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Abstract: This study focuses on classroom interaction in English teaching and learning at SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Bengkulu. The objective of this study is to 1. Describe student-teacher interaction pattern, 2. Find out the type of interactional features in the classroom. The data were first-grade students. This study shows how teacher and student talk and give response to each other. This study is conducted in form of discourse analysis. The writer used observation to get the data. The data were in a form video recording of classroom interactional both teachers and students. The writer made transcription from recorded data and analyzed it through IRF exchange structure and applied Walsh’s framework in interactional features. The result of the research showed teacher A and B interaction pattern is Initiation (I)- Response (R)- Feedback (F). Teacher A’s pattern was I (initiation), R (response) and F (feedback). In her classrooms, teacher A provides lots of initiation to her students. Teacher B’s pattern was IRF in this class with the highest amount of initiation in form question. Teacher A used 12 (twelve) interactional feature based on Walsh framework (2006). There were extended learner turn (ELT) 171 frequencies, extended teacher turn (ETT) 90 frequencies, Display Question (DQ) 66 frequencies, confirmation check (CC) 36 frequencies, seeking clarification (SC) 35 frequencies, Teacher echo (TE) 27 frequencies, referential question (RQ) 20 frequencies, Scaffolding (SCF) 16 frequencies, extended wait time (EWT) 13 frequencies, turn completion (TC) 12 frequencies, direct repair (DR) 5 frequencies, content feedback (CF) 1 frequency. Teacher B used 12 (twelve) interactional feature based on Walsh framework (2006). There were extended learner turn (ELT) 155 frequencies, Display Question (DQ) 53 frequencies, extended teacher turn (ETT) 42 frequencies, referential question (RQ) 23 frequencies, confirmation check (CC) 17 frequencies, seeking clarification (SC) 13 frequencies, Form focus feedback (FFF) 12, Teacher echo (TE) 8 frequencies, Scaffolding (SCF) 8 frequencies, extended wait time (EWT) 7 frequencies, turn completion (TC) 4 frequencies, direct repair (DR) 3 frequencies. Both of teacher A and B provide a lot of extended learner turn by giving a direct question and referential question. Students’ response frequently in English, in Indonesian and in another hand in their mother tongue.
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Introduction

The language used by teacher or teacher talk is a part of communication in the classroom. It is so important because it covers everything that goes on in the classroom. It is central in teaching and learning process. It is used for managing students, and organizing tasks or activities in learning process at the classroom. Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics defines teacher talk as “that variety of language sometimes used by teachers when they are in the process of teaching. In trying to communicate with learners, teachers often simplify their speech, giving it many of the characteristics of foreigner talk and other simplified styles of speech addressed to language learners” (Richards and Schmidt, 2010: 588).

Teacher talk has important role in the success of English learning activity. The success of learning depends on the way of teacher talk and interaction between teacher and students. As Nunan (1991) argues: “Teacher talk is of crucial importance not only for the organization of the classroom but also for the processes of the acquisition. Many scholars found teacher talk makes up around 70% of classroom language (Cook, 2000; Chaudron, 1988; Zhao Xiaohong, 1998). Its goal is to communicate with students and develops students’ language proficiency.
The goal of teacher talk related with language is used to promote interaction. The term interaction is considered as an activity that provides teachers and learners to communicate each other. In addition, Cambridge dictionary of English defines ‘interaction’ as a noun; an occasion when two or more people or things communicate with react to each other. Interaction is a crucial element to teaching and learning process. As Walsh (2011, p.159) stated in ‘the real world’ effective communication rests on an ability to interact with others and to collectivity reach understanding. The importance role of classroom interaction in EFL is providing opportunities to acquire new language. For this to happen, learner need interactional space and support to express their ideas or thoughts. Opportunities for learning (language acquisition) are maximized when new concepts and language can be both understood and verbalized.

However, many problems of interaction occur in the classroom. For instance, students difficult to express themselves in using English that is not their mother tongue. Studies in classroom discourse also have result in consistent findings. Teacher talk dominates around 60% of classroom time (Chaudron, 1988:50). It makes the role of participants (teachers and learners) are not equal in teaching and learning process. Most teachers education programs pay very little attention to classroom interaction. Teachers talk dominates most of the teaching and learning process in the classroom. In addition, most teachers education programs are not aware the important of classroom interaction and teacher talk in teaching and learning process. It devote a considerable amount of time to teaching methods, and to subject. A research finding of Asma (2011) in raising teachers’ interactional awareness of their teacher talk with a view to facilitating learning opportunities revealed teacher talk affect learning opportunities and teacher plays a crucial role in shaping his learners contributions. Hence awareness to be promoted. Thus, the language used by teacher (teacher talk) in providing interaction for developing students’ language are very important to understand. Therefore, through investigating interaction in the classroom, teachers will increase their awareness of applying teacher talk in teaching correctly.

An interesting framework used for classroom interaction is SETT (Self-evaluation teachers talk) by Walsh (2006). The SEET framework comprises four classroom modes and fourteen interactional features. This framework is designed to help teacher both describe the classroom interaction of their lesson and develop an understanding of interactional process as a way becoming a ‘better’ teacher (Walsh, 2011). Using SETT analysis allows teacher to gain a rapid profile the kinds of features to be found in their classes and ases their appropriacy.

This study focus on investigating classroom interaction by using Self-Evaluation Teachers Talk (SETT). This research attempt to identify and analyze classroom interaction between teacher and students. How they communicate each other in the classroom and what types of classroom interaction features that teachers apply. It can be useful to increase teachers’ knowledge about the important of classroom interaction in teaching and learning process and as a way to evaluate classroom interaction in their lesson. This paper aim to describe teacher-students interaction pattern in first grade of SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Bengkulu and to find out what are the type of interactional features used by teacher in the classroom interaction at the first grade of SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Bengkulu.

**Literature Review**

The first principal reason for studying classroom discourse is that it lies at the hart of everything that take place in classroom (Walsh 2011:182), the importance role of classroom interaction in EFL classroom is providing opportunities to acquire new language. For this to happen, learner need interactional space and support to express their ideas or thoughts. Opportunities for learning (language acquisition) are maximized when new concepts and language can be both understood and verbalized. In addition, through classroom interaction students access new knowledge, develop new skills, identify problem of understanding, deal with ‘breakdowns’ in the communication, establish and maintain relationship.

Walsh (2011:111) stated The SETT framework is designed to help teacher both describe the classroom interaction of their lesson an develop an understanding of interactional process as a way of becoming a ‘better’ teacher. The SETT framework uses four modes ; Managerial mode, materials mode, skill and system mode, classroom context. Each mode with distinctive pedagogic goals and different interactional features. The SETT framework is made up of the fourteen interactional features. The interactures used in SETT framework can be found in varying degrees in any classroom. Using SETT analysis allows teacher to gain a rapid profile of the kinds of features to be found in their classes and...
asses their appropriacy. Content feedback for example is more likely to be found in classroom context mode, whereas skills and system mode is more likely to contain examples of direct repair, which, in turn, will be less visible in classroom context mode.

By making of short recordings of activities in teaching and by listening to these recording, it is possible to increase the awareness of (a) which modes are being used, and (b) which interactures appear in each mode. This combined analyzing, first focusing in modes, then on interactures will give the detailed profile of the interactions taking place in the classes and permit to make adjustment. For example it may find that in classroom context mode, only ask display questions, thereby restricting the kind of response open to the learners. Or it may notice that constantly interrupt when eliciting. The SETT framework uses four modes; Managerial mode, materials mode, skill and system mode, classroom context. Each mode with distinctive pedagogic goals and different interactional features (Walsh: 2011). These are all important features of the teaching that can be changed in order to improve learning and learning potential for the students. The fourteen Interactional features are presented as follow:

Table 1. Interactional Features of Self Evaluation Teacher Talk (SETT)

| Feature of teacher talk | Description |
|-------------------------|-------------|
| A scaffolding           | 1. Reformulation (rephrasing a learner’s contribution)  
                          | 2. Extension (Extending a learner’s contribution)  
                          | 3. Modeling (providing an example for learners)  
                          | In a classroom this mail entail teacher “feeding in” specific words or structures as and when needed by learners (Walsh :2011). |
| B direct repair         | Walsh (2011) Where errors are corrected quickly and directly with little explanation or exemplification. |
| C content feedback     | Walsh (2011:174) stated Evidence of content feedback by the teacher who respond to the message and not to linguistics form used to articulate a particular message. |
| D extended-wait time   | Allowing sufficient time (several second) for students to respond or formulate the response. Extended wait-time allowed by teacher to answer a question not only increase the number of learners responses, it frequently result in more complex answers and lead to an increase in learner / learner interaction. (Walsh 2011, 34). |
| E referential questions | Referential Questions, which require greater effort and depth of processing on the part of the teacher, one possible reason for language teachers’ preference for display questions over referential question (Walsh 2011:41). Genuine questions to which the teacher does not know the answer (Walsh 2011:126) |
| F seeking clarification | 1. Teacher ask to students to clarify something the students has said.  
                             | 2. Students ask teacher to clarify something the teacher has said. |
| G extended learner turn | Learner turn of more than one utterance. |
| H teacher echo         | 1. Teacher repeats teacher’s previous utterance  
                          | 2. Teacher repeats a learner’s contribution |
| I teacher interruptions | Interrupting a learner contribution |
| J extended teacher turn | Teacher turn of more than one Utterance |
| K turn completion      | Completing a learner’s contribution for the learner. |
| L display question     | Asking questions to which teacher knows the answer |
| M form-focused feedback | Giving feedback on the word used, not the message |
| N confirmation check   | Confirming understanding of a student’s or teacher’s contribution |

Walsh (2011:159) stated in ‘the real world’ effective communication rests on an ability to interact with others and to collectively reach understanding. Interaction in classroom provide opportunities to acquire new language. Moreover Van lier (1996:5) stated interaction is the most important thing on the curriculum. However, many problems of interaction occur in the classroom. For instance, students
difficult to express themselves in using English that is not their mother tongue. Studies in classroom discourse also have result in consistent findings. Teacher talk dominates around 60% of classroom time (Chaudron, 1988:50). It makes the role of participants (teaches and learners) are not equal in teaching and learning process.

This study presents understanding of classroom interaction pattern and classroom interaction features that discuss by using the IRF exchange structure and SETT framework. The IRF exchange based on the work Sinclair and Coulthard (1975), who noted that most classroom discourse follows a three part structure; initiates, responds, and follow up/ evaluation. The SETT framework based on Walsh (2006) comprises four classroom micro-contexts (called modes) and fourteen interactional features (called interactures). Its is designed to help teachers both describe the classroom interaction of their lesson and develop an understanding of interactional process.

The SETT (Self evaluation teachers talk) framework comprises four classroom micro-contexts (called modes) and fourteen interactional features (called interactures) by Walsh (2006). Classroom discourse is a portrayed as a series of complex and interrelated micro-context (modes), where meaning are co-constructed by teachers and learners and where learning are occurs through the ensuing talk of teachers and learners. The SETT framework uses four modes; Managerial mode, materials mode, skill and system mode, classroom context and fourteen interactional features; Scaffolding, direct Repair, content Feedback, extended- wait time, referential questions, seeking clarification, extended learner turn, teacher echo, teacher interruptions, extended teacher turn, turn completion, display question, form-focused feedback and confirmation check.

The SETT framework is designed to help teachers both describe the classroom interaction of their lesson and develop an understanding of interactional process as a way becoming a ‘better’ teacher (Walsh, 2011). Classroom interaction is important in teaching and learning process. Learning is not something we have or own, it is something that we participate in and it entails encounters with other. Students’ action, activities and interaction with other all work together to determine what it is that student learn. Learning entails completing task, taking part in activity, talking, discussing, debating and arguing with others. This position suggest that the teacher now has an important role to play in creating and managing interaction that is ‘acquisition rich’.

The IRF exchange structure is one of the most important features of all classroom discourse it follows a fairly typical and predictable structure, comprising three part: a teacher initiation, a student response, and a teacher feedback. Commonly known as IRF, or IRE; initiation, response, evaluation. This three part structure was first put forward by Sinclair and Coulthard in 1975 and is known as the IRF exchange structure. The work of Sinclair and Coulthard has had a huge impact on our understanding as the ways in which teachers and learners communicate and has led to many advances in the field.

**Method**

This research focuses on classroom discourse analysis. Classroom discourse is a type of research method that perform analysis on teacher-students interaction in the class. Walsh (2011:81) also stated discourse analysis is the study of spoken or written text. It is focus on words and utterances above the level of sentence and its main aim is to look at the ways in which words and phrases function in context. This study presents understanding of classroom interaction pattern and classroom interaction features that discuss by using the IRF exchange structure and SETT framework. Researcher used observation to collect the data. The aim of observation is to explain all of activities in teaching and learning process naturally without any stranger in the classroom. The observation was conducted by recoding classroom activities. The data in this study is in form of video recording. In addition, during the recording the researcher was not allowed to enter in the classroom and make conversation inside the classroom. It makes the observation easier to interpret the situation in the field.

The researcher used video recorder and tripod. According to Walsh (2011: 68) audio recording are, in many ways, the easiest means of capturing spoken interaction in classroom. Thus researcher left video recorder by using tripod in the classroom to observe the activities and interaction in the classroom. The data was collected in two English classes of first grade in SMA 1 Muhammadiyah Bengkulu academic year 2017/2018 with two different English teachers. Each class will record in 90 minutes. The researcher recorded teaching and learning process from opening until closing activities.
Classroom interaction patterns can be discovered by analyzing the transcription of video recording. The main concern of transcription is to ‘represent reality’ as accurately and faithfully as possible. The researcher used transcription adapted from Van Lier (1988) and Johnson (1995). Firstly, in order to investigate teacher and students discourse, it is required to transcribed the video recording. Secondly writer described teacher A, and B’s interaction pattern through IRF framework. Thirdly writer described the interaction features which find in the classroom interaction through SETT framework.

### Table 2. Example of Interaction Features

| No | Interactional features | Description |
|----|------------------------|-------------|
| A. | Scaffolding | *T:* He went to what do we call these things the shoes with wheels= <br> L2: =ah skates= <br> L6: = roller skates= |
| B. | Direct repair | L5: He has has … <br> *T:* Simple past <br> L: He broke= |
| C. | Content Feedback | L1: go to picnic we made playing or talking with the teacher more closely because in the school we have a line you know he the teacher and me the students= <br> *T:* So you say there was a gap or wall between the teacher and the students so when yo |
| D. | Extended wait-time | L: I don’t know password symbol (…) is paused of one second or less marked by three periods |
| E. | Referential Questions | *T:* Have you any idea what country life would have been like? <br> L: scary |
| F. | Seeking clarification | L5: [at eight] o’clock at nine o’clock you can call= <br> L6: In Japan same= <br> *T:* It’s the same eight hours?= |
| G. | Extended Learner Turn | *L:* so it’s good news (laughter) <br> *LL:* /bad news/ ok/ no no that’s good news /… <br> L2: Bad news <br> *T:* =That’s good news G N good news… |
| H. | Teacher echo a. Teacher-learner Echo | *S:* (unclear) <br> *T:* The national museum. Yes thank you very much and how about you, NAME? |
| | b. Teacher-teacher echo. | *T:* sit down please (3) Our topics today is museums. the national Museum. Have you ever been to museums (1)? Have you ever been to museums (2)? Yes of course. And what kind of museum have you been to (4) NAME? |
| I. | Teacher Interruptions | *T:* =Some food, ↓yes. ↑ha= <br> L4:↓ yes (2.0) |
| J. | Extended teacher turn | *L2: it depends u:m for the situation. It’s ↑good = <br> *T:* =if you are alone or with your family, ↓yes, but if you have a lot of guests it’s very bad. ↑yes= |
| K. | Turn completion | *L2: before going we telephone (.) and = <br> *T:* =yes, before going on a trip, you call a special hotel in that place and reserve. Some time you should pay some money in advance. In advance means before going there, but to most of people (1.0) will pay after (.) they want to leave the room. They want to leave that place (1.0) the whole part of the money will be paid after that, but in advance means pay the whole money before you go and stay there. |
| L. | Display Questions | *L1:* (reading from book) where was Sabrina? When this happened? |
| M. | Form-Focused Feedback | *T:* Ok. Does anyone agree with his statement? <br> L: (2) erm I am agree= |
T: agree be careful with the verb to agree there you as well Ensa that its we agree it's not be agree it is to agree ok=

N. Confirmation check

L1: Somebody just follow me either a man or a woman I don’t know if it’s a man I feel really exciting if it’s a woman ((4)) I don’t now why like I’m trying to do things better like I’m eh… look like this. you FEEL it… I don’t know=

T: you think it's a kind of spirit =

Table 3. Example of Interaction Pattern

| No. | IRF Structure | Example Conversation | Description |
|-----|--------------|----------------------|-------------|
| 1.  | Teacher: SO, can you read question two, Junya? | I               |
| 2.  | Junya: [Reading from book] where was Sabina when this happened? | R               |
| 3.  | Teacher: Right, yes, where was Sabina. | F               |
| 4.  | Teacher: In unit 10, where was she? | I               |
| 5.  | Junya: Er, go out…. | R               |
| 6.  | Teacher: She went out, yes. | F               |

Result and Discussion

In this section, the writer displays classrooms interaction at SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Bengkulu through Sinclair and Coulthrad’s IRF (Initiation, Response, and Feedback) to describe the classroom’s interaction pattern both teachers A, and B. The summary of the data analyzed are presented in the form of table and short description. Then, deeply description will be explained on discussion section. Furthermore, the writer displays the interactional features both teacher A and B and their students according to SETT Framework.

Classroom Interaction Pattern

Teacher A’s Classroom Interaction Pattern

In this research, the writer took a data, in X MIA A class from teacher A. The topic was about song. From the transcription, the writer found the teacher A’s interaction pattern. From the data analysis, Teacher A’s pattern was I (initiation), R (response) and F (feedback). Teacher A mostly given feedback and Initiation in one turn talking. Teacher A mostly used question as initiation to get students’ verbal response. Teacher A provides lots of initiation to students in form of question rather than giving clue and command. Moreover, teacher has given initiation in highest frequency but students are passive in this lesson. Students response the initiation with short utterance and frequently in Indonesian. In addition, Teacher A’s feedback in form of correcting, repetition, informing, and statement. Teacher A’s feedback is given when it is needed.

Teacher B’s Classroom Interaction Pattern

The writer took a data from teacher B in XIS A class. In this class, teacher B taught about song material. From the analysis of transcription, the writer found teacher B’s interaction pattern. According to the interactions, the class was driven with a simple pattern, Initiative (I) Response (R) and feedback (F) to the students. Teacher B talked more than her students. She usually used initiation to get the response from students. She mostly translated to Indonesian in giving initiation or feedback. Teacher’s question was her strategy to interact with her students.

Classroom Interaction Features

The writer analyzed 2 (two) transcription from both teacher A, and B. The analysis provides information about the interaction features which used by the teachers and their students during the lesson. Through SETT Framework, the writer classified the teachers and students’ utterances to find out their classroom interaction strategy in teaching and learning English. The writer presents the interaction features in form of tables below:

Teacher A and students’ interactional Features

Table 4 a provide information about teacher A’s interaction frequency. In X MIA A the writer found teacher A provide a lot of extended learner turn by giving direct question and referential question.
Teacher A was success to stimulus her students through her question strategy. Moreover, students in her lesson were passive but they respond teachers A’s question with short answer frequently in Indonesian and sometime in their mother tongue (Bengkulu language). Teacher talk was longer than students in the class. It shows with the second highest of extended teacher turn and direct question. Teacher A’s frequently show effort to make sure students understanding by using confirmation check and seeking clarification.

Table 4. Teacher A’s Total Interaction Features

| No. | Interactional features       | Symbol | X MIA A |
|-----|------------------------------|--------|---------|
| 1   | Scaffolding                  | SCF    | 16      |
| 2   | Direct Repair                | DR     | 5       |
| 3   | Content Feedback             | CF     | 1       |
| 4   | Extended-wait time           | EWT    | 13      |
| 5   | Referential Questions        | RQ     | 20      |
| 6   | Seeking clarification        | SC     | 35      |
| 7   | Extended Learner Turn        | ELT    | 171     |
| 8   | Teacher Echo                | TE     | 27      |
| 9   | Teacher Interruptions        | TI     | -       |
| 10  | Extended Teacher Turn       | ETT    | 90      |
| 11  | Turn Completion              | TC     | 12      |
| 12  | Display Question             | DQ     | 66      |
| 13  | Form-Focused Feedback        | FFF    | -       |
| 14  | Confirmation Check           | CC     | 36      |

Teacher A Mostly used Extended teacher turn to provide information to students and to giving feedback. It means teacher A gave lots of instruction, command and question in her class. So, the classroom interaction was full of modeling display question from teacher and short answer from students. Analysis data from transcript has showed the high amount of symbol [ ] (adopted by Van Lier (1998) and Jhonson 1995). The symbol means the utterances is overlap between teacher and students. It showed the students response frequently in short utterances.

*Teacher B and students’ interactional Features*

Table 5. Teacher B’s Total Interaction Features

| Interational Feature               | Symbol | X IS A |
|-----------------------------------|--------|--------|
| Scaffolding                       | SCF    | 8      |
| Direct Repair                     | DR     | 3      |
| Content Feedback                  | CF     | -      |
| Extended-wait time                | EWT    | 7      |
| Referential Questions             | RQ     | 23     |
| Seeking clarification             | SC     | 13     |
| Extended Learner Turn            | ELT    | 155    |
| Teacher Echo                     | TE     | 8      |
| Teacher Interruptions             | TI     | -      |
| Extended Teacher Turn            | ETT    | 42     |
| Turn Completion                   | TC     | 4      |
| Display Question                  | DQ     | 53     |
| Form-Focused Feedback             | FFF    | 12     |
| Confirmation Check                | CC     | 17     |

In table 5 shows the highest was extended learner turn. Teacher B provide a lot of extended learner turn to get more students response in classroom interaction. The second place teacher B’s interactional features was direct question. Teacher B frequently used direct question as one of her strategy to get verbal response from the students. The students in this lesson is active in giving response from teacher B’s direct question. Teacher B has some variation in gave feedback. She used teacher echo, teacher compliment, form focused feedback, direct repair, and extended teacher turn. Deeply explanation will be explained in discussion section.
Discussion

In this section, the writer describe teachers A and B’s interaction pattern through IRF Framework (Sinclair and Coulthard 1975). Secondly, in order to gain deeper understanding about classroom interaction analysis, the writer describes the interaction features which found in the classrooms interaction through SETT Framework (Walsh, 2006) and analysis interactional pattern. The descriptions can be drawn as follow:

Classrooms Interaction Pattern

Teacher A’s classroom interaction Pattern

In this research, the writer took a data, in X MIA A class from teacher A The topic was about song. From the transcription, the writer found the teacher A’s interaction pattern. Below are some extract which are taken from Teacher A’s classroom interaction. The extract 1 is taken from X MIA A. In extract 1, teacher greeted the students with Salam, asking students condition and checking attendance.

Table 6. Extract 1

| No. | Speaker | Utterances                                      | I/R/F | Exchange          |
|-----|---------|-------------------------------------------------|-------|-------------------|
| 1   | T       | Assalamu’alaikum Warahmatullahi Wabarakatuh     | I     | Greeting         |
| 2   | LL      | =Waalaikumsalam Warahmatullahi Wabarakatuh      | R     |                   |
| 3   | T       | =Good Morning students                         | I     |                   |
| 4   | LL      | =Morning Ma’am                                 | R     |                   |
| 5   | T       | =Okay. How are you today?                      | I     | Asking            |
| 6   | LL      | =I am Fine and you?                            | R     | students          |
|     |         |                                                 |       | condition         |
| 7   | T       | =Ok. I am fine too. Alhamdullilah. Okay, eh… before we start to study let say Alhamdullilah or say thank you to Allah because Allah has given us a healthy ya…. we can still breathe . So, we can study English today. Jadi jangan lupa selalu mengucapkan : = | F/I  | Checking students |
| 8   | LL      | =syukur=                                       | R     |                   |
| 9   | T       | =syukur=                                       | F     |                   |
| 10  | T       | =Ok. Now before we are going to study, I want to check your attendance list first. Who is absence today?= | I     |                   |
| 11  | L       | =Absence… =                                    | R     | Checking          |
| 12  | T       | =Who is absence today?                         | I     | students          |
| 13  | LL      | =(3) unclear=                                  | R     | attendance        |
| 14  | T       | =Nothing, eh. no one ?                         | F     |                   |
| 15  | LL      | =Nothing=                                      | R     |                   |
| 16  | T       | =(6) I will check your attendance list. Aldi Saputra? | I     |                   |
| 17  | L1      | =yes Ma’am / present=                         | R     |                   |
| 18  | T       | =Bagusni?=                                     | I     |                   |
| 19  | L2      | =yes Ma’am=                                    | R     |                   |
| 20  | T       | =Baitulah?=                                    | I     |                   |
| 21  | L3      | =Present Ma’am=                                 | R     |                   |
| 22  | T       | =Deva Septia?=                                 | I     |                   |
| 23  | L4      | =yes, Ma’am=                                   | R     | Checking          |
| 24  | T       | =Elrin Herliant Purnama =                      | I     | students          |
| 25  | L5      | =Present Ma’am=                                 | R     | attendance        |

In the opening class consist of greeting, asking condition, and checking attendance. In greeting Teacher A pattern is I-R, in asking condition is I-R-F and in checking student attendance the pattern is constantly with I-R. According to exact 1 teacher A presented her first step by greeting the student, it is known as I (initiation) where the teacher initiate to open the class and students answer her greeting with R (response). This pattern frequently used by teacher and students “Assalamu’alaikum Warahmatullahi Wabarakatuh”. Teacher A’s pattern generally was IRF in this class with the highest amount initiation in form question. In the opening section the pattern dominantly I-R. In introduction and gave explanation of material the pattern was I-R-F. In the next section, gave exercise the pattern was I-R-F and discussion
the pattern was I-R-F. The last, closing section the pattern same with the opening class dominantly with I-R pattern.

Teacher B’s classroom interaction Pattern

Teacher B’s classroom interaction pattern was IRF in her classes, X IS A. The interaction between teacher B and her students run smoothly. Teacher B’s initiation was responded by her students and the teacher gave feedback to them. In teacher B’s class the students was active. She usually used initiation to get the response from students. She mostly translated to Indonesian in giving initiation or feedback. Teacher’s question was her strategy to interact with her students.

In the opening class consist of greeting, teacher B pattern is I-R. In this section, there is a student as leader who gave command to give formal greeting from students to teacher “good day Ma’am” (extract 8 no 2) and teacher reply the greeting and continue to say salam ”Assalamu‘alaikum Warahmatullahi Wabarakatuh’.

Table 7. Exact 8

| No. | Speaker | Utterances | I/R/F | Exchange |
|-----|---------|------------|-------|----------|
| 1.  | L       | Stand up, Please Greetings to our Head | I     | Greeting |
| 2.  | LL      | Good day ma’am | R     |          |
| 3.  | L       | Sit down, please | I     |          |
| 4.  | T       | Good day, sit down please | R/I   |          |
|     |         | OK. Assalamualaikum wr wb |       |          |
| 5.  | LL      | Wassalamualaikum wr wb | R     |          |
| 6.  | T       | OK Nice to see you again | I     |          |
| 7.  | LL      | Nice to see you too | R     |          |

Teacher B’s pattern generally was IRF in this class with the highest amount initiation in form question. In the opening section the pattern dominantly I-R .In introduction and gave explanation of material the pattern was I-R-F. In the next section exercise the pattern was I-R-F and discussion the pattern was I-R-F. The last, closing section the pattern same with the opening class dominantly with I-R pattern.

The type of Interactional Features

**Teacher A and Students’ Interaction Features**

According to the transcription of teacher A’s class the writer described through the finding in table 1. Writer described type of interactional features used by teachers in the classroom based on finding in table 1. From the result of teacher A’s transcript teacher A used 12 (twelve) interactional feature based on Walsh framework (2006). There were extended learner turn (ELT) 171 frequencies, extended teacher turn (ETT) 90 frequencies, Display Question (DQ) 66 frequencies, confirmation check (CC) 36 frequencies, seeking clarification (SC) 35 frequencies, Teacher echo (TE) 27 frequencies, referential question (RQ) 20 frequencies, Scaffolding (SCF) 16 frequencies, extended wait time (EWT) 13 frequencies, turn completion (TC) 12 frequencies, direct repair (DR) 5 frequencies, content feedback (CF) 1 frequency

**Teacher B and Students’ Interaction Features**

According to the transcription of teacher B’s class the writer described through the finding in table 2. Writer described type of interactional features used by teachers in the classroom based on finding in table 2. From the result of teacher B’s transcript teacher B used 12 (twelve) interactional feature based on Walsh framework (2006). There were extended learner turn (ELT) 155 frequencies, Display Question (DQ) 53 frequencies, extended teacher turn (ETT) 42 frequencies, referential question (RQ) 23 frequencies, confirmation check (CC) 17 frequencies, seeking clarification (SC) 13 frequencies, Form focus feedback (FFF) 12, Teacher echo (TE) 8 frequencies, Scaffolding (SCF) 8 frequencies, extended wait time (EWT) 7 frequencies, turn completion (TC) 4 frequencies, direct repair (DR) 3 frequencies.
Conclusion

This study attempts to examine and analyze the classroom interaction at SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Bengkulu. Based on the analysis result, the conclusions can be drawn as follow: Teacher A’s pattern was I (initiation), R (response) and F (feedback). In her classrooms, teacher A provides lots of initiation to her students. The initiations were in form of questions, clues, or commands. Students’ response teachers A’s question with short answer frequently in Indonesian and sometime in their mother tongue. Teacher A mostly given feedback and Initiation in one turn talking. Teacher A mostly used question as initiation to get students’ verbal response. Teacher A provides lots of initiation to students in form of question rather than giving clue and command. Moreover, teacher has given initiation in highest frequency but students are passive in this lesson. Students respond the initiation with short utterance and frequently in Indonesian. In addition, Teacher A’s feedback in form of correcting, repeating, informing, and statement. Teacher A’s feedback is given when it is needed.

Teacher B’s interaction pattern is Initiation (I) Response (R) and feedback (F) to the students. Teacher B used initiation to get the response from students and mostly translated to Indonesian in giving initiation or feedback. According to the interactions, the class was driven with a simple pattern, Initiative (I) Response (R) and feedback (F) to the students. Teacher B talked more than her students. She usually used initiation to get the response from students. She mostly translated to Indonesian in giving initiation or feedback. Teacher’s question was her strategy to interact with her students.

In interactional feature based on Walsh framework (2006), teacher A used 12 (twelve). There were extended learner turn (ELT) 171 frequencies, extended teacher turn (ETT) 90 frequencies, Display Question (DQ) 66 frequencies, confirmation check (CC) 36 frequencies, seeking clarification (SC) 35 frequencies, Teacher echo (TE) 27 frequencies, referential question (RQ) 20 frequencies. Scaffolding (SCF) 16 frequencies, extended wait time (EWT) 13 frequencies, turn completion (TC) 12 frequencies, direct repair (DR) 5 frequencies, content feedback (CF) 1 frequency. Teacher B used 12 (twelve) interactional feature based on Walsh framework (2006). There were extended learner turn (ELT) 155 frequencies, Display Question (DQ) 53 frequencies, extended teacher turn (ETT) 42 frequencies, referential question (RQ) 23 frequencies, confirmation check (CC) 17 frequencies, seeking clarification (SC) 13 frequencies, Form focus feedback (FFF) 12, Teacher echo (TE) 8 frequencies, Scaffolding (SCF) 8 frequencies, extended wait time (EWT) 7 frequencies, turn completion (TC) 4 frequencies, direct repair (DR) 3 frequencies.

Regarding to the benefit of SETT to improve the classroom interaction, the writer would like to offer some suggestions that may be useful for English teachers and students. Based on the findings and discussion, teacher talk dominate the classroom and students’ response in short utterances. The writer suggest The English teacher especially who teach speaking skill to more consider about giving extended wait time to increase students’ response. The extended wait time can allow student to think what they want to talk from teachers initiation. Teacher also must be careful don’t dominate the students contribution, give they time to think and giving response.
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