teacher is talking (Teacher Talk) and two when the students is talking (students Talk) and tenth category is that of silence or confusion. Besides that, Flanders (1970) divides teacher talk (accepting feeling, praising or encouraging, accepting ideas, asking questions, lecturing, giving directions, and criticizing or justifying authority) student talk (student talk response and student talk initiate) and silence (periods of silence or confusion).

So, based on the condition when the researcher conducted a pre-observation during pre-teaching service in SMAN 1 Liwa, it was found that the most dominant interaction in the classroom was done by the teacher. Although the teacher was dominantly led the whole classroom interaction, the teacher also asked the students to be actively interact during teaching and learning process not only interacting between teacher and students, but the interaction between students and students should be occurred as well.

On the other hand, based on the pre-observation explained above, the dominant interaction led by students was possibly occurred. Ayunda (2021) has investigated EFL Classroom Interaction by Using Flanders Interaction Analysis Category System (FIACS). It was found that the students were more active to be involved in the interaction inside classroom. The interaction was dominantly occurred by the students than the teacher. This means that classroom interaction is not always lead by the teacher, but the students have the possibility to dominate the classroom interaction. Based on the explanation above, the researcher wanted to conduct research to analyze the classroom interaction. Thus, the researcher entitles this research as An Analysis of Classroom Interaction in speaking class at the first grade in SMAN 1 Liwa.

II. METHODS

This research used a qualitative method. McLaughlin, Robert & Eric (2012) define qualitative research as an approach that uses methodologies designed to provide a rich, contextualized picture of an educational or social phenomenon.

Participants

The subject of this research was students of X IPA 1 at SMAN 1 Liwa. The object of this research was the teacher talk and the student talk during the classroom interaction in the teaching and learning process.

Instruments

There are two instruments used in this research namely observation tally sheet and video recording. According to Robert (2017) Observation is activity of researcher that looking at what people actually does. Observation sheet was a main instrument in this research. The observation sheet was adopted from Flanders (1970). During the observation, the researcher acted as a participant in which the researcher directly involved herself in the subject activities in the classroom. In the observation, the researcher used two different tasks of descriptive text. They were Information Gap Task and Group Discussion Task. Those tasks were used as guidance for the class discussion to obtain the data, because the researcher will know which task will make students to talk more. Next, video recording is very important to obtain more accurate data because the researcher can watch the recording repeatedly

outside the classroom. Burns (1999) stated that recording can be valuable in furnishing researchers with objective first hand data for analyzing data of teacher and students behavior in classroom.

Data Analysis

Furthermore, the data were collected by conducting two times class meeting by using two instruments in collecting the data including observation sheet and video recording. After collecting the data, then the data were analyzed through some procedures. The researcher conducted data analysis in the following three steps adopted from Flanders (1970).

The three steps were follows:

1. The researcher transcribed the interaction among the teacher and students in the recorder video and put code on the particular the teacher and students talk in order to get expected data.
2. The researcher put the plotting of the coded data into matrix of Flanders interaction analysis
3. The researcher Analyzing Teacher Talk, Student Talk, Silence.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Result

After analyzing the data, the researcher presents table the result of classroom interaction analysis. The result can be seen on this following table:

Table 1. The Result of Classroom Interaction Analysis (1st Meeting)

No	Categories	Amount	Percentage
1	Accepts Feeling	2	0.8%
2	Praises or encourages	8	3.27%
3	Accepts or uses ideas of students	9	3.68%
4	Ask questions	44	18.03%
5	Lecturing	15	6.14%
6	Giving directions	12	4.91%
7	Criticizing or justifying authority	1	0.4%
8	Students talk response	49	20.08%
9	Students talk initiation	94	38.52%
10	Silence or confusion	10	4.09%

Table 2. The Result of Teachers' Talk and Students' Talk in(1st meeting)

No.	Meeting	Teacher Talk		Student Talk		Silence	
		Quantity	%	Quantity	%	Quantity	%
1	First	91	37.29%	143	58.60%	10	4.09%

Table 1 shows that in Teacher talk category (1-7) the teacher spent most in Ask question and Lecturing, with 18.03% and 6.14%. These number represented that the process of question-answer between students and teacher was many enough although it only focused on short answer and 'yes/no

question'. The aspect of Giving direction was in the third place with the percentage 4.91%. Accepts or uses idea and Praise or encouragement was in the fourth and fifth place with the percentage 3.68% and 3.27%. The two lowest tallies in Teacher talk category was Accepts feeling and Justifying authority with the percentage 0.8% and 0.4%. In Student talk category (8-9) the percentage of Student talk initiate and Student talk response dominated classroom with each total was 38.52% and 20.08%. The Initiation aspect is the talk that is initiated by the students themselves. The last category (10), Silence or confusion with the percentage 4.09%. Also, table 2 shows that the proportion of teacher talk was 91 or 37.29%, student talk was 143 or 58.60% and silence was 10 or 4.09%.

Table 3. The Result of Classroom Interaction Analysis (2nd Meeting)

No	Categories	Amount	Percentage
1	Accepts Feeling	4	1.58%
2	Praises or encourages	5	1.97%
3	Accepts or uses ideas of students	4	1.58%
4	Ask questions	51	20.15%
5	Lecturing	17	6.71%
6	Giving directions	10	3.95%
7	Criticizing or justifying authority	0	0%
8	Students talk response	27	10.67%
9	Students talk initiation	124	49.01%
10	Silence or confusion	11	4.34%

Table 4. The Result of Teachers' Talk and Students' Talk in (2st meeting)

No.	Meeting	Teacher Talk		Student Talk		Silence	
		Quantity	%	Quantity	%	Quantity	%
1	First	91	35.96%	151	59.68%	11	4.34%

From the table 3 above it can be seen that result of the table in the second meeting was not too different than before. In Indirect teacher talk category, the aspect Ask question was also in the first position spent by the teacher with the percentage up to 20.15%. In Students talk category, Student talk initiate also still dominant. The percentage was 49.01%. Meanwhile, the percentage of Silence category was 4.34%. In table 4, the result showed that teacher talk gained 91 or 35.96%, student talk gained 151 or 59.68%, and silence or confusion 11 or 4.34%.

Table 5. Summary of Teachers' Talk and Students' Talk

No.	Meeting	Teacher Talk		Student Talk		Silence	
		Quantity	%	Quantity	%	Quantity	%
1	First	91	37.29%	143	58.60%	10	4.09%
2	Second	91	35.96%	151	59.68%	11	4.34%

From the table of summary above, the researcher found that the percentage of students talk in the second meeting is more than the percentage of students talk from the first meeting. It is 58.60% and 59.68%. It showed that students are more active when did the Discussion Task in the second meeting.

Discussion

This research was set out to find out the dominant category used by the teacher and the student during classroom interaction in teaching learning process by using Flanders Interaction Analysis System (FIACS) and to investigate which task that require student to talk more in the classroom. The data was collected through observation and gathered from two meetings of English teaching and learning process at first grade of senior high school student. The data gathered from the observation was analyzed through three steps which are transcribing and coding, translating the code into structural matrix, analyzing matrix, and analyzing the additional data (teacher talk, student talk, and silence or confusion).

Based on the analyzed observation, the data were outlined that for the teacher, the dominant category applied by the teacher was Ask question with the percentage 18.03% in the first meeting and 20.15% in the second meeting. In the other hand, the dominant category that used by the students in the first and the second meeting was Student talk initiate with the percentage 38.52% and 49.71%. Further analysis, of the first meeting also shows that the percentage category of Teacher talk was 37.29%; Student talk, 58.60%; Silence or confusion, 4.09%. In the second meeting the percentage category of Teacher talk was 35.96%; Student talk, 59.68%; and Silence or confusion was 4.34%. The data above also shows that the percentage of students talk in the second meeting is more than the percentage of students talk from the first meeting. It means that students are more active when did the Discussion Task in the second meeting.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Based on the data results from observation, it could be concluded that the teacher and the students used ten categories of the classroom interaction proposed by Flanders. The dominant category applied by the teacher was Ask question and the dominant category applied by the students was Student Talk Initiation. Additionally, the proportion of student talk in the second meeting using discussion task was higher than the first meeting by using information gap task. It means, students were more active in the second meeting by using discussion task.

Based on the conclusion above, the researcher would like to propose some suggestions which are mentioned as follows; first, the researcher suggest for the teacher to create interactive and effective teaching strategies. Teachers should not only spend teaching and learning process by explaining the content, but also provide the task for students to discussion and include more warming up activities during the classroom, so that the students can explore their thinking and enjoy the learning process. Second, the researcher suggests for further researcher to carry out a research in the other level i.e. junior high school and university level

REFERENCES

Ayunda, A. (2021). An investigation of EFL classroom interaction by using Flanders Interaction Analysis Category System (FIACS). *Research in English and Education (READ)*, 89-100.

- Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Dagarin, M. (2004). Classroom interaction and communication strategies in learning English as a foreign language. *ELOPE*, 127-139.
- Flanders, N. (1970). *Analysis teaching behavior reading*. MA: Addison-Wesley
- McLaughlin, Robert, Hurt, L., & Eric J. (2012). Applied Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods in Academic Advising. A. *NACADA Journal*, 32(1), 63-71
- Radford. (2011). Book Review: Classroom Interaction: Why is it Good, Really? *Education Study Math*. 76.101–115
- Tuan, L.T., & Nhu, N.T.K. (2010). Theoretical review on oral communication in EFL classrooms. *Studies in Literature and Language Journal* Vol. 1., No. 4, 2010, pp. 29-48.