A STUDY OF TEACHER TALK IN A CLASSROOM INTERACTION AT A SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Oleh:
Raden Panji Hartono[1], Slamet Setiawan[2], Maria Mintowati[3]
[1,2,3]Universitas Negeri Surabaya
[1]raden17070835054@mhs.unesa.ac.id, [2]slametsetiawan@unesa.ac.id, [3]mintowati@unesa.ac.id

Abstrak

Studi ini menganalisa bagaimana interactional features yang diusulkan oleh Walsh (2006) diterapkan oleh seorang guru Bahasa Inggris, sehingga fitur-fitur yang digunakan membantu guru untuk mencapai objektif pembelajaran. Metode deskriptif kualitatif digunakan untuk menggambarkan dan mendiskusikan bagaimana talk yang disampaikan memicu terjadinya interaksi guru-siswa. Pengambilan data melibatkan 13 siswa laki-laki dan 15 siswi perempuan dengan menggunakan audio, video recorder, dan juga field note. Wawancara kepada guru juga dilakukan guna untuk mengkonfirmasi kejadian interaksi yang tercakup dalam interactional features. Hasilnya menunjukkan bahwa sebanyak sebelas dari empat belas fitur ditemukan dan digunakan dalam interaksi guru dan siswa, yakni; scaffolding, extended wait-time, seeking clarification, confirmation check, extended learner-turn, teacher echo, teacher interruption, extended teacher-turn, turn completion, display question, form focused feedback. Sedangkan tiga fitur yang tidak ditemukan dan digunakan adalah direct repair, content feedback, dan referential question. Kesebelas fitur yang diusulkan oleh Walsh (2006) dan diterapkan oleh guru membantu dalam pencapaian objek pembelajaran dikelas.

Kata Kunci: teacher talk, classroom interaction, interactional features

1. INTRODUCTION

Communication in the field of foreign or second language context is a complicated phenomenon which is being the central to the classroom activities. The interaction between teacher and students is the key toward the success or failure of learning a foreign or second language. Van Lier (1996, cited in Walsh, 2006) argues that if a foreign language teacher expects an effective interaction, then the interaction should be well considered as the most important thing in the teaching foreign or second language acquisition curriculum. An effective teacher talk should try to improve the foreign or second language classroom and to promote learners for doing it.

There are many ways in which teachers can construct students participation in interpersonal, or commonly called as face to face classroom interaction through their choice of language (Walsh, 2002). A language used by the teacher holds a pivotal role for students' success learning. Success learning is underlined since it still leave questionably toward how to apply it. Again, the talk from the teacher should facilitate and maximize students' participation during the foreign language teaching in the classroom. Alternatively, learning is promoted through communication so that learners engage in the negotiation of meaning. The awareness of the teacher minds their interaction quality that would determine the effective learning. As Walsh (2006) suggests that an awareness of the interactional process help teacher and learners to have a comprehensive understanding of how language is acquired.

Moreover, the spoken language which is being used by the teacher called teacher talk. Teacher talk is used to manifest and share knowledge for the students. Commonly, there are three things guiding teacher to do teacher talk; (a) elicit relevant knowledge from students; so that teacher choose a proper word to convey the knowledge as it has already known by the students as well; (b) respond to things that students say; a feedback towards students respond should be attempted by incorporations into the flow of discourse meaning by the students; (c) describe the classroom experiences that they share with students in such a way that the educational significance of those joint experiences is revealed and emphasized (Mercer, 1995:25).

Teacher talk for the learner is potentially becomes valuable source of comprehensible input which is viewed necessary for language acquisition (Cullen, 1998:179). This reason evoked to the issue of this study that teacher should be aware to the fluency of their speech, how much the teacher talk, and what a meaningful talk need to be performed. Cullen (1998:179) suggests that how effectively the talk which would facilitate and promote communicative interaction in the classroom is more emphasized. The same view argues by Lei (2009) that good teacher talk focused on how the teacher effectively promote genuine communication in the classroom. She also added that "good" teacher talk meant "little" teacher talk, since when a teacher dominantly the talk can deprive students' opportunities to speak the target language.

Furthermore, a constructive communicational is essential in building students'

motivation to speak the target language. As Setiawati (2012) suggested that the use of constructive teacher talk is vital and effective for learners to improve their skill in target language. It can be seen that constructive talk is an essential ingredients of a good lesson, a vital part to engage student with their learning, an instrument to transform relationships (Coultas, 2009).

In attempting the effectiveness of teacher's talk, consequently the quality of the teacher talk is also considered important to give chance for the students to develop and perform the language by interaction. Interaction is one of among activities which provide both teacher and students to be engaged in communication as the language being used. This is the main goal of teacher in learning a foreign language, where students can practice the target language. This requires teacher's experience in finding ways to construct a successful lessons how a teacher provides learners with a new tool and opportunities for doing things and for organizing information through the language used.

Nevertheless, to make students be attractively engaged in teacher talk, a teacher has to plan such a fun teaching and learning in accordance the level and the needs of the students. As a model in the classroom, teacher holds their role in such a way establish motivating, interesting, and challenging activities during the teaching and learning process. This leads to build better dynamic interaction between teacher and students in the classroom settings.

As a matter of fact, the teaching and learning process should be able to grab students' attention especially they can predict what they will learn. Another thing is to let the students express the target language. The students are expected to produce the language either by spontaneous answer or purposeful answer from dependently into independently. As Brown (2001:168) states that interactive teaching is to strive against the upper, non-directive end of the continuum, gradually enabling the students to move their roles from total dependent to relatively total independent. This leads to the statement above that students have known spontaneously what need to do and say by themselves.

Nonetheless, need to be claimed that encourage and organize students to produce the target language is not easy to do. That is why teachers should function their talk as "central point" to gain effective teaching and learning process (Vygotsky, 1978). Wood as cited in Cameron (2001 pp. 8-9) added that teacher talk is very effective in scaffolding learners in various ways. Thus, teacher should manage their talk in a meaningful way, and might use repetitions on key language if it eventually needed. As Nunan (1989) suggested that teachers need to modify the language to make it easier to comprehend which in turn helps the students understand the target language.

Even so, the term of talk in language classroom is still leave question toward what talk should be applied, what activity, what proper utterance and so forth. Since the goal of language teaching is students can produce the target language, a teacher is to be keen on to be creatively establish an enthusiastic teaching learning through the language which being used. In another word, teacher talk aims to establish and maintain good interaction between teacher and students in a complex series discourse in the classroom. By hence, by doing observing, investigating, and analyzing the teacher talk, it provides awareness for the teacher to aware and improve their talk in a meaningful way while teaching the target language.

However, there should be a reason back why a teacher performed such a certain talk, namely pedagogy. Pedagogy and interaction happens coincide in a classroom. Here a teacher has the chance to improve their goal at the teaching process in accordance and to achieve the goal based on their teaching objective and pedagogic purpose. Since pedagogy and interaction stand along during the teaching and learning, then learning opportunity is facilitated; oppositely, since the "language use and teaching goal experience deviation, then the opportunity for learning are missed (Walsh, 2002:5). Again, a teacher obviously should be aware mindful these two between their pedagogy and language used to reach the goal.

Several studies had been conducted toward the classroom research seen from the interaction between teacher and students. Cullen (2002) investigated some aspects of teacher talk that is teacher's feedback toward students' responses, examined the target language (second language) by role it plays. This kind of observation and study is in the form of classroom discourse. He found that teacher plays pivotal role of teacher talk in clarifying and giving ideas from the students' expression through respond. Contrary, since the existence of second language is learner is asking to practice it directly in spoken, Mercer (2000), Mulyati (2013) and Nuraini & Hamim (2015), shown in their research that the teacher spent more time talking during the second language process. They became dominant interlocutor in the classroom activities and found very little talk occurs between students. This makes students learned limitedly the target language mastery. Hence, it seems that "the students had failed for the lesson. According to Dudley-Evans and St Jones (1998) stated that apart from the main tasks of English teacher generally is to control ongoing classroom activities, providing information about skills and language, organizing pair- or group work, in other words acting as provider of input activities.

In following previous studies above, Noorizah, Idris, Rosniah, and Teo Kok were also examined about "Teacher's Verbal Feedback on Students' Response: A Malaysian ESL Classroom Discourse Analysis". In this study IRF structure was used to analyze the classroom discourse which focused on the teacher feedback dealing with the students' response. In like manner, Douglas A. Demo studies about "Discourse Analysis for Language Teacher". In this journal Douglas revealed how the language used by the teacher engage the students with more communicative way of response (verbal and non-verbal).

Moreover, teacher talk and its teaching foreign/second language classroom had been under researched by Flanders (1970) and Moskowitz (1971). FIAC (Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories) by Flanders was addressed to be used in classroom language. In responding the foreign language interaction analysis models designed by Flanders (1970), Walsh (2006:42) claimed that the Flander's categories are rather broad and still leave questionably in a certain complexity interactional organization of the contemporary classroom. Walsh (2006:42) in responding Flint (Foreign Language INTeraction) by Moskowitsz (1971) thought more sophisticated and more complex than the original Flanders system.

Otherwise, since those categories proposed to analyze the interactional models during the foreign or second language teaching by the teacher, Seedhouse (1996:23) suggested to concentrate on the characteristic features which related to the institutional discourse. In this case, characteristic features was addressed to be more fruitful to be placed on the interaction, and it was likely take proportion on this problem.

In following those studies above, similar study recently conducted by Wasi'ah (2017) about teacher talk. She obtained the data by using the old Walsh's (2006) instrument as well. She concluded that the teacher performed eleven interactional features proposed by Walsh (2006) of fourteen. They were scaffolding, direct repair, content feedback, extended wait-time, seeking clarification, confirmation check, teacher echo, teacher interruption, extended teacher turn, display question, and extended learner turn. Unfortunately, she said that the teacher had failed in performing teacher interruption to achieve the pedagogic goal. Means, the student's response towards the teacher interruption was unrelated but the teacher dealt with it. It supposed to be corrected whether the student's response was an expected answer or not, not to let it worked as it expected to be.

In the following, this study investigated the extend to which EFL Iranian teachers hinder and facilitate learning for students through their choice of language, how the teacher can enhance language use and in what way the teacher deny opportunities for foreign language learning. Some teachers in conversational classes appear to impede interaction and obstruct student involvement. This study considered the ways through which the teacher can construct or obstruct student involvement in face to face classroom communication in conversation class and identified the ways how the teacher can improve herselves and optimize student involvement. In addition, second language teacher should find interactional awareness to control use of language in class to improve teaching and learning because teacher's ability to control use of language as well as its importance as their ability to select appropriate methodologies.

Walsh's (2006) instrument is to set up to gain more information against teacher talk, knowing the pivotal role of teacher talk in the classroom which highly related to the language being used by the teacher. The gap relies on the level of the object, where Wasi'ah (2017) conducted her study in a junior high school, but this study chosen senior high school claimed that they more adequate to be observed.

Furthermore, interactional features (2006) proposed by Walsh (2006) was used to analyze the teacher talk whether its fit to engange students participating to the class activity and to let teacher knows what and why it is happening of the entire activities. The reasons why was this present study not applied the revised one by Walsh (2011), namely Self Evaluation Teacher Talk (SETT). First, since the term 'evaluate' appeared, it seems to be not feasible to evaluate the teacher since they helped the researcher as to fulfil the data of this study. Second, to avoid a defense answer if the teacher is asked whether he or she applied SETT, in form of questionnaire even interview.

This present study was conducted in a senior high school in Surabaya. This school is including 1 of 31 schools in Indonesia as a school partner (sekolah mitra) and become 1 of 4 schools in East Java as a school partner. This school is having such a cooperation with German which are required English skill and German skill. Since the matter of English is required, then this study focused on how the teacher improved the students' ability to learn English itself.

That being said, since English is taught as a second language, then there should be investigation of how the teacher establish the students' comprehension through the teacher talk. This is vital since knowing that the students' have different ability to learn the English as their foreign language. In addition, the interaction occured between the teacher and the students was the focuse one of how the teacher attempted to teach English through her talk.

2. RESEARCH METHODS

This study was designed qualitatively. Qualitative research seeks to understand the context or setting of the participants by visiting the context and gathering information personally. Creswell (2009, p.37) states "qualitative research is a means for exploring and understanding the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem". Since teacher's talk come up with interaction among students, then this study aims to investigate the interactional features and how it fits with the teacher's aim (pedagogic goal) to use certain talk. Cullen (1998:179) suggests that there is a need to investigate and analyze teacher talk relating to the use of language qualitatively rather than quantitative view. In addition, the effective of teacher's talk accommodate in the learning process and to promote communicative interaction. So that is why qualitative method is more appropriate to analyze the data rather than quantitative toward its interactional.

The data were collected during the teaching and learning process occurring naturally. As Creswell (2014:185) stated that characteristics of qualitative study; (a)occurs in natural ways, (b) researcher as key instrument, (c) more than two sources of data (multiple data sources), (d) inductive and deductive data analysis, (e) participants meaning: means that during analyzing the data, the researcher should mere focus on learning the meaning of the problem that participants faced, not to carry out the researcher's problem, (f) emergent design: the initial plan from researcher cannot be prescribed, (g) reflexivity, and (h) holistic account; means since the study was designed qualitatively, so there should be attempt to develop complex or issue which being raised up.

For the purposes of this present study, a female English teacher with the students were selected to participate in this study. The teacher had been experienced in teaching for more than ten years. She was also graduated as a master degree as an English education and literature program. The thing, the implementation of English classroom interaction during the entire conversation attracted this study to overview how was the interactions occured through the teacher's language use. The data presented in this study were gained from the teacher talk (utterances) and the students' responses which were recorded through video and audio. After the data have fulfilled, it was then operated into Walsh's (2006) model.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This research was conducted to look into the validity, practicality, and effectiveness of the learning document that have been developed. Learning document were developed using socio-cultural diversity material in the fifth grade. Components of learning document that have been completed were then assessed by the validator for their eligibility. Below is the results of the assessment of learning document that have been carried out.

Based on the data gained through the teacher talk, then it was analyzed based on Walsh (2006) framework theory, namely interactional features. Afterall, it was found that the talk performed by the teacher contained eleven interactional features proposed by Walsh (2006). In another word, the teacher performed eleven features; scaffolding, extended-wait time, seeking clarification, confirmation check, extended-learner turn, teacher echo, teacher interruption, extended-teacher turn, turn completion, display question, and form focused feedback, while direct repair, content feedback and referential question were not found and perfomed by the teacher.

1. Scaffolding

This was the first feature as its occupied number one on Walsh (2006) instrument. This scaffolding helped the teacher by continuing asking the students around the picture given. This was aimed to let the students learned dependently by re-thinking their answer after being questioned by the teacher. The scaffolding type here was reformulation. Means, to reach the pedagogic talk, the teacher attempted to find another ways (utterance) to make the students understand. Here how the reformulation was performed during the teaching and learning process:

a) Reformulation
Extract 4.1

T : okay, see the picture here, actually where is it? Can you guess where is it? Is it in Surabaya?
Ss   : Noooooo.
T : Then, can you guess where is it?
Ss   : Jakarta
T : Jakarta? Why is it in Jakarta? Is it in Indonesia?
Ss   : Noooooooo.
T : Why are you saying no in Indonesia?
S : The car is not in Indonesia.

In this situation, the teacher was showing such a picture of traffic jam happened in overseas and asked the students to give their argumentation, and opinion towards the picture. The extract above shows how the teacher who has already know the best answer attempted to re-asking until she achieved the best answer from them. Step by step of questions were given to fulfil the expected answer. This was happening after the teacher changed the seat-arrangement from lock-step into group. This was confirmed by the teacher that she believed they would be more competitive in learning and to establish more attractive learning.

The students were not realized that the traffic jam was not happening in Indonesia, even in Jakarta. Another question still given until the students realized something from that picture

showing. It was seen from this questions, *"Jakarta? Why is it in Jakarta? Is it in Indonesia?"*, and *"why are you saying no in Indonesia?"*. Those questions indicated as to demand another answer from the students while they were watching the picture which eventually they fulfil the expected answer.

2. Extended-Wait Time

This extended-wait time was perfomed by the teacher once. As the term available, this is to provide more time for the students to rethink and recall any of their awarness. The teacher keeps facilitate the ongoing discussion and sometimes feedback was given as motivation. See how extended-wait time was perfomed by the teacher as below:

Extract 4.2
S : eee.....
T : do you agree or disagree?
S : disagree.
T : disagree, why?
S : (talk in a slow tone)
T : louder, please!
S : =*silent in a moment*=
S : the people around him will be annoyed.
T : okay, the people around him will be annoyed, or uncomfortable.

Need to be underlined that when the teacher uttered *"louder, please"*, was not classified as teacher interruption, but it was followed by a break from both (teacher and students).

Second, the teacher let the students to finish their opinion first, and followed by the order of voice demanding. This was helped the teacher to merely achive their answer as to speak out loud the target language with no hesitation.

3. Seeking Clarification

This seeking clarification was performed when the teacher felt unsatiesfied with the students' answer. This is possible for two things, first, when the teacher think that what the student' said is new information, so that she or he re-asking to get more information on it. Second, the teacher thinks that what the student' said is not the expected answer. In another word, this features is used when something unexpected opinion, argumentation, and answer found during the interaction as to deal with the final conclusion. Here is how the teacher performed the seeking clarification as below:

Extract 4.3
S : the causes if we are smoking.
T : okay, the causes if we are smoking. How about the other? But, the causes or the effect?
Ss : effect...
T : Yeaaaaaa...

This was happened when the teacher asked the tittle of the video given. Apparently, the teacher firstly deal with the initial answer by the students, *"the causes if we are smoking"*, she found something went wrong. The video was about the

effect of smoking, the impact, and any further potential diseases would be when someone being a smoker. She straightly re-ask to make the students realized the different between causes and effects. When the teacher utter, *"T: okay, the causes if we are smoking. How about the other? But, the causes or the effect?"*, the students spontaneously realized and change their answer into, "*Ss : effect...*".

Again, how this seeking clarification eventually helped the teacher to guide the students reach the pedagogic goal, and to focus to another material ahead. As Walsh (2006) argues that the using of seeking clarification potentially maximize students' participation.

4. Confirmation Check

Another features performed by the teacher was confirmation check. As a facilitator, a teacher holds two responsibilities, first, she or he needs to make sure themselves that they have correctly understood the students' response or contribution, and (or) she or he needs to make sure that the students' have correctly understood toward what has being learned. So, this confirmation check deals with what teacher just known, and to make sure the students' comprehensibility. It was functioned to make sure the students' literally understood and realized to what they said.

Extract 4.4
S : thicken the blood.
T : thicken the blood. Okay, and then next? Is that all?
Ss : Increase the bad breath.
T : Good, increase the bad breath. What else? Is it the last one?
Ss : NOooo
T : You still have?
Ss : Four.
T : four, okay. Raise your hand. Okay, mention all.
S : increase the visibility of aging, breaks the immune system, *sama apa yaa?*
T : how about the last?
S : Cataract.
T : Cataract. Okay. Give applause.

From the extract above, there were three questions used by the teacher as to check the students memorizing after they watched a short video about the effect of smoking. *"Is that all?"*, *"is it the last one?"*, and *"you still have?"* contributed as a tool to measure the students' ability to skimming and memorizing the points which being mentioned in the video. It resulted that the students' keep adding their answers since it was being questioned by the teacher. It signed that they have good memory towards English acquisition of vocabulary.

2. Extended-Learner Turn

This extended-learner turn belongs to students' contribution in conveying their opinion, argument, and answer. Here the teacher played as a

passive role and let the students to extend their utterances. Here how the extract below shows the interaction:

Extract 4.5

G4 : So, the conclusion of smoking is, yes smoke is may be some people taking as relaxing or enjoying us, but what it really do is truly affect the negative side. And it can make you get skinnier and other by getting all these diseases, smoking is very bad and doesn't have positive side. That's from our group, and thank you.

T : Okay, good. Give applause!

Gs : -give applause-

The extract above shows how the interaction happened in the post teaching. This was happened when they were instructed to promote their argumentation in front of their friends about the effect of smoking. They freely conveyed their opinion as to practice their speaking ability.

Afterward, it also can be noticed that the teacher simply deal with the group and provide no feedback. An applause given as to reward their performance and build their confident ahead. All the interaction classified as extended-learner turn were similar one another **(see appendix 4)** where the teacher played passive role and mere give an applause as to reward.

3. Teacher Echo

This teacher echo deals with two types of strategies. First, the teacher repeats her previous utterance, and second, the teacher repeats the students' contribution. By repeating previous utterance, it is in charge of to provide a clue towards expected or best answer. So that, it helps the students to find a way to the closest answer after the teacher repeats her utterance. Similarly, as to evoke students' participation, the students will be guided to finish their answer. This the second one performed by the teacher as this extract below:

Extract 4.6

T : Yes, raise your hand please! The title, what is it? (points someone)

S : The terrible things.....

T : The terrible things.......

S : of smoking due to your body.

T : due to your body. Okay give applause to your friend.

Ss : (give applause)

The extract above simply shown how the teacher supported her student's answer by repeating it. This worked as to provide a clue that what she or he said was true, and need to extend their answer. As a reward, applause was given to appreciate the answer. This second extract below was also performed by the teacher by repeating their answer.

Extract 4.7

S : (talk in a slow tone)

T : louder, please!

S : the people around him will be annoyed

T : okay, the people around him will be annoyed, or uncomfortable.

At the first, the teacher found the student was a bit nervous or hesitate to answer through his voiceless. A cutting *"louder, please!"* was used to encourage them convey the answer, or opinion. In addition, since a motivation still needed to keep the interaction, the teacher kept repeat the student's contribution.

4. Teacher Interruption

This teacher interruption deals with any related with cutting learner's contribution to keep the points, and rule on track. As classroom interaction by communicating the target language, mother tongue was not allowed. The teacher customed the target language during the teaching and learning was ongoing. This extract below shown how the teacher interrupted the students when a mother tongue used by the student.

Extract 4.8

G3 : Eee, the first pharagraph is paragraph number two, and then number five, number four, number six, number three, and number one. Because paragraph number three is eeee, the third ee the paragraph number three itu talking about pulmonary and respiratory infection *terus habis itu ke....*

T : Say it in English!

G 3 : and then the next paragraph is number one, because it explains more...more....yaa..more detail.

The student was instructed to switch the mother tongue being used to speak the target language. A directly cutting given by the teacher to remind that target language. So that, the student tried to find a way to convey the message in another word.

5. Extended-Teacher Turn

Another type of teacher interaction found in this research was extended teacher turn where the teacher have a wider turn in the interaction. This type of interaction usually occur when the teacher explain and transfer the material of the lesson. While teacher has this type of interaction, the students commonly listen and pay attention to the teacher explanation. In the other word students have minimal turn during the teacher the explanation, as the extract below:

Extract 4.9

T : Okay, thank you. Next, here an analytical exposition things.Eeee, it is a spoken or written text that is intended to persuade the readers by presenting arguments, analyze, or explain about what and why. And then, Yaa, can you guess what is it? The social function. Yaa, the purpose of analytical exposition. First, to persuade the readers by presenting arguments, and the second .....

Ss : to tell the readers that something is important.

T : Okay, and next is the generic structure of analytical exposition. The first, yaa, thesis yaa, introduces the topic indicated an arguments. Arguments, means that there are, of course more than one arguments ya, argument one two three, and the last one is conclusion. Next, the language features of analytical exposition, they used simple present tense, and then connectors, firstly secondly and others. And the last one is to summarize at the last pharagraph, summarizing or concluding.

Okay now, the danger of smoking. Here are some jumble pharagraph, what you have to do is, you have to rearrange into a good order, and here i would like you to make a group of four students and after you have to present and give your opinion why are you choose that arrangement. And the next, another group gives question about it. Okay? so, would you please make a group of four?

Ss : -students are beginning to find their group and starting to discuss-

In this case the teacher try to explain the new material to the students about kind of text in english. The teacher has long turn since he should transfer the knowledge to the students.

Extract 4.10

S : Yess....

T : Okay, good. Next, here other learning objectives for today's learning, the first is, analysing language features of analytical exposistion sentence, second, understanding the structure of an analytical exposition text, understanding the language features of an analytical exposition text, and then finding and arranging the jumble sentences of an analytical exposition text, and the last is reading the analytical exposition loudly in front of the class with correct pronunciation and stressing.

In addition, the teacher use extended teacher turn to expalin about the objective of the class. Similarly it is used to explain what students should do and what class activity to achive the goals.

6. Turn Completion

During the classroom interaction, there will be some of students response who may not be as expected. In this case the teacher will use turn completion type of interaction in order the information or answer can be completed. As an example:

Extract 4.11

G1 : so, the first pharagraph is number two, because that is the thesis of this text

T : where is the thesis?

G1 : (points out) number two, aa pharagraph two. Next pharagraph five, this, but, aaaa, pharagraph one three, four, and six are the arguments. But, pharagraph five doesn't have word another, also, and other. And, pharagraph four, one, and six.

T : the last one is?

G1 : Six

In this extract the student explained about the order of paragraph. However the expalnation was incompleted so the teacher used the type of turn completion to engage the student comoplete the information.

7. Display Question

Display question is a type of interaction where the teacher's questions were intended for checking student understanding during or after the explanation. In this case, the teacher has already know the expected answer from the question. In the other word, this type of interaction merely makes sure whether the student has mastered the material or not.

Extract 4.12

T : yeah, i am very well, thanks. Well, actually today we will talk about Analytical Exposition. Anyway, can you still remember our last meeting, what is the material?

Ss : We learned invitation.

In this extract the teacher has already know about the answer that should be presented by the students. So the use of this type of interaction is to make sure taht the student has mastered the lesson. Since this question is to measure the student understanding, so the answer was commonly short. The fact is, the short answer mostly performed by the students. This is supported Walsh (2006) argues that a shorter answer and simpler commonly found.

In addition, as the the purpose of this teaching, the students were expected to analyze and identify the social function, generic structure, text structure, and language features of analytical exposition, the teacher performed several questions to recall their memorizing and understanding. Those points were stated in the lesson plan **(see associating in appendix 5).** Here how the questioned were given as below:

Extract 4.13

T : Okay now, before we end this class, actually i would like you to conclude it, about analytical exposition. Who is remember what are the social function of analytical exposition?

S : to persuade the reader...

Extract 4.14

T : about something. And then? Okay, what is the generic structure of analytical exposition? The first?

Ss : Thesis, arguments, and conclusion.

T : yaa, thesis, arguments, and conclusion.

Extract 4.15

T : And, do you still remember the language features of them?

Ss : use simple present tense...

T : use simple present tense, what else?

Ss : connectors

T : connectors.

Those questions and answers above were the evidences that the students have correctly

understood to what was being learned. As the indicator **(see appendix 5)**, those simply answered the second question of this study which is how the implementation of the feature in effective way helped the teacher to reach the teaching objective. This question and answer happened almost in the end of the teaching. So the post teaching learning was more emphasized to reach the learning objective.

Moreover, this present interaction below also contributed to answer the second question of this study.

Extract 4.16

G1 : so, the first pharagraph is number two, because that is the thesis of this text.

T : where is the thesis?

G1 : (points out) number two, aa pharagraph two. Next pharagraph five, this, but, aaaa, pharagraph one three, four, and six are the arguments. But, pharagraph five doesn't have word another, also, and other. And, pharagraph four, one, and six.

T : the last one is?

G1 : Six

The teacher apparently applied what she really meant on the lesson plan **(see questioning, exploring in appendix 5)** that the students trained to found the first idea, detail information from the topic. The student's answer above showed how she or he attempted to arrange the puzzle sentence arrangement. The teacher again merely responded by a short turn question for the students to complete their answer.

8. Form-Focused Feedback

This type of interaction is to correct student mistake during the classroom innteraction speccifically in term of form such as grammar, pronounciation, and vocabulary. As an example:

Extract 4.16

T : The car is not in Indonesia, how do you know?

S : *Setir di kiri.*

T : In English, please.

S : the steering is in the left.

In this extract, the teacher was giving feedback dealing with the student vocabulary where the student use indonesian and the teacher made a correction by asking the student to use englsih. In short, this interaction focus on the form rather than the content.

As the three remain features which were not performed (direct repair, content feedback, and referential question) leaving questionably. However, since at the very first this study stated that the students were literally capable in learning English. The teacher confirmed that they more attractive rather than another class. The implementation of English classroom interaction such brought them a fun learning supported by

PPT, video, and audio provided by the teacher. However, the language use by the teacher were the keys how an effective talk should be performed. The three remain features were seemed to be not necessary because the teacher did not found any grammatical error, mistake in structure, or miss-pronunciation during their learning related to direct repair. The content feedback was also one of the feature which was not performed. It means that the teacher just deal with the their contributions, answers, and responses by no feedback. The feedback here belongs to the message not the word use. It simply different if the teacher does interrupt when the student tries to respond and to correct them directly, because it has to be clasify as teacher interruption. Lastly, referential question was also include to those three remain feature. This was just because there was no complex question evoke during the interaction that made the teacher did not know literally the answer. However, this should be unfortunate knowing that this referential question was not available during the interaction. There could be open discussion if this referential question performed whether from the students or the teacher, especially for the students. They could more do practice their speaking. As Walsh (2011) argued that this referential question not merely to open discussion, but to provide speaking time for the students as well.

4. CONCLUSION

Afterall the identifying and analyzing done by classified the entire transcription into Interactional Features proposed by Walsh (2006), it was found that the teacher performed eleven features from out of fourteen. Those were scaffolding, extended-wait time, seeking clarification, confirmation check, extended-learner turn, teacher echo, teacher interruption, extended-teacher turn, turn completion, display question, and form-focused feedback. While those were performed, three of the remain features were not found through the talk, namely, direct repair, content feedback, and referential question.

Each of features mentioned above have their own role in establishing students' understanding during the teaching and learning process. They were related each other to promote language learning. From those eleven features performed by the teacher, display question was the most frequently used by the teacher. Even though it obtained short and simplier answer from the students, it beneficial as long as they responded through the target language. Then it was followed by extended-teacher turn, as the second frequently performed, and third, it was followed by seeking clarificationa and extending-learner.

A custom to speak the target language was implemented at the very first meeting by the teacher to establish students' confident and courage

to practice the target language. This first sight is very important to be clearly implemented in the very first meeting. However, the sensitivity of the teacher knowing the students ability is the vital one. A teacher holds responsibility to be creative wrap up the target language in an effective way. In addition, to keep the sight between teacher and students, a fun teaching learning is also required as to genuinely keep the chemistry one another. So that, the students would be more comfortable in learning the language. In this study, power point text, video and audio were used to attract students' motivation to learn. It also was helped by good and effective delivery from the teacher in promoting the target language as well.

However, as still there were features not performed by the teacher (direct repair, content feedback, and referential question), these were not mean that they less contribution towards the teaching learning. The talk conciously and unconciously would be following the flow of the interaction to deal with the message. Those features were not performed because none of those need to be performed.

The writer is still hoping for any further comments, and believed that none of words of human are perfect. This study somehow provided and supported by theories, and former studies related with this study which is to add factual awareness.

In this study, there were still three features which were not performed by the teacher to be fulfil in another study. For a temporary believe, allow this study to say that the talk contributes conciously and unconciously during the interaction. None of talk need to be performed as it is might be unnecessary. The eleven features performed by the teacher anyhow helped her to reach the teaching objective as well in teaching analytical exposition.

However, any further research as to claim that there is necessary to perform the entire interactional features by Walsh (2006) is still needed. Knowing that previous study conducted by Wasi'ah (2015) was the same where the teacher performed eleven features out of fourteen.

5. REFERENCES

Brown, H. Douglas. 2001. *Teaching by Principles; An interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy.* New York: Person Education.

Brown, K., & Kennedy, H. 2011. *Learning through Conversation and Extending Teacher and Children's Involvement in Classroom Talk.* London: School Psychology International.

Cullen, Richard. 1998. *Teacher Talk and the Classroom Context.* English Language Teaching Journal Vol. 25 No.3, 179-187.

Dudley-Evans, T., & St John, M. J. 1998. *Developments in ESP*. A Multidisciplinary Approach. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, Rod. 1994. *The Study of Second Language Acquisition (Oxford Applied Linguistic).* New York: Oxford University Press.

Harmer, Jeremy. (2003). *The Practice of English Language Teaching (3rd Ed.).* London: Pearson Educational Limited.

Krashen, Stephen D. 1981. *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning.* California. Pergamon Press Inc.

Kumaravadivelu, B. 1999. *'Critical classroom discourse analysis', TESOL Quarterly*, 33: 453–84.

Seedhouse, Paul. 1996. *Classroom Interaction: Possibilities and Impossibilities.* English Language Teaching Journal Vol. 50 No.1

Mercer, Neil. 1995. *The Guided Construction of Knowledge: Talk Among Teachers and Learners.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Miles, M.B., Huberman, A.M. and Saldana, J. 2014. *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook.* Sage, London.

Nunan, D. 1989. *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nuraini, K., and Hamim, M. 2015. *Teacher Talk in Vocational High School Context "Does it Matter?".* Muhammadiyah University of Malang, Malang

Renandya, W.A. 2018. *What Kind of English Proficiency is Needed for Effective Teaching?.* Education Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

Renandya, W.A., Le, V.C., Madya, S., Oda, M., Quah, S.H., & Sitthitikul, P. 2017. *Language teacher education in Asia.* Colloquium conducted at the AsiaTEFL Conference, 13-15 July 2017, Yogyakarta, Indonesia.

Richards, J.C. 2018. *Communicative competence.* Available at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RpGvWYPL7cU.

Richards, J. C. 2017. *Teaching English through English: Proficiency, Pedagogy and Performance.* RELC Journal, 48(1), 7-30.

Richards, J. C. 1991. *Towards Reflective Teaching.* TTT Journal. http://anyflip.com/ptji/cllr/basic

Richards, J.C., Platt, J., and Platt, H. 1992. *Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics.* London: Longman.

Richards, Keith. 2003. *Qualitative Inquiry in TESOL.* Aston University: MacMillan.

Seedhouse, Paul. 1996. *Classroom Interaction: Possibilities and Impossibilities.* English Language Teaching, Journal Vol. 50 No. 1.

Setiawati, Liani. 2012. *A Descriptive Study on Teacher Talk at EYL Classroom*. Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, Vol. 1 No. 2

Shamsipour, Anahita. 2012. *Teacher Talk and Learner Involvement in EFL Classroom: The Case of Iranian Setting.* Theory and Practice in Language Studies, Vol. 2, No. 11, pp. 2262-2268

Van Lier, L. 1996. *Interaction in the language curriculum: Awareness, autonomy and authenticity*. New York: Longman.

Walsh, Steve. 2002. *Construction or Obstruction: Teacher Talk and Learner Improvement in the EFL Classroom*. Language Teaching Research Vol. 6 No. 1, 3-23

Walsh, Steve. 2006. *Investigating Classroom Discourse*. New York. Routledge.

Walsh, Steve. 2011. *Exploring Classroom Discourse: Language in Action.* New York: Routledge.

Yan, Xiaou. 2006. *Teacher Talk and EFL in University Classroom.* Chongqing Normal University & Yangtze University, China.