

AN ANALYSIS OF TEACHER TALK IN ENGLISH CLASSES IN SMK PGRI 4 DENPASAR

ABSTRACT

By:
Ni Wayan Widha Astiti

The objective of this study at describing the types of Teacher Talk, the effectiveness/ineffectiveness of Teacher Talk, and the aspect of Teacher Talk in classroom observation. To meet the objective, sampling technique was employed to select three classes together with the three English teachers who taught in those classes. The data were collected through recorded classroom interaction, observer's field notes and questionnaire, while the data were analyzed qualitatively on the basis of Flander's Theory of the Teacher Talk (1980).

The Analysis of Teacher Talk Types includes identifying the different types of Teacher Talk, categorizing the various types of Teacher Talk into ten footing patterns and generalizing the relationship among these footing. The findings reveal that the three teachers most frequently used six footings such as Mediator, Evaluator, Learning task assignor, teaching material interpreter, inspector and classroom climate conductor.

The observation used three instruments to analyze the data; Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC) to identify the classroom interactions, teaching effectiveness elements based on the Walberg's theory, and Likert Scale to measure the students' opinion resulted from questionnaire. The results of the analysis showed that the most dominant characteristic in English classes was the student participation. It reflected that most of the teaching-learning time was devoted to questions and answers by the students. But, without the Teacher Talk the students could not devote their participation. The teacher spent 59.52% of the teaching-learning time, while the students spent 69.05% of the teaching-learning time. It showed that the students were active in the classroom interaction. The interaction in these English classes was in three-way communication; there were interaction between teacher-student, student-teacher, and students-students. The English classroom interaction also met the requirements of teaching effectiveness elements by Walberg (1986). The teaching effectiveness elements used in the classroom were in the form of academic learning time, the use of reinforcement, cues and feedback, co-operative learning, classroom atmosphere, higher order questions, advance organizers, direct instruction, indirect teaching and democratic classroom. Based on the students' opinion, the teaching learning process in the classroom was good enough however some students felt uncomfortable with the classroom atmosphere and the teacher's discipline of time.

The research found that there are three major Teacher Talk Aspects, covering physiological aspect, interpersonal aspect, pedagogical aspect, which are stated as strong / effective aspects.

Keyword: teacher talk, types of teacher talk, classroom interaction

ANALISIS TUTURAN GURU DI KELAS BAHASA INGGRIS PADA SMK PGRI 4 DENPASAR

ABSTRAK

Oleh:
Ni Wayan Widha Astiti

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mendeskripsikan jenis Tuturan Guru, efektivitas / tidak efektifnya Tuturan Guru, dan aspek Tuturan Guru di observasi kelas. Untuk memenuhi tujuan, teknik sampling yang digunakan untuk memilih tiga kelas bersama dengan tiga guru Bahasa Inggris yang mengajar di kelas. Data dikumpulkan melalui interaksi kelas yang direkam, catatan lapangan pengamat dan kuesioner, sedangkan data dianalisis secara kualitatif berdasarkan Teori Flander terhadap Tuturan Guru (1980).

Analisis Jenis Tuturan Guru mencakup identifikasi berbagai jenis Tuturan Guru, jenis Tuturan Guru dikategorikan menjadi sepuluh pola pijakan dan generalisasi saling berhubungan antara pijakan – pijakan tersebut. Temuan menunjukkan bahwa tiga guru yang paling sering digunakan enam pondasi seperti Mediator, Evaluator, Belajar tugas pemberi tugas, mengajar juru material, Inspektur dan konduktor kelas iklim.

Pengamatan menggunakan tiga instrumen untuk menganalisis data; Flanders Kategori Analisis Interaksi (FIAC) untuk mengidentifikasi interaksi kelas, elemen efektivitas mengajar berdasarkan teori Walberg, dan Skala Likert untuk mengukur pendapat siswa dihasilkan dari kuesioner. Hasil analisis menunjukkan bahwa karakteristik yang paling dominan dalam kelas bahasa Inggris adalah partisipasi siswa. Ini mencerminkan bahwa sebagian besar waktu belajar-mengajar yang telah dikhususkan untuk pertanyaan dan jawaban oleh para siswa. Tapi, tanpa Guru Bicara siswa tidak bisa mencurahkan partisipasi mereka. Guru menghabiskan 59,52% dari waktu belajar mengajar, sedangkan siswa menghabiskan 69,05% dari waktu belajar-mengajar. Hal ini menunjukkan bahwa siswa aktif dalam interaksi kelas. Interaksi dalam kelas-kelas bahasa Inggris dalam tiga-arah komunikasi; ada interaksi antara guru-siswa, siswa-guru, dan siswa-siswa. Interaksi kelas bahasa Inggris juga memenuhi persyaratan unsur efektivitas mengajar oleh Walberg (1986). Unsur-unsur efektivitas mengajar digunakan di dalam kelas adalah dalam bentuk waktu belajar akademis, penggunaan penguatan, isyarat dan umpan balik, koperasi belajar, suasana kelas, pertanyaan orde tinggi, penyelenggara muka, instruksi langsung, tidak langsung dan mengajar kelas demokratis. Berdasarkan pendapat para siswa, proses belajar mengajar di kelas cukup baik namun beberapa siswa merasa tidak nyaman dengan suasana kelas dan disiplin guru waktu.

Penelitian ini menemukan bahwa ada tiga Aspek utama Bicara Guru, meliputi aspek fisiologis, aspek interpersonal, aspek pedagogis, yang dinyatakan sebagai aspek yang kuat / efektif.

Kata Kunci: tuturan guru, jenis tuturan guru, interaksi kelas

I. INTRODUCTION

English has an important role in the world. Most people use English to

communicate with other people from other countries. Science, technology, art and culture development also cannot be

separated from the role of English language. For those reasons English has been taught at every level of education in Indonesia as the first foreign language (Ramelan, 1994:3)

English in SMK is conceptualized as an entity of complex linkages of content, substantive and syntactic structures, and beliefs about the subject discipline. English in SMK is relatively unexplored, especially from the view point of the teachers who are ultimately responsible for the student's learning.

In general SMK cannot be the same as SMA. Learning styles, needs and students' characteristics are very different. SMK students demand stricter disciplines of SMA's students. The worlds that require of vocational graduated students, SMK has a ready-made expertise in the world of work. Essentially, the teaching learning process has evident in student learning ability difference in the classroom. Therefore, it is vital that teachers focus more to the needs of their individual students. The teacher should not only focus on material achievement when teaching, they should also be able to treat the student individuals by the language used or "Teacher Talk". Thereby they can encourage and

motivate their students to accomplish their proficiency in all skills of English such as reading, writing, speaking and listening skills.

The language used by teacher or here after is referred as 'Teacher Talk' is a vital aspect of classroom based language teaching and learning since it is one of the main resources of language input for the learners. In line with the process of teaching, the teachers have to understand the philosophy of teaching itself.

Teaching is the activity of organizing student activities and providing good learning facilities so that the students can learn well. Usually, "Teacher Talk" involves different phonological, syntactic, lexical, or even discoursed modification with the objective of making the teacher's language more comprehensible for students. This means that a teacher must be able to equip themselves with a number of different skills and various kinds of knowledge that is essential for their success as a teacher.

According to Nafrina (2007:1) in addition to this linguistic aspects of "Teacher Talk", there are other aspects of Teacher Talk which are as important

as these linguistic aspects that language teachers can use in their talk not only neutrally to convey comprehensible information but also to express positive attitudes toward their students in the classroom.

In line with the background above, this study focused on how teachers effectively implement their talk to enhance student learning potential. As long as the Teacher Talk in all school grades, it is also very important to do in SMK especially in SMK PGRI 4 Denpasar which as a great place to do this study because its' allied School Based International (SBI) and also being set up to International Standart Organization (ISO) management standards which must prepare their students to have strengths skills of competencies are supported by good English. So, it is hard to do for teachers to focus their talk effectively on the need of their students which is different from one another. It also makes that the Teacher Talk is needed to help the teacher in developing students' learning, especially SMK students in English classroom interaction.

The researcher chose the Teacher Talk in English Classes based on FIAC

as a topic of this study with following consideration:

- a. The Teacher Talk is very important in teaching and the affect the student's acquisition.
- b. Through the Teacher Talk, the teacher can realize his role and what he is going to do.
- c. There are several methods of classroom interaction analysis, some of them are: Flanders' Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC), Foreign Language Interaction Analysis (FLINT) system, Initiation Response and Evaluation (IRE), Topically Related Sets (TRS). FIAC is the simplest one to be method of tis study.
- d. Based on Yang et.al in Huang (1998), the researcher analyze the type of Teacher Talk and Walbergs' Theory for occur the Teacher Talk effectiveness or ineffectiveness.

Based on the background above, the problems of the study are formulated as follows: (1) What types of Teacher Talk are there in English classes in SMK PGRI 4 Denpasar?, (2) How effective is the Teacher Talk in the teaching and learning activities? And what are the indications of effectiveness

(or ineffectiveness) as such?, and (3) What aspects of Teacher Talk occur in classroom interaction in English classes of SMK PGRI 4 Denpasar?.

Based on the research problem above, the objectives of the study are formulated as follow: (1) To describe and explain the Teacher Talk types as revealed in the interaction between them while they were in the classroom, (2) To describe and explain the effectiveness and/or ineffectiveness of Teacher Talk occurs in the interaction between teacher and student in relation to teaching learning activities, and (3) To describe and explain the aspects of Teacher Talk occur in classroom interaction.

II. RESEARCH METHOD

This study was designed as a descriptive qualitative research. In this respect, this study aimed to describe the Teacher Talk which had been applied by the teacher of class XI AP1, XI R2, and XI MM2 in SMK PGRI 4 Denpasar to treat the students based on their motivation and also their achievement level by using English as a foreign language.

The location of this study was in three classes at SMK PGRI 4 Denpasar.

This school was chosen because the school was allied SBI and also being set up to ISO Management standard which applies to perfect output for world of work cauldron.

The subject of this study were three English teachers and the object were the three English Teacher Talk along with their students to participate in the current study are eleventh grade students at SMK PGRI 4 Denpasar. To ensure anonymity, the real names of the teachers as well as the schools are kept confidential in the present study. The teacher who taught the eleventh-grade class is labeled Teacher A, the teacher who taught eleventh-grade class at the same school is referred to as Teacher B, and the teacher who taught eleventh-grade in another school is labeled Teacher C.

This study used several instruments to help the researcher in collecting the data. The instruments are check list and questioners. The data analysis activity was conducted through several steps. First, the researcher fulfilled some formal administrative procedure including getting the school principles' permission to collect the data, that is doing observation in the school classroom. As soon as the

permission was given, the researcher met the English teacher to make appointment for doing observation.

In this study, Teacher Talk was categorized into ten footings according to the function of their teacher talk types. They are (1) Learning task assignor, (2) Mediator, (3) Teaching material interpreter, (4) Unexpected events reactor, (5) Manager, (6) Evaluator, (7) Digresser, (8) Learning-space administrator, (9) Inspector, and (10) Classroom climate conductor.

The data to be analyzed in this study were the data of the teacher-learners interaction Analysis System suggested by this study, the researcher analyzed the observing data by using Flanders' Interaction Analysis Categories suggested by Allwright and Bailey (1991:10, 202-203). The researcher choose FIAC, because of its simple form.

The data analysis of the Teacher Talk categorized is descriptive in nature. The four steps of Flanders Interaction Analysis Categorized (FIAC) were used to analyze the data. The four steps of FIAC are presented below (the details are given in previous sub-chapter). (1) STEP 1: Coding the verbal interaction, (2) STEP 2: Plotting

the coded data into the matrix, (3) STEP 3: Analyzing the matrix to the categories, (a) Content Cross, (b) Teacher Control, (c) Teacher Support, and (d) Student Participation, and (4) STEP 4 : Analyzing the additional data: (a) Teacher's Talk, (b) Lecturing, (c) Direct Teaching, (d) Indirect Teaching, and (e) Silent.

III. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

1. Findings

a. Classroom Interaction Analysis

The characteristics of the classroom interaction Teacher Talk of each meeting in English Classes have been presented on the data results in the previous part of this chapter. The interpretation of data results will be presented as follows;

1). The Characteristics of Teacher Talk in Classroom Interaction in the First Meeting

The content cross was the most dominant characteristic in the first meeting. The proportion (50.00%) show that the teacher spent more time in teaching-learning process to ask questions and lecture.

The second dominant characteristics was the students'

participation. The students participated in responding the teacher's question and talking initiation. The proportion of student's participation in the first meeting was 88.46%, it means that the students were very active enough in the classroom interaction.

The teacher controlled was the third dominant characteristic in the first meeting. It spent 3.37% of teaching-learning time. From the result, it shows that the teacher spent a little time in giving directions and criticizing or justifying activity. While in supporting the students, teacher only spent 2.24% of the teaching-learning time. It shows that the teacher was rarely in praising or encouraging the students.

From the additional data results, the other characteristics of classroom interaction could be interpreted. The characteristics of classroom interaction in the first meeting are summarized below;

- The teacher spent more her talking time in lecturing (16.35%). She was giving facts or opinion about content or procedure with her own ideas and asking rhetorical questions to the students. It means

that lecturing was the dominant activity this teaching-learning time.

- Teacher used more direct teaching (57.51%) than indirect teaching (42.59%) in her talking time. It means that the teacher used more direct teaching in teaching her students; for example: lecturing, giving directions, and criticizing or justifying authority.
- The proportion of silent time was low in this classroom interaction. Silence or confusion in this classroom spent 3.85% of the teaching- learning time.

2) The Characteristics of Teacher Talk in Classroom Interaction in the Second Meeting

The content cross was also the most dominant characteristics in the second meeting. The proportion of content cross was 44.44%, it means that the teacher dominant in the classroom activities was still high enough but it was lower than the first meeting.

The second dominant characteristic in the second meeting was also students' participation. It spent 83.33% of teaching-learning time.

It shows that the students more participated very active but it's lower than in the first meeting.

Just like in the first meeting, the teacher control was the third dominant characteristic in the second meeting. It spent 3.24% of teaching- learning time. It had a same proportion with the first meeting. From the result, it shows that the teacher spend a little time in giving directions and criticizing or justifying activity. While in supporting the students, teacher only spent 3.39% of the teaching-learning time. It shows that the teacher was always in praising or encouraging the students.

From the additional data results, the other characteristics of TT in classroom interaction could be interpreted. The characteristics of TT in classroom interaction in the second meeting are summarized below;

- The teacher spent more her talking time in lecturing (12.96%). She was giving facts or opinion rarely about content or procedure with her own ideas and asking rhetorical questions to the students. It means that lecturing was the less dominant activity this teaching-learning time.

- Teacher used more direct teaching (53.33%) than indirect teaching (46.67%) in her talking time. It means that the teacher used more direct teaching in teaching her students; for example: lecturing, giving directions, and criticizing or justifying authority.
- Silence or confusion in this classroom spent 2.78% of the teaching- learning time. It means that pauses, short periods of silence, and periods of confusion in which communication cannot be understood by the observer were very low.

3). The Characteristics of Teacher Talk in Classroom Interaction in the Third Meeting

The most dominant characteristics in the third meeting was also content cross. The proportion of content cross was 40.28%; it means that the teacher did more less asking question and lecturing in classroom activities. During teaching-learning process, the teacher was not asking questions about content or procedure with the intent that a students' answer, she was seldom giving facts or opinion about content or procedure with her

own ideas and asking rhetorical question.

The next dominant characteristic was students' talk or students' participation. Whether the student was still talking more than the teacher, the proportion of students' talk was 80.56%, it means that the students were very active in the classroom interaction. The students were very active in responding teacher's questions in both of predictable and unpredictable response.

The teacher control in this meeting increased from the previous meetings. The proportion of the teacher control was 3.99%, it means that the teacher was giving more directions and criticizing or justifying activity in this meeting. While the teacher support was still in high proportion (6.48%), it means that the teacher used the limited time to accept feeling, to praise and encourage the students and to accept or use students' ideas.

From the additional data results, the other characteristics of TT in classroom interaction could be interpreted. Then the characteristics of

TT in classroom interaction in the third meeting are summarized below;

- Lecturing (6.94%) was the less dominant activities in teacher's talk time. She was giving little facts or opinion about content or procedure with her own ideas and asking rhetorical questions to the students. It means that lecturing was still the less dominant activity this teaching-learning time.
- Teacher used more direct teaching (57.49%) than indirect teaching (42.31%) in her talking time. It means that the teacher used more direct teaching in teaching her students; for example: lecturing, giving directions, and criticizing or justifying authority.
- The proportion of silent time was low in this classroom interaction. Silence or confusion in this classroom spent 5.56% of the teaching-learning time.

4). The Characteristics of Teacher Talk in Classroom Interaction in the Fourth Meeting

In the fourth meeting, content cross was still the most dominant characteristic; it was 79.12%. From the percentage, it could be interpreted that teacher spent the teaching-learning

time in asking questions and lecturing, but that was not too much. The students in this meeting were very active; they participated more in responding the teacher. The proportion of students' participation was 68.13% and it was dominant characteristic in the fourth meeting.

Teacher controlled in this meeting was increased from the three previous meetings. The proportion of teacher control was 2.38%, it means that the teacher was giving more directions and criticizing or justifying activity in this meeting. While the teacher support was also still in enough proportion (3.48%), it means that the teacher used the limited time to accept feeling, to praise and encourage the students and to accept or use students' ideas.

From the additional data results, the other characteristics of classroom interaction could be interpreted. The characteristics of classroom interaction in the second meeting are summarized below;

- The teacher spent her talking time for lecturing in proportion 12.09%. She was giving facts or opinion about content or procedure with her

own ideas and asking rhetorical questions to the students. It means that the proportion of lecturing was decreased in this teaching – learning time.

- Teacher still used more direct teaching (62.96%) than indirect teaching (37.04%) in her talking time. It means that the teacher used more direct teaching in teaching her students; for example: lecturing, giving directions, and criticizing or justifying authority.
- Silence or confusion in this classroom spent 6.59% of the teaching- learning time. It means that pauses, short periods of silence, and periods of confusion in which communication cannot be understood by the observer were not high enough.

From the discussion, it can be concluded that the classroom interaction in Immersion Class had the same characteristics in each meeting. The teacher was still the dominant in the teaching-learning Teacher spent more time in teaching learning process than the students. She usually taught the children by using direct influence. However, the students were active enough in the classroom interaction. It

can be seen from the results of the students' participation.

5). The Characteristics of Teacher Talk in Classroom Interaction in the Fifth Meeting

The content cross was the most dominant characteristics in the first meeting. The proportion (47.62%) shows that the teacher spent more time in teaching-learning process to ask questions and lecture.

The second dominant characteristics was the students' participation. The students participated in responding the teacher's question and talking initiation. The proportion of student's participation in the first meeting was 69.05%, it means that the students were in the classroom interaction.

The teacher controlled was the third dominant characteristic in the first meeting. It spent 2.38% of teaching-learning time. From the result, it shows that the teacher spent a little time in giving directions and criticizing or justifying activity. While in supporting the students, teacher only spent 4.37% of the teaching-learning time. It shows that the teacher was

rarely in praising or encouraging the students.

From the additional data results, the other characteristics of classroom interaction could be interpreted. The characteristics of classroom interaction in the first meeting are summarized below;

- The teacher spent more her talking time in lecturing (4.76%). She was giving facts or opinion about content or procedure with her own ideas and asking rhetorical questions to the students. It means that lecturing was the less activity this teaching-learning time.
- Teacher used more direct teaching (76.00%) than indirect teaching (24.00%) in her talking time. It means that the teacher used more direct teaching in teaching her students; for example: lecturing, giving directions, and criticizing or justifying authority.
- The proportion of silent time was low in this classroom interaction. Silence or confusion in this classroom spent 5.45% of the teaching- learning time.

6). The Characteristics of Teacher Talk in Classroom Interaction in the Sixth Meeting

The content cross was also the most dominant characteristics in the second meeting. The proportion of content cross was 57.47%, it means that the teacher dominant in the classroom activities was still high enough but it was lower than the fifth meeting.

The second dominant characteristic in the sixth meeting was also students' participation. It spent 75.86% of teaching-learning time. It shows that the students more participated very active but it's lower than in the first meeting.

Just like in the first meeting, the teacher control was the third dominant characteristic in the fifth meeting. It spent 1.72% of teaching- learning time. It had a same proportion with the first meeting. From the result, it shows that the teacher spend a little time in giving directions and criticizing or justifying activity. While in supporting the students, teacher only spent 4.60% of the teaching-learning time. It shows that the teacher was always in praising or encouraging the students.

From the additional data results, the other characteristics of TT in

classroom interaction could be interpreted. The characteristics of TT in classroom interaction in the second meeting are summarized below;

- The teacher spent more her talking time in lecturing (4.96%). She was giving facts or opinion rarely about content or procedure with her own ideas and asking rhetorical questions to the students. It means that lecturing was the less dominant activity this teaching-learning time.
- Teacher used more direct teaching (80.00%) than indirect teaching (20.00%) in her talking time. It means that the teacher used more direct teaching in teaching her students; for example: lecturing, giving directions, and criticizing or justifying authority.
- Silence or confusion in this classroom spent 4.60% of the teaching- learning time. It means that pauses, short periods of silence, and periods of confusion in which communication cannot be understood by the observer were very low.

From the discussion, it can be concluded that the classroom interaction in Immersion Class had the same characteristics in each meeting.

The teacher was still the dominant in the teaching-learning. Teacher spent more time in teaching learning process than the students. She usually taught the children by using direct influence. However, the students were active enough in the classroom interaction. It can be seen from the results of the students' participation.

b. Element Teaching of Teaching Effectiveness by Walberg

The data result of the observation was presented in the previous part of this chapter. In summary, the results of Teacher Talk in teaching effectiveness elements in the classroom activities are interpreted as follows;

1. First meeting; Teacher Talk in teaching effectiveness elements was on the classroom interaction. Use of reinforcement, cues and feedback, co-operative learning and democratic classroom were not appeared in the classroom interaction. It reached 60% of the teaching effectiveness (enough).
2. Second meeting; Teacher Talk in teaching effectiveness elements were on the classroom interaction. Use of reinforcement, cues and feedback, and co-operative learning

were not appeared in the classroom interaction. It reached 70% of the teaching effectiveness (effective).

3. Third meeting; 8 of 10 teaching effectiveness elements were on the classroom interaction. Co-operative learning and democratic classroom were not appeared in the classroom interaction. It reached 80% of the teaching effectiveness (effective).
4. Fourth meeting; all of the teaching effectiveness elements were on the classroom interaction. It reached 100% of the teaching effectiveness (very effective).

c. Students' Opinion on Teaching-Learning Process

The 30 students in English Classes at year eleventh SMK PGRI 4 Denpasar were asked to give their opinion about teaching-learning process in their English classes by responding to a checklist using Likert scale. Then the data results were analyzed by using Likert Scale. The findings of data results discussed as follows:

- 1). **Statement 1:** The result shows that 30% of students said that they disagreed and 30% of them were in neutral opinion. However 20% of the students agreed on the statement. It

could be said that this statement got neutral response from the students.

2). Statement 2: “The teacher uses the time efficiently.”. Statement number two was “teacher starts and ends the class on-time.” The result shows that 40% of students said that they disagreed, and 26.67% of them were in neutral opinion. However, 16.67% agreed on the statement. It could be said that this statement got neutral response from the students.

3). Statement 3: “The teacher on time in starting or ending the lesson” Statement number 3 was “the teacher gives explanation what they are going to learn in the beginning of the lesson.” The result shows that 50% of students said that they agreed, and 20% of them were in neutral opinion. It could be said that this statement got positive response from the students.

4). Statement 4: “The teacher explains the subject matter well and clearly.” Statement number 4 was “the teacher is efficiently organizing the teaching-learning time.” The result shows that 30% of students said that they disagreed, and 30% of them were in neutral opinion. But 20% of them strongly agreed and 16.67% of them agreed in this statement. It could be said

that this statement got neutral response from the students.

5). Statement 5: “Teachers interact with students by providing questions about the material being taught.” Statement number 5 was “the teacher explains the materials clearly.” The result shows that 50% of students said that they agreed, and 30% of them were in neutral opinion. Only 10% of them disagreed in this statement. It could be said that this statement got positive response from the students.

6). Statement 6: “If there are students who have little or no understanding of the subject matter, the teacher will explain to you again in a different way.” Statement number 6 was “the teacher re-explains the materials if the students don’t understand.” The result shows that 46.67% of students were in neutral opinion and 23.33% of them were disagreed. Only 16.67% of them agreed in this statement.

7). Statement 7: “In giving the questions to students, teachers give "keywords" to answer that question.” Statement number 7 was “the teacher interacts with the students by asking them questions related to the materials.” The result shows that 43.33% of students agreed and 30% of them were

in neutral response. Only 13.33% of them disagreed in this statement.

8). Statement 8: “If the answer is right or wrong from the student, the teacher will correct and notify the correct answer.” Statement number 8 was “the teacher helps the students to answer the questions by giving clues.” The result shows that 40% of students agreed and 26.67% of them were in neutral response.

9). Statement 9: “The teacher asks the students to do the work in groups in the classroom.” Statement number 9 was “the teacher will help the students to give the correct answer when they can’t answer the questions correctly.” The result shows that 43.33% of students agreed and 26.67% of them were in neutral response.

10). Statement 10: “Teachers check students’ understanding by asking questions to some students.” Statement number 10 was “the teacher asks the students to work in group.” The result shows that 36.67% of students agreed and 56.67% of them were in neutral response.

11). Statement 11: “Teachers use a lot of time in the classroom to explain the matter and provide questions to the students” Statement number 11 was

“the teacher checks the students’ understanding by asking questions to some of them.” The result shows that 60% of students agreed and 30% of them were in neutral response.

12). Statement 12: “Teachers use a bit of time in the classroom, while many students discuss and answer questions from the teacher.” Statement number 12 was “the teacher uses direct influence in teaching.” The result shows that 40% of students agreed and 36.67% of them were in neutral response.

13). Statement 13: “The atmosphere in the classroom to support teaching and learning process.” Statement number 13 was “the teacher uses indirect influence in teaching.” The result shows that 30% of students agreed and 40% of them were in neutral response.

14). Statement 14: “Students are given the freedom and responsibility in the classroom.” Statement number 14 was about the students’ democracy activities. The result shows that 30% of students agreed and 50% of them were in neutral response.

15). Statement 15: “Students feel happy and able to follow the teaching-learning process as well.” Statement number 15 was about the students’ feeling during the teaching-learning

time. The result shows that only 13.33% of students agreed and 26.67% of them were in neutral response.

2. Discussion

a. Classroom Interaction

Characteristics

Based on the results, it could be concluded that most dominant characteristics in the classroom interaction was student participation, it means that student most actively in question and answer activity in classroom interaction.

Teacher Talk control had a little proportion in the classroom interaction. It shows that the teacher used a little time to control the students, such as giving direction and criticizing or justifying activity. It means that the teacher gave directions, commands, or orders to which a student was expected to comply in little proportion.

The result also reflected that the teacher spent a little time to accept feeling, praise or encourage the students, and accept or use ideas of students. The teacher rarely clarified, built, or developed ideas suggested by a student. It would be better if the

teacher praised the students more to increase the student's participation in classroom interaction.

The students were very active in the classroom interaction. The result shows that the students' participation (students' talk response and students' talk-initiation) was high from the total teaching-learning time.

b. The Teacher Talk Types

The Analysis of Teacher Talk Types includes identifying the different types of teacher talk, categorizing the various types of teacher talk into ten footing patterns and generalizing the relationship among these footings. The findings reveal that the three teachers most frequently used six footings such as Mediator, Evaluator, Learning task assignor, teaching material interpreter, Inspector and classroom climate conductor.

c. Teaching Effectiveness

Walberg in 1986 made the most comprehensive review of elements of teaching effectiveness. The selected elements consists of academic learning time, use of positive reinforcement, cues and feedback, cooperative learning activities, classroom

atmosphere, high order questioning, and use of advance organizers. Each elements of teaching effectiveness are discussed one by one as follows;

1) Academic Learning Time

Based on the data result, the students' opinion shows that they disagree with the statement "the teacher was on time in starting and ending in teaching learning process"; it means that the teacher sometimes did not start and end the class on-time.

But overall, the teacher spent the teaching-learning time in a good proportion. She used the teaching-learning time for explaining materials, asking questions, giving tasks and another activity in a good proportion. Teacher could arrange the time well, but some meetings the silent proportion was still high.

2) Use of Reinforcement

There are two kinds of reinforcement; positive and negative reinforcement. Positive reinforcement is presenting a reward after a desired behavior, whereas negative reinforcement is taking away an aversive stimulus after a desired behavior.

3) Cues and Feedback

Cues and feedback in this classroom interaction appeared in the classroom interaction, but in very little proportion. When the students couldn't answer teacher's question, sometimes the teacher would give little cues, so that the students could answer the question. Then after student's answered the teacher's question or gave opinion, the teacher gave a feedback. The students also gave feedback to the teacher when the teacher made mistake in explaining the material.

4) Cooperative Learning

Cooperative leaning means the students are asked to do something in group or work in group. Cooperative learning in this classroom only appeared in the last meeting. It was reflected when the teacher asked the students to work in group. In the end of lesson, teacher asked the students to make group of three and gave them question to discuss. While the students discussed, the teacher looked around to check the students' activity.

Based on the result, it can be interpreted that the teacher sometimes asked the students to work in group, especially at the end of lesson. She asked the students to discuss the explained material with their partners.

While the students discussed, the teacher looked around to check the students' activity.

5) Classroom Atmosphere

A positive atmosphere can make a classroom more pleasant place and, in turn, more effective, motivating place to learn. It can have positive results on the achievement of students. The positive atmosphere could be created not only from the physical condition, e.g. facilities, classroom arrangement, etc, but also from the non-physical condition, e.g. classroom discipline, classroom management, etc.

Based on the observation, the classroom atmosphere in immersion class was quite good and the facilities were complete. They supported the students and teacher activity in teaching-learning process. However, some students did not enjoy the classroom atmosphere, because of the physical condition or non-physical condition.

6) Higher-Order Question

Higher-order questions means a query that requires the student to analyze and produce a reasoned response, not the teacher's words. In other words, there is not an already

prescribed factual answer to the question.

So, in this English classes, teacher frequently asked questions to the students. The teacher's questions were usually asking the students understanding, it required the students to analyze and produce a reasoned response, e.g. teacher asked question to the students using "why" questions, then the students should analyze and produce a reasoned response.

7) Advance Organizer

Based on, the students' opinion to statement "the teacher is efficiently organizing the teaching-learning time." The result shows that 30% of students said that they disagreed, and 30% of them were in neutral opinion. But 20% of them strongly agreed and 16.67% of them agreed in this statement. It could be said that this statement got neutral response from the students.

8) Direct Instruction

In a teaching-learning process in the classroom, if the direct influence is greater than indirect teaching, it means the model of teaching-learning process is still focused on the teacher or in other words teacher centered. Teaching-learning process would be better if the

students also participate actively in the classroom.

Direct instruction in the immersion classroom interaction reflects the proportion of lecturing, giving direction, and criticizing or justifying authority. In Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories, it is categorized in category 5, 6 and 7.

9) Indirect Teaching

If the teachers in teaching-learning process do more indirect teaching, it means she allows the students to be active in her classroom. It is kind of students-centered model learning, the teacher only gives little explanation about the material, then students have discussion with their friends or with the teacher.

Based on the student's opinion, teacher did more direct influence than indirect influence. The result in previous sub-chapter shows that 30% of students agreed in statement "teacher uses indirect influence in teaching-learning process," and 40% of them were in neutral response. The statement was in strong category (62%), but the direct influence got more response from the students (72.67%). It means that the teacher sometimes spent more the

teaching time in discussion than explaining to the students.

10) The Democratic Classroom

The democratic activity was appeared in this classroom, but only in the second and fourth meetings, because the classroom control was still in under teacher's control. Teacher controlled the activities during the teaching learning process, such as; material, teaching learning time, discussion, doing exercise, etc.

The democratic activity in the classroom interaction was done, for example, when the teacher gave exercises or assignments to discuss in groups. The students chose the group's member, and also the group's leader. They tried to do democratic activities through this activity.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Based on the data analysis and the results of the study, following conclusions were drawn.

1. This research found that there are six types of Teacher Talk that are of frequent use in English classes in SMK PGRI 4 Denpasar. The six types include Mediator, Evaluator,

Learning task assignor, teaching material interpreter, Inspector and classroom climate conductor. There are 10 types of Teacher Talk however among those unexpected reactor, manager, digressor, Learning Pace administrator did not occur in English classes.

2. The most dominant characteristic in English classes in classroom interaction was Student Participation.
3. The effectiveness of Teachers Talk was effective in the classroom interaction. The results showed, in average, 75% from the total teaching-learning time was devoted to question and lectures by the Teacher. The Teacher Talk participated in Direct in Indirect statement.
4. The English Classes in classroom interaction met the requirements of Teacher Talk effectiveness aspects made by Walberg (1986). Most of the teaching effectiveness elements were on the classroom interaction
5. Based on the data results from the questionnaire, it could be concluded that the students responded positively to some extent in the teaching-learning process.

6. The research found that there are three major Teacher Talk Aspects there are Physiological aspect, Interpersonal aspect, Pedagogical aspect as stated all of the aspect are strong/effective.

Based on the conclusions, following suggestions were drawn.

1. The classroom interaction met most of requirements of Teacher Talk effectiveness elements by Walberg, but some of them were in very little proportion. So, the classroom interaction was not active enough. Teacher still controlled all of the teaching-learning activities. For this, there are some suggestions for the teacher to realize the importance of the classroom interaction characteristic and to develop her teaching skill and method.
2. This research is focused on the classroom interaction in immersion class. It is known that seven subjects in immersion class are explained in English. The teacher is not used to explaining the material in English. So, this research is focused in types and the effectiveness of Teacher Talk in classroom interaction in English classes.

REFERENCES

Departemen Pendidikan Nasional
Direktorat Jendral Pendidikan
Luar Sekolah dan Pemuda. 2004.
Pemahaman dan Pijakan dalam
Pengembangan Anak Usia Dini.
Disajikan dalam *Simposium
Nasional Sehari Pendidikan Anak
Usia Dini II*, Jakarta 29 Mei 2004.

Huang, H. (1998). *An Analysis of the
Functions of Teacher Talk Based
on EFL Classroom Interaction in
Junior High School*. Unpublished
M.A. thesis. Taiwan: National
Kaohsiung University.

Nafrina, Ajeng. 2007. *The Teacher and
Learner Talk in Classroom
Interaction in SMPN 2 Kendal*.
Semarang: English Department
Language and Art Faculty
Semarang State University.

Ramelan.1994. *Introduction to
Linguistic Analysis*. Singaraja:
UNDIKSHA.

Richards, J.C. and David Nunan. 1992.
*Second Language Teacher
Education*. USA: Cambridge
University Press.