

A Portrait of Indonesian EFL Teacher Talk and Student Talk in International Teaching Practicum: Thailand Classroom Context

Mila Ida Nurhidayah*, Nia Kurniawati, Dahlya Indra Nurwanti

UIN Sunan Gunung Djati, Bandung, Indonesia

*Corresponding author. Email: milaida79@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Several research studies have been conducted in recent years to investigate teacher talk and student talk in a classroom setting, with a focus on teachers' teaching and students' learning of a second or foreign language. The present research aimed to investigate the interaction of teacher and student talk in an EFL classroom in Thailand using the framework of the Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC) system. The study employed a descriptive qualitative design with one Indonesian English teacher and 31 Thai second-grade students. The findings showed six types of teacher talk were applied within the classroom, including asking questions, giving directions, accepting or using students' ideas, lecturing, praises or encouragement, and the more rarely used criticizing or justifying authority type. Nevertheless, the accepting feelings category was not present within the talk of the teacher in the research. In terms of student talk categories, student talk response was predominantly utilized over student talk initiation. The research also revealed the impact upon learning of the teacher talk and student talk was that the students lacked confidence to initiate talk due to the imbalance of indirect teacher talk. This research may also be utilized as a reference for teachers to reflect and develop upon their use of talk and activities for students in the classroom.

Keywords: *English classroom discourse, student talk, teacher talk, Thailand context.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Classroom interaction is a significant feature of the learning and the teaching course when examining an EFL classroom (Amatari, 2015; Nasir et al., 2019) as it permits the exchange of knowledge (Septiana, Hamzah, & Amri, 2019). Therefore, it is the interactions which decide the achievement of the teaching process and of the students' learning outcomes (Handayani & Umam, 2017). Nevertheless, classrooms have frequently been shown as teacher dominated (Blanchette, 2009; Boyd & Rubin, 2002; Sum & Kwon, 2020; Yanfen & Yuqin, 2010). Therefore, the current research is aimed to investigate the interaction of teacher talk and student talk in an EFL classroom.

In the teaching and learning process, teacher talk (TT) and student talk (ST) arises in the classroom. Teacher talk is the teacher's language of instruction utilized in the classroom (Xiao-Yan, 2006). Meanwhile, student talk is the language utilized by students to process their learning through reasoning, sharing, explaining, or applying their knowledge across several activities (Boyd, 2015). The

present research intends to explain which categories of teacher talk and student talk proposed by Flanders (1970) arise in an EFL classroom in Thailand.

Talk in a classroom context is a multi-faceted process for learning and teaching. Furthermore, talk permits the students to contribute to academic interaction. Talk could be utilized by teachers to control and direct the direction of the class (Basra & Thoyyibah, 2017), but it can also be a disruptive tool to limit participation to manage classroom behavior (Walsh, 2002 as cited in Chavez, 2016; Shamsipour & Allami, 2012). Therefore, the role of the teacher in the context of talk is to assist and steer the students to encourage active English learning and communication within the class (Teo, 2016; Vongsila & Reinders, 2016).

Furthermore, one role which is frequently seen as the normal responsibility for the teacher is to run the conducive learning environment for the students to develop their language skills (Islami, 2016). The teacher must persistently manage the relationship with them (LeBlanc, 2018) and utilize a communicative approach to

organize the classroom activities (Yanfen & Yuqin, 2010). Hence, the teacher's talk plays a key role in the process of language accomplishment (Rezaee & Farahian, 2012; Yanfen & Yuqin, 2010).

Moreover, the vital role which students play to improve their learning experience is to interact with the teacher to achieve well in the classroom. Student talk displays competence in communication and engaging in the language. Nevertheless, the students must undertake a gradual process of increasing their confidence in their knowledge and expertise in order to fluently engage in student talk. Students necessitate a supportive, engaging, and attentive environment to produce quality student talk (Boyd & Galda, 2011). Consequently, students must pay attention and build on their contributions in the classroom.

The present study is different from the previous research. Previous research by Jing and Jing (2018) explored the characteristics of EFL teacher talk and it reveals that teacher talk now still follows the widely acknowledged IRF (Initiation-response-feedback) pattern. Meanwhile, this current study centers on the types and impacts of teacher and student talk collectively. Additionally, the research addresses several inquiries regarding the aforementioned problem: 1) What categories of teacher talk rise in an EFL classroom? 2) What categories of student talk take place? 3) What are the impacts of the teacher talk to students in an EFL classroom in Thailand?

The writers hope that this research could be used by teachers for guidance and methods for managing an EFL classroom and for awareness of the effect of talk theory in the EFL classroom. The research has certain significance for language acquisition in the Indonesian EFL classroom setting given its focus on this area. EFL teachers might utilize the research as a form of guidance for reference when planning lessons and seeking to develop classroom communications. As it provides information about the quantities of student and teacher talk and the impact of this balance, it aims to encourage students to contribute more actively and positively in the class for their own learning advantage.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Classroom Interaction

Classroom interaction assumes a main part in the learning and teaching process a foreign language (Vongsila & Reinders, 2016). Classroom interaction is the interactions which take place in the classroom setting happening between the teacher and their students (Rezaee & Farahian, 2012), thus covering entire interactions in the teaching and learning process. Classroom interaction also permits for exchange between students themselves (Walsh, 2002; Westwood, 2008).

Sárosdy et al. (2006) state that classroom interaction is the pedagogy of learning itself. The method or practice of teaching is the interactions which happen in the class. The classroom comes to be a site of shared language and mirroring of the teacher's speech patterns and lexical choices by the students thus making the classroom interaction, a two-way process between the participants in the language process (Dagarin, 2004). Students would arrive at their own understanding and meaning of the interaction when spoken language becomes open to interpretation by the listener (Dobinson, 2001).

Moreover, there are extra roles of classroom interaction to increase the vocabulary in the students' language memory and permit students to improve the skills to utilize the vocabulary in practice thus they improve communication skills (Dobinson, 2001; Jiwandono & Rukmini, 2015; Thapa & Lin, 2013). Within this safe classroom space, students could be permitted to build confidence (Thapa & Lin, 2013) to use those communication skills. Additionally, they could build a good relationship with their teacher (Naimat, 2001; Yanfen & Yuqin, 2010 as quoted in Jiwandono & Rukmini, 2015) so that the teacher uses interactions to allow students to have their own ideas (Englert et al., 1991) and participation and they would feel respected.

2.2. Teacher Talk

Teacher talk conveys students with the occasion for classroom learning (Liu, 2008; Teo, 2016; Tsegaw, 2019; Walsh, 2002). Teacher talk is utilized to give instructions, describe activities, and check understanding (Sinclair & Brazil, 1982 as quoted in Yanfen & Yuqin, 2010). In addition, student contribution has been found to be completely dependent on the nature of the teacher talk in the classroom.

Teacher talk is divided into two distinct influences which are direct and indirect influence (Flanders, 1970 as quoted in Sahlberg, 2010). Indirect talk involves creating an atmosphere in the classroom for students to feel welcomed and able to participate more independently (Cochran, 1973). Meanwhile, direct influence is the role of the teacher in giving information and instruction (Sahlberg & Boce, 2010).

The teacher must use many methods of talk (Mercer, 2010) to create an interactive classroom, which FIAC recognizes several ways of doing. One of these techniques includes modifying their speech (Walsh, 2002) such as utilizing simple sentences (Takahashi-Breines, 2002). The teacher might also paraphrase what they say many times to enforce the message of learning (Takahashi-Breines, 2002).

Another method the teacher might utilize is question (Åberg, 2017; St. John & Cromdal, 2016; Takahashi-Breines, 2002; Viiri & Saari, 2006; Walsh, 2002) to ensure interaction and engagement. A final method is

utilizing diverse teaching styles like group tasks (Salas, 2005) so that even weaker students can learn from their friends. The teacher must convey clear direction and interesting topics which are age appropriate for the students (Westwood, 2008) so that they would see the personal benefit for themselves to learn about this. The teacher must become a classroom manager in their role as a teacher (Gujjar & Choudhry, 2009; Marzano, Marzano, & Pickering, 2003; Norton, 1995; Steere, 1988) so that conversation stays on the topic and every student understands what is expected of them.

2.3. Student Talk

Student talk is a talk utilized by students to ask questions (Park, 2012; St. John & Cromdal, 2016), give their opinions, ideas (McElhone, 2013; Yanfen & Yuqin, 2010) and to clarify their understanding of a topic (Åberg, 2017). Based on FIAC theory, student talk is divided into two types: student talk response and student talk initiation. The student talk response is utilized to respond to the teacher, whereas the student talk initiation is when the student initiates the talk to the teacher or their friends (Åberg, 2017).

If students are stimulated to participate actively in classroom interaction, they would create progress and apply the target language so that language acquisition occurs more quickly. It would also aid the weaker students so that they feel confident to follow their peers in using the language in the class (Lai, 1994). If the students are active participants, the teacher is able to understand the level of the students and identify weak areas to tailor their materials.

However, the audible talk of students is as significant as what they do not verbalize. Students use silence when interaction is paused. It also can signal confusion (Amatari, 2015), either in that many students are trying to speak or answer at one time. The former silence is a vital part of showing the variation of methods in learning. The latter, however, shows whether the interaction is working well to inspire students to talk, or is failing in those students are less interested in the topic. FIAC theory makes this essential distinction so that the researcher could analyze the success of the interactions for the students.

2.4. Teacher Talk and Student Talk in FIAC Theory

Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories (Flanders, 1970) theory classifies ten different types of teacher talk and student talk, with seven categories related to teacher talk, two for student talk, and the final is silence (Etter, 2005; Nasir et al., 2019; Schermer & Fosker, 2020; Septiningtyas, 2016). FIAC focuses on teacher and student interaction (Cotton, Stokes, & Cotton, 2010) and code types of interaction analysis to identify the quantity

of verbal interaction that happens in the classroom (Etter, 2005; Tsegaw, 2019).

In FIAC theory, teacher talk comprises direct influence and indirect influence (Mahmoodi, 2016). Indirect influence consists of four portions:

- 1) Accepting feelings: The teacher might confirm the student's feelings based on their tone used but must do so in a non-threatening way (Amatari, 2015).
- 2) Praise and encouragement: Here, the teacher praise their student, so they know their behavior is acceptable to the teacher. For instance, saying 'good job', 'excellent', 'correct', et cetera (Nasir et al., 2019).
- 3) Accepting or using student's ideas: The student shares their idea or understanding, and the teacher would support this and develop the idea (Dagarin, 2004) so the student's viewpoint is affirmed and explored.
- 4) Asking questions: If the teacher asks an inquiry about the topic or the instructions, they could clarify if the students have understood and give them a chance to explain in their own words (Kim & Ahn, 2017).

The direct influence of the teacher contains three further types:

- 1) Lecturing: The teacher describes the content as facts or gives their informed opinions and ideas (Sahlberg, 2010).
- 2) Giving directions: This is the commands for students to follow (Nasir et al., 2019).
- 3) Asserting authority or criticizing the students: The teacher might have to justify their actions to students so that they would accept them.

The following two points describe how students utilized talk in classroom interaction:

- 1) Response: The student responds to the teacher.
- 2) Initiation: The student initiates the talk to the teacher or the other students.

Finally, silence can be utilized by the teacher and students:

- 1) Silence or confusion: This is marked by pauses or short periods where no verbal interaction occurs (Sahlberg, 2010).

2.5. The Impacts of Teacher Talk to Student in Classroom Interaction

Students expect teachers to prepare for real-life situations they may encounter and provide them with the vocabulary and language skills necessary to show

confidence and skill in these situations. Since speaking skills are how people judge the social status, professional status, and educational level of others (Bygate, 2010), students can measure their value and rank in society based on their capability to express verbally in the target language.

Teachers should utilize various activities to inspire students to participate and promote learning. Regarding FIAC theory, teachers must generate an atmosphere where students have the chance to respond and express their thoughts, make them feel worthy as speakers, encourage open-minded expression, and make them actively participate in decision-making and dialogue (Al-Sfasfh, 2005). At the same time, nevertheless, the teacher must have enough control over the class by using speech to keep the discussion on topic. This environment not only strengthens the student-teacher relationship, but also helps the teacher to achieve their goals for the students' progress (Al-Badri, 2005).

In addition, the evaluation of theoretical classes in the classroom can have a positive influence on the practice of teachers. It forces people to reflect on present techniques and performance in order to assess which ones are effective and which are not for teachers and students in order to view their practice objectively and develop improved learning plans that will benefit students (Al-Sfasfh, 2005).

For teachers, talk is used to achieve teaching goals that help students progress and share skills and knowledge with students. FIAC then allows teachers to reflect on their use of speeches to ensure that they do their best to achieve their goals and continue to improve as educators. Thus, teacher-student interaction affects classroom interaction and affects learning (Alkhazraji, 2018; Putri, 2015).

3. METHOD

This study implemented a qualitative approach in the form of a descriptive design. It is used to explain the types of teacher talks, student talks and their impact on the English as a foreign language classroom. Furthermore, this qualitative research design is supported by a simple statistical calculation (percentage) to support the research results (Septiningtyas, 2016).

In addition, this study used a two-stage data collection process to support this research. First, the data was collected through video documentation, and then the interviews were conducted for the purpose of the research. The video of second-grade students is chosen for the investigation, because it was observed that students were accustomed to participating in classroom interactions. This phenomenon helps researchers to enrich research data in a natural way (Emilia, 2005).

Table 1. Interview questions for teacher

No.	List of Question
1.	Which kind of talk did you use mostly in the classroom; indirect talk or direct talk?
2.	Do you always accept students' positive or negative feelings during teaching?
3.	In what way, usually, do you encourage your students to be active in class?
4.	How do you accept students' ideas?
5.	Do you often ask questions to the students? Why?
6.	How do you explain the material to the students?
7.	What do you usually do to make your students understand when giving directions?
8.	Have you ever criticized students' behavior or response in the class?

Adapted from Brown (2001); Septiningtyas (2016)

Additionally, interviews are conducted to complete the data collected and verify the reliability of the data. One pre-service teacher from one of universities in Indonesia who followed an international teaching internship program in Thailand has been interviewed in order to provide a deeper analysis. For her openness and readiness to involve this current research, the participant is selected for samples. Thus, current research uses purposeful sampling methods. The questions given to the teacher is as presented in Table 1.

Furthermore, the data is coded based on FIAC theory. The following Figure 1 is the observation tally sheet for assigning the code.

Coding systems are used to investigate interaction patterns (Amatari, 2015). Once the recorded data is transcribed, the utterances are coded sequentially from transcribed to each category number.

Day/Date :
 Meeting :
 Teacher's Name:
 Material :
 Class :

		Teacher indirect talk			Teacher direct talk				Student talk response		Silence	Total
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Teacher indirect talk	1											
	2											
	3											
Teacher direct talk	4											
	5											
	6											
Student talk response	7											
	8											
Silence	9											
	10											
Total												

Adapted from Hai & Bee (2006) as cited in Septiningtyas (2016)

Figure 1 Matrix of FIAC.

When the data is obtained from the analysis of the observation procedure matrix and matched in sequence, the data is calculated as the frequency of teacher-student dialogue in classroom interaction. The following are the formulas used:

a. Percentage of Teacher Talk (TT)

$$TT = \frac{C_1+C_2+C_3+C_4+C_5+C_6+C_7}{N} \times 100 \quad (1)$$

b. Indirect Teacher Talk Ratio (ITT)

$$ITT = \frac{C_1+C_2+C_3+C_4}{N} \times 100 \quad (2)$$

c. Direct Teacher Talk Ratio (DTT)

$$DTT = \frac{C_5+C_6+C_7}{N} \times 100 \quad (3)$$

d. Percentage of Student Talk (ST)

$$ST = \frac{C_8+C_9}{N} \times 100 \quad (4)$$

e. Silence or Confusion Ratio (SC)

$$SC = \frac{C_{10}}{N} \times 100 \quad (5)$$

f. Indirect and Direct Ratio (I/D)

$$\frac{I}{D} = \frac{C_1+C_2+C_3+C_4}{C_5+C_6+C_7} \quad (6)$$

Finally, combined with the research questions of this study, the results of the percentages of each category are analyzed. The coding process and interviews are very useful for the researcher’s explanation. The coding process was used as the main data source, while the interviews were used as additional data to verify the results.

4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Types of Teacher Talk in the Classroom




Figure 2 The result of matrix analysis of FIAC.

It was revealed that teacher talk type was found to be the most widely used, followed by student talk, and finally silence in an EFL classroom in Thailand. It can be seen in Figure 2 that during the teaching internship in

Table 1. The Result of Matrix from Observation of Teacher Talk in FIAC

No.	Types of Teacher Talk	Percentage	Total Percentage
1.	Accepting feelings	-	Indirect talk: 38.26%
2.	Praises or encouragements	5.06%	
3.	Accepting or using ideas of students	8.3%	
4.	Asking questions	24.9%	
5.	Lecturing	5.06%	Direct talk: 17.41%
6.	Giving direction	11.74%	
7.	Criticizing or justifying authority	0.61%	

Adapted from Brown (2001); Septiningtyas (2016)

Thailand, the teacher talk has the proportion 55.67% of the total, while the student talk accounted for 40.69% and the lowest proportion of silence was 3.64%. In addition, Table 1 illustrates the matrix results of teacher talk types and their proportions in teaching practice.

Accepting feelings

Based on the data from the classroom learning, accepting feelings in teacher talk did not appear. It was neglected because students simply let the learning flow; the students also seemed to delight in the teaching given by the teacher. Even though this type of teacher talk did not emerge in the data finding, the class can still run well. Additionally, as the teacher is a foreign English teacher, the students felt excited about being with her which seemed to show from their behavior. Hence, accepting feelings does not increase teaching practice in the classroom.

Praises or encouragements

The proportion of praises or encouragements has a ratio 5.06%. Here is an example from the data.

Excerpt 1

Teacher : What color is it? #4

Malai : It is pink. #8

Teacher : It is pink. Very good. #2

The Excerpt 1 revealed praises or encouragements from the teacher to the student after he answered the teacher’s inquiry correctly. The teacher used the words ‘very good’ to praise her students. Furthermore, the data revealed that the teacher utilized the words ‘come on’ and ‘you are very brave’ to motivate the students’ to be willing to come to the front of the class. Such praise or encouragement is usually intentionally used to reward students verbally and positively (Nasir et al., 2019). In addition, it can also enhance students’ interest in the subject being studied.

Accepting or using ideas of students

According to the data, the type of accepting or using students’ ideas was revealed to have a proportion of 8.3%. Excerpt 2 demonstrates an instance of this kind of teacher talk from the data.

Excerpt 2

Aslan : Teacher, this orange? #9

Teacher : Yes, it is orange. #3

In Excerpt 2, it is obvious that the teacher accepted the students' ideas and developed them. The teacher answered "Yes, it is orange" with a complete and simple sentence. She assumed that by giving a basic example, it would be easier for students to understand how to organize speech. This type accepts students' thoughts rather than their feelings (Hai & Bee, 2006).

Asking questions

With the proportion of 24.9%, asking questions became the second main type of conversation used by teachers. Excerpt 3 shows a case in which a teacher asked a student a question.

Excerpt 3

Teacher : What color do you like? #4

Asnee : I like white. #8

In Excerpt 3, the teacher asked the students what color they liked. She applied asking questions to ensure that her student can finally distinguish the color types and speak correct simple sentences after explaining the lesson. Asking questions can be used to check if the student is on the right track or understands the given lesson (Park, 2012).

Lecturing

Based on the data, it was discovered that the teacher applied lecturing type in the classroom for a ratio of 5.06%. The following Excerpt 4 an example from the data.

Excerpt 4

Teacher : It is pink. #5

Students : It is pink. #8

Teacher : It is pink. #5

Students : It is pink. #8

According to Excerpt 4, the teacher applied lecturing to explain simple grammatical materials for students to understand. She also described it in a simple way so that students would not be confused about the arrangement of sentences. She repeated the words repeatedly, and then the students followed her to improve their pronunciation. This phenomenon is very common in Indonesian English classes (Suryati, 2015). Thus, she tried to use it in an English classroom in Thailand.

Giving directions

According to the data, giving directions is the third main type used in the classroom. It represents 11.74% of all types of teacher talk. Example of the data is as follows:

Excerpt 5

Teacher : Now, look at your class. Look at your class. If the teacher says, "Please, touch something white".

Teacher touches white. If the teacher says, "Please,

touch something blue". Teacher touched blue. You can go wherever in your class. #6

The Excerpt 4 displays a time when the teacher gave direction to the students to do an activity. Teachers used this type of teacher talk since learning foreign languages requires more processing and teacher guidance. Hence, she often applied this kind of giving directions in her teaching class.

Criticizing or justifying authority

This type of teacher talk is the least utilized type, accounting for only 0.61% of all data. The following Excerpt 6 demonstrates this kind of teacher talk from the data.

Excerpt 6

Teacher : You have a pen? #4

Maleek : No. #8

Teacher : Why? No pen? #7

Excerpt 6 shows how the teacher criticized the students for not bringing the necessary stationery. She criticized her students with "why". Moreover, the word "why" and "what" can be used to criticize students for misbehaviour. This type of teacher talk included when the students are noisy, out of control, or to get their attention. However, by criticizing the students, she made sure not to hurt their feelings or negatively affect their behaviour (Gharbavi & Irvani, 2014).

Data from Interview
Accepting feelings

In the following IE2, the teacher explained about accepting students' feelings during the teaching process.

IE2 : Mmm, I think not. There were no students who said that kind of thing. They tend to just obey the teacher. Suppose I guide an activity, they just follow along. Like just enjoying any activity.

The data in IE2 shows that the teacher explained that she did not do anything to accept the students' feelings. This is because the students like this class and just follow her instructions. She further explained that she always made the class interesting by doing a lot of interesting activities so that the students would not get bored. In addition, according to the data, Thai students seem to enjoy the enthusiasm of learning with foreign teachers.

Praises or encouragements

The following IE3, the teacher explained about the teacher's praises or encouragement to her students.

IE3 : Suppose someone answers, for example, I ask, "What colour is it?" Then it is usually answered by all students first, such as, "It is blue" Then I ask a specific student whose name is called, like, "What colour is it?" "It is blue" Then we reply "Very good. Thank you so much".

The data in IE3 illustrates that the teacher established that she used praise and encouragement in the teaching

process. She opined that young students should be recognized to make them happy and increase their confidence. In addition, she believes that by appreciation, students will feel accepted for their reaction to the teacher's conversation.

Accepting or using ideas of students

Here the teacher answered how she accepts or uses students' ideas throughout her teaching process.

IE4 : As I usually do, suppose he answers my question then I reply, "Yes, that's right". Or to make sure, I repeat what he answered. Then if there is something incomplete, I will re-evaluate the correct answer. Reproduced but in the correct version.

The teacher answered that she accepted the ideas of the students, said 'That is correct', or repeated what they said, and then provided additional information. Also, if students' ideas are less correct, the teacher will reword their utterances, but in the correct answer. In this way, students will know the correct answer without feeling rejected.

Asking questions

The following IE5 clarifies how often the teacher asked questions to her students.

IE5 : Oh yes, I do. You have to do that as that's a form of evaluation, too. So, if we teach, we must determine if that is already understood by them or not. Thus, there must be questions for evaluation.

The IE5 indicates that the teacher approved that she often used asking question type to the students. Suppose that asking questions is a way of assessing whether students have understood the lesson. Additionally, by asking questions, students have the opportunity to speak English, which will become a communicative classroom. Therefore, one of the teaching objectives can be achieved.

Lecturing

Lecturing took place during the teaching process because it described the material provided to the students. IE6 explained how teachers give lectures in the classroom.

IE6 : Mmm, if I am explaining, I must use English. The problem is that there was a language barrier because we have different native languages, so we have to use English, which we both understand. Also so that they get used to it, too. Thus, in English class, we just speak English as well. However, when I explain it to the young learners, it must be simple due to the nature of the young learners.

The teacher replied that when teaching elementary school students, she always utilized simple words so that students can understand easily. It is the nature of young students to explain in plain and clear language. In addition, there is a language barrier between the teacher

and the student, which causes the teacher to use English as simple as possible. This is since young students have limited vocabulary knowledge and limited understanding of English. However, if students still do not understand, one way is to use gestures to explain the word.

Giving directions

The following IE7, the teacher described about giving directions in her classroom activity.

IE7 : It is the same as teaching when I explain the material. Must be simple. What they have to do, straight to the point. Use words they can understand easily.

The IE7 shows that the teacher gave the instruction to the students the same as giving lecturing, that is by using simple words. Additionally, it must be straight to the point so that the students do not get confused. The students are also required to check if they had understood or had got the directions.

Criticizing or justifying authority

In IE8, the teacher responded about criticizing or justifying authority of the behaviour of the students which occurred in the learning process.

IE8 : Yes, I have. During English lessons, there was a textbook for them to study. Then there was a student who didn't bring that book, he was asked "Why", "What is the reason?" Then if they said "Forget" or anything, I reminded him to not forget to bring the book again.

Interview data in IE8 showed that the teacher clarified that she used criticism of student behaviour. She further explained that if students were noisy or did not bring stationery or even textbooks to class, she thinks it is necessary to criticize the students for doing this. In addition, she believes that criticism will make students more self-disciplined and will not repeat the same mistakes.

4.2. Types of Student Talk in the Classroom

Observation data found that student talk accounted for 40.69% of the total FIAC category. Moreover, student talk in FIAC theory includes student talk response and student talk initiation.

Student talk response

Student talk response is a talk used by students in response to their teacher (Amatari, 2015). According to the result data on Figure 3, it can be concluded that the proportion of student talk response type is 38.46%.




Figure 3 The distribution of student talk.

Excerpt 7 shows an example of an actual classroom conversation:

Excerpt 7
 Teacher : Yes or not? #4
 Students : Yes. #8
 Teacher : Is it blue? #4
 Students : Yes. #8

In Excerpt 7, when the teacher asked the students, the students' talk response occurs. It is supposed that to make the students willing to speak should be asking them questions, just like students answering questions from teachers. In addition, even if she used simple sentences, the teacher tries to make the class talkative. Furthermore, the teacher further explained that simple sentences are a good way to learn grammar without getting confused with the rules.

Student talk initiation

Student talk initiation is a conversation started by the student without being asked for (Hai & Bee, 2006). According to the data, it was revealed that the type of student talk initiation only has a ratio 2.23% of the time. An example of the data is in Excerpt 8 below.

Excerpt 8
 Sifan : Is this red? #9
 Teacher : No, it is orange. #3
 Maleek : This red? #9
 Teacher : Yes. #3

Excerpt 8 is an example of student talk initiation that occurred in the learning process. The students initiated a talk to the teacher to confirm their chosen color. It is a rare event that students start talking with teachers and classmates during the learning activities. Suppose that since the students' English proficiency is beginner, the students began to talk to their teachers only when necessary.

Silence or Confusion

Both teachers and students can use silence or confusion (Amatari, 2015). This occurs when no verbal contact happens for a moment (Dagarin, 2004). It can be seen from the data that the rate of silence is 3.64%. An example from the data (see Excerpt 9) revealed a case where a student is confused by what the teacher said:

Excerpt 9
 Teacher : Do you know coconut? #4
 Students : (They are silent for 4 seconds) #10
 Teacher : Do you know coconut? #4

Students : Coconut... coconut... (They seem confused) #10

In Excerpt 9, the students thought they did not know what coconut meat and got very confused, so they were just silent. In addition, the teacher asked many times, trying to make the students understand the meaning. Finally, even if they answered in Thai, the students understood.

4.3. The Impacts of Teacher Talk to Student Talk upon Learning Process

In these results, it was found that student-initiated talk accounted for only 2.23% of all student interactions. This creates obvious boundaries for students, allowing them to recognize the right time to talk and how to frame the conversation. Related to the results of this study is that the proportion of student conversations is seriously unbalanced in response rather than initiative. This effect can make students contribute less to the classroom.

The teacher's talk pattern is dominated by asking questions, which represents 24.9% of her talk pattern. The second result is giving direction, in 11.74% of her talk. Although the teacher uses asking questions in her words, this helps teachers to check the listening and understanding of the students. As the second major category, giving direction is usually used to explain what they have to do and utilize words that are easy for them to understand. It enables teachers and students to understand when their mother tongues are different.

However, although the teacher talk promoted active participation and created an atmosphere that surpassed Flanders' initial discovery that student talk accounted for only 20% of the exchange, it can be said that the wrong type of student talk was encouraged as student response was clearly dominated by initiation. It can be said that the teacher has partially achieved the goals set in the FIAC theory, so the teacher can monitor and realize the progress of the students, as shown by the students keenly able to respond to her enquiries (Al-Badri, 2005). On the other hand, the second goal of teachers to strengthen the relationship between teachers and students cannot be achieved while the students feel discouraged from initiating talk.

The data shows that silence only represents 3.64% of the time. Students respond to uncertainty about materials or teaching with silence rather than asking the teacher to explain or clarify their meaning again. This demonstrates that the current classroom is still teacher-dominated and has not fully created a student-dominated educational space. This idea is consistent with the current shift towards modern teaching methods in recent years, where the methods and experiences of students become strategies for shaping the curriculum (Shinn, 1997).

5. CONCLUSION

To sum up, according to data analysis, teachers tend to use indirect talk rather than direct talk during the teaching process. Indirect talk accounted for 38.26% of total teacher conversations, and direct talk accounted for 17.41% of total teacher conversations, which is 55.67% in total. In addition, teachers influence students by asking questions, giving directions, accepting or using students' ideas, lecturing, praises or encouragements in the most frequent order, as well as the types of criticizing or justifying authority that are rarely found. Furthermore, this study did not find the accepting feeling type in the learning process.

Regarding student talk, two types of student talk appeared in the classroom, namely, response and initiation. Student talk accounted for 40.69% of total time, student talk responses accounted for 38.46%, and student talk initiation accounted for 2.23%.

In the context of international teaching practice, teacher talks and student talks in classroom discourse have an impact on the learning process. The impact is that, unless they are guided by a teacher, today's students lack the confidence to start speaking, and unless it is properly addressed, this will continue to affect their environmental life. Teachers must also reflect on feedback, because accepting students' feelings and using students' ideas is a basic way to make them feel valued.

The writer admits that the current research is conducted through one meeting classroom. Moreover, due to the Covid-19 pandemic, students who participated in the interview were not interviewed because the distance was too far. Students also were not allowed to bring mobile phones, and it was difficult to contact students. Therefore, other researchers in the future may use more than one meeting to do the same research, to explore more of the teacher-student talk, and to interview the participating students, so that the type of student talk can be verified as well. It is also recommended to find out about the current composition of characteristics of both teacher talk and student talk. In addition, it is advised for future researchers to discover the language or cultural barriers during international teaching as it plays an important role in the imbalance between teacher and student talk.

REFERENCES

- Åberg, M. (2017). Talk, text, and tasks in student-initiated instructional interaction. *Discourse Processes*, 54(8), 618–637. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0163853X.2016.1139966>
- Al-Badri, T. (2005). Management of classroom verbal interaction “Principles and Procedures.” *Dar Al Thaqa for Publishing and Distribution*.
- Alkhazraji, A. M. (2018). Analyzing the impact of teacher talk on English grammar learning: with correlation to the procedures in classroom interaction. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 9(5), 1109–1115. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0905.27>
- Al-Sfasfh, A. (2005). Management of classroom and verbal interaction. *Yazeed Center for Student Services*.
- Amatari, V. O. (2015). The instructional process: A review of Flanders' interaction analysis in a classroom setting. *International Journal of Secondary Education*, 3(5). <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijsedu.20150305.11>
- Basra, S. M., & Thoyyibah, L. (2017). A speech act analysis of teacher talk in an EFL classroom. *International Journal of Education*, 10(1), 73. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ije.v10i1.6848>
- Blanchette, J. (2009). Characteristics of teacher talk and learner talk in the online learning environment. *Language and Education*, 23(5), 391–407. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500780802691736>
- Boyd, M. P. (2015). Relations between teacher questioning and student talk in one elementary ELL classroom. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 47(3), 370–404. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1086296X16632451>
- Boyd, M. P., & Galda, L. (2011). *Real talk in elementary schools: Effective oral language practice*. New York: Guilford.
- Boyd, M. P., & Rubin, D. L. (2002). Elaborated student talk in an elementary ESOL classroom. *National Council of Teachers of English*, 36(4), 495–530. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40171587?seq=1>
- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (2nd ed.). New Jersey: Longman.
- Bygate, M. (2010, September 3). *Speaking*. The Oxford handbook of applied linguistics. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195384253.013.0004>
- Chavez, M. (2016). The first language in the foreign language classroom: Teacher model and student language use – an exploratory study. *Classroom Discourse*, 7(2), 131–163. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2016.1149499>
- Cochran, M. M. (1973). Education for slow-learners: Student-teacher interaction process. *Sociological Focus*, 6(3), 100–110. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00380237.1973.10570855>

- Cotton, D. R. E., Stokes, A., & Cotton, P. A. (2010). Using observational methods to research the student experience. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 34(3), 463–473. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03098265.2010.501541>
- Dagarin, M. (2004). Classroom interaction and communication strategies in learning English as a foreign language. *ELOPE: English Language Overseas Perspectives and Enquiries*, 1(1–2), 127–139. <https://doi.org/10.4312/elope.1.1-2.127-139>
- Dobinson, T. (2001). Do learners learn from classroom interaction and does the teacher have a role to play? *Language Teaching Research*, 5(3), 189–211. <https://doi.org/10.1177/136216880100500302>
- Emilia, E. (2005). *A Critical Genre-Based Approach to Teaching Academic Writing in A Tertiary Level EFL Context in Indonesia* (Doctoral dissertation, Melbourne University). Retrieved from <https://minerva-access.unimelb.edu.au/handle/11343/39548>
- Englert, C. S., Raphael, T. E., Anderson, Helene M. Anthony, L. M., & Stevens, D. D. (1991). Making strategies and self-talk visible: writing instruction in regular and special education classrooms. *American Educational Research Journal*, 28(2), 337–372. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312028002337>
- Etter, F. C. (2005). *Use of the Flanders interaction analysis categories as a tool for providing descriptive data on the verbal interactions between mentor teachers and novice teachers during one-to-one conferences*. Southern Illinois University. Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/openview/fcf17d9649d57c7229b8ef8411a5ea5/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y>
- Flanders, N. A. (1970). *Analyzing Teaching Behavior*. Addison-Wesley Pub. Co.
- Gharbavi, A., & Irvani, H. (2014). Is teacher talk pernicious to students? A discourse analysis of teacher talk. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 552–561. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.451>
- Gujjar, A. A., & Choudhry, B. N. (2009). Role of teacher as classroom manager. *Journal on Educational Psychology*, 2(4), 65–73. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1097655>
- Hai, S. K., & Bee, L. S. (2006). Effectiveness of interaction analysis feedback on the verbal behaviour of primary school mathematics teachers. *Jurnal Pendidik Dan Pendidikan*, 115–128.
- Handayani, A., & Umam, A. (2017). Teacher talk time in English classroom. *English Journal*, 20(2), 54–61.
- Islami, M. (2016). Character values and their internalization in teaching and learning English at Madrasah. *Dinamika Ilmu*, 16(2), 279. <https://doi.org/10.21093/di.v16i2.417>
- Jing, N., & Jing, J. (2018). Teacher talk in an EFL classroom: A pilot study. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 8(3), 320–324.
- Jiwandono, D., & Rukmini, D. (2015). Types of classroom interactions in the implementation of mini drama script project. *English Education Journal*, 5(2), 7. <http://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/eej>
- Kim, H., & Ahn, S. (2017). *An analysis of verbal interaction in elementary school class using the Flanders interaction analysis categories*. 20(4), 2383–2389. <https://search.proquest.com/openview/a72b34dd45ac075f40f8513278edc32b/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=936334>
- Lai, C. (1994). Communication failure in the language classroom: An exploration of causes. *REL C Journal*, 25(1), 99–129. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003368829402500105>
- LeBlanc, R. J. (2018). Managed confrontation and the managed heart: Gendered teacher talk through reported speech. *Classroom Discourse*, 9(2), 150–165. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2018.1441728>
- Liu, Y. (2008). Teacher–student talk in Singapore Chinese language classrooms: A case study of initiation/response/follow-up (IRF). *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 28(1), 87–102. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188790701850071>
- Mahmoodi, F. (2016). The effect of teacher talk style on student achievement. *International Journal of Educational & Psychological Researches*, 2(4), 205–212. <https://doi.org/10.4103/2395-2296.189668>
- Marzano, R. J., Marzano, J. S., & Pickering, D. (2003). *Classroom management that works: Research-based strategies for every teacher*. ASCD.
- McElhone, D. (2013). Pressing for elaboration in student talk about texts. *The Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 48(1), 4–15. JSTOR. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43858883>
- Mercer, N. (2010). The analysis of classroom talk: Methods and methodologies. *British Journal of*

- Educational Psychology*, 80(1), 1–14.
<https://doi.org/10.1348/000709909X479853>
- Naimat, G. (2001). Influence of teacher-students interaction on EFL reading comprehension. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 23(4), 672–687.
- Nasir, C., Yusuf, Y. Q., & Wardana, A. (2019). A qualitative study of teacher talk in an EFL classroom interaction in Aceh Tengah, Indonesia. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8(3), 525.
<https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v8i3.15251>
- Norton, R. C. (1995). *The quality classroom manager*. Routledge.
- Park, I. (2012). Asking different types of polar questions: The interplay between turn, sequence, and context in writing conferences. *Discourse Studies*, 14(5), 613–633.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445612454077>
- Putri, D. S. (2015). The analysis of teacher talk and the characteristic of classroom interaction in English as a foreign language classroom. *Journal of English and Education*, 3(2), 16–27.
<https://ejournal.upi.edu/index.php/L-E/article/view/4752>
- Rezaee, M., & Farahian, M. (2012). An exploration of discourse in an EFL classroom: Teacher talk. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 47, 1237–1241.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.806>
- Sahlberg, P. (2010). Hope of cooperative learning: Intentional talk in Albanian secondary school classrooms. *Intercultural Education*, 21(3), 205–218. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14675981003760408>
- Sahlberg, P., & Boce, E. (2010). Are teachers teaching for a knowledge society? *Teachers and Teaching*, 16(1), 31–48.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13540600903475611>
- Salas, M. R. (2005). Grouping techniques in an EFL classroom. *Actualidades Investigativas en Educación*, 5.
<https://doi.org/10.15517/aie.v5i3.9167>
- Sárosdy, J., Bencze, T. F., Poór, Z., & Vadnay, M. (2006). *Applied linguistics I*. Bölcsész Konzorcium.
- Schermer, M., & Fosker, T. (2020). Reconsidering methods for systematic classroom observation: The measurement and analysis of categorical time-series observations. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 43(3), 311–326.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1743727X.2019.1687667>
- Septiana, A., Hamzah, H., & Amri, Z. (2019, March). Verbal Interaction between Male and Female Teachers and Their Students in the English Classes. In *Seventh International Conference on Languages and Arts (ICLA 2018)* (pp. 513–516). Atlantis Press.
- Septiningtyas, M. (2016). A Study of Interaction in Teaching English to Young Learners (TEYL) Classroom using Flanders’ Interaction Analysis System. *Yogyakarta: The Graduate Program in English Language Studies Sanata Dharma University*.
- Shamsipour, A., & Allami, H. (2012). Teacher talk and learner involvement in EFL classroom: The case of Iranian setting. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(11), 2262–2268.
<https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.2.11.2262-2268>
- Shinn, Y. H. (1997). *Teaching strategies, their use and effectiveness as perceived by teachers of agriculture: A national study*.
<https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd/12244>
- Sinclair, J. M., & Brazil, D. (1982). *Teacher talk*. Oxford University Press.
- St. John, O., & Cromdal, J. (2016). Crafting instructions collaboratively: Student questions and dual addressivity in classroom task instructions. *Discourse Processes*, 53(4), 252–279.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0163853X.2015.1038128>
- Steere, B. F. (1988). *Becoming an Effective Classroom Manager*. SUNY Press.
- Sum, E. S. W., & Kwon, O. N. (2020). Classroom talk and the legacy of Confucian culture in mathematics classroom. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 88, 102964. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.102964>
- Suryati, N. (2015). Classroom Interaction Strategies Employed by English Teachers at Lower Secondary Schools. *TEFLIN Journal*, 26(2), 247–264.
<https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v26i2/247-264>
- Takahashi-Breines, H. (2002). The Role of Teacher-Talk in a Dual Language Immersion Third Grade Classroom. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 26(2), 461–483.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2002.10668721>
- Teo, P. (2016). Exploring the dialogic space in teaching: A study of teacher talk in the pre-university classroom in Singapore. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 56, 47–60.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.01.019>
- Thapa, C. B., & Lin, A. M. Y. (2013). *Interaction in English Language Classrooms to Enhance Students’*

- Language Learning*. Retrieved from https://uia.brage.unit.no/uia-xmlui/bitstream/handle/11250/139721/Thapa_2012_Exploring.pdf?sequence=1
- Tsegaw, S. A. (2019). An analysis of classroom interaction in speaking class by using FIAC system: Teachers questioning and feedback (Grade Seven Students in Focus). *Malaysian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (MJSSH)*, 4(7), 41–61. <https://msocialsciences.com/index.php/mjssh/article/view/301>
- Viiri, J., & Saari, H. (2006). Teacher talk patterns in science lessons: Use in teacher education. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, 17(4), 347–365. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10972-006-9028-1>
- Vongsila, V., & Reinders, H. (2016). Making Asian learners talk: Encouraging willingness to communicate. *RELC Journal*, 47(3), 331–347. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688216645641>
- Walsh, S. (2002). Construction or obstruction: Teacher talk and learner involvement in the EFL classroom. *Language Teaching Research*, 6(1), 3–23. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1362168802lr095oa>
- Westwood, P. S. (2008). *What teachers need to know about teaching methods*. Aust Council for Ed Research.
- Xiao-Yan, M. A. (2006). Teacher talk and EFL in university classrooms. *Unpublished master's thesis, Chongqing Normal University & Yangtze Normal University, China*, 5-13.
- Yanfen, L., & Yuqin, Z. (2010). A Study of teacher talk in interactions in English classes. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 33(2), 1–11.