Exploring the Practice of Teacher-Students’ Classroom Interaction in Speaking Subject at Higher Education
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Abstract. This study aims at formulating the teaching and learning’s interactional patterns on speaking subjects in universities. This is qualitative study which applied a realistic ethnographic approach. The data were the lecturers and students’ speech fragments on learning and teaching speaking skills. The instruments were technically obtained from observation using video recording. The data sources were the lecturers and students’ speech fragment at four different specific higher education (HE), the data were further labelled as HE-1, HE-2, HE-4 and HE-3. The data analysis followed Miles and Huberman’s interactive models. The results showed that the teaching-learning interactional patterns of speaking subjects at four specific universities remains dominantly controlled by the lecturers. In the HE-1, the lecturers were found speaking more actively than students (TTT) whereas in HE-3 & HE-4, students were given more speaking opportunities (STT), where this has led affecting the students’ achievement and optimal learning objectives. The interactions were mainly occurred at the time the students construct both their experience and knowledge with the received information. Lecturers at both universities have not been able to facilitate students to developing and expressing their ideas. Among the compared higher education of HE-1, HE-2, HE-3 & HE-4, the learning and teaching interactional patterns at the speaking subjects’ implementation were directed towards constructivism. Through generative learning strategy, there were found elements which reflect each step of the strategies, although at an early stage. It is necessary to develop varied learning models which engage students’ active participation. In addition, there should be an understanding towards the concept of students’ classroom interactional competence.

1. Introduction
The essence of learning concerns with a process of interaction between educators and learners. In a learning situation, the learners are given their access to the educators’ facilities in order that they can experience effectively the learning process. This is because the key learning process is on the interaction between participants, educators and learners, and learning in collaboration [24]. Allwright and Ellis [7] argue that successful learning is closely related to the success of interactional management. The most influential factor in students’ development and coaching is the educators [15]. Banner and Todd [9] suggest that the way an educator speaks shows the impact on students’ learning.

In an interaction of both teaching and learning, it is required speaking skills. Since speaking is a second language learning method in which people do as a kind of linguistic acquisition after having
learned from listening. Speaking ability can be an effective measurement for knowing a language [3]. Speaking skill is the skills in producing spoken language containing messages to convey others [21]; [1], [32]. Speaking activity according to Florez [13] is an interactive process in constructing certain meanings that involve the production, acceptance and processing of information. A speaking skill is about spontaneous, open-ended and neutrality. Such skills are of pivotal requirement to build information acquired from the existing self-experience or knowledge. In fact, the speaking skills embodiment remains difficult and confronts with a lot of constraints to realize the ideal teaching-learning interaction. This situation may not only happen in Indonesia. An evidence from Thai as has been reviewed by Punthumasen [5], accordingly the Thai learners have low English speaking skills, while in the dominant lecture / explanatory lesson, learners are asked to write down the lesson from the board and memorize them. This phenomenon according to Saengboon and Wongsothorn, et al. [5] that English learning in Thailand has too much content in the curriculum, educators, burdens and excessive responsibility, in addition to the excessive number of students within a class.

In Indonesian context, Untoro’s research [26] indicated that the Indonesian learners speaking ability is below average, the significant difference lays on the educators’ dominant roles within the learning process, consequently learners are not given much opportunity to train their speaking abilities. Similarly, the observations made in classroom activities, the lecturers who control the learning. As noted by Edwards and Wastgate [8] that in a formal education, the learning as a 'verbal meeting' is arranged by lecturers, the learning takes place in one direction, in such a case, the lecturers take more dominant roles in teaching and learning process.

The teacher's role in shaping class interaction needs to be reconsidered, as is the idea of teaching the whole class. The lecturers may not just to organize the exercises. Indeed, in most parts of the world, if they just "handed in" to students, lecturers will be criticized for not doing their job or be accused of neglecting responsibility. The lecturer's assumption of being a 'mere facilitator' may be a middle-class, western, and culture-bound perspective [28]. In lined with this fact, evidence from the field shows that learning pattern is still dominated by educators, Untoro’s [26] results emphasize that the classroom conversation, dominant lecturer's role, consequently leads into the ineffectiveness of students’ learning speaking competence since they are not given subsequent opportunity to speak by their own. Similarly, further argued by Liu and Le [1] that lecturers' speaking time allocation surpass the students'. The dominant IRF pattern (Initiation Feedback) often time prevails in classroom. The discussed issues in this study cantered on how the interactional patterns of teaching and learning speaking subjects at the four compared higher education/universities.

Although feedback is called educators as implications [2], other researchers instead propose a variable approach to feedback in interactional discourse. Kasper [15], i.e., explains that specific implication strategies are either preferred or unpreferred based on the lecturers’ objectives, as opposed to 'centralized language' with 'central content' improvements. Van Lier concludes that improvement is "closely related to the context of what is being done" [27], the implication being that improvement, like other aspects of classroom discourse, is fairly good, or should be, related to pedagogic purposes.

Kasper [14] argues that the IRF sequence is often considered negative in the language classroom because the learner is given minimum interactional space. He goes on to suggest how this position is enhanced when teachers offer learners greater participation rights and a more central position in interaction. McCarthy [18] further explains that 'listeners' on IRF exchanges: students' ability to recognize their involvement in discourse even at interactions where they are not the main speakers. Obviously, as McCarthy [18] underlined, this is a skill that is more closely related to speaking than listening. Arguably, this is a skill that teachers can encourage through more careful interaction with learners [28].

Studies on classroom discourse undertaken by previous researchers among others Smith [23], Chadia [7], Husna [12], Andryani (2011), Kumpul [16], Xhemaji [32]. The analyses were typically applied to the research subjects ranging from early childhood up to students of various educational levels by using corpus analysis, conversation linguistic, FIACS. However, previous research results limited on both presenting data analysis and measuring the teachers and learners’ participation, none of the researchers concern examining the interactional pattern of teaching and learning in universities. In this article, we analyse the conversations of lecturers and students in college.
Discourse analysis according to Brown and Yule [4] “is the analysis of language in use”. This restriction is based on functional language, which means discourse analysis examines what language is used. Carthy [6] further points out that discourse analysis deals with the study on the relationship between language and context in a language usage. Thakur [3] defines a class interaction analysis as "an instrument designed to record verbal interaction categories during, or from, recording teaching and learning session. This is a technique to capture qualitative and quantitative dimensions of the teacher's verbal behavioural activities in classrooms. ‘The analysis is an analysis of discourse in the classroom and behind the classroom’. Class is the main context of the discourse object of study. ‘Context' for discourse analysis in both within a class and behind the class. Classroom conversation at the beginning will be different from the final conversation. It describes the classroom teaching and learning interactional patterns. Many contexts influencing what things are spoken and interpreted. Everything spoken in a classroom affects the context behind it. Learning and teaching interactional patterns is based on personal point of view. In this research, the teaching and learning interactional pattern is conducted especially to cope with problems on the educators and learners’ activities, basic learning interactional pattern, in accordance with the constructivism through generative learning strategy

2. Methods
This study is under the qualitative methodology [20], [25] and is based on realistic ethnographical approach. Researchers are considered the ‘objective’ observers since they are observing the record facts, interactional events in classrooms objectively. The research design adopted classroom discourse analysis. The data are obtained from lecturers and students' speaking fragments on the learning and teaching activities of speaking skills at HE-1, HE-2, HE-3 & HE-4. The instrument of analysis uses observation on recorded videos which are then transcribed. The data sources are lecturers and students’ at the four compared higher educations. The data analysis used the interactive model adopted from Miles and Huberman’s model [19], conducted in four stages, namely data collection, data reduction, data presentation, and the conclusion or verification of the findings.

3. Results and Discussion
The teaching and learning interactional pattern of speaking subjects in the four compared higher educations has led to constructivism which is dominantly controlled by lecturers although the quality of constructivism may last different. The levels of lecturers’ control over students in HE-1 & HE-2 is higher than that of HE-3 & HE-4. However, in HE-1 & HE-2, the religious values directed towards character inculcation, which is higher than the HE-3 & HE-4.

The occurring interactional patterns are divided into early activities, the core that includes motivating activities, learning process, creation process, and generation process. The construction established by students have not yet emerged and evolved out of the knowledge understanding or students’ personal experiences. Students usually come out with ideas because they are assigned by the lecturers, related telling stories, taking a role as master of ceremony or host, speech delivery, discussion practice, or debate. Therefore, the students' performance has not shown optimal results. This is illustrated by the number of lecturers’ inputs to the students for the mistakes made.

The typical learning in religious colleges is quite strong with religious values. In HE-1, the Qur'anic values transmission is presented to the students as obligatory which necessarily be done by the lecturer in each lecturing time. Even the lecturers ought to follow several stage training programs before carrying out academic tasks. Learning device product as proof of readiness of lecturers to carry out learning in class. In RPS, the lecturers were also incorporating the initial activities of learning in which the letter and verse are written in relation to the lecturing materials. In HE-2, students normally perform prayers at the beginning of lecturing time which has been entrenched. However, in HE-3 & HE-4, students inclined towards experiencing the learning process. The interactional pattern of teaching and learning subjects at each of the compared higher education (HE) presented in the following table.
Harmer [11] argues that ESA (Engage Study Activate) as a strategical embodiment of an effective learning atmosphere. In table 1, it is presented the learning between lecturers and students, there are four universities as the samples among others are the HE-1, HE-2, HE-3, and HE-4. ESA may occur at various learning, in HE-1 the ESAES was occured, in HE-2 there was occured EASAS, in HE-3 occured ESAAS, and similarly in HE-4 the EAAAS was occured.

In HE-1, the learning was described with ESAES, this means that students are involved in question and answer (Q&A) learning towards the level of knowledge followed by informational provisions by the lecturers. Students are given the opportunity to practice their speaking skills within a discussion session is controlled by the lecturers. In this case, the students are re-enrolled in interactive lecture learning, one who guides the learning is the lecturer. At the end, the lecturer provides a discussion as a practical realization in lectures form accompanied with Q&A sessions. In contrast to HE-2, speaking lessons are described with EASAS. The learning begins with Q&A on some materials to be discussed, practically, students are involved in this learning process and is controlled by the lecturer. The learning followed by students’ speaking practice of telling stories in front of the classroom individually along with setting up a discussion by both lecturers and students. At the discussion session, the lecturer further elaborated the related theory.

Learning activities at HE-3 and HE-4 showed more students’ active role because the learnings are in presentation and debate forms. In both of these universities, speaking learning begins with information from lecturers who engaged the students’ active roles. The students’ next activities is the presentation and debate. In the HE-3, students’ presentation activity, significant interactive interaction tends to be regularly occured. The response is realized in referential question form, which was primarily addressed to the presenters. This consequently leads the presenters into having critical thinking to answering for questions. The questions are: "Lah, apakah ada solusi dari Mbak Novita supaya saya tidak panik?" [Trans. Is there any sollution from Miss Novita to avoid being panic]. At the presentation session, students delivering questions using the guidance or introductory before the question was asked, the students who were being asked can be explained in complex. This is as illustrated by Berns [22], “Experience with peers enable children to acquire a wide range of skills, attitude, and roles that influence their adaptation throughout life”. Students who are interacting with fellow students as peers, their various skills, attitudes, and roles influencing the adaptation in communication. This opinion is also relevant to what has been elaborated by Chadia [7], that students who were being asked with an open question, their answers remain longer and quite complex.

The expressed opinions are in a along and complex form of sentences additionally occur in speaking learning at HE-4. The method use in HE-4 applied the debate model. The debates were directed by the students. In the debate, there are pro teams, counter teams, supporters of the pro teams,
supporting group of the counter team, and jury teams, however, in this case, the lecturers take a role as observers. The prevailing interactional circumstances in both universities remain different, in HE-3 the proposed opinions are still limited to the discussed topics, whereas in HE-4, the typical long argumentation presented, are often time found less relevant to the arguments presented by the opposing team, due to the opposing teams’ lack of understanding over the discussed materials.

The teaching and learning interactional patterns in both religious and HE-3 & HE-4, it is found they are applying typical learning steps toward constructivism, but early constructivism. This is evidenced in the activities of generative learning steps strategy are found, even though only few found, such as learning process steps are in the activities of students who provide responses, as marked by B6.

Lecturer : “Kemudian saya ingin memberikan bahasa non verbal yang alatnya adalah tubuh kita sendiri, kalau saudara menyatakan setuju dengan bahasa tubuh kita”. [Trans. And, I would be giving you non verbal language, by which our body is the only means, if only you are in agreement with our body language]
Students : [nodding].

The learning-teaching interactions at both HE-1 & HE-2, the lecturers often time were found dominantly take more role. The model applied by lecturers in the learning is lecturing in addition to providing for questions and answers time. Learning processes which took place in such a university shows the lecturers’ active roles insted of the students’. Harmer [11] notes that a good educator is an educator who maximizes the students's active roles or Student Talking Time (STT) conversely educators who dominantly take over the classroom’s conversation is the so called Teacher Talking Time (TTT). However, these two universities show significant advantages to be compared with the HE-3 & HE-4, which is students’ noble characters inculcation. Among the inculcating noble characters were the subjects on praying, connecting everything learned under the God’s Suprime Power. Even in HE-1, any preparation made by lecturers (RPS), should include and attach every learned things with the Qur'anic values.

In the HE-3 & HE-4, students are given the opportunity to actively perform the learning process. Although the students have not been able to construct the knowledge gained with the knowledge or experience they have. The information conveyed in the learning is, therefore, still limited by certain topics. There is the needs for being facilitated by the lecturers, thus the interactions develop optimally as part of their critical thinking. As referred to Husna [12]. Flanders similarly assumes that the educators share influential authority in the classroom, because lecturer’s talk and things being delivered were primarily determined by the students’ great reactions.

This may also affect the students’ academic achievement. In lined with Good and Brophy's opinion [10] that the lecturers’ verbal behaviour in classroom affects students’ academic achievement. The above table shows the average value achieved by students, in which the HE-1 with the average of 73; HE-2 69, HE-3 79.8 and HE-4 83.5. These values illustrated that the HE-1 & HE-2 are lower than that the HE-3 & HE-4. In HE-1 & HE-2, the interactional pattern seemed to be dominantly controlled by the lecturers, while in HE-3 & HE-4, the students’ interaction was fairly good. The achievement value was relevant to Bailey's opinion [13] that speaking skill is more difficult than other skills.

4. Conclusion
The results of this research conclude that the teaching and learning interactional pattern of speaking subjects at the HE-1 & HE-2 is mostly controlled by the lecturers. In HE-1 & HE-2 lecturers speak more than students (TTT) whereas in HE-3 & HE-4 both lecturers and students were given a lot of opportunities to speak (STT). It affects student achievement. Both groups of universities have not been able to achieve the objectives, because students have not been able to optimally interact. An interaction occurs at the time students constructing both their experience and knowledge with the received information. Lecturers at both universities have not been able to facilitate students with self-development and ideas expressions. Both religious and HE-3 & HE-4 interactional patterns of the learning and teaching speaking subjects towards constructivism. Through generative learning strategy
in learning, there were found elements that reflect each step of the strategies, although at the early stage. It is necessary to develop varied learning models that involve learners’ participation. In addition, there should be an understanding of the concept of classroom interactional competence. The results of this study may significantly contribute the educators’ insight into the importance of teaching-learning interaction between educators and learners. The creation of interactional learning is perceived to be a successful achievement of students’ learning objectives. In addition, the results of this study can be used as a rationale that all educators determine the learners’ learning achievements, such as motivation, the delivery of questions, and the selected learning models.
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