

**ACTION BETWEEN TEACHER AND STUDENTS IN  
LEARNING ENGLISH AT GRADE  
XI OF MAN SERDANG BEDAGAI**

\*Indah Nurhasanah

\*\*Dr. Isli Iriani Indiah Pane, S.Pd., M.Hum.

\*\*Rafika Dewi Nasution, S.Pd., M.Hum.

**ABSTRACT**

The aim of this study were to figure out the dominant category used by teacher and students and the types of verbal interaction used by teacher and students in learning English at grade XI of MAN Serdang Bedagai. The methodology of this study is descriptive qualitative research. The researcher took two classes (XI-IPA2 and XI-IPS2). The researcher used observational tally sheet, matrix, and audio recording as the instruments for collecting the data. The data were analyzed by using Flanders' Interaction Analysis Category System (FIACS). The data analysis showed that the teacher more dominant in the classroom interaction than the students. The percentage of teacher talk in class XI-IPA2 was 74.03%, in class XI-IPS2 was 65.60%. The dominant category used by teacher in class XI-IPA2 was lecturing by 31.78%, in class XI-IPS2 was also lecturing by 24.73%. The percentage of student talk in class XI-IPA2 was 20.16%, in class XI-IPS2 was 26.88%. And the dominant category of student talk was student talk-response with 15.11% in class XI-IPA2 and 23.65% in class XI-IPS2. All the types of verbal interaction based on Flanders' Interaction Analysis Category System (FIACS) occurred in the classroom during teaching and learning process at grade XI of MAN Serdang Bedagai.

***Keywords:*** *Verbal interaction, teacher talk, student talk, Flanders' Interaction Analysis Category System (FIACS)*

---

\*Graduate Status

\*\*Lecturer Status

## INTRODUCTION

### *Background of the Study*

Classroom interaction involves students and teacher as the participants in using the target language. Teacher has the important role to create good environment or to create a good interaction in the classroom and to engage the students to be more active in speaking which in the end will affect their academic achievements.

In the language learning, the language skills have to be taught integratedly. For example, speaking skills cannot be separatedly taught from listening skill, someone will not be able to respond well to the others saying without listening to the speaker's saying. Danielson et al cited in Lumettu and Runtuwene (2018: 1) states that valid procedure in language learning includes listening, and then followed by speaking, reading and the last is writing. Teacher has the proficiency for managing the classroom to increase students to be interesting and more active in speaking (Sundari, 2017: 148). Teacher uses the target language in the classroom, the students will imitate and also use English (Kang, 2013: 149).

Wood (2009: 341) states that there are three general purposes of speaking: informing, persuading, and entertaining. In informing, the speaker is defining, explaining, demonstrating, or giving the information about something. In persuading, it is to influence, to motivate and to inspire the listener. In entertaining, it is to make the listener feel interest and to amuse the listener at the same time.

Classroom plays a significant role to succeed the activity of teaching and learning. The interaction between teacher and students will happen in the classroom. Classroom interaction is a place to practice the students' skills to communicate and to interact with the teacher and other students. In classroom interaction, there are verbal interaction and nonverbal interaction found. People use verbal interaction to ask the question, to get the information that people need, verbal interaction is also to describe the people, things, or any ideas, while

nonverbal interaction is the process to produce the meaning by using behavior than words (Leonard, 2012).

In teaching and learning process, verbal interaction occurred to explain the material, to ask and answer the question or to share any ideas which happen in the classroom during the lesson. Verbal interaction takes place in many context, for instances when conducting a presentation, group discussion, performances, and forth.

Flanders' Interaction Analysis Category System (Flanders, 1970) is about a system in the classroom interaction with regard to verbal interaction only. Flanders' Interaction Analysis Category consists of ten categories system of communication. There are seven categories in teacher talk (accepts feeling, praises or encourages, accepts or uses ideas of pupils, asks question, lecturing, giving direction, criticizing or justifying authority), and there are two categories of student talk (pupil talk response and pupil talk initiation), and the tenth category is silence or confusion.

## **REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

### **1. The Nature of Interaction**

Brown (2001: 165) says that interaction is a collaborative to exchange the ideas, thought, feeling between two or more people.

### **2. Classroom Interaction**

Amatari (2015: 43) states that classroom interaction is a significant component in teaching and learning process in the classroom environment.

Sundari (2017: 148) argues that interaction as a central of learning and teaching the language. Teacher and students use the language in classroom interaction to achieve the goal of learning process. In the classroom interaction, teacher is mostly as a person who initiated and maintained the communication to help the learning activity running fast.

According to Flanders (1970) as cited in Sharma (2016: 3771) classroom interaction indicates to chain of events that happen one after another, each taking

only a small segment of time. Classroom interaction is the action taken by the teacher and students during learning activity (Sukarni & Ulfah, 2015: 263). Interaction in the classroom among teacher and learners goes on oftentimes as initiatory or responsive acts.

Fawzia (2002) as cited in Tuan & Nhu (2010: 38) argues that there are some factors for influencing the classroom interaction and it is divided into three categories, namely: student factors (student's perception, attitudes, language factors, learning styles, background of the learner, personal affective factors), social factors (gender of the students in the class and nature community feelings in group) and educational factors (the course, the topic).

### **3. Flanders' Interaction Analysis Category System (FIACS)**

Flanders' Interaction Analysis Category is a system of classroom interaction which is concerned with verbal behavior only and non verbal gestures are not taken into account. Although the use of spoken language might use non verbal behavior, verbal behavior can be analyze and observed with higher reliability than non verbal behavior (Amatari, 2015: 44).

Flanders' Interaction Analysis Category consists of ten categories system of communication. Ten categories of Flanders analysis is divided into three types, they are teacher talk, student talk and silence or confusion. There are seven categories used when teacher talk, they are: accepts feeling, praises or encourages the students, accepts or uses ideas of students, asking question, lecturing, giving direction, and criticizing or justifying authority. From category one until category four, it is included in indirect talk. Otherwise, from category five until category seven are direct talk. There are two categories used when student talk are student talk-response and student talk-initiation. And tenth category is silence or confusion.

## **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

This research was conducted by using descriptive qualitative research. Qualitative research is research that involves analyzing and interpreting texts in order to discover meaningful patterns descriptive of a particular phenomenon (Auerbach and Silverstein, 2003: 3). The researcher observed verbal interaction between teacher and students in learning English and this research used Flanders' Interaction Analysis Category System (FIACS) to analyze verbal interaction.

The data in this research are the transcription of audio recording that showed verbal interaction which is occurred among teacher and students during English teaching learning process at grade XI. The sources of the data are the students and the teacher at grade XI of MAN Serdang Bedagai. There are five classes at grade XI and only two classes were chosen as the sample in this study.

The instruments used for data collection are observational tally sheet, matrix, and audio recording to record the interaction occurred in the teaching learning process. And the techniques of collecting data were Observation, and Recording.

## **RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS**

### *Research findings*

1. The types of verbal interaction of Flanders' Interaction Analysis Category System (FIACS); accept feeling, praise or encouragement, accept or use students' ideas, ask question, lecturing, giving direction, criticizing or justifying authority, student talk-response, student talk-initiation, and silence or confusion happened in the classroom during teaching and learning process. By the presentation of teacher talk, beginning from the highest to the lowest percentage at XI-IPA2: lecturing was 31.78%, asking question was 17.44%, praise or encouragement was 8.13%, accept or use ideas of students was 7.80%, giving direction was 5.42%, accept feeling was 1.93%, and criticizing or justifying authority was 1.55%. And the types of verbal interaction of

student talk: student talk-response was 15.11%, student talk-initiation was 5.03%. And for silence or confusion was 5.81%. In addition, the highest to the lowest percentage of teacher talk at XI-IPS2: lecturing was 24.73%, giving direction was 18.30%, asking question was 11.30%, accept or use ideas of students was 4.84%, praise or encouragement was 3.22%, accept feeling was 2.15%, and criticizing or justifying authority was 1.07%. And the types of verbal interaction of student talk: student talk-response was 23.65%, student talk-initiation was 3.22%. And for silence or confusion was 7.52%.

2. The interaction in the classroom during teaching and learning English lesson is dominated by the teacher. It can be seen from the percentage of teacher talk and student talk in two classes. In class XI-IPA2 the teacher spent 74.03% to talk and students only spent 20.16% to talk. While in class XI-IPS2 the teacher spent 65.60% to talk and students only spent 26.88% to talk.
3. The dominant category used by the teacher in class XI-IPA2 and XI-IPS2 was lecturing with 31.78% in class XI-IPA2 and 24.73% in class XI-IPS2. And then, the dominant category used by students in class XI-IPA2 and XI-IPS2 was student talk-response with 15.11% in class XI-IPA2 and 23.65% in class XI-IPS2. The average percentage of teacher talk during teaching and learning process was 69.81%, and the average percentage of student talk was 23.52%.

#### *Discussion*

Ten categories of Flanders', namely: accept feeling, Praise or encouragement, accept or use the ideas of students, ask question, lecturing, giving direction, criticizing or justifying authority, student talk-response, student talk-initiation, silence appeared in the classroom. Nunan (1998) as cited in Pujiastuti (2013:163) says that many teachers were surprised of the amount of talk used by teacher during teaching and learning process in the classroom, it is about 70-80 percent out of the class time was spent mostly by teacher talk. That is indeed, after analyzing the data and got the result from the research, teacher spent time too much to talk in two classes. In class XI-IPA2 teacher talk was 74.03%, while in class XI-IPS2 teacher talk was 65.60%. The student only spoke in the classroom

when the teacher asked them to speak or to answer the teacher's question. It can be seen from the percentage of the students in the class: 20.16% for XI-IPA2 and 26.88% for XI-IPS2.

In two different classes, teacher always dominated the talk in the classroom while learning activities. Lecturing took place as the most applied one by the teacher in two different classes. It means that the teacher talks more to explain the material in class and the students have less chance to talk. Meanwhile, the least dominant of teacher talk in two classes was criticizing or justifying authority. Teacher used criticizing to critic and to change the students' behavior from non acceptable become acceptable pattern. So, the teacher is rare to critic the students. On the other hand, the most dominant category of student talk in two classes was student talk-response. It indicates that the students spoke in the class when they are able to respond the questions or commands of the teacher, so the students initiate their ideas in the classroom infrequently.

Good interaction between teacher and students is needed in the classroom. The students are expected to be more active in the class than teacher while teaching and learning process. Nilton (2005) as cited in Tsegaye and Davidson (2014:1) argues that the amount of talk time the teachers use in given the lesson is not the same. For example, the teacher needs to speak more when starting the material, after that the teacher may speak less and give the opportunity for the students to speak up, to more active in the classroom. Tsegaye and Davidson (2014:2) according to second language acquisition theories, both teacher and students should participate actively in the classroom. In communicative EFL classes students need a large opportunity to practice their target language, it means that the teacher should reduce the amount of their talk to 20-30%, and student talk time should be around 70-80% while teaching and learning process.

Allwright (1982) the teacher who works too much than the students in the classroom were not teaching successfully, a good teacher is who succeeded in making the students to do more work in the classroom. It means that the teacher should give more chances for the students to talk or to initiate their opinion in the

classroom during teaching and learning process. When the students become active in the class, it will make the learning activities successful.

## **CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION**

### *Conclusion*

1. All types of verbal interaction are used by the teacher and students at grade XI of MAN Serdang Bedagai. This study is categorized from the highest to the lowest percentage of types of verbal interaction of teacher talk in class XI-IPA2: lecturing was 31.78%, asking question was 17.44%, praise or encouragement was 8.13%, accept or use ideas of students was 7.80%, giving direction was 5.42%, accept feeling was 1.93%, and criticizing or justifying authority was 1.55%. And the types of verbal interaction of student talk: student talk-response was 15.11%, student talk-initiation was 5.03%. And for silence or confusion was 5.81%. In addition, the highest to the lowest percentage of types of verbal interaction of teacher talk in class XI-IPS2: lecturing was 24.73%, giving direction was 18.30%, asking question was 11.30%, accept or use ideas of students was 4.84%, praise or encouragement was 3.22%, accept feeling was 2.15%, and criticizing or justifying authority was 1.07%. And the types of verbal interaction of student talk: student talk-response was 23.65%, student talk-initiation was 3.22%. And for silence or confusion was 7.52%.
2. The dominant category used by the teacher in two classes was lecturing with 31.78% in class XI-IPA2 and 24.73% in class XI-IPS2. And then, the dominant category used by students in two classes was student talk-response with 15.11% in class XI-IPA2 and 23.65% in class XI-IPS2. It means that the teacher is more active and dominated in the classroom activities.



### *Suggestion*

The teacher should encourage the students and give more opportunities for the students to initiate their opinions or ideas and always praise the students' ideas whether it is good or not, because if the teacher praises or encourages the students, they will be more confident and brave to speak during teaching learning process.

### **REFERENCES**

- Allwright, D. (2014). *Observation in the Language Classroom*. London and New York: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Allwright, R. L. (1982). What do we want teaching materials for?. *ELT Journal*, 36, 5-18.
- Amatari, V. O. (2015). The Instructional Process: A Review of Flanders' Interaction Analysis in a Classroom Setting. *International Journal of Secondary Education*, 3, 43-49.
- Auerbach, C. F. & Silverstein, I. B. (2003). *An Introduction to Coding and Analysis Qualitative*. New York: New York University.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching. Fourth Edition*. White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.
- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by Principles an Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy. Second Edition*. White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research Design Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches. Third Edition*. London: Sage Publications.
- Fitri, S. & Syafri, H. (2017). Utilizing FIACS for Excalating Classroom Interaction as Teaching Innovation. *English Language Teaching and Research*, 1, 323-332.
- Flanders, N. (1970). *Analyzing Teacher Behavior*. New York: Addison-Wesley.
- Kang, D. M. (2013). EFL Teachers' Language Use for Classroom Discipline: A Look at Complex Interplay of Variables. *System*, 41 (1), 149-163.

- Kaur, J. & Tatla, J. K. K. (2015). Flanders Classroom Interaction Category System as a Tool of Teaching. *International Journal of Advancement in Engineering Technology, Management & Applied Science*, 2, 62-66.
- Leonard, V. (2012). *An Introduction to Interpersonal Communication: A Primer on Communicative Studies*.
- Lumettu, A. & Runtuwene, T. L. (2017). Developing the Students' Speaking Ability through Impromptu Speaking Method. *Journal of Physics*, 1-9.
- Mardiyana, F. (2018). *Verbal Interaction in English Classroom Using Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories System (FIACS)*. Medan: State University of Medan.
- Mulyati, A. F. (2013). A Study of Teacher Talk and Student Talk in Verbal Classroom Interaction to Develop Speaking Skill for Young Learners. *Journal of English and Education*, 1, 1-10.
- Neuman, W. L. (2014). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches. Seventh Edition*. London: Pearson Education.
- Pujiastuti, R. T. (2013). Classroom Interaction: An Analysis of Teacher Talk and Student Talk in English for Young Learners (EYL). *Journal of English and Education*, 1, 163-172.
- Rahayu, S. (2014). *The Students Teacher Interaction in Teaching Practice of SMK N 1 Kudus in Academic Year 2013/2014*. Kudus: Muria Kudus University.
- Sharma, S. (2016). A Study of Classroom Interaction Characteristics Using Flander's Classroom Interaction Analysis Ina Maths Class of Rural and Urban Schools. *Scholarly Research Journal for Humanity Science & English Language*, 3, 3770-3776.
- Sipahutar, K. (2017). *Classroom Interaction Analysis of English Class in SMPN 2 Babalan*. Medan: State University of Medan.
- Sukarni, S. & Ulfah, S. (2015). An Analysis of Teacher and Student Talk in the Classroom Interaction of the Eighth Grade of SMP Negeri 18 Purworejo. *Journal Vision*, 4, 261-277.
- Sundari, H. (2017). Classroom Interaction in Teaching English as Foreign Language at Lower Secondary Schools in Indonesia. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 8, 147-154.

- Tsegaye, A. G. & Davidson, L. M. (2014). The Ratio of Teacher Talking Time to Students Talking Time in EFL Classroom: A Case in Six Partner Preparatory Schools of Haramaya University, Ethiopia. *Abinav National Monthly Refereed Journal of Research in Arts & Education*, 3, 1-5.
- Tuan, L. T. & Nhu, N. T. (2010). Theoretical Review on Oral Interaction in EFL Classroom. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 1, 29-48.
- Ulan, D. A. (2017). An Analysis of Classroom Interaction in the Teaching-Learning Process of Speaking at Tenth Grade Students of SMK Al-Husain Keling in the Academic Year of 2017/2018. *Journal Edulingua*, 4, 93-100.
- Wilkinson, D. & Birmingham, P. (2003). *Using Research Instruments a Guide for Researchers*. London and New York: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Wood, J. T. (2009). *Communication in Our Lives. Fifth Edition*. Wadsworth: Cengage Learning.