

CLASSROOM INTERACTION STRATEGIES IN TEACHING SPEAKING (A CASE STUDY AT SPEAKING CLASS OF SECOND SEMESTER AT EFL OF ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY SULTAN MAULANA HASANUDDIN BANTEN)

Sa'adah

University of Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa

saadahtuljannah51@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This research reports a study on Lecturer's use of interaction strategies in English Language Teaching at Speaking Class of Second Semester at EFL of Islamic University Sultan Maulana Hasanuddin Banten. Classroom observation was selected as a method in this study by FIAC (Flanders' Interaction Analysis Categories) and Rebecca Oxford as instrument. The researcher conducted a case study with qualitative method, in which the writer took first and second meeting. The writer collects the data with observation for lecturer and student, questionnaire for student, and then interview for lecturer. this research show that lecturer spent 63.64% in her teaching time for lecturer-student and student-student interaction spent 36.36%. Category in FIAC can be divided into four categories, the first is lecturer support. It consists accepting feeling, praises and encourage, and Accepts or uses ideas of pupils. All of them can be calculated 7.26% in the first meeting and the second meeting was 1.62%. and the second is content cross 85.46% in the first meeting and the second meeting was 99.88%. It consists Asks questions and lecturing. The third is lecturer control 2.83% in the first meeting and the second meeting was 4.06%. It consists Gives directions and Criticizes or justifies authority. the last is student participation 4.60% in the first meeting and in the second meeting was 6.14%. It consists Response, Initiation and Students Talk Initiation. In summary, that lecturer dominated interaction in the class. The lecturer used all of FIAC strategy in lecturer talk, except accepts or uses ideas of pupils. The researcher didn't find it in the class, so the effect that student had limited time and opportunity in interaction or practice in the class. Besides that, the student was rarely in speaking English, they refer to use Bahasa Indonesia than English in the class in order to get easy in understand or answer the question of lecturer question.

Keywords: *classroom interaction, lecturer-student interaction, interaction, teaching strategies*

INTRODUCTION

English is a foreign language in Indonesia and it is not used in daily conversation or interaction in the society. This situation makes English language less used by both of student and lecturer in Speaking Class of Second Semester of Islamic University Sultan Maulana Hasanuddin Banten and they seldom used it in classroom.

When the student listens to the lecturer's explanations in front of the class, the student sometime is not understand what the lecturer said and the lecturer should translate it or use Indonesian language, even the lecturer doesn't looking for the other alternative way to explain it before. Then when they express their ideas, answer and ask question, carry out activities, and also atmosphere effects toward interaction in the class such as they less of motivation, student anxiety, where those are can be concluded in lecturer talk and student talk in the class.

Besides that, in teaching English most of them teach grammar firstly than practice, so it makes less interaction in English language. And also a target language is seldom used outside the classroom, input and language use in classroom interaction especially in teacher-student interaction and student-student interaction are vital, because studying English without interaction or speaking English is useless. Through speaking one can express their minds, ideas and thought freely and spontaneously (Arbain & Nur, 2017). And also the success of a lecturer may be judged through the degree of effectiveness of his teaching which may be objectively assessed through his classroom behaviour or interaction (Sharma, 2016). If effective classroom interaction strategies can be employed in the classroom, so it will improve students' communicative competence.

Interaction between lecturer and student in the class is important in making good learning in the class. Lecturer has the primary responsibility toward student in the classroom activities in order to lecturer can establish and improve the students' skill of English, especially speaking skill. The lecturer also has part in making the sense and comfort during in the class, in order to the student get increasing in their motivation and good feeling of classroom atmosphere in leaning speaking English (Saha & Drowkin, 2009, p. 147). Moreover, Interaction has been central to theories of second language learning and pedagogy since the 1980s (Richard & Rodgers, 1986). It means that, interaction is a critical factor in determining student outcomes. The teacher will know that students understanding in learning, especially in learning speaking.

Hence, interaction in speaking class can be effected by some components such as place, condition, kinds of activities and strategies or method of teaching learning.

Sometime lecturer to be a center in giving material and getting information for student, so there is no interaction between teacher and student and also lecturer dominates in the class, it get same way that about 70 to 80 percent out of class time was spent mostly by teacher (Pujiastuti, 2013). And talk will effect in success of speaking teaching learning like student less of confident, shy, less of vocabulary and motivation in learning speaking. In this case, the lecturer is assigned to use appropriate strategies in teaching speaking.

Learning strategies are steps taken by students to enhance their own learning. Strategies are especially important for language learning because they are tools for active, self-directed involvement, which is essential for developing communicative competence (Oxford, 1990). Beside that as a teacher should has strategies or rules in teaching, especially in teaching speaking, because good strategies in teaching will make good interaction between student and teacher or student and student. It shows based on “Language Learning Strategies” by Rebecca L. Oxford (1990). All appropriate language learning strategies are oriented toward the broad goal of communicative competence. Development of communicative competence requires realistic interaction among learners using meaningful, contextualized language. Learning strategies help learners participate actively in such authentic communication. Such strategies operate in both general and specific ways to encourage the development of communicative competence.

As this review shows, interaction is one of determining in success of speaking teaching learning and strategies as the way in making good interaction between lecturer and student get understanding each other to solve the problems of the lessons in the class, in order to the aims of teaching learning can be reached, especially in speaking teaching learning process. And also it can be understood that effective speaking class is only will be realized when the lecturer and the students or students and students interact one another. Most importantly, how lecturer interacts with the student-boys and girls, how he/she motivates speech activities, and relates them to his/her personal interests and on-going life of the school days are vital factors for the improvement of speech.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS

Speaking is so much a part of daily life that we take it for granted. The average person produces tens of thousands of words a day, although some people- like auctioneers or politicians- may produce even more than that. Speaking is a cognitive skill is the idea that knowledge becomes increasingly automated through successive practice (Thonbury, 2005, p. 79). In line of statement above, the role of the second or foreign language classroom is to bring a student to a point where he can begin to use the outside (Krashen, 2009). To sum up the statements above that, speaking is one of cognitive skill which is used by people in their daily life, express their idea to show what they want, not only in the class but also out the class.

In other hand, speaking seems intuitively the most important people who know a language are referred to as ‘speaker’ of that language, as if speaking included all other kinds if knowing and many if not most foreign language learners are primarily interested in learning speak. Classroom activities that develop learners; ability to express themselves through speech would therefore seem an important of a language course (Ur, 1996, p. 120). In same way that speaking is one way to communicate which ideas and though a message orally. To enable students to communicate, we need to apply the language in real communication (Efrizal, 2012). Concluding center of statement above is about kind of language in world that should be known by all people in the world. So, if every people can mastery all of languages, it will make easy to get information, communication and so on. So, to get them every people should learn and practice of language.

Element of speaking can be divided into two parts, namely language Features and Mental/ social processing (Harmer, 2001, p. 269). There are three points in language features that should be known. The first point is connected Speech. It effective speakers of English need to be able not only to produce the individual phoneme of English (as in saying I would have gone) but also to use fluent’ connected speech” (as in I’d’ve gone). The second is expressive device. It native speakers of English change the pitch and stress of particular parts of utterances, vary volume and speed, and show by other physical and nonverbal (paralinguistic) means how they are

feeling (especially in face to face interaction). The third is lexis and grammar. It spontaneous speech is marked by the use a number of common lexical phrases, especially in the performance of certain language functions, and the last one is negotiation language. It effective speaking benefits from the negotiatory language we use to seek clarification and to show the structure of what we are saying.

Basic Type and Function of Speaking

There are five basic type and function of speaking (Brown, 2004, p. 141) such as imitative, intensive, responsive, interactive and extensive. Imitative is one and of a continuum of type of speaking performance is the ability to simply parrot back (imitate) a word or phrase or possibly a sentence. While, intensive is a second type of speaking frequently employed in assessment contexts is the production of short stretches of oral language designed to demonstrate competence in a narrow band of grammatical, phrasal, lexical, or phonological relationship (such as prosodic elements-intonation, stress, rhythm juncture). And next is responsive is assessment tasks include interaction and test comprehension but at the somewhat limited level of very short conversation, standard greeting and small talk, simple requests and comments, and the like.

Besides that, interactive is the most relation in speaking. It differences between responsive and interactive speaking is in the length and complexity of the interaction, which sometimes includes multiple exchanges and/or multiple participants. While, extensive (monologue) is oral production tasks include speeches, oral presentation, and story-telling, during which the opportunity for oral interaction from listeners is either highly limited (perhaps to nonverbal responses) or ruled out altogether.

Teaching Speaking

Student often think the ability to speak a language is the product of language leaning. The skill of speaking is much more than the production of grammar items (Brown, 2004, p. 116). Actually, speaking can be taken not only from language learning proses, but also speaking or oral language ca stand in its individual every person. In this perspective, Language is a natural object, a component of the human mind, physically represented in the brain and part of the biological endowment of the

species. Within such guidelines, linguistics is part of individual psychology and of the cognitive sciences; its ultimate aim is to characterize a central component of human nature, defined in a biological setting (Chomsky, Belletti, & Rizzi, 2002, p. 1). Based on statement above, people who stand in this theory believes that without learn English language or how to speak. Every people can speak by themselves, because God has given us special form in brain of human to speak each other in the world naturally.

Teachers of English language learners must be aware of students' first and second languages and how to teach according to students' proficiency levels in both languages. They must consider students' cultural and familial experiences when planning instruction and assessment. Students' language and culture should be viewed as *assets* to instruction, rather than obstacles (Haager, Kingner, & Aceves, 2010, pp. 5-6). Moreover, teaching sets up the practice games of language learning: the opportunities for learners to listen, think, take risks, set goals, and process feedback from the "coach" and then recycle through the skills that they are trying to master (Brown, 2004, p. 5). In the same way, there are six teaching and learning methods which make students active in teaching and learning process. They are individual learning, peer learning, affective learning, collaboration learning, play learning and cooperative learning. Every teaching method has some advantages and disadvantages dealing with the topic and ability which will be improved (Erfiani, 2017) . There are some practice in teaching language that can be done by learners in learning language like statement above and as the teacher should avauable or guidance both learner and process of teaching learning, especilally in speaking learning.

The roles of the teacher in teaching speaking

As with any other type of classroom procedure, teachers need to play a number of different roles during the speaking activities described above, however, three particular relevant if we are trying to get student speak fluently (Harmer, 2001, p. 275). The first is Prompter, where students sometimes get lost, cannot think of what to say next, or in some others way lose the fluency we expect of them. we can leave them to struggle out such situations on their own and indeed sometimes this may be the best option.

However, we may be able to help them and the activity to progress by offering discrete suggestions.

The second is participant. Teacher should be good animators when asking student to produce language. Sometimes this can be achieved by setting up an activity clearly and with enthusiasm. At the other times, however teachers may want to participate in discussion or role-plays themselves. That way they can prompt covertly, introduce new information to help the activity along, ensure continuing student engagement, and generally maintain a creative atmosphere. The last is feedback provider. The vexed question of when and how to give feedback in speaking activities is answered by considering carefully the effect of possible different approaches.

Characteristic of Successful Speaking activities

There are some characteristic of successful speaking activities (Ur, 1996). Learners talk a lot as much as possible of the period of time allotted to the activity is in fact occupied by learner talk. This may seem obvious, but often most time is taken up with teacher talk or pauses. Besides that, participation is even. It means classroom discussion is not dominated by a minority of talkative participants; all get a chance to speak, and contributions are fairly evenly distributed. The other characteristic is high motivation. Learners are eager to speak because they are interested in the topic and have something new to say about it, or because they want to contribute to achieving a task objective. And the last of characteristic of successful speaking activities is Language as an acceptable level, learners express themselves in utterances that are relevant, easily comprehensible to each other, and of an acceptable level of language accuracy.

Concept of Classroom interaction

Interaction is an important word for language teachers. In the era of communicative language teaching, interaction is, in fact, the heart of communication; it is what in a context, we negotiate meanings and we collaborate to accomplish certain purposes. And after several decades of research on teaching and learning language, we have discovered that the best way to learn to interact is through interaction itself (Brown, 2000). In additional, interaction is the collaborative exchange of thoughts,

feelings, or ideas between two or more people, resulting in a reciprocal effect on each other (Brown, 2000). In other hand, classroom interaction: the teacher and the learners, classroom interaction is classified into two categories: teacher-learner interaction, learner-learner interaction. Teacher-learner interaction has broad sense and narrow sense. In broad sense, teacher-learner interaction is the interaction between the teacher and learner. In narrow sense, it is the interaction between the teacher and learner or the teacher and learners in teaching situation (Jia, 2013). Based on those statements above, interaction in the best way in teaching and learning language, where student ask the question and answer teacher question, show ideas. So, they can improve speaking skill.

From the very beginning of language study, classroom should be interactive Wilga Rivers Puts it this way:

Through interaction, students can increase their language store as they listen to or read authentic linguistic, or even to output of their fellow students in discussions, skits, joint problem-solving tasks, or dialogue journals. In interactive students can use all they process of the language-all they have learned or casually absorbed--in real-life exchanges. ...even at an elementary stage, they learn in this way exploit the elasticity of language (Brown, 2000). 165

Based on statement above, interaction is not only can increase in speaking skill, but also it can increase listening and reading skill, even all output of language of student such as student do their task, discussion, presentation and vive versa.

According to (Kaur & Tatla, 2015) stated Interaction is viewed as significant because Only through interaction, the learner can decompose the teaching learning structures and derive meaning from classroom events interaction gives learners the opportunities to incorporate teaching learning structures into their own speech and the meaningfulness for learners of classroom events of anykind, whether thought of as interactive or not will depend on the extent to which communication has been jointly constructed between the teacher and learners.

Lecturer-student interaction plays an important role in ensuring the comfort and sense of belonging in the classroom. Lecturers have the primary responsibility for pulling students into classroom activities and for establishing the tone and feeling of the classroom atmosphere. The receptive and approachable lecturer, versus the

domineering or disconnected teacher, is able to make students feel included with positive affect in the class (Saha & Drowkin, 2009). Based on statement, there are two kinds of teachers, the first is interactive teacher where they always consider what they want to do in the class and responsible to achievement of student such as about student feeling, atmosphere in the class and so on. The second lecturer is uninteractive teacher. They always unconsider what they want to do, it can be seen that the lecturer always dominates the activities in the class without think more about student.

Classroom communication is both highly complex and central to all classroom activity. In the rapid flow of classroom interaction, it is difficult to comprehend what is happening. Not only is the interaction very fast and involves many people, it has multiple foci; the language being used may be performing several functions at the same time: seeking information, checking learning, offering advice and so on (Walsh, 2011, p. 2). To sum up this statement, interaction is one of form classroom communication that complex and central activity and it effects not only to student, but also to the function itself like checking learning, seeking information and offering advice. Besides that, Communication refers to the ways in which language is used to promote interaction; according to van Lier (1996), interaction is 'the most important thing on the curriculum'. If we are to become effective as teachers, we need not only to understand classroom communication, we need to improve it.

Four features of classroom discourse have been selected, largely because they typify much of the interaction that takes place in classrooms and are prevalent in all parts of the world. Those are Control of the interaction, Speech modification, Elicitation, Repair (Walsh, 2011, p. 155). Four points that submitted in this statement will effected to interaction in the class, because interaction in the class is just focus on lesson or environment, event level of student. It will be way how to interact in classroom.

Moreover, an understanding of interaction is crucial to effective teaching for a variety of reasons (Walsh, 2011). Some reasons in understanding of interaction such as Interaction is at the heart of learning, it means that interaction is the most important in determined the goal of teaching learning in class. And also understanding interaction

is the first step to improving awareness of context, so it will effect in student behavior and their daily life. Reflective practice is more effective when the focus is classroom interaction, Learners are more engaged and more involved in classes where lecturers understand how to make effective use of interaction, and lecturers can research their own practices by focusing on interaction

METHODOLOGY

The researcher uses Qualitative method with a case study approach for conducting this research. As mentioned in the list of characteristics, qualitative research is interpretative research; the inquirer is typically involved in a sustained and intensive experience with participants. This introduces a range of strategic, ethical, and personal issues into the qualitative research process (Locke, Spirduso, & Silverman, 2013). In other hand, this research explained and identified the phenomena of research subject by collecting, identifying, describing, classifying, and evaluating (Syafrizal & Sari, 2017, p. 123).

The data and source of data was collected by researcher. Data can be obtained from observation that conducted to lecturer and student interaction at Speaking Class of Second Semester at EFL of Islamic University Sultan Maulana Hasanuddin Banten. Besides observation, the researcher used interview that gave to the lecturer of speaking subject, and questionnaire which based on Likert theory, it gave to 32 students in the class to get more information about classroom interaction strategies.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Lecturer and student Speaking Skill in EFL Classroom Interaction

The researcher found some categories of FIAC that have conducted by lecturer in class. The data presented in the table above that in Lecturer Talk and indirect Influence. Both of them have three branches. (1) The first was accepting feeling. In this case, the data got 0.7%.but it different in the second meeting 1.1%. both of them showed that the lecturer was rarely in accepting feeling. The lecturer focused in her

material without looking for the student feeling like situation in the class, but the researcher found one interaction about accepting feeling bellow:

Figure 1 .Interaction Transcript of Accepting Feeling

L :Ok, it is cool day,
S: silence
L :for today we will practice for speaking, and you must

The lecturer begun in her teaching with a sentence “Ok, it is cool day”. She felt around the situation in or out the class like cool day. It meant that the situation of learning was comfortable and focus. But there was not comment or idea from student when the lecturer said it, although most of them as felt as the lecturer talk. (2) The second was Praises or Encourages. In the first meeting this category was 18.2% but in the second meeting was 1.6%, it showed that in every activity the lecturer tried in giving praises or the word encourage and in the second meeting lecturer was rarely in giving praises. It can be seen the interaction bellow:

Figure 2 Interaction Transcript of Praises or Encourages

L : And please attention for Tia group
L :Ok explain and describing the story
S :Student practice
L: Ok next you please
S :Student practice
L: Ok all right
L : Thank you
L :Ok next you, Finish
L :Ok thank you very much
L :Ok next group tell the story, Finish
L :Ok thank you

The lecturer said word “thank you” in several time, the lecturer gave a task to student and student could do that, though was not perfect yet, because she wanted build the student motivation in learning English, especially in speaking skill. (3) The third was Accepts or uses ideas of pupils. In the first meeting this point, the researcher didn’t find in the class, so the score was 0%, but in the second meeting 0.9%. Actually, in the

first meeting there was interaction that talking about accepting ideas of pupil, but the idea was not receipt by lecturer, because the idea was not good for doing the task. But in the second meeting the researcher found this category in the class. It can be seen interaction bellow:

Figure 3 Interaction Transcript of Accepts or Uses Ideas of Pupils

L: and then Wanda's group and then Tini's group (Lecturer asked every group)
S: *miss pake suara efek gak?*
L: *Suara* effect? No..no silence

The interaction above showed that one of student conveyed his idea in question to lecturer in getting clearer about the task, but he still used bahasa Indonesia, because for him it was difficult or less motivation in using English. Moreover, the lecturer didn't try to force him in using English, event lecturer followed him in using bahasa Indonesia. It meant both of them used code switching and lecturer didn't receipt the idea yet.

Three categories above included in Lecturer Support. The lecturer gave praises and encourage to student in teaching learning process, accepted feeling and used idea of pupil in, although the idea still didn't received yet by the lecturer. The proportion of lecturer support was (7.26%) and the second meeting was 1.62%. it meant that in the first meeting the lecturer were enough in the classroom interaction but in the second meeting was not enough. .

The forth category was asking question. The first meeting percentage of this category was 12.0% and the second meeting was 6.6%. it indicated that often in asking question to student, while expected of lecturer was student as center of teaching-learning, but it was difficult for doing in teaching-learning process. But in the second meeting lecturer was rarely in asking question.

The fifth was Lecturing. In first meeting lecturing got 30.6% and the second meeting 44.0%, that was one of high score category than other. It indicated explaining material, giving information, guiding the student, giving task, and almost activity

determined by lecturer in the class and the other time for giving opportunity to student in doing the task, asking question, showing their ide, Although, little opportunity

The sixth category was giving direction. The first meeting percentage of this category was 13.3% and the second was 9.3%. It meant that the lecturer neutral in giving direction to student such as making group, stopping in their talking, doing task, helping the lecturer.

The seventh was Criticizes or justifies authority. The first meeting percentage of this category was 0.3% and the second meeting was 1.8%. it meant that the lecturer rarely in using Criticizes or justifies authority. It can be seen the interaction bellow:

The eight category indicated Student Talk and Student Participation 4.60%. Both of them have two points, respond initiate and Students Talk Initiation. One of them was Response, Initiation. In the first meeting, this category got 23,4% and the second meeting was 5.4%. The student often gave response in learning process or received the lecturer question, but it different in the second meeting that student was rarely in initiate respond of lecturer or found error interaction

The ninth category was Students Talk Initiation 0.17% in the first meeting and in the second meeting was 4.7%. The researcher found just once student tried to ask to lecturer and even used Bahasa Indonesia. It meant student was less motivation and less vocabulary in giving idea. Also it found in second meeting was not enough for increasing that student active in the class.

The last was Silence. This category got highest in FIAC that have done by lecturer and student in the first meeting. It was 33.33%, but different in second meeting 9.1%, where the observer counted it in every three second, because both of lecturer and student sometime felt confuse or silence in some activities in the class. The interaction showed that, when the lecturer explained the material, respond of student with laugh, there was not interaction or idea of student. It meant that student confuse how they would said or responded, but the lecturer appreciated it, in order to the teaching-learning become success.

In additional data result, the others characteristics of classroom interaction. The lecturer spent more her talking time in lecturing than the other additional data result

(76.41%) she was giving facts, asking, explaining more about theory and opinion, trying to force student in getting understand of her explanation. It meant that lecturing was the dominant in teaching learning time. And then Lecturer spent more in lecturing, it was seen that lecturer always guide the student in the class and the data got (67.57%). And next about lecturer used more direct teaching (56.57%) than indirect teaching (40.60%) in her talking time. It meant that the lecturer used more direct teaching to student. The last was the proportion of silent time was still high in this classroom interaction. Silence or confusion in this classroom spent (33.33%) of the teaching leaning time.

From the discussion, it can be concluded that the classroom interaction in speaking class was dominated by the lecturer in teaching learning. Lecturer spent time more time than student. She usually taught the student by using direct influence. It can be seen in table 4.2.

Table 1 Time Spent on Teacher and Student and Student – Student Interaction at Speaking Class

No	Time spent type of interaction	Minutes (2 topic)	%
	Total teaching time	220	
1	Time Spent on lecturer-student	140	63.64%
2	Time spent on student-student	80	36.36%

The Result of Observation

Based on the data of observation that there are some effects for student in the class between the first meeting and the second meeting. The percentage of the table above is not different, it can be seen that the first meeting in scale 3 was 40%. There was not bed effect to student when lecturer apply some FIAC categories, as follows (1) Student feel appreciated, feel happy, spirit in class, and they think learning English is easy. (2) Student more understand of the material and feel brave to show their idea, (3) Student get knowledge of lecturer, smarter and it can be used in their life, (4) Student can finished their task and train in solving the problem. And the second meeting was 30%. There are some effects that influence in the second meeting as follows; (1) Student feel satisfied because they know that they can answer lecturer

question and Train their thinking. (2) Student more understand of the material and feel brave to show their idea, (3) Student get knowledge of lecturer, smarter and it can be used in their life.

In scale 2 (neutral) found same percentages between the first meeting and the second meeting. The first meeting was 50%, some categories in this case as follows; (1) Student honor to lecturer, student susceptible of lecturer and they can create activity without lecturer direction, (2) Student feel appreciated that their idea can be received by lecturer and train student thinking, (3) Ensure student that they should hard learning English and add their knowledge, (4) Student feel satisfied because they know that they can answer lecturer question and Train their thinking. (5) They can't solve the problem in the class, or afraid in show the idea, low score from the lecturer, not confident and high anxiety. And the second meeting was 50%, there are some effects in this meeting as follows; (1) Student honor to lecturer, student susceptible of lecturer and they can create activity without lecturer direction, (2) Student feel appreciated that their idea can be received by lecturer and train student thinking, (3) Student can finished their task and train in solving the problem, (4) Student feel appreciated, feel happy, spirit in class, and they think learning English is easy, (5) They can't solve the problem in the class, or afraid in show the idea, low score from the lecturer, not confident and high anxiety.

The last scale was different percentage. In the first meeting was 10%, namely To ensure the student that they have a lot of ideas in their brain and they brave in discussion and the second meeting was 20%, those are To ensure the student that they have a lot of ideas in their brain and they brave in discussion and Ensure student that they should hard learning English and add their knowledge. This table can be explained that the activity in the class was neutral, sometime the lecturer did that or even the activity can be counted. But student activity still in lowering scale.

The Result of questionnaire

Based on the result of questionnaire above that in positive statement. Those are (1) AF. In positive result was (81.33%) and negative result was (48.00%). It meant that the effect of this category such as student honored to lecturer, student was susceptible of lecturer and they could create activity without lecturer direction when lecturer

accepted their feeling of student. So, this statement was strong category in positive statement and negative statement was weak category. (2) PE. In positive result was (93.33%) but in negative result was (49.33). It meant that the effect of this category such as student feel appreciated, they were happy, spirit in class, and they thought of learning English was easy when Lecturer gave praising or encouraging. So, this statement was strong category in positive statement and weak category in negative statement. (3) IS. In positive result was (86.67) and negative result was (50.67%). It meant that the effect of this category such as student feel appreciated that their idea could be received by lecturer and trained student thinking when lecturer used idea of student. So, this positive statement was strong and negative statement was weak category. (4) AQ in positive result was (73.33%) but in negative result was (54.67%), It meant that the effect of this category such as student more understand of the material and they was brave to show their idea when lecturer asked question to student. So, this positive statement was strong and negative statement was weak category. (5) L. in positive result was (85.33%) but in negative result was (44.00%). It meant that the effect of this category such as student got knowledge of lecturer, student was smarter and it could be used in their life when lecturer gave the material. To sum up, this positive statement was strong and negative statement was weak category (6) GD in positive result was (81.33%) but in negative result was (52.00%). It meant that the effect of this category such as Student finished their task and trained in solving the problem when lecturer gave direction. In concluding that this positive statement was strong and negative statement was weak category.

(7) CJ in positive result was (84.00%) and in negative result was (49.33%). It meant that the effect of this category such as persuaded to student that they had should hard learning English and added their knowledge when lecturer criticized or justified authority. It can be said that this positive statement was strong and negative statement was weak category. (8) SR in positive result was (84.00%) and in negative result was (56.00%). It meant that the effect of this category such as student satisfied because they knew that they could answer lecturer question and Trained their thinking when student responded of lecturer question. To sum up that this positive statement was

strong and negative statement was weak category. (9) SI in positive result was (84.00%) and in negative result was (52.00%). So, It meant that the effect of this category such as persuaded the student that they had a lot of ideas in their brain and they was brave in discussion when student initiation. So, this positive statement was strong and negative statement was weak category. (10) SC in positive result was (58.67) but in negative result was (49.33%). It meant that the effect of this category such as They can't solve the problem in the class, or afraid in show the idea, low score from the lecturer, not confident and high anxiety when student and lecturer silence or confuse. In concluding that this positive statement was strong and negative statement was weak category.

Discussion

Classroom interaction observations has conducted that some categories are used many time in the class than other category. Lecturing, praising and encouraging, giving direction, asking question, respond of student and silence or confusing were appeared frequently in teaching-learning of speaking. Although those are categories taken by lecturer there was one category taken by student or student talk namely, student respond. but the most frequent was lecturing. That is similar finding of Nunung Suryati Research Classroom Interaction Strategies Employed by English Teacher at Lower Secondary School by using SETT (Self Evaluation Teacher Talk) in TEFLIN Journal (2015). And also it is similar statement of (Pujiastuti, 2013). Other category including accepting feeling, using idea of pupil, Criticizing or justifying authority and student talk initiate (student talk) were found to rarely happen in the class of speaking. Lecturer applied teaching practice and teaching grammar in the class with different topic in each meeting. In teaching practice that lecturer explained about silence drama which lecturer divided into some group and all of student should make dialog after that practice it. In teaching grammar that lecturer explain about present perfect which the student should make some sentences and dialog based on grammar after that student practice in each group. These activities were conducted in lecturer and student interaction when student

explain the material, but student and student interaction when student do the task in the class.

Actually, all of the categories above has found in the class but most of category released to lecturer. Although there were two categories that including in student talk, those are not enough to increase student interaction, because it will give little opportunity in student interaction even in speaking subject which this subject helps student in practice how to speak or interaction. It can be showed the statement of H. Douglas Brown (2000). So, it can be explained that classroom interaction strategies were done without being followed by giving many opportunities to student interaction the class. Many activities in the class can be conducted by lecturer and short opportunity for student to interact in the class may suggest that lecturer ignored the procedure that how much time for student activities in the class and how to manage a time effectively that should be used in the class. it can be explained by interview of student that lecturer need more time to explain the material. The effect was disturbing the other activities because the time should end. Moreover, in the result of questionnaire that student interaction was neutral. It meant that student was not often responding or giving opinion to lecturer in the class but it include in strong category. So, it was different with lecturer talk. Based on the result questionnaire that most of categories were 80%. It indicated lecturer spent much time in their activity than student in. In additional data from interview showed that all of category of interaction had aimed by lecturer. But there are two categories that sometime lecturer applied such as silence or confusing and using the student idea.

CONCLUSION

Based on the data Analysis, the result and discussion of this research show that lecturer spent 63.64% in her teaching time for lecturer-student and student-student interaction spent 36.36%. Category in FIAC can be divided into four categories, the first is lecturer support. It consists accepting feeling, praises and encourage, and Accepts or uses ideas of pupils. All of them can be calculated 7.26% in the first meeting and the second meeting was 1.62%. and the second is content cross 85.46% in the first meeting and the second meeting was 99.88%. It consists Asks questions and lecturing. The third is lecturer control 2.83% in the first meeting and the second meeting was

4.06%. It consists Gives directions and Criticizes or justifies authority. the last is student participation 4.60% in the first meeting and in the second meeting was 6.14%. It consists Response, Initiation and Students Talk Initiation.

To sum up that lecturer dominated interaction in the class. The lecturer used all of FIAC strategy in lecturer talk, except accepts or uses ideas of pupils. The researcher didn't find it in the class, so the effect that student had limited time and opportunity in interaction or practice in the class. Besides that, the student was rarely in speaking English, they refer to use Bahasa Indonesia than English in the class in order to get easy in understand or answer the question of lecturer question.

Based on the data of questionnaire that, The first was positive highest statement in opinion of student was praise or encourage and giving direction, both of them. The second was negative statement. The highest score was found Student doesn't initiate to Response. And the last interview of lecturer that, The lecturer answer the question that submitted by researcher with some reason, she did all of question in the class and it can be answered by lecturer, either positive activity or negative activity, advantage and disadvantage activity in the class. The questions were not only talking about the lecturer, but also about student. The lecturer expressed their opinion and idea. Besides that lecturer talked about fact and planning that would be applied in the class. To minimalize the low less of opportunity and bed effect result above. in this case, the researcher suggest that arrange the teaching-learning time efficiently in the class, in order to balance between teaching learning time and outcome of student, also student should become a center of teaching learning in the class. And then commitment in using English in the class. In order to teaching speaking can effective in increasing speaking skill and more variety strategies in teaching learning of speaking, Because more interaction, more increase your speaking skill.

Learning Speaking English is not easy, because English is second language, so students should much practice through interaction in the class or out class, it can help student not only in their learning in school, but also in real-life such in work and when student get broad in other country.

In this research is not perfect. It means that not all problem of interaction in the class can be solved or appeared. This research used FIAC or Flanders analysis, for the other researcher can use the other theory in research. And also this research focus on classroom interaction that explain about the lecturer and student interaction, effect of classroom interaction and cause of classroom interaction, for next researcher can chose one of sub focus research question above to be next research.

REFERENCES

- Ajaniputra, A. G. (2013). Teacher's Strategies in Teaching Speaking To studies at Secondary Level. *Journal of English and Education* , 1-8.
- Amatari, V. O. (2015). The Instructional Process: A Review of Flanders' Interaction Analysis in a Classroom Setting. *International Journal of Secondary Education*, 43.
- Amidon, E. (1966). *Interaction Analysis—Recent Developments*. Philadelphia: Temple University.
- Anjaniputra, A. G. (2013). Teacher's Strategies in Teaching Speaking to Students At Secondary Level. *Journal of English and Education*, 1-8.(Miles & Huberman, 1994)
- Arbain and Dedi Rahman Nur. (2017). *Techniques for Teaching Speaking Skill in Widya Gama Mahakam University*. Script Journal: Journal of Linguistic and English Teaching
- Brown, D. H. (2000). *Teaching by Principle an Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. New York: Cmbridge University Press.
- Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language Assessment Principles and Classroom Practice*. San Francisco: Longman.
- Chaer, A. (2011). *Psikolinguistik kajian teoritik*. Jakarta: PT. Rineka Cipta.
- Chomsky, N., Belletti, A., & Rizzi, L. (2002). *On Nature and Language*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design Qualitative, Quantitative and mixed methods Approaches*. USA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Derakhshan, Ali, Atefeh Nadi Khalili & Fatima Beheshti. (2016). *Developing EFL Learner's Speaking Ability, Accuracy and Fluency*. English Language and Literature Studies.
- Efrizal, Dedi. (2012). *Improving Students' Speaking through Communicative Language Teaching Method at Mts Ja-alhaq, Sentot Ali Basa Islamic Boarding School of Bengkulu, Indonesia*. International Journal of Humanities and Social Science.
- Erfiani, Yohanes Paulus Florianus. *Improving Second Semester Students' Speaking Ability Through Storytelling Learning Model at English Study Program of Timor University (A Classroom Action Research Method)*. Journal of English Language, Literature, and Teaching

- Haager, J. D., Kingner, & Aceves, T. (2010). *How To Teach English Language Learners Effective Strategies From Outstanding Educators*.
- Hai, See Kin and Lim Siew Bee. (2006). *Effectiveness Of Interaction Analysis Feedback On The Verbal Behaviour Of Primary School Mathematics Teachers*. *Jurnal Pendidik dan Pendidikan*, Jil. 21, 115–128
- Harmer, J. (2001). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. New York: Longman.
- Jack Fraenkel, N. W. (1932). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. San Francisco State University: McGraw-Hill.
- Jia, X. (2013). The Application of Classroom Interaction in English Lesson. *International Conference on Education Technology and Information System*, 209-212.
- Kaur, J., & Tatla, J. K. (2015). Flanders Classroom Interaction Category System As A Tool Of Teaching. *International Journal of Advancement in Engineering Technology Management & Applied Science*, 64.
- Koşar, Gülten and Hasan Bedir. (2014). *Strategies-based Instruction: A Means of Improving Adult EFL Learners' Speaking Skills*. International Journal of Language Academy.
- Krashen, S. (2009). *In Second Language Acquisition*. California: Pergamon Press Inc.
- Leong, Lai-Mei and Seyedeh Masoumeh Ahmadi. (2016). *An Analysis of Factors Influencing Learners' English Speaking Skill*. International Journal of Research in English Education.
- Manaj, C. L., & Sadiku. (2015). the importance of four skills reading, speaking, writing, listening in a lesson hour. *European Journal Of language and literature studies* , 29.
- Miles, Matthew B. and A Michael Huberman. 1994. *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*. USA: SAGE Publication, Inc.
- Nation, I. S., & Newton, J. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL Listening and Speaking*. New York: Routledge.
- Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-Based Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know*. Alabarna: Heinle & Heinle Publisher.

- Pujiastuti, Rini Triani. (2013). *Classroom Interaction: An Analysis of Teacher Talk and Student Talk In English For Young Learners (EYL)*. Journal of English and Education.
- Rechards, J. C. (2008). *Teaching Listening and Spaeking from Theory to Practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Richard, J. C. (2008). *Teaching Listening and Speaking from Theory to Practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Richard, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (1986). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching: A Description aND Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. (2001). *Curriculum Development in language teaching*. cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2002). *Methodology in Lnguage Teaching An Anthology Of Current Practice* . New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (1986). *Approach and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Saha, L. J., & Drowkin, A. G. (2009). International Hndbook of Research on Teachers and Teaching . *Spinger Science+ Business Media LLC*.
- Sharma, S. (2016). A Study of Classroom Interaction Characterstics Using Flander's Classroom Interaction Analysis in a Maths Class of Rural and Urban Schools. *An International Peer Reviewed & Referred Scholarly Reseach Journal for Humanity Science & English Language*, 3770-3776.
- Syafrizal, & Sari, A. R. (2017). code mixing in students' twitter status at sultan ageng tirtayasa university in banten indonesia. *Europan Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 117-135.
- The Instructional Process: A Review of Flanders' Interaction Analysis in a Classroom Setting. (2015). *International Journal of Secondary Education*, 43.
- Thonbury, S. (2005). *how to Teach Speaking* . England : Longman.
- Trasih, Hidayati, S., & Wibowo, Y. (2016). Classroom Interaction Analysis On Learning Biology Subject In Man Yogyakarta Ii (Case Study In Class Xi Mipa 2). *Jurnal Pendidikan Bologi*, 62-73.
- Ur, P. (1996). *A course Language Teaching : Practice and Theory*. Cambridge: Cmabridge University Press.
- Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring Classroom Discourse Language In Action*. New York: Taylor& Fancis e-Library.

Widiati, U., & Cahyono, B. Y. (2016). The teaching of efl speaking in the indonesian context the state of the art. *Bahasa dan seni*, 269-292.

Yin, K. Robert.(2003). *Case Study Research Design and Methods*. USA: Sage Publication. Inc.