

**CLASSROOM INTERACTION PATTERNS AND TEACHERS-STUDENTS PERCEPTIONS ON ENGLISH CLASSES AT SMAN 2 BUKITTINGGI WEST SUMATRA****CLASSROOM INTERACTION PATTERNS AND TEACHERS-STUDENTS PERCEPTIONS ON ENGLISH CLASSES AT SMAN 2 BUKITTINGGI WEST SUMATRA****Mike Nurmalia Sari, Mukhaiyar, and Hamzah**English Graduate Program, Faculty of Languages and Arts  
Universitas Negeri Padang[mikenurmalia@gmail.com](mailto:mikenurmalia@gmail.com)URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24036/komposisi.v19i2.10037>

DOI: 10.24036/komposisi.v19i2.10037

**Abstract**

This article aims to describe the results of research on interaction patterns and characteristics of classroom interaction in teaching and learning activities in English class in Bukittinggi West Sumatera, as well as perceptions of students and teachers to the interaction. This research type is descriptive and research data is classroom discourse between teacher and student when studying English, as well as questionnaire of student and teacher to class interaction. Participants are 4 English teachers with 3 meetings for each teacher (12 meetings). The research used classification theory of class interaction type from Lindgren (1981), Wajnryb (1992), and El-Hanafi (2013), while for interaction characteristics used Flanders' Interaction Analysis Code (FIAC) model. The results of this study indicate that the dominant interaction pattern is teacher-student with one way traffic interaction, while the dominant interaction characteristic is the cross content. From teacher perception, dominant interaction pattern is student-student interaction and dominant interaction characteristic is teacher support. Whereas from student perception, dominant interaction pattern is teacher-student with two-way traffic interaction, and characteristic of dominant interaction is content cross. It can be concluded that the interaction pattern and the interaction characteristics that occur in the teaching and learning process are strongly influenced by the material and skills taught by the teacher.

**Key Words:** *elicitation techniques, classroom interaction.***Abstrak**

Artikel ini bertujuan untuk mendeskripsikan hasil penelitian tentang pola interaksi dan karakteristik interaksi kelas dalam kegiatan belajar-mengajar dikelas bahasa Inggris dikota Bukittinggi Sumatera Barat, serta persepsi siswa dan guru terhadap interaksi tersebut. Jenis penelitian ini adalah deskriptif dan data penelitian adalah percakapan kelas (*classroom discourse*) antara guru dan siswa ketika belajar bahasa Inggris, serta angket siswa dan guru terhadap interaksi kelas. *Participants* berjumlah 4 guru bahasa Inggris dengan 3 kali pertemuan pada masing-masing guru (12 kali pertemuan). Penelitian menggunakan teori pengelompokan tipe interaksi kelas dari Lindgren (1981), Wajnryb (1992), dan El-Hanafi (2013), sedangkan untuk karakteristik interaksi digunakan teori *Flanders' Interaction Analysis Code (FIAC) model*. Hasil penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa pola interaksi yang dominan adalah *teacher-student with one way traffic interaction*, sementara karakteristik interaksi yang dominan adalah *content cross*. Dari persepsi guru, pola interaksi yang dominan adalah *student-student interaction* dan karakteristik interaksi yang dominan adalah *teacher support*. Sedangkan dari persepsi siswa, pola interaksi yang dominan adalah *teacher-student with two-way traffic interaction*, dan karakteristik interaksi yang dominan adalah *content cross*. Dapat disimpulkan bahwa pola interaksi dan karakteristik interaksi yang terjadi dalam proses belajar-mengajar sangat dipengaruhi oleh materi dan keterampilan yang diajarkan guru.

**Kata kunci:** *teknik elisitasi, interaksi kelas.*

## Introduction

Interaction in the classroom is seen as an essential part of teaching learning process. Lasac (2011) believes that it is in the classroom that the patterns of thinking should be set, attitudes should be shaped and participation can influence students' self-confidence to the learning. Therefore, the interaction should be built well for both students and teacher so they can be engaged to the learning materials well.

Moreover, Tuan and Nhu (2010) state that the traditional language classroom interaction is commonly characterized by a constant pattern, particularly the acts of asking questions, instructing, lecturing, and correcting students' mistakes toward the lesson given. This means these aspects will determine how the classroom will be. If the interactions given by the teacher are meaningful, challenging, and meet the students' prior knowledge, the students would easily engage with the topic of lesson. This will then result a positive and interactive classroom situation.

Classroom interaction refers to activities done by both teacher and students in the classroom where they engage each other toward the lesson given by the teacher. Brown (2001:165) says that interaction is the heart of communication where communication is all about. Dagarin (2004:128) also

supports that classroom interaction can be defined as a two-way process between the participants in the learning process. The teacher influences the students and vice versa. Therefore, it is clear that interaction in the classroom is seen as crucial since the interaction involves both teacher and students to the teaching materials where they have communication during the interaction in the English classroom.

The importance of investigating classroom interaction can be seen from how it has helped in finding effective ways of preparing teachers, evaluating teaching, studying the relationship between teaching and learning, and promoting teachers' awareness of their teaching and consequently improving it (Al-Garawi, 2008). These research fields give more evidence the importance to observe more about classroom interaction because any kinds of problems that might be faced by teachers or students happen in the classroom could be solved through analyzing the classroom interaction.

Regarding to the classroom interaction patterns, some researchers have classified the interaction into several groups. El-Hanafi (2013) divides the interaction pattern into four types: (1) T-SS (teacher-students), (2) SS-SS (students-students), (3) S-T (student-teacher), and (4) S-S (student-student) pattern of interaction.

Based on the classification made by El-Hanafi (2013), the teacher-student interaction pattern can be simplified into smaller types. First, according to Lindgren (1991), there are three variations of teacher-students interaction: (1) one-way traffic interaction, which is indicated by response from the student, (2) two-way traffic interaction which is indicated by feedback for the teacher, and (3) multi-way traffic interaction pattern which indicated by involving many students and commenting by the teacher on a single topic.

The first two variations of the teacher-students interaction patterns (one-way traffic interaction pattern and two-way traffic interaction pattern) that are proposed by Lindgren (1981) and Wajnryb (1992), do not show multi-traffic interaction which involves an interaction of inter-students. The teacher gives initiation to the students by giving question or statement and it is answered or commented by single student, and then the interaction does not continue. Therefore, the last interaction type is multi-way traffic interaction pattern.

The teacher should give another reinforcement that is able to ignite students' curiosity to involve the topic being discussed. There should be other comment or respond from other students toward the question or statement given; after answering or commenting, the student gives the chance back to the teacher to respond them back. The multi-way traffic interaction pattern is seen as ideal interaction created by both teacher and students since it indicates that the teaching and learning process are interactive and allows them to engage well to the lesson.

Classroom interaction can also be in the form of student-student interaction. It is believed that student-student interaction is more conducive

and challenging especially for students to practice the target language, the student-student interaction can increase the students self-reliance and confident and participation in communication since they have peer interaction (El-Hanafi, 2013). The student-student interaction is commonly in form of group discussion, group project, role-play, and many others.

Furthermore, Wajnryb (1991) believes that student-student interaction pattern through an interactional activity are intended to make the students participate more in speaking. Frequency of turns for each student to speak in a pair can be optimal. For example, the student-student interaction pattern can be done through group work discussion. Teacher gives a task for group working and the students can interact each other within the group members to solve the problem of the topic given. The peer interaction helps them to motivate the group members to speak since the teacher is not directly involved in the discussion. They feel more confidence to speak and not too afraid to make mistakes.

In analyzing the interaction characteristics in the classroom, FIAC model is chosen to analyze the present research. Flanders in Dagarin (2004) establishes ten interaction analysis categories to describe teaching and learning process according to the classroom language, also known as Flanders' Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC) model.

The FIAC model are seen from three perspectives: perspective of teacher talk: (1) Accepts feelings: it may be positive or negative and their prediction and recalling are included, (2) praises or encourages, (3) accepts or uses ideas of pupils, (4) ask questions-may be about content or procedure, (5) lectures-gives facts or opinion about content or procedures, (6) gives directions-commands or orders, (7) criticizes or justifies authority-statements to change students' behavior; Perspective of student talk: (8) response, (9) initiation; and perspective of silence: (10) silence or confusion-pauses, short periods of silence, confusion and incomprehension.

FIAC model was designed to categorize the types and quantity of verbal interaction in the classroom and to plot the information on a matrix so that it could be analyzed and interpreted (Dornyey, 2007). The results will give a picture as to who was talking in the classroom, how much and kind of talking that took place. FIAC model became widely used coding system to analyze and improve teacher-student interaction pattern. The easiness to gain and analyze the data is seen to be the beneficial of using this system, as well as the well-structured of categorizing the spoken interaction happen during teaching and learning time. That is why this model is seen suitable to use in order to analyze the whole interaction happen in the classroom.

Moreover, Sampath and Santhanam (2007:53-64) say that the analysis of matrix is so dependable that even a person not present when observations were made could make accurate inferences about the verbal communication and get a mental picture of the classroom interaction. Different matrices also can be made

and used to compare the behavior of teachers at different age levels, sex, subject-matter etc.

So that, Sampath and Santhanam (2007:53-64) believe this analysis would serve as a vital feedback to the teacher or teacher trainee about his intentions and actual behavior in the classroom. The supervising or inspecting staff can also easily follow this system. That is why FIAC model is an effective tool to measure the social-emotional climate in the classroom.

From 10 categories available on FIAC model, the matrix could be concluded into 4 categories: (1) *Content Cross*: a heavy concentration in a column 4 and 5, and row 4 and 5 indicates teacher dependence on questions and lectures. (2) *Teacher Control*: a concentration on column and row 6 and 7 indicates extensive commands and reprimands by the teacher. (3) *Teacher Support*: a heavy concentration of tallies in column and row 1, 2, and 3 indicates that the teacher is reinforcing and encouraging students' participation. (4) *Student Participation*: a concentration of tallies in column 8 and 9 reflects student responses to the teacher's behavior.

For the perception, Gosmire et al. (2009) divide the perception regarding interaction into four areas: learner-content interaction, learner-learner interaction, learner-instructor interaction, and overall interaction. Thus, these indicators were used in order to measure perceptions for both teachers and students toward the classroom interaction happen during teaching and learning process.

Also, the 10 indicators in FIAC model and the four types of interaction patterns were used to triangulate the data from classroom discourse, questionnaire of teachers' perception and students' perception toward the interaction. So the reality in classroom with the perceptions of teachers and students can be compared each other.

### **Research Method**

The design of this research was descriptive. There were 4 teachers at SMAN 2 Bukittinggi West Sumatra that have been attended. Each teacher was attended for three times in the same class. It was done to see the interaction pattern and interaction characteristic of the classroom, with 124 students from the four classes where the four teachers taught (32 students at class A, 32 students at class B, 34 students at class C and 26 students at class D) which the students were in academic year 2014/2015 representing science and social class.

### **Finding and Discussion**

Based on the finding from the teaching and learning process, it is found that most dominant interaction pattern in English classes was the teacher-student interaction pattern with one-way traffic interaction pattern. This means the teachers focused on teaching by lecturing and asking question without

having interaction with the students, or if there were, the interactions were in a little portion of students' talk.

The data show that the four English teachers with three meetings for each, the teacher-student interaction with one-way traffic interaction appeared 54.57% from the total interactions, while the teacher-student interaction pattern with two-way traffic interaction appeared 38%, the multi-way traffic interaction pattern appeared 5.20%, and the student-student interaction pattern appeared 2.22% from the total interaction. Therefore, the dominant pattern of interaction in English classes in SMAN 2 Bukittinggi West Sumatra was the teacher-student interaction pattern with one-way traffic interaction pattern.

The example of the teacher-student pattern of interaction with one-way interaction is as follow:

#### Extract 1

T: Okay, now based on the dialogue what are the speakers use for their dialogue? Or what are the expressions the use in their dialogue?

S: (silent)

(Transcript 4, teacher B: line 155-156)

For the teacher-student pattern of interaction with two-way interaction, the example is as follow:

#### Extract 2

T: Okay, next, text number two. Complete the correct word in the bracket. Ilham. Number one. Read the text. *Baca text nya dulu.*

S2: I finded

T: I finded. Ilham answer. Okay. So this is irregular verb. Find, *bentuk keduanya adalah?*

S3: found

T: found. Okay. *Nah* found. Not finded. Find, found, found.

(Transcript 5, teacher B: line 78-84)

For the multi-way traffic interaction, the example can be seen as follow:

#### Extract 3

T: separate. *Apa artinya* separate?

S1: berpisah

T: *Berpisah. Terpisah. Ini* adjective or verb?

S1: adjective

S2: No. Verb

T: Verb. *Kalau dia bentuk negatif, kita menggunakan kata kerja, berarti kita menggunakan kata bantu.* He and his wife didn't separate.

(transcript 5, teacher B: line 68-73)

For the student-student interaction pattern, the example can be seen as follow:  
Extract 4

S1: Dina, have you experienced a natural disaster?  
S2: Yes  
S1: What is it?  
S2: Tsunami, in 2004  
S1: what happen?  
S2: The earthquakes came. Then the sea water receded. Then seven minutes later, very big waves came.  
S1: Thank you for your information, Dina.  
S2: You are welcome.  
T: That's you two made it? Okay.  
(Transcript 9, teacher C: Line 73-82)

The classroom activities were still in a teacher's dominant. This determines the students had little initiation to ask question, to comment teacher's explanation, or to add some information toward the lesson given in the teaching and learning process. The domination of the teacher is seen as normal since in Indonesia, it is believed that teacher should give lesson about the teaching materials during the teaching and learning process, and the students accept the teacher's explanation. The typical of Indonesian students are passive, so it is difficult for them to initiatively ask question to the teacher without being asked or questioning material given by the teacher.

The teacher-student interaction pattern with one-way traffic interaction pattern indicates that the teacher is difficult to engage the students to participate with the materials given. It can be caused by several things, such as lack of interactive media used by the teacher, so she or he is difficult to ask the students to be involved, the limitation of the teacher's knowledge toward the topic lesson, or lack of interactive classroom activities that the teacher could create.

For the interaction characteristics that used the theory of FIAC model, from with three meetings for each, it can be recapitalized that 61.24% of the interactions were categorized as content cross where the teaching and learning process was dominated by teacher talk by asking questions to the students and lecturing the lesson. Therefore, the second characteristic was students' participation (29.63%) where students talk appeared in form of answering or responding teacher talk and initiatively asking or commenting the lesson matter.

Thus, there were 8.46% of the interactions classified as Teacher control where the teacher gave commands, directions or order and criticized or justified authority (in form of statements to change students' behavior). The last, teacher support appeared 0.67% where the teacher accepted feelings (it may be positive or negative and teacher's prediction and recalling), praised or encouraged, and

accepted or used ideas of the students. In short, the dominant interaction characteristic appeared in English classes in SMAN 2 Bukittinggi West Sumatra was content cross.

The four English teachers in SMAN 2 Bukittinggi West Sumatra had different perceptions toward the interaction patterns and interaction characteristics when they taught. To see the overall perceptions from the four teachers, the recapitulation of the data can be described as follow: 95% for the student-student interaction pattern, 80% for teacher-student interaction pattern with one-way traffic interaction pattern, 70% for the multi-way traffic interaction, and 60% for the teacher-student interaction pattern with two-way traffic interaction pattern. Therefore, the data imply the most dominant interaction pattern based on perception of the teachers was student-student interaction pattern.

For the interaction characteristics, the perception of the teachers can be described as follow: 95% for teacher support, 92.50% for content cross, 91.67% for teacher control, and students' participation for about 82.50%. Therefore, the perceptions of English teachers in SMAN 2 Bukittinggi West Sumatra can be concluded that the dominant interaction pattern was student-student interaction pattern interaction characteristic was teacher support.

For the students' perception, From the recapitulation, 88% of the respondents believed that the interaction pattern was teacher-student interaction pattern with two-way traffic interaction, 76% chose one-way traffic interaction, 67% picked student-student interaction pattern, and 61% chose multi-way traffic interaction pattern.

For the interaction characteristics, the perception of the students can be described as the following data: 86.61% picked content cross, 78.39% chose teacher control, 75.73% voted teacher support, and 71.13% chose students' participation.

Therefore, the perception of the students about the pattern of interaction in English classes was teacher-student interaction pattern with two-way traffic interaction and the characteristic of the interaction was content cross.

Finally, it can be concluded that Different materials or skills that the teacher teaches will create different pattern of interaction and characteristics of interactions, resulting different atmosphere and dominant role in teaching and learning process from both teacher and students. The four teachers taught different materials for different skills. Therefore these factors give direct influence to the interaction patterns and interaction characteristics.

## Conclusion

Based on the finding from the teaching and learning process, it could be sum up that most dominant interaction pattern in English classes was the teacher-student interaction pattern with one-way traffic interaction pattern. This



means the teachers focused on teaching by lecturing and asking question without having interaction with the students, or if there were, the interactions were in a little portion of students' talk.

For the interaction characteristic by FIAC model, the most dominant characteristic in the classroom interaction was content cross. It also means that most of the teaching-learning time was devoted to asking questions and lecture by the teacher. Here, asking questions means the teacher asks a question about content or procedure with the intent that a student answers, while lecturing means giving facts or opinion about content or procedure with his own ideas, asking rhetorical question.

From the questionnaire of students' perception, it is found that the most dominant interaction pattern during the teaching and learning process believed by the students was teacher-student interaction pattern with two-way traffic interaction pattern. This means the students believed that their English teachers could engage more than one student to participate in the lesson. The teachers might ask one question to more than one student, and those students could respond her. This means the interaction was fair enough.

From the perceptions of the students toward the interaction, it is found that the dominant interaction characteristic was content cross. It is matched with the conclusion from the teaching and learning process.

From the perceptions of the teachers toward the interaction pattern, it is found that the dominant interaction pattern was student-student interaction pattern where the students are having interaction each other in group discussion, pair work, or group work. However, the conclusion is different with the data from the teaching and learning process.

From the perceptions of the teachers toward the interaction characteristic, it is found that the dominant interaction characteristic was teacher support where the teachers are predicting or recalling feeling, praising or encouraging student actions or behavior and clarifying, building, or developing ideas suggested by a student. However, this conclusion is also different with the data from teaching and learning process.

Also, different materials or skills that the teacher teaches will create different pattern of interaction and characteristics of interactions, resulting different atmosphere and dominant role in teaching and learning process from both teacher and students.

The implications of the present research for language learning can be seen from the teachers. The English teachers in SMAN 2 Bukittinggi seem to know the theory of having interactive teaching and learning process during the lesson, but it was hard for them to apply in real situation. For example, some teachers used interactive multimedia, but failed to use them well. As the result, the interaction between the teachers with the students in the classroom was passive where it was dominated by the teachers that mostly adopted a role as controller in the classroom as she frequently led the flow of interaction.

## REFERENCES

- Al-Garawi, Buthayna. 2008. *A Review of Two Approaches to L2 Classroom Interaction*. Retrieved from <http://www.ub.uit.no/garawi/approaches-to-l2-classroom-interaction.pdf> on October 15, 2015
- Brown, D H. 2001. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. New York: Pearson Education - Longman
- Dagarin, Mateja. 2004. Classroom interaction and communication strategies in learning English as a foreign language. *English Language Overseas Perspectives and Enquiries (ELOPE): Studies in the English language and literature in Slovenia. Journal volume 1/1-2: ISSN 1581-8918*. Retrieved from <http://www.adas.edus.si/Elope/PDF/ElopeVol1Dagarin.pdf> on March 20, 2015
- Dornyei, Zoltan. 2007. *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics: Quantitative, Qualitative and Mixed Methodologies*. Oxford: Oxford University press
- El-Hanafi, Mourad. 2013. *Pattern of Interaction in Moroccan Middle School Classroom: Study*. Retrieved from <http://www.moroccoworldnews.com/2013/06/94745/patterns-of-interaction-in-the-moroccan-middle-school-classroom-study/> on May 14, 2015
- Gosmire et al. 2009. Perception of Interactions in Online Course. *Merlot Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*. Vol. 5 no. 4. Retrieved from [http://www.jolt.merlot.org/vol5no4/gosmire\\_1209.pdf](http://www.jolt.merlot.org/vol5no4/gosmire_1209.pdf) on October 16, 2015
- Lasac, Lovelyn B. 2011. *Classroom Interaction Analysis*. Retrieved from <http://www.scribd.com/doc/67287182/Classroom-Interaction-Analysis#scribd> on October 16, 2015
- Lindgren. Henry Clay 1991. *Educational Psychology in the Classroom*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc
- Sampath K., Panneerselvam A. and Santhanam S. 2007. *Introduction to Educational Technology*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Private Limited
- Tuan, Luu Trong and Nhu, Nguyen. 2010. Theoretical Review on Oral Interaction in EFL Classroom. *Journal of Studies in Literature and language, Vol. 1, No. 4, 2010, pp. 29-48, ISSN 1923-1563*. Retrieved from <http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/sll/article/download/j.sll.1923156320100104.004/1434> on October 20, 2015
- Wajnryb, Ruth. 1992. *Pattern of Interaction*. Retrieved from <http://www2.vobs.at/ludescher/Planning/Patterns%20of%20Interaction.doc> on May 14, 2015