

Discourse analysis on teacher-students interaction pattern of English teaching learning process

Bayu Jati Raharja *, Imam Ghozali

Universitas Sarjanawiyata Tamansiswa. Jalan Kusumanegara No.157, Yogyakarta 55165, Indonesia

* Corresponding Author. Email: bayujati17@gmail.com

Abstract

The objectives of this research are to: (1) describe patterns of teacher-students interaction of English Teaching Learning process in the Tenth Grade of SMK Negeri 1 Saptosari Gunungkidul, and (2) reveal the interactional features used by the teacher related to the pedagogic goals during teaching learning process. This research belongs to discourse analysis which aims at describing conversation and interaction of teacher-students during English teaching learning process in the tenth grade of SMK Negeri 1 Saptosari Gunungkidul. The data were collected through observation and backed up with reading and were analyzed using the theory of IRF exchange structure and the SETT Framework (Walsh, 2006). The result showed that there were 20 patterns of interaction of 21 exchange structures used in 7 types of transaction. The transactions were opening/greeting session, introduction, warm up/re-checking session, explaining session, instructioning session, practicing session, closing/note taking session. Some interactional features used by the teacher were found in the classroom interaction. There were 10 types of interactional features were used by the teacher with the total number 115. The using of *display question* 47, *confirmation checks* 17, *predominant of IRF* was 12, *use of scaffolding* 11, *form focused feedback* 9, *clarification request* 7, *teacher turn by giving instructions* 4, *teacher turn by giving explanations* 3, *corrective repair* 3, *use of transactional marker* 2. It revealed that the use of display questions was the most commonly used by the teacher in this classroom interaction. From the classroom interaction, it can be concluded that the teacher tended to pose display questions which prevented the students to express their elaborate ideas. The teacher also gave few scaffolding in her teaching and it hindered the students' fluency. However, it might be effective for vocabulary learning through the exercise discussion.

Keywords: *Discourse; IRF exchange structure; interactional features; SETT Frameworks*

INTRODUCTION

Language is important part in interaction (Buxton, 1989; Cho, 2000). As we know that there are so many language in this world. English as the example of language. Nowadays, English is still be the international language. English leads in anything field such as: to find an education or to find a job.

English is also one of subjects which taught in formal education. Schools as a formal education still try to prepare good English skill for the students. This meant that students are able properly to use English both in oral or written. Especially for students of vocational school, they surely need English to support their carrier after graduated.

Teacher and students are the part of teaching learning process, teachers as educator, fasilitator, motivator will give English knowledge to students. The teachers always do the teaching in the classroom. This always needs well relation between teacher and students in doing teaching learning process. Teachers teach four skill in English, they are listening, speaking, reading and writing. Teachers also provide his/her English stimuli for students to reach pedagogic goals.

In teaching learning process will happen conversation transactions between teacher and students when teacher teach English materials. Teacher will try to provide enjoyable, creative and initiative class to make the students be more active in following the learning process. The teacher will try to ask students to speak rather than wait for their responses. It will become an interesting object that the researcher can take it as a research.

Brown (2001) believes that interaction is the heart of communication. For while, social interaction plays an important role in the learning process where learners construct the new language through socially mediated interaction. So then, the teacher and the students can use this acknowledge as the importance of two-way communication in the target language. Two-way communication which ask the process of teaching learning use the interaction as a good model to practice and improve the English in the class.

One of interesting frameworks is SETT (Self-Evaluation of Teacher Talk) by Walsh (2006), which emphasizes the fact that the teacher-students interaction and the classroom activity are inextricably linked, and accepts that as the lesson emphasis changes, interaction patterns and pedagogic goals change. From this, the researcher tries to know the teacher's talk characteristic when she/he teach English for students, to know teacher's modes performance during the classroom interaction (teaching behavior). Then, the researcher can know, is the teaching interactive or not and can know the method that used by the teacher in his/her teaching learning process.

So, the researcher decided to set English teacher and students interaction at English class of tenth grade students of SMK Negeri 1 Saptosari, Gunungkidul. This school is one of the favourite vocational schools in Gunungkidul and the researcher know that SMK Negeri 1 Saptosari, Gunungkidul has competence English teachers.

There are two main problems here. Those problems are stated into two questions. The questions become the guideline of the research. The research questions are formulated as follows: (1) how is teacher-students interaction pattern of English Teaching Learning Process in the Tenth Grade of SMK Negeri 1 Saptosari Gunungkidul? (2) What are the interactional features used by the teacher related to the pedagogic goals during teaching learning process?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Teacher-Student Interaction

This is kind of two ways communication between teacher and students happening in the classroom activities. Teacher takes part in such interaction by negotiating with the students the materials, asking questions, using students' ideas, lecturing, giving directions, criticizing or justifying by drawing on the experience of their teachers on how well to interact in the manner that is more effective.

The IRF exchange structure

Languages used by the teachers and the students during their classroom interactions needed to be analyzed. The analysis was done by using two methods proposed by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975). The first one is completed by using a rank scale model i.e. 'lesson; transaction; exchange; move, and act. The second method is the three-part structure consisting of three elements of structure; they are Initiation (I), Response (R), Feedback (F).

Languages used by the teachers and the students during their classroom interactions, in this study, are analyzed by the five ranks scale model consists of five ranks those are lesson, transaction, exchange, move, and act. The lessons of teacher are divided into six *Transactions*, those are (1) *opening*, (2) *warm up*, (3) *introduction*, (4) *guided activity*, (5) *exercise* and (6) *closing*.

Self Evaluation of Teacher Talk (SETT)

SETT or Self-Evaluation of Teacher Talk was introduced by Steve Walsh in 2006. He emphasized that the interaction and classroom activities are linked. Walsh (2006) has also stated that the SETT is designed to help teachers both to describe the classroom interaction of their lessons and to foster the understanding of interactional processes. As a lesson progresses, teachers' pedagogic goals are constantly shifting in order to take account of their agenda of the moment, to deal with unexpected problems, to vary the interaction and so on. Walsh (2006) has also stated that the SETT is designed to help teachers both to describe the classroom interaction of their lessons and to foster the understanding of interactional processes. The position adopted is that the single L2 classroom context

does not exist. Contexts are locally constructed by participants through and in their interaction in the light of overall institutional goals and immediate pedagogic objectives. The notion of the L2 lesson context is too broad brushed. Contexts are locally produced and can be transformed at any moment.

Walsh (2006) also described some of the classroom mode. The classroom mode are divided into four classifications, they are Managerial, Material, Skills and System, and Classroom context. The modes are classified through the interactional features that the teacher applied in the classroom. It helps the educational practitioner who intended to evaluate his/her interaction styles.

METHOD

This study focuses on a qualitative research which employs discourse analysis. It is concerned with language used in social context, and in particular with interaction or dialogue between the speakers. Stubbs (1983:1) defines Discourse Analysis as (a) concerned with language use beyond the boundaries of a sentence/utterance, (b) concerned with the interrelationship between language and society and (c) as concerned with the interactive or dialogic properties of everyday communication.

The researcher also apply Discourse Analysis (DA) model to do the research. The discourse analysis was adopted as the methodology to analyze the research data on classroom interaction between teacher and students. This data analysis method is employed to analyze the data and to discuss the finding for all research questions. The discourse analysis is applied because the source of the data in form of transcription. It means that the data is spoken classroom discourse.

The source of the data on this research that the researcher used one session of teaching learning process that recorded from tenth grade of SMK Negeri 1 Saptosari Gunungkidul as the primary data. It is chosen because the researcher interests on the teaching learning process and there is some scripts that help the researcher to analyze every turn and utterance. The utterances of each character and their background become the focus of the study.

Data collecting technique is the technique to get and collect data systematically. The object of the study is the classroom discourse that involved in the conversation of each teaching learning process. This analysis done by doing some steps to make it easier for the researcher in explaining the analysis. The first step, the researcher determine the object of the analysis. The object is the teacher-students interaction in English teaching learning process. The second step is recording the interaction of teaching learning process in one session of teaching. Then, I wrote down all conversation into the script. The next step is that the researcher study the theory of classroom discourse from books and others sources.

The data analysis started by recording the teaching learning process, then make the script of conversation. After that, numbering the utterances and the turns of each speaker in each conversation. Then, the researcher try to analyze the utterance first to find the IRF exchange structure of what the speaker said. The next step is the researcher categorized each utterance based on the classroom modes. The relationship between the language used and the pedagogic analyzed by SETT framework theory. In order to acquire the answer of the research questions, the researcher make conclusions based on the data. The researcher also make conclusion about teacher's talk characteristic, performance and behaviour based on the analysis.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Based to the result of the research, the researcher found the pattern of exchange structures as shown in the Table 1. From the table above the researcher found 20 patterns from 21 exchanges structure in the classroom interaction. Those 20 patterns were formed in six types of sessions. They are opening/greeting session, introduction, warm up/re-checking session, explaining session, instructioning session, practicing session, closing/note taking session.

The pattern of exchange structures is in the interaction between teacher and students during teaching learning process. For example.

IR-IRF-IR pattern

The pattern consists of 3 initiations by the the teacher (I), 3 responses from students (R) and the there is one feedback from teacher. The example of **IR-IRF-IR** pattern as in Table 1.

Table 1. The pattern of Exchange Structure of the Conversation

No.	Pattern	Exchange of Pattern	Total
1.	IR-IR-IRF	Opening	1
		Greeting session	
2.	IR-IR-IR-IRF-I	Introduction	1
3.	IR-IR-IRF-IRF	Warm up Re-checking session	1
4.	IR-IRF-IR	Warm up	1
		Re-checking session	
5.	IR-IR-IR-IRF-IIR	Explaining session	1
6.	IRF-IIR	Explaining session	1
7.	IR-IR-IR-IR	Explaining session	1
8.	IR-IR-IRF-I	Explaining session	1
9.	IR-IR-IRF-IR-IR-IRF-IR-IR	Explaining session	1
10.	IR-IR-IR-IR-IRF-IRF-IR-IR-IR	Explaining session	1
11.	IR-IR-IR-IR-IR-IR-IR	Explaining session	1
12.	IR-IR-IR-IR-IIR-IR-IRF-IIR-IR-IR-IR-IR	Explaining session	1
13.	IR-IR-IR-IR-IRF-IRRIR	Explaining session	1
14.	IR-IR-IR	Explaining session	2
15.	IR-IIR-I	Instructioning session	1
16.	IR-IR-IR-IR-IR	Instructioning session	1
17.	IIRF-IRFR-IIR-I	Practicing session	1
18.	IR-IR-IRF-IR-IR-IR	Re-checking session	1
19.	IR-IR-IR-IR-IR	Re-checking session	1
20.	II	Closing	1
		Note taking session	
Total			21

Table 2. IR-IRF-IR pattern

29	Teacher: How about narrative text? Bedanya dimana? Kalo narrartive text itu diawali dengan?	I
30	Students: Orientation	R
31	Teacher: Oke orientation, and then?	I
32	Students: Complication	R
33	Teacher: Complication, betul.	F
34	Teacher: Sudah dibaca yaa, tu disana ada.Kemudian yang terakhir?	I
35	Students: Re solution	R

Table 3. Example of interactional features used by the teacher related with the pedagogic goals

Utterance	Mode	Pedagogic goal	Interactional feature
Teacher: How about narrative text? Bedanya dimana? Kalo narrartive text itu diawali dengan? (29)	Material Mode	To check and display question	Clarification request
Teacher: Oke orientation, and then? (31)	Material Mode	To elicit responses in relation to the material	The use of display questions
Teacher: Sudah dibaca yaa, tu disana ada. Kemudian yang terakhir? (34)	Material Mode	To elicit responses in relation to the material	The use of display questions

The pattern started by the teacher's initiation, she asked about the first structure of narrative text. Second intiation, the teacher continued her question about second structure of narrative text. The last initiation was question about the last part of narrative text structure.

There was a feedback from the teacher, it given to students that they could answer the second structure of narrative text correctly. The interactional features used by the teacher related with the pedagogic goals during teaching learning process (Table 3).

In line 29, the teacher displayed question to check the students about narrative text. The questions used by the teacher to clarify the students that they can answer or not. Then, line 31 and 34, the teacher displayed question to ask students about the structure of narrative text.

CONCLUSION

This research examine and analyze teacher students interaction pattern of the tenth grade in SMK Negeri 1 Saptosari Gunungkidul. Based on the analysis result, it can be concluded that:

From the teacher students interaction pattern that occurred during teaching learning process, the researcher found 20 patterns from 21 exchanges structure in the classroom interaction. Those 20 patterns were formed in 6 types of sessions. They are IR-IR-IRF (opening/greeting session) 1, IR-IR-IR-IRF-I (introduction) 1, IR-IR-IRF-IRF (warm up/re-checking session) 1, IR-IRF-IR (warm up/re-checking session) 1, IR-IR-IR-IRF-IIR (explaining session) 1, IRF-IIR (explaining session) 1, IR-IR-IR-IR (explaining session) 1, IR-IR-IRF-I (explaining session) 1, IR-IR-IRF-IR-IR-IRF-IR-IR (explaining session) 1, IR-IR-IR-IR-IRF-IR-IR-IR (explaining session) 1, IR-IR-IR-IR-IR-IR-IR (explaining session) 1, IR-IR-IR-IR-IIR-IR-IRF-IIR-IR-IR-IR-IR (explaining session) 1, IR-IR-IR-IR-IRF-IRRIR (explaining session) 1, IR-IR-IR (explaining session) 2, IR-IIR-I (Instructioning session) 1, IR-IR-IR-IR-IR (instructioning session) 1, IIRF-IRF-IIR-I (practicing session) 1, IR-IR-IRF-IR-IR-IR (re-checking session) 1, IR-IR-IR-IR (re-checking) 1, II (closing/note taking session) 1.

Based on the interaction pattern above, the teacher always giving the initiation (I) by giving questions and explanations. The teacher always spoke more than the students when she transferred the material in teaching learning process. The teacher always used Bahasa Indonesia and Javanese language. The students also responded their teacher (R). But, the students' responses only in one word or more such as: *yaa, iyaaa, yesss, children*, etc. In this case, the teacher did not show creative teaching that made students actively participate in classroom activities.

The use of SETT framework will help the teacher to describe the classroom interaction and develop an understanding of interactional process. The teacher used some interactional features to reach the pedagogic goals in each mode. From the result above, the researcher 10 types of interactional features were used by the teacher with the total number 115. The using of *display question* 47, *confirmation checks* 17, *predominant of IRF* was 12, *use of scaffolding* 11, *form focused feedback* 9, *clarification request* 7, *teacher turn by giving instructions* 4, *teacher turn by giving explanations* 3, *corrective repair* 3, *use of transactional marker* 2.

Considering the patterns of interaction and the interactional features executed by the teacher, the researcher concluded that the teacher tended to pose display questions which actually could prevent the students to produce longer answer. However, by answering the display questions, the students could improve their vocabulary mastery. Another conclusion resulted from the interaction between teacher and students shows that the teacher gave few scaffolding in her teaching. She frequently did question and answer with students. This condition was ineffective to help the students reach the objectives of the learning process.

REFERENCES

- Brown, H.D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. 2nd Edition. New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.
- Buxton, B. (1989). The "Natural" language of interaction: A perspective on non-verbal dialogues. *INFOR: Information Systems and Operational Research*, 27(2), 221-229.
- Cho, G. (2000). The role of heritage language in social interactions and relationships: Reflections from a language minority group. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 24(4), 369-384.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2000.10162773>

- Sinclair, J. M., & Coulthard, R. M. (1975). *Toward an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stubbs, M. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating classroom discourse*. London: Routledge
- Walsh, S. (2006). *Exploring classroom discourse language in action*. London: Routledge
- Walsh, S. (2006). "Talking the Talk of the TESOL Classroom." *ETL Journal*