ANALYSIS OF CLASSROOM INTERACTION IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF 2013 CURRICULUM IN SMAN

Edward Rukmana, Hery Yufrizal, Hartati Hasan
Email: edward.rukmana@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

Tujuan penelitian ini adalah (1) untuk mengetahui proses interaksi kelas melalui *Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF),* (2) untuk mengetahui pola yang dominan muncul di kelas, dan (3) untuk mengetahui pola interaksi di kelas sesuai atau tidak dengan aspek kurikulum 2013. Sampel dari penelitian adalah kelas IPA dan IPS di tahun ajaran 2013/2014. Penelitian ini adalah penelitian kualitatif. Hasil dari pola interaksi melalui *Sinclair and Couthard Initiation-Response-Feedback model* menunjukan : *Teacher Elicitation* (20%), *Check* (21%), *Student Information* (20%), *Student Elicitation* (13%), *Teacher Information* (12%), dan *Teacher Direct* (11%). Di kelas IPA, interaksi didominasi oleh murid, *Student Inform* 30%. Pola yang terjadi di kelas IPS didominasi oleh guru, *Teacher Elicitation* 15%. Dapat disimpulkan bahwa pola interaksi yang muncul tidak sesuai dengan aspek – aspek kurikulum 2013.

The aims of this research were (1) to investigate the process of classroom interaction through initiation-response-feedback (IRF), (2) to find out the exchange pattern of classroom interaction that dominantly appear, and (3) to find out whether or not the exchange pattern of classroom interaction is suitable with curriculum 2013. The sample of this research were science class and social class of SMA in the year 2013/2014. The research is qualitative research. The result of the classroom interaction pattern suggested by Sinclair and Coulthard Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) model namely: *Teacher Elicitation* (20%), *Check* (21%), *Student Information* (20%), *Student Elicitation* (13%), *Teacher Information* (12%), and *Teacher Direct* (11%). In the science class handled by the students, amounting *Student Inform* 30%. The exchange pattern in social class taken by the teacher, *Teacher Elicitation* 15%. It can be concluded that the exchange pattern is not suitable with 2013 curriculum principle.

Keywords: classroom interaction, *initiation-response-feedback model*, student inform.

INTRODUCTION

As an international language, English takes a big role as a part of subject in school. There are four skills of English which should be taught in Senior High School in Indonesia i.e, listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Commonly, the goal of language is to communicate with others. In other words, to communicate with others, we should improve our skill especially in speaking. McCarthy (2002) states that among those four skills that make up language proficiency, speaking is most observable phenomenon in the classroom.

Speaking is the important aspect in language teaching and learning in order to communicate and delivers the message to the people clearly. According to Lado (1976: 240) speaking as the ability to express oneself in life situation or conversation, to report acts or situation in practice word or the ability to express a sequence of ideas fluently. Therefore, speaking facilitates an individual to deliver information whether it is in the form of expression or report through communication.

Communication needs speaker and listener as a media in delivering message or information. Mehan (1979: 8) mentions that speaking or oral communication is a two-way process between speaker and listener and involves the productive skills and the receptive skills of understanding. It means that there must be at least two people: one is a speaker that has the information and a listener who receive the information or material itself.

To delivers the material in the classroom, interaction is needed by the teacher to facilitates learning process. Rivers (1987: 4) says that interaction is the key to teach language communication. Through interaction, speaker and listener will share the idea that make the process of delivering information happen. Interaction happens when all of the need of communication are fulfilled. Interaction involves not just expression of one's own idea but comprehension of those of others.

Classroom interaction is the action performed by the teacher and the students in the process of teaching and learning in the classroom. Classroom interaction covers classroom behaviors such as turn-taking, questioning and answering, negotiation of meaning, and feedback (Chaudron, 1998:10). In addition, according to Brown (2001), interaction is the heart of communicative competence. When a learner interacts with other learners he/she receives input and produce output. The input should be given by the teacher through proper material to stimulate students' response and get the goal of the material itself.

Malamah-Thomas (1987:5) states that interaction in language classroom will lead the learners to better learning, and will active their competence. The learners that have good interaction between teacher and others will get the knowledge better than the learners that have bad interaction. Environment in the class will be conducive depends on the teacher's treatment for the learners, appropriate treatment will create active class.

To make a conducive environment, the teacher should create a good interaction to bridge the material to the learners. Interaction is the device to introduce a new teaching material to the students in their learning activity. In the 2013 curriculum

principles, interaction that produce by students becomes the aspect that expected appears in learning process. Government recommended that new curriculum namely 2013 curriculum should be implemented in all schools in purpose to increase the quality of education. Even this curriculum is still in experimental phase, Minister of Education expects that the decision is a way to achieve bright future of our education.

Initiation-response-feedback (IRF) model is a model of classroom interaction which provide guidance for analyzing spoken language, which was developed from classroom interaction (McCharty, 2002:36). In the Sinclair and Coulthard model, there are initiation or asking the question, responding the initiation, and feedback to measure how well the material absorbed. The researcher uses this model for analyzing the student and teacher interaction.

Therefore, the objective of this article are (1) to investigate the process of classroom interaction through initiation-response-feedback (IRF), (2) to find out the exchange pattern of classroom interaction that dominantly appear, and (3) to find out whether or not the exchange pattern of classroom interaction is suitable with curriculum 2013.

METHOD

This research is classroom interaction and non experiment research, so the researcher used qualitative method, in which focused on the process of teaching and learning not on the product. According Suparman (2009), qualitative researchers report the result obtained from qualitative analysis through detailed descriptions of

the processes which the researchers need in arriving at the categories and patterns of research. The researcher, as an observer, record during the process of teaching English in the classroom. Furthermore, the data are focused on the teaching learning process by analyzing the interactional conversation among teacher-students and students-teacher in speaking class by using Sinclair and Coulthard Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) model. The population of this research was all the first grade students at SMA Negeri 2 Metro in the academic year of 2013/2014. There were six classes available at the first grade. From those classes, the researcher took one science class and social class as the observation class; it was class science three consisting of 26 students and social class as the; it was class social two consisting of 27 students.

The data were collected from the interaction between teacher and students when they interact during speaking class. The interactions that happen in the class were recorded by using video recorder. After recording, the data was analyzed based on the category using Sinclair and Coulthard model. In addition, researcher used interview to make sure that there is no mistake about the meaning of some acts during the class.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This research was aimed at answering the questions (1) how is the process of classroom interaction through initiation-response-feedback (IRF), (2) to find out the exchange pattern of classroom interaction that dominantly appear, and (3) to find out whether or not the exchange pattern of classroom interaction is suitable

with curriculum 2013. The classroom interaction research was done since this research focused on the analysis of classroom interaction in reading class teaching learning stage became the source of data. The first observation in science class was conducted on Saturday, January 18th 2014. There were 26 students attending the class and participated during the teaching and learning process conducted by the English teacher.

The highest percentage forms the teaching exchange patterns is *Student Inform* (IF) in which students conveyed information to the teacher or students themselves. The pattern above gave contribution 30 %. The next pattern was *Check* (IRF) which functioned to discover how well students are getting on and identify the problem, which contributed 19, 41 % or 19%.

The next pattern was *Teacher Elicit* (IRF). It functioned to elicit a verbal response from the student/s. This pattern of teaching exchange contributed 15, 88 % or 16%, the third highest percentage during all the interaction. Furthermore, there were 12,35 % or 12 %. *Teacher Direct* (IRF) from all the teaching exchange patterns. *Teacher Direct* here functioned to elicit non-verbal response from the student.

The next was *Student Elicit* (IR) pattern. This teaching exchange pattern functioned to elicit a verbal response from the teacher or the students themselves. *Student Elicit* placed as the fifth, which contributed 11, 17 % or 11%. The last teaching exchange pattern emerged in the classroom was *Teacher Inform* (IRF) which contribute 7,64% or 8%.

The second observation was conducted in reading class on Saturday, September 18th 2014. There were 27 students attending the class and participated during the teaching and learning process conducted by the English teacher. In analyzing the interaction from the speaking class, the writer applied Sinclair and Coulthard IRF model, focusing on the teaching exchange, since in this exchange, the move of Initiation (I), Response (R) and Feedback (F) happened.

Teacher Elicit (IRF) placed the highest percentage among those six teaching exchange patterns which was 29,37 % or 29 %.The next was *Check* (IRF), in which functioned to discover how well students are getting on and identify the problem, contributed 21,67 % or 21 % from all the teaching exchange patterns. *Teacher Inform* placed as the third of the highest percentage, which contributed 16,78 % or 17 %. Besides that *Students Elicit* (IR) which functions to elicit a verbal response from the teacher or the students themselves, contributed 15.38 % or 15 % from all teaching exchange patterns occurred during the interactions.

The next stage was *Teacher Direction* (IRF) which functioned to elicit non-verbal response from the student, contributed 8,39 % or 8 %. The last teaching pattern is *Student Information* (IF), functioning in which students conveyed information to the teacher or students themselves, which gave contribution 6,99 % or 7 %.

The researcher tried to find the average data of the teaching exchange pattern occurred during the interactions in the teaching and learning process to get the reliable and valid data. The following table and graph presents quantitative and percentage from the science and the social class observation in the analysis of

6

classroom interaction using Sinclair and Coulthard Initiation – Response – Feedback (IRF) Model in Reading Class.

Table 4.3 Total Quantities and Percentage in Teaching Exchange Patterns

Teaching Exchange Patterns	Predicted Moves	Science Class		Social Class		Average Data	
		Quantity	%	Quantity	%	Quantity	%
Teacher Information	Initiation (I)	13	7, 64 %	24	16,78 %	19	12 %
Teacher Direction	Initiation Response Feedback (IRF)	21	12, 35 %	12	8,39 %	17	11 %
Teacher Elicitation	Initiation Response Feedback (IRF)	27	15, 88 %	42	29, 37 %	35	23 %
Student Elicitation	Initiation-Response (IR)	19	11, 17 %	22	15, 38 %	21	13 %
Student Information	Initiation Feedback (IF)	51	30 %	10	6, 99 %	31	20 %
Check	Initiation Response Feedback (IRF)	33	19, 41 %	31	21, 67 %	32	21 %
Total		178	100 %	140	100%	155	100 %

Based on the table, the science and social class, it can be seen that the students talk occurs more frequently in the science class than in the social class. Total of the dialogue in science class showed 178 and the pattern that dominantly appear in the science class is *Students Information* which contribute 30 %, it means higher than social class that showed only 140 dialogues and the pattern that dominantly appear is *Teacher Elicitation* by percentage 29 %. It might be caused by adding in the science class, the teacher asked the students to play *"Stop the Bus"* game. Whether in the social class, the teacher gave much explaining the explanation text then the teacher asked them to discuss in group, finished by presentation.

Curriculum 2013 puts attitude on the higher priority than skill competencies and knowledge. In the last curriculum the students have to determine the major that they want to take in the second grade of senior high school, but in this new curriculum, they have to do it in the first grade of senior high school. In the learning process there are five steps, observing, questioning, associating, experimenting and also networking. This is some examples of students' learning process by five steps:

- Observing: Involving the students to find out information that related to the topic that will be learnt.

- Questioning: Facilitating the students by giving tasks, discussions, etc. to bring out the idea in the verbal or written form.

- Associating: Giving chances for the students to think, to analyze, to solve the problems, and to make some act without fearful.

- Experimenting: Facilitating the students to make the exploration report in the verbal or written form, individually or groups.

- Networking: Facilitating the students to present the result of their works individually or groups.

From the whole aspect or steps of learning process in 2013 curriculum, the researcher found that the activities in the class should be dominated by the students. The teacher became a facilitator of learning process and giving a chance the students to deliver their ideas through oral or written form.

Based on the result, *Teacher Elicitation* are placed the highest percentage among those six teaching exchange patterns. It function that to elicit a verbal response from the student/s gave contribution 23%, and then *Check* (IRF). It functioned functions to elicit a verbal response from the teacher or the students themselves. Even the teacher gave a game to the students to stimulate students' idea, the role of teacher as a facilitator cannot be seen on the class. *Check* placed as the second of the highest

percentage, which contributed 21% from all teaching exchange patterns occurred during the interactions. It means that the teacher spend the much time to checked the progress of students' work.

The next stage was *Student Inform (*IR) placed the third of highest percentage among those six teaching exchange patterns. It to convey or deliver certain information to the students in the class, contributed 20 %. This phenomenon occurs, based on the writer's assumption was because the activities were dominated by the presentation of the dialogue by students in front of the class.

Meanwhile, *Student Elicitation* (IR) functioned to elicit a verbal response from the teacher or the students themselves, which was 13%, placed the fourth of highest percentage among those six teaching exchange patterns. The percentage of Student Elicit happened because during the teaching and learning process, the activities were dominated by the presentation of the dialogue by students in front of the class. So, students take a chance to elicit some question related from the material about explanation text.

The next was *Teacher Information* (I) which functioned to convey or deliver certain information to the students in the class, contributed 12 %, are placed the fifth of highest percentage among those six teaching exchange patterns. The last *Teacher Direction* (IRF), functioning to elicit non-verbal response from the student. It gave contribution 11% among those six teaching exchange patterns. It happens because teacher commands the students to make a group consist of 4 to 5 in order to present the material. Teacher gave some instructions to the students about the rule of presenting the material.

Teacher Elicitation (IRF) gave the highest of percentage in six exchange pattern. Based on Sinclair and Coulthard (1992) points out that *Teacher Elicitation* is these exchanges begin with the teacher asking question or verbal respond.

From the previous statement, it could be inferred that Teacher Elicitation is one of six components in teaching exchange patterns in which it comes from the initiation (I) from the teacher to deliver certain information or idea which can be sent as the follow up (F) to students in the class.

This phenomenon occurs, based on the researcher assumption was because the activities were dominated by the students who confused about the material and difficult to inform what they have learnt to the teacher and other students. Brown (1994: 8) suggests that teaching is guiding and facilitating learning, enabling the learner to learn, setting the condition for learning. The teacher as facilitator should give the facility to the learners the learning process.

As the researcher knew that, the researcher faced the problem that some students got difficulty to communicate in class. It might be caused by the quality of the interaction in classroom between teacher and students. When their teacher elicited them, only few students gave the respond. The teacher got those respond because the teacher did not choose communicative words to deliver the material, so the teacher always tried translating to Indonesian if the students confused about what teacher said in the classroom.

The researcher's problem was there were many aspects that caused their difficulties such as shyness, feeling afraid of making mistakes, difficult to find the way how to

pronounce certain words, and not having substantial vocabulary, the teacher always tried to help students by negotiation of meaning. It functioned to keep the students find vocabulary before they performed in front of class. And then it also functioned to keep them understand the new vocabulary that they got in one day. The teacher gave opportunities like game for the students got active in the class. Moreover, teacher always did brainstorming in pre – teaching that functioned to remember students what they have learned last meeting. It also happened in post – teaching that functioned to remember students what they have learned that day.

In summary, classroom interaction process in English reading class reflected the pattern proposed by Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) Model. These six exchanges were enlisted as follows:

1. Teacher Elicitation (Initiation-Response-Feedback/IRF) 23%,
2. Check (Initiation-Response-Feedback/IRF) 21%,
3. Student Information (Initiation-Feedback/IF) 20 %,
4. Student Elicitation (Initiation-Response/IR) 13%,
5. Teacher Information (Initiation/I) 12%,
6. Teacher direction (Initiation-respond-feedback/IRF) 11%.

Based on the result of the research shown above, it can be inferred that the teacher dominates the class because the students need a guidance from the teacher to deliver their idea. Besides that students less active in interaction in the class because teacher gave monotonic methods in teaching activity that made students felt bored during learning process. So, exchange pattern that shown by the data is not suitable with the principles of 2013 curriculum.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

1. The process of classroom interaction in English speaking class reflects the classroom interaction pattern suggested by Sinclair and Coulthard Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) model, namely: *Teacher Elicitation* (20%) and *Check* (21%), *Student Information* (20%), *Student Elicitation* (13%), *Teacher Information* (12%), and *Teacher Direct* (11%).

2. The exchange pattern of science class dominantly handled by the students, it was proved based on the data that showed *Student Inform* 30%, *Check* 19,41%, *Teacher Elicitation* 15,88%, *Teacher Direction* 12,35%, *Students Elicitation* 11,17%, and *Teacher Information* 7,64%. On the other hand, the exchange pattern in social class taken by the teacher that showed *Teacher Elicitation* 15,38%, *Check* 21,67%, *Teacher Information* 16,78%, *Student Elicitation* 15,38%, *Teacher Direction* 8,39% and *Student Information* 6,99%. It can be conclude that teacher are dominate the class by percentage 60 %. Besides that students less active in interaction in the class by percentage 40 %.

3. The participation of teacher in learning process is higher than the students' participation. It can be concluded that teacher are dominate the class by amounting to 60 %. Besides that students are less active in interaction in the class amounting to 40 %. Therefore, the exchange pattern is not suitable with the 2013 curriculum principles.

Referring to the conclusion above, some suggestions can be listed as follows:

1. English teachers should accept in mind that interaction is something people can do together i.e. collectively. Obviously, in the classroom it is considered as important

for the teacher to manage who should talk, to whom, on what topic, in what language and so on.

2. For future researchers in the area of classroom interaction, the teacher should needs more strategies in the process of teaching and learning. The teacher should facilitate the students in their work.

REFERENCES

Brown, H. Douglas. 1980. *Principle of Language Learning and Teaching.* New Jersey: Prentice Hall. Inc.

Brown. 2001. *Teaching by Principles: An Analysis Approach to Language Pedagogy. Second Edition. Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.*

Choudron, C. 1998. *Second Language Classroom – Research on Teaching and Learning.* Cambrige*:* Cambrige University Press.

Lado, R. 1976. *Language Teaching a Scientific Approach.* New Delhi: Grow Hill Publishing Company.

Malamah-Thomas, A. 1987. *Classroom Interaction.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McCarthy, M. 2002. *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. New York: Cambrige. University Press.

Mehan, M. 1979. *Learning Lessons: Social Organization in the Classroom*. Cambrige: Cambrige University Press.

Rivers, W. M. 1987. *Language Teaching*. Cambrige: Cambridge University Press.

Suparman, U. 2009. *Qualitative Research for language teaching and Learning, Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design*. Bandung: Arfino Raya Publisher.