
**FROM INITIATION TO FEEDBACK: UNRAVELLING
TEACHER-STUDENT INTERACTION IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE
ACTIVITIES**

Alfan Hariri¹, Rizka Safriyani², Zulidyana D. Rusnalasari³

¹STKIP Al-Hikmah

²³UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya

ABSTRACT In teaching, teacher do not only think about the pedagogic goals, material, and activity used. At the same time, the teacher should also think about how effective the interaction used linked to the pedagogic goals. In short, the success of the teaching learning process relies on how the teacher's interaction in leading the students to achieve the pedagogic goals. From those phenomena, this thesis analyzes the suitability of teacher's interaction with the pedagogic goals in teaching English lesson in SMPN 13 Surabaya by using SETT. The research object is an English teacher of SMPN 13 Surabaya who teach in two different classes; A and G 7th grade. This study practices qualitative method specifically case study which uses SETT frame work as a means of analysis. In addition, the researchers used voice recording and interview as a technique to get the data. As a result, the teacher's interaction is in the form of IRF pattern that mostly uses close question as initiation. In addition, the teacher's interactional features that often occur is teacher echo, display question and confirmation request. Furthermore, the teacher's interaction coincides with the SETT framework to lead student in gaining the pedagogic goals. Though, there are some part of interaction that can be improve for better student involvement such as extended wait time, teacher echo and way of scaffolding.

Key Words: *Teacher's interaction, SETT (Self-evaluation Teacher Talk), Interactional feature*

A. INTRODUCTION

The curriculum and the approach used are probably the external problem of the teachers in deciding the quality of the teaching learning process and the creativeness of the teacher in arranging activities in the class. At the same time, there is the most fundamental ability that should the teachers have, that is the ability to manage the interaction. Walsh (2011) states that dealing with mastering material and approach, a teacher should also underline how teacher used an interaction to meet the demand of the curriculum. Consequently, teacher needs to pay attention to the interaction used in leading the students to reach the goal to make sure that the interaction engages students in learning (Rezaee & Farahian, 2012). Specifically, the teacher can not only think about how good the pedagogic goals and how the material and activity will be appropriate with the pedagogic goals are. At the same time, the teacher should also think about what talk will be used, what initiation might be questioned to the students, and how effective the interaction linked to the pedagogic goals (Inceçay, 2010); which became the most vital part to lead students to the

objectives. Based on the explanation above, the researchers realize that interaction has a significance role influence the success of the teaching learning process. For this reason, the teacher needs to make evaluation on how the talk-interaction can effectively direct to the pedagogic goal.

As the matter of fact, Mclaughlin (1991) proves that teacher self-evaluation gives significant improvement toward the consciousness of teacher language-use in teaching. He analyzes the student teacher instructional performances to encourage the students' involvement in learning. Furthermore, Edstrom (2006) used teacher self-evaluation in building teacher awareness toward the language-use of native language of the students and the target language. He analyzes the function of the language-use and how the teacher perception to his own language-use. As a result, he finds that teacher language-use have implication for classroom practice in teacher development. H Jarome Freiberg (1987) used the term self-assessment of interaction for the evaluation of teacher talk. He analyzes the interaction with six-item instruments to understand the teaching behavior.

On the other hand, there are various ways to improve the teacher competency through teacher development program such sending the teacher for training, teacher certifications and seminars. In fact, these development programs seem to have small effect to the teacher development since the program is not always needed by the teacher in teaching learning activity. For this reason, Bransford (2005) argue that teacher development program is not effective way to improve the teacher quality. Furthermore, as an alternative she proposes that the teacher awareness toward his teaching performance is better way to improve the teacher teaching performance. By the reason of the effectiveness of the teacher self-evaluation to his improvement for the teaching performance ability, teacher awareness have more urgency to understand the teaching performance and what need to improve in teaching process. In short, teacher self-evaluation, teacher awareness in the word of Bransford (2005), has more impact toward teacher improvement because it leads the teacher to the real issue in his own class. In the other word, teacher's interactional awareness lead the teacher to the development of teaching interaction since the teacher overviewed himself about how his language used to achieve the pedagogic goals in teaching learning process (Akkaya & Demirel, 2012; Albergaria-Almeida, 2010).

In Indonesian context, there are some researches about the teacher interaction as well as classroom discourse in English teaching classroom (Liando, 2010; Fraser, Aldrige, and Soerjaningsih, 2010; Rido, Ibrahim, & Nambiar, 2014). Rido, Ibrahim, & Nambiar (2014) focuses on the classroom intercation in the vocational high school: Interaction management, question, feedback and error repairation. They conclude that the classroom interaction engages the interactive participation. Similarly, Liando, 2010; Fraser, Aldrige, and Soerjaningsih (2010) find that there is a correlation between the studnets' achievement and the teacher intereaction. In

addition, Liando (2010) observes about the English teacher candidate perspective toward the EFL interaction in classroom.

Seeing from above discussion, it is interesting to know how the students respond to the teacher interaction in classroom discourse. In this research, the researchers use the Self-evaluation of teacher talk (SETT) which focuses on language use, interaction and opportunities of learning in classroom discourse.

B. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

1. Discourse

According to Coulthard (2002), Discourse; in broad meaning, is the language use whether spoken or written. Discourse deals with how one interacts to communicate the thought, information, feeling etc by using the language. Furthermore, in communication there are two aspects that cover the language, form and function. Language form is the area of linguistic where there are grammar, word, phrase, sentence etc. On the other hand, the language function deals with how speaker and listener interpret the meaning of language. In other words, discourse is the language use and how the language fit with the intention of the utterer.

Since the discourse is general use of language, it can happen in every communication of our daily life. As an example, discourse in the market, meeting, school etc which each of the discourse happening in different place and condition have its distinctive features of discourse among one another.

2. Classroom Discourse

Classroom is the special social place of interaction among the students and the teacher and so does the classroom discourse. Regarding to classroom discourse we should consider classroom as a context, which is different with another context. Understanding the classroom context, in one hand, is viewed as easy interaction to identify with its set of certain routine interaction and procedure (Walsh, 2011). To illustrate, when we talk about the classroom context, we will point a thing such age of the learner, the proficiency level, first or second language use, who the teacher, material used etc. Those characteristics of the classroom context help us to plan a lesson, instructional and material, and developing the curriculum.

On the other hand, classroom context views as complex interaction among the students and teacher in teaching learning process (Walsh, 2011). This view sees how the impact of an utterance to encourage the students in achieving pedagogic goals. For example, language functions, extended wait time, elicitation and feedback. This perspective helps us to understand each interaction and moment-by-moment decision made by the teacher.

The classroom context enables teacher to comprehend how was his teaching practice and

make an evaluation on how effective his/her utterance toward the students' response (Douglas, 2001). Again, the teacher gets sense about what is happening and, the most important, why it is happening. For this purpose, the teacher has an overview about what he is saying and how the students' response. As a result, the teacher repairs and improves the interaction for the next meeting of the class.

3. Teacher interaction

Teacher's interaction is the most important aspect of teaching learning activity because the interaction leads the class to the objectives of the learning. Furthermore, through the rhetorical style of interaction decide how the students' response as well (Walsh, 2006). Teacher's interaction plays the most important role in deciding the success of the learning since through his/her interaction enables the students to access new knowledge, practice and maintain new skill, establishing relationship and so on (Coulthard, 2002).

In the same way, Teacher is like a conductor of an orchestra. In orchestra, each move of the conductor hand, the orchestra delivers different music and tone. Similarly, the teacher's interaction; each interaction that the teacher makes leads the students to different activities and skill practice (Tardif, 1994). Hence, teacher should be able to facilitate supportive interaction to help students acquiring the objective of the class. To sum up, teacher's interaction is the most vital point in determining how the class succeed.

4. Self-evaluation teacher talk (SETT)

The researchers, in this research, used SETT in analyzing of teacher classroom interaction. First, SETT focused on the teacher talk in interaction with the students and of course the teacher has very vital role in managing the classroom interaction. SETT is designed to help the teacher in understanding the complex context of the class that might be not realized while the teaching learning process (Walsh, 2006). As a result, the teacher was able evaluate whether or not his/her interaction is accurate toward the students' response. To sum up, with this evaluation teacher can develop their model of interaction to gain the goals of the curriculum. Thus, researchers need to analyze conductor of an orchestra of the class to make sure that his/her interaction fit to engage the students in participating to the class activity.

Second, SETT let the teacher/observer knows what was happening in the class and, the most important, why it is happening. Thereby, the teacher had an evaluation to the interaction made in the class and try to repair some interaction that may hinder the students' opportunity of learning (Walsh, 2011). For these reasons, the researcher considers that SETT fitted with the purpose of analyzing interaction in the classroom.

Walsh (2011) introduces four modes in SETT frame work; Managerial mode, material mode,

skill and system mode and Classroom context mode (Walsh, 2011).

a. Managerial mode

Managerial mode is deal with the organization toward the learning process. It purposed to manage about the time and space, student involvement to the class, how the activity of the class etc (Walsh, 2006). Similarly, John Sinclair (1975) used term “transaction” for the managerial mode in which the teacher makes a boundary of teaching learning context. Usually it happens at the beginning of the lesson or activity where the teacher tells the students about what to do or to learn. When the managerial mode occurs in the beginning of the lesson it means that tell the students about the main context of the class. Thus, this mode has a vital point in locating the students’ perspective about what to learn. Again, it is an initiation mode to occurrence of another three modes.

b. Material mode

Material mode deals with the use of some learning material such as tape, newspaper, worksheet, magazine etc. This mode is where the interaction among teacher and students are dictated by the material. For the example in doing some exercises in worksheet; the teacher follow the instruction of the task as means of interaction.

c. Skill and system mode

This mode provides the learners practice about what has been taught by the teacher, it enables teacher to measure how far the goals has been reached. What makes it different with the material mode is that the interaction among students and teacher is not mirrored from the material rather than from the target language and the context of the class.

d. Class room context mode

This mode is connected with what external factors of the learners that have something to do with the context that is going to be presented by the teacher (Walsh, 2010). It can be the belief, attitude, experience, culture of the students. This aim of this mode is that to make students easily picture and notify what they are going to study. Again, it indirectly tells the students about the urgency of studying the lesson. To this purpose of the class, the students keep on the encouragement of participating in the class room activity (Cullen, 1998). Malcolm (2002), in like manner, used the term “situation” to address some factors in the real life that has something to do with the lesson.

To sum up, here the researchers provide a summary of SETT grid from Walsh (2011):

Table 1. the summary of the SETT frame work proposed by Walsh (2011)

SETT grid		
Mode	Pedagogic Goals	Interactional Features

<p>Managerial</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To transmit information. • To organize the physical learning environment. • To refer learners to materials • To introduce or conclude an activity. • To change from one mode of learning to another. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A single, extended teacher turn which used explanations and/ or instructions • The use of transitional markers. • The use of confirmation checks • An absence of learner contributions
<p>Materials</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To provide language practice around a piece of material. • To elicit responses in relation to the material. • To check and display answers. • To clarify when necessary • To evaluate contributions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Predominance of IRF pattern • Extensive use of display questions. • Form-focused feedback. • Corrective repair • The use of scaffolding
<p>Skills and systems</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To enable learners to produce correct forms. • To enable learners to manipulate the target language. • To provide corrective feedback. • To provide learners with practice in sub-skills. • To display correct answers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The use of direct repair. • The use of scaffolding. • Extended teacher turns • Display questions. • Teacher echo • Clarification requests. • Form-focused feedback

<p>Classroom context</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To enable learners to express themselves clearly. • To establish a context. • To promote oral fluency. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extended learner turns • Short teacher turns • Minimal Repair • Content feedback. • Referential questions. • Scaffolding • Clarification requests.
--------------------------	--	--

C. METHOD

The design of this study used qualitative method with case study research because the researchers start from the theory of the discourse analysis to be investigated with the teacher’s interaction. Furthermore, data is collected through the transcription of the class and interview from the teacher. The purpose is to get fully portrayed of the classroom context through the interaction in the class among the students and the teacher. After having those complete images of the classroom context the researchers use one of the qualitative interpretation: construction of patterns through analysis and resynthesize of constituent parts (Ary, Jacobs and Sorensen, 2006). From this interpretation the researchers analyze the data collection of the transcription of the classroom interaction with the fitness of the modes in SETT. In this case, the object of the research is English teacher of SMPN 13 Surabaya, Indonesia. Here are the steps how the researchers were analyzing the data.

Frist of all, the researchers collected the data from the class by recording then transcript it. Then, from the transcript made a coding by deciding what mode each interaction is based on SETT. After knowing the mode in SETT, the researchers examine whether the mode is in the correct/appropriate used and gives explanation and comment about the decision. Upon the explanation, the researchers make general statement about the effectiveness of teacher talk toward the pedagogic goals of the class. At the last, the researchers make overall evaluation and suggestion for the teacher’s interaction.

Furthermore, to complete the portrayed classroom interaction the researchers used interview of the teacher to know the reason why the teacher used the interaction in teaching learning process.

This interview result can help the researchers to analyze the teacher talk. With this evaluation the researchers find another interaction that might be works better to replace the interaction. It is purposed to improve teacher quality of the interaction and the awareness of the teacher in using the language.

D. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

1. Teacher's interaction analysis based on SETT frame work.

The researcher categorizes the teacher's interaction based on the mode in SETT those are: (1) managerial mode, (2) material mode, (3) skill and system mode and (4) classroom context mode.

a. Managerial mode

The teacher's interaction which is categorized as managerial mode is how the teacher controlled the students' participation in the class. Furthermore, the use of interactional feature of managerial mode is in the form of transmitting the information explanation dealing with the lesson. In addition, the teacher used confirmation request dealing with the explanation to make sure that the students understand the instruction.

According to Walsh the managerial mode functioned as organization for the learning process including the learning behavior, time, students' involvement, class activity and so on (Walsh, 2011). For example, "I want to give you something if you are good now", "Rise your hand!". To this purpose, the teacher's interaction used in this extract is coincided with the managerial mode function.

In the contrary, theoretically managerial mode occurs at the beginning of the class because it is the teacher turn to tell how the class activity (Walsh, 2010). Yet, in this extract the managerial mode occurs after some turn-taking interaction among teacher and students. In the other word, the teacher started the class without telling the students how the class setting and students involvement. Consequently, only few students participated to the class because most of students did not understand about how the class management and how to contribute before the teacher clearly manage the contribution. (see extract 1.11 and 1.21). Thus, the teacher should realize that management of the student involvement is very important especially at the beginning of the class.

The interactional features of managerial mode in the form of transferring the information in which the teacher used clarification request as a means to engage students' contribution for the explanation and make sure that the students understand it (utterance number 366 and 369) "I want to see, because the question is she, because the question is she, I would like you to know, the answer is "she". Right or no?, Right or no?, Right or no? benar (right)?. In like manner, Cullen (1998) assumes that it is more crucial for teacher to create communicative opportunities during the explanation. With this way of interaction, the teacher allowed the students to have turn in the

mode which usually dominated by the teacher. As a result, the students would have fully understanding toward the teacher explanation because they are involved in that process. (See extract 1.38 for the complete interaction).

Similarly, at the second meeting (extract two) the managerial mode function is to control the students' contribution, giving instruction and/ or explanation

"Ok next, because I see that only one or two students active to answer, I will make a ball from a paper. Can I ask a paper? (Asking to the students in the middle row)", "and I will throw this ball, just see it as a ball to you, but, I don't know, I don't know where this ball will go because I will face like this (facing to the front, so, students behind her). If you get the ball you must answer the question?" (Utterance number 112 and 114).

From the interview the researchers found that according to the teacher, the G class (extract two) has lower proficiency of English and self-efficacy than A class. Therefore, the teacher used different strategy in organizing the students contribution in order to make fair spread of learning activity. However, in A class the learning involvement is fair among the students because almost all students actively participated to the class activity. (See in extract 2.6)

At the same time, the interactional features of managerial mode in form of giving an explanation are in extract 2.34

"Today I would like you to describe about an occupation like that. for example hm,,,,, , I am a teacher. Kemudian I teach many students in SMPN 13. Look at to that now(pointing the example in the slide) and I need book, projector, laptop, and marker . tapi dalam bentuk dialog, jadi kalian bersama teman sebangkunya saling bertanya tentang job masing-masing like in the dialog just now! do you understand?" (utterance number 498).

This is suitable with what Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) stated that the transaction among teacher and students decide the class outcome. Thus, the teacher should pay attention to the interaction used in this mode in order to make students can absorb the information or explanation.

In this extract the teacher used the combination between mother language and target language to explain about what the students should do for the task (498 and 500). This is very important for the teacher to know how far the students can understand the target language used in explanation that the teacher can use mother language as a support for the students to understand. The use of mother tongue can be a helpful aid for the students since they can know the general purpose of the explanation by guessing some targets language words that they do not know the meaning. Moreover, with the help of visual aid such as pictures and examples of the task will help the students to not being lost in managerial mode.

b. Material mode

In this mode mostly the teacher's interaction are in the form of IRF (Initiation, response, and feedback). In addition, the teacher way of praising was very unique in which the teacher made students give applause after the students' answer. Furthermore, the teacher echoes occurred frequently after the students' response; every time the students answer or respond a question the

teacher always repeat the students answer. Furthermore, in this mode the use of scaffolding is very important because the scaffolding helps the students to know about the appropriate and correct use of vocabulary.

The teacher used echo every time after the student respond (utterance number 151, 154 and so on). The teacher assumed that this repetition (echo) has two purposes: as a feedback and confirmation toward the students answer besides as a vocabulary drill process for the students. The more students listen to the vocabulary the more familiar the vocabulary will be. It will ease them to memorize and use the vocabulary for a language skill practice. In the contrary, there is a suggestion that reduced echo might make students listen carefully to each other and extend the students involvement (Walsh, 2002). Thus, the teacher should be able to decide when to use the teacher echo in order that it will not disrupt the students' contribution for the class.

In utterance number 254 *"I think the farmer also need that, juga membutubkan, if they do something, but If you say about this origin, original It is about the carpenter"* the teacher made a repair toward students answer about an occupation. However, according to interactional feature of SETT the content-focused feedback only occurs in classroom context mode which deals with students' belief, experience in the real life, opinion and so on. At the same time, the teacher considered that this content-focused feedback as additional information for students about the function of a tools. From this point of view, the researchers assume that in classroom activity there will be some interaction that might be urgent to delivered, though it is not included in the interactional feature that commonly use. To sum up, as long as the interaction still coincides with the pedagogic goals, it is a must for the teacher to create the interaction for students' better understanding.

Furthermore, the scaffolding in extract 1 utterance 203 *"because he can drive with a bus. give applause!"* will let the students know about how the correct English sentence from their answer. Nevertheless, the teacher did not provide a time for students to repeat the teacher scaffolding that will enable the students practice the correct form. In the researchers' view, it will be better for the teacher to invite students repeat the teacher scaffolding to make students familiar with the correct form of a sentence.

Similarly, the interaction features were dominated by IRF pattern in which the teacher mostly used display question; *"Next, ub...what picture is that? Ha? (showing sketch picture)", "you know sketch?"*. In this pattern, the learner turn is very minimal because teacher initiations were in the form of simply answered question. Consequently, the learner can only answer in the form of a vocabulary, not a sentence or more. Whereas, some expert assume that the use of question must be considered with the goals of the study (Douglas, 2001).

In addition, the teacher echoes always occurred in each students' response before or after the

teacher gives a feedback (extract 2 utterance number 204). It was because the teacher assumption that through the teacher echo, the students will get used to be familiar with the vocabulary used. However, Walsh (2002) warns that in some context the overuse of echo may hinder students involvement to the class. According to the researcher, the teacher echo is not categorized as dangerous echo that can minimize the students' opportunity of learning because the teacher repeated the finished students answer and followed with a feedback as a sign that the answer was correct. For this reason, the researchers agreed with the teacher assumption that teacher echo can be a means of vocabulary drill.

Besides, in correcting error the teacher asked a confirmation to the students about the correct form such as in "*Scissor (correcting the students' pronunciation), repeat after me! Scissor! come on...*" extract 2.7 (utterance number 130) when the teacher asked the students to create a correction before the teacher. With this way of correction, the teacher gave a students' turn to have larger contribution to the class. On the other hand, the student who was corrected may feel blamed with the all class, yet Atar and Seedhouse (2018) confirms that this (repair) is what students want in whatever way the teacher corrected them. Thus, the correction is very crucial for students in learning a language. For this, reason the researchers suggest that it will be better for the teacher to use suchlike interaction for correcting the students' error because it provides more involvement for students.

The scaffolding in utterance number 120 "*So, someone cut the children's hair*" is in the form of extending students answer in 119 that use incomplete word (see extract 2.7). The scaffolding will make students notify about how is the correct form of their answer (Walsh, 2006). Yet, after the teacher scaffolding, the teacher did not give a learner turn to practice or even notify the teacher scaffolding. The students' response usually is in the form of nodding after the teacher scaffold the learner sentence. Indeed, it is a big chance for the students to know the more "sophisticated" construction of a sentence. To this purpose, it is urgent for the teacher to give students turn to repeat the scaffolding.

Furthermore, dealing with the connection between the interaction used and the pedagogic goals in this mode, the teacher stuck on the purpose of the class especially number one that is to make students were able to know the occupation through the classroom interaction and activity which were mirrored from the material. Repair, for example, always deals with the students' error in answering about the occupation. The purpose is to make learner know about what is the correct form or pronunciation of the language in context of occupation. In addition, the material helps the teacher to have more systematic way of interaction with the visual aid from the material that support teacher in focusing to the pedagogic goals.

c. Skill and system mode

This is the mode that occur extensively in the teacher's interaction at SMPN 13 whether in extract one and extract two which the teacher gives a learner chance to practice the language skill (listening, reading, writing, speaking) and sub skill (grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation). Most of the practice that the teacher involved in the skill and system mode was vocabulary practice. The dominant interactional feature is still IRF pattern which typically the feedback is in the form of explanation.

What make the IRF pattern different among the skill and system mode and material mode is the initiation made by the teacher. In the skill and system mode the IRF pattern is formed through the practice, explanation and clarification deals with the language skill practice. Whereas, in material mode IRF pattern is shaped from the material used; extract 1.19 in which the teacher use a picture as visual aid in eliciting a response. Again, the direct repair strategies that teacher used are effective when the teacher found a mistake, the teacher waited the students to complete the answer before correcting.

In both extract, especially in extract 1 the teacher use skill and system mode in form of vocabulary practice by using ended question as an elicitation; *"What does it mean Profession in Indonesia(4)?"*(extract 1 utterance number 1). As a result the students' response was very short with only one or two word. Furthermore, the teacher did not provide follow up question for the purpose of extending learner involvement turn. The teacher, for example, can use open question that likely produce longer answer than closed question. For instance, the teacher can ask "how could you know that profession?" after students turn in 36. This question will at least giving more turn to students to involve in the classroom activity by having longer answer.

Only one extract that the teacher gave a students practice chance to form a sentence that is in extract 1.35 utterance number 325 *" what is she? I think, the answer is...the answer is...?"*. In the writer point of view, it will be better for the teacher to not only use the question that engage students to have vocabulary skill practice, but also engage the students to form the vocabulary into a sentence whether in oral or written expression; such as asking students to describe the picture after the teacher explanation, making a sentence, or even repeat the vocabulary for the class. As a result, the students will have more turn to practice the new linguistic knowledge for the better understanding and use. This is what Tardif states that it is very important for the teacher to consider the language use in engaging students' participation by using some speech modifications (Tardif, 1994).

However, in extract two the teacher provided the extended learner turn by giving the learner opportunity to practice the target language at the end of the explanation by making the students describe about an occupation; extract 2.7 utterance 141 *"Ok, come on describe about this picture now..."* The students' opportunity to practice the knowledge will enable the students to understand more

about the real use of the knowledge. Therefore, the teacher should realize that the students extended turn to practice the language is very important for wholly understanding about linguistic knowledge and practice.

In the IRF pattern the teacher used supportive feedback in which teacher give a evaluation after the students completely answer the teacher initiation; extract 1.9 utterance 57 ” *Ok, thank you. But, Patient is not a profession. Patient is not a profession. Seorang pasien yang tidur itu bukan profesi. Siapa yang mau profesinya sakit disini? Ndak ada tho?*”. The feedback that the teacher gave enabled learner to notify whether or not the answer is right. The way how the teacher give feedback was supportive in which the teacher did not overlap the learner turn rather the teacher lets the students to answer completely and giving a feedback in form of evaluation toward students answer. This way of evaluation, as Musumeci (1996), can make students feel good with the feedback because the teacher freely gives the students turn to answer before the feedback.

What make the IRF pattern different among the skill and system mode and material mode is the initiation made by the teacher. In the skill and system mode the IRF pattern is formed through the practice, explanation and clarification deals with the language skill practice; extract 1.36 utterance 346 ” and then the answer is?”. Whereas, in material mode the interaction is shaped from the material used; 1.19 utterance 165 “where does he work?”. From these two utterances, it is clear that the theme or topic that used in skill and system mode is wider since the language skill practice is not mirrored from the material rather the teacher initiation itself. For this reason, Walsh (2011) suggests that it is important for the teacher to create interactions that support students in reaching the goals with some initiations to provide language practice space. In the contrary, the theme or topic in material mode is narrowed by the materials used as a means of initiating the interaction.

Similarly, in extract two, the teacher initiated students to notify about an error of students answer; extract 2.10 utterance 239 “*the “a” di he is a architect, seharusnya pakai “an”.... iya kan?*”. The interaction invited the learner to involve to the correction process that helps them to have better understanding about the grammar.

Additionally, the students opportunity in skill and system mode that teacher provided, especially in extract 1, for students turn to produce the target language was very minimal because the teacher initiation used the display question deal with the vocabulary; extract 1.18 utterance 153 “*where does he work?where?*”. The initiation that the teacher made in 153,155, and157 was open question which consequently the students will response with only one or two words. Thus, the teacher should pay attention to the initiation made that can vary the students response. As an example, the teacher can use referential question after the students answer; “*why do you answer that*

profession?”, “*can you describe the profession please?” etc.*

The direct repair strategies that teacher used were effective when the teacher found a mistake, the teacher waited the students to complete the answer before correcting; extract 1.9 utterance 57 “*Ok, thank you. But, Patient is not a profession. Patient is not a profession. Seorang pasien yang tidur itu bukan profesi. Siapa yang mau profesinya sakait disini? Ndak ada tho?”*. With this repair strategy, the students will have better confidence in participating to the class with no teacher interruption. Walsh states that it is very important for teacher to know the “right timing” to correct the students in order to avoid the possibility of hindering students turn. To this purpose, the teacher should be able to manage his interaction in repairing the students. Moreover, the teacher used confirmation check to the class as a way of correcting the error, of course after the students completing the answer; extract 1.11 utterance 73 “*sailor, he is a sailor,? I would like you to see, he is a sailor?”*. Consequently, the students were actively involve to the classroom interaction for purpose of repair which exactly this is teacher time to correct the mistake and give explanation. Though, in some chances the students could not response for the correct answer and finally the teacher does this part; extract 1.34 utterance 323 “*because they are woman, dia bukan laki-laki, iya tho? Bukan laki-laki, tapi she is a woman, iya tho? Iya enggak?”*. At the same time, the students recalled the information from the explanation that may deals with the repair. This process facilitated the learner to elaborate the linguistic knowledge they have with the real use of language. In short, the teacher used repair as way of encouraging student participation for the classroom activity.

The teacher used some scaffolding for extending and paraphrasing learner contribution as in extract 1.22 utterance 203 “*because he can drives with a bus*” as well as in extract 2.29 utterance 456 “*what do you do for living?”* for the purpose of modeling and rephrasing students use of language. The scaffolding in both extracts enabled the learner to know about what the correct utterance in English that may be difficult for student to produce. Thus, the scaffolding is very crucial to help learner in producing a target language. Furthermore, in extract two the teacher scaffolded the students’ answer from the text that with the scaffolding the students will know about an expression that they may use in the practice. From those facts, it is vital for teacher to have scaffolding in some teacher turn as a support and example for the student in creating sentences in target language.

However, the teacher’s scaffoldings, whether in extract two and extracts one, were not followed by the students’ repetition. In the writer point of view, the students’ repetition dealing with the teacher’s scaffolding will drill and introduce students to the correct and appropriate form of language. Indeed, Walsh assumes that the purpose of scaffolding is modeling the student for the correct or even more sophisticated language use (Walsh, 2010). To sum up, it is important for the teacher to make students practice the teacher’s scaffolding to give the students turn to practice

the correct form.

d. Classroom context mode

Classroom context mode is identical with learner freedom of selecting and developing a topic. This mode is like the “daily conversation” when the students talk to his friend about an experience and his friend is responding based on his experience as well. As a result the students will have more turn than teacher in participating to the classroom interaction. Furthermore, the teacher focused for feedback is not in the form of the language rather than the content (message) of the language and with minimal correction. In the other word, the classroom and context mode build up the “real” communication rather than the practice of linguistic knowledge.

In extract one of classroom context mode, the students turn was very short by only answering the teacher question which asks about how the students feel during the lesson; extract one utterance 514 *“and then I want to give a reflection. Reflection about this. About this lesson today. Is it interesting?”* and the students answer is *“yes (interesting)”* utterance 515.

Furthermore, the teacher tried to extend the students turn by elicitation in the form of questioning the students’ reason for the answer or even the teacher allows the students to use the students’ mother tongue language extract one utterance 518 *“because ...ayo why? Come on why? In Indonesia is ok”*. Unfortunately, the students’ response was still minimal where the students’ answer only with one clause 519; *“it’s fun”*. However, Walsh (2011) suggests that in the classroom and context mode the teacher should be able to provide wider space of interaction for the student. To this purpose, the teacher should be aware about the language use in inviting student to participate. The writer proposes that in this case the teacher can use speech modification to invite the students share their experience or background knowledge dealing with the lesson. As an example the can ask student opinion about one of the occupation presented; *“what do you think about this occupation? Why?”*

On the other hand, in extract two the classroom and context mode occurs at the beginning of the class which the teacher built up the context of what going to learn through the interaction with the students by giving some questions to elicit the students’ response. Most of the teacher turns used more than one clauses whether for eliciting or repairing. However, the students turns was responding with only one word; *yes, no, study, siapa* such in utterance 7 and 9. This is what make the classroom context mode is ineffective where the teacher turn is exactly short since the function of this mode is to invite students, as Walsh (2011) suggestion, to share their experience and practice oral fluency.

From the interview that the researchers made, the teacher assumed that students will not be able to contribute more if the teacher did not give them elicitation because most of the students

are in the low proficiency level of English. Furthermore, the students were lack of confidence in expressing their idea or experience to the class by using English. It is acceptable that the teacher extend his turn by providing the elicitation because the students tend to not giving a response if the teacher gives them the turn without giving elicitation. In the other word, the teacher function is as mediator for wider student involvement by deciding the topic and turn for student.

In the researchers' point of view, something need to improve here is how the teacher gives a question. Most of the teacher questions were in the form of closed question which automatically gives short involvement for the students for example: "What is mom karsih?", "who teach in the class" "what do you do in the class" and so on. The teacher can use open question to extend the students turns in sharing their idea such as "what is your opinion about being a students?", "what are your activities of being a students in the classroom/school?". The open question will engage the students to extensively express their experience rather than closed question. In addition, the teacher can nominate the students by signing with hand to make spread contribution of the class.

Furthermore, the classroom context mode in extract 2.1 always used the same question as an elicitation before the students answer correctly. For the example, the question "what must you do in the classroom" is uttered for six times (in utterance 1, 3, 6, 8, 23, and 25) and the utterance "*who studies in the classroom*" is uttered 7 times (6, 10, 13, 19, 39, 41 and 46). From these repetitions, the researcher concludes that the students are difficult to understand the teacher question. As an alternative, in this mode the teacher can use scaffolding as a way of reformulating the question to ease the learner in understanding the initiation. Moreover, the teacher tended to give minimal wait time for the students to answer after the question uttered. However, according to Nicola Woods the extended wait time will give students valuable time to process the response and enhancing the quality of the respond as well.

To sum up, the classroom and context mode whether in extract one or two is less effective to engage student involvement by expressing their idea and experiences dealing with the topic in the pedagogic goals. For the example, the teacher only asked about how the students feeling about the lesson at the end of the study "is very interesting?" whether at extract one or extract two. Though, in extract one; teacher tried to initiate students for the more expression of students feeling by questioning the reason of their answer. In fact, with beginner level it needs more effort to make students express their idea in English. For this reason, the teacher should be able to facilitate initiation and ask confirmation to students such as in the beginning of extract two. In extract two, the teacher made interactions that led students to the topic of the pedagogic goal at the beginning of the class. Even though, there will be some interactional features that must be corrected for the improvement, for the example; wait time, speech modification, turn-taking and so on.

E. CONCLUSION

Based on the data analysis, the interactions used in teaching learning process were mostly in the form of IRF pattern where the teacher dominates the turn. The teacher's initiations were dominated by the use display question which provides minimal opportunity of learning for student. Thus, the teacher must aware that different initiation will produce different response which may hinder or engage the student opportunity of learning. Furthermore, the interaction strategies such as extending wait time will let the student to produce enhanced response. To this purpose, the teacher should be realized that each interaction he/she makes can make or hinder the students' opportunity of learning.

In addition, the teacher's interaction is coincided with the SETT frame work to gain the pedagogic goals. As a matter of fact, whether in extract one and two, teacher's interaction fitted with the four modes in SETT. In the managerial mode the interactional feature used by the teacher are the use of confirmation check, transitional markers, and giving learner information about the lesson. Similarly, in skill and system mode the teacher's interactional features are the use of direct repair, scaffolding, display question, teacher echo, and form-focused feedback. In like manner, the materials mode is in the form of dominant IRF pattern with display question as the initiation, the use of corrective repair, and form focused feedback. Furthermore, the classroom context mode has view implementation especially in extract one; in extract two the teacher use interactional features of classroom context mode are in the form of establishing a context of the pedagogic goals, clarification request and repair. Those interactional features in all modes are coincided with the pedagogic goals.

REFERENCES

- A.Demo, Douglas (2001). *Discourse analysis for language teacher*. Washington DC. Center for applied linguistic, ERIC.
- Aman, Noor, - Mustaffa, R - Teo Kok Seong (2010). "*Teacher's Verbal Feedback on Students' Response: A Malaysian ESL Classroom Discourse Analysis*".-. Elsevier ltd.
- Anne Edstrom. (2006). *The Canadian Modern Language Review*. 63:2, 275-292
- Ary, Cheser Jacobs - L K. Sorensen,C (2006). *Introduction to Research in Education Eighth Edition. Canada*. Wadsworth.
- Atar, Cihat & Seedhouse, Paul. (2018). *A Conversation-Analytic Perspective on the Organization of Teacher-Led Clarification and Its Implications for L2 Teacher Training*. *International Journal of Instruction*. 11. 145-166. 10.12973/iji.2018.11211a.
- Cambridge advanced learner's dictionary 3rd edition (2008)*. Cambridge. Cambridge university press.

- Celce-Murcia – Olshtain (2002). *Discourse and context in language teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Christie, Francais (2002). *Classroom discourse analysis: a functional perspective*. New York. Continuum.
- Claudete, Tardif (1994). 'Classroom teacher talk in early immersion'. Canada. Canadian Modern Language
- Darling-Hammond, Linda & Bransford, John & Lepage, Pamela & Hammerness, Karen & Duffy, Helen. (2005). *Preparing Teachers for a Changing World: What teachers should learn and be able to do*.
- Freiberg, H. J. (1987). Teacher Self-Evaluation and Principal Supervision. NASSP Bulletin, 71(498), 85–92. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019263658707149814>
- H. James McLaughlin (1991) The reflection on the blackboard: student teacher self-evaluation, International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 4:2, 141-159, DOI: [10.1080/0951839910040204L1](https://doi.org/10.1080/0951839910040204L1) Use in the L2 Classroom: One Teacher's Self-Evaluation
- Huth, Torthen (2011). *Conversation Analysis and Language Classroom Discourse*. -. Blackwell publishing ltd.
- Inoue, Keisuke (2009). *Discourse analysis of online chat reference interviews*. New York. the American Society for Information Science and Technology Volume 46.
- McCarthy – Carter (1994). *Language as discourse: Perspectives for language teacher*. New York. Longman.
- Musumeci, D (1996). 'Teacher–learner negotiation in content- based instruction: communication at cross-purposes?', -. Applied Linguistics.
- Paul Gee, James (2011). *An introduction to discourse analysis: theory and method 3rd edition*. USA and Canada: Routledge.
- Rogers , Rebecca (2004). *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education*. New Jersey. Laurence Erlbaum associates inc.
- Rogers, Rebecca - Mosley. (2008) *A critical discourse analysis of racial literacy in teacher education*.-. linguistic and education 19
- Rymes, Betsy (2008). *Classroom Discourse Analysis: A Tool for Critical*. in press.
- Sinclair, John - Malcolm Coulthard (1975) . *Toward an Analysis of Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Strong, Tom (2003). *Engaging Reflection: A Training Exercise Using Conversation and Discourse Analysis*.- Counselor Education & Supervision.
- Walsh, Steve (2002). Construction or Obstruction: Teacher Talk and Learner Involvement in the EFL classroom. Language teaching research 6.
- Walsh, Steve (2006). *Exploring Language Discourse*. New York and London. Routledge Taylor and Francis group.

- Walsh, Steve (2006). *Investigating classroom discourse*. USA and Canada: Routledge,
- Walsh, Steve (2010) . *Developing interactional awareness in the second language classroom through teacher self-evaluation*. London. Routledge.
- Walsh, Steve (2011) . *Exploring classroom discourse: language in action*. USA and Canada. Routledge.
- Wood,Nicola (2006). *Discribing discourse: a practical guide to discourse analysis*. New york. Oxford university press.
- Wooffitt, Robin (2006). *Conversation Analysis and Discourse Analysis: A Comparative and Critical Introduction*. London. SAGE Publication Ltd.