

## **An analysis on Teacher Talk using Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC)**

**Feny Martina**

IAIN Bengkulu

[feny@iainbengkulu.ac.id](mailto:feny@iainbengkulu.ac.id)

**Ira Rahmadani Utari**

[irarahmadani@gmail.com](mailto:irarahmadani@gmail.com)

**Syamsul Riza**

[syamsulriza@iainbengkulu.ac.id](mailto:syamsulriza@iainbengkulu.ac.id)

**Corresponding email:** [feny@iainbengkulu.ac.id](mailto:feny@iainbengkulu.ac.id)

### **Abstract**

The problem of this research was some lecturers only used one categories of teacher talks. The aims of this study were to identify the characteristics and the categories of teacher talk in the classroom using Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories System (FIACS). This study was case study design and qualitative method. The subject of this study was one novice and senior lecturer at IAIN Bengkulu. It used Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories System (FIACS) to analyze teacher's talk. The researcher used observation and interview for collecting the data. The result both of novice and senior lecturer showed that the characteristics of teacher is content cross and the most frequent is indirect talk. The percentage of teacher characteristics of novice lecturer was 45% while the percentage of teacher characteristics of senior lecturer was 39%. Novice lecturer used asking question and lecturing as the most frequent in indirect and direct talks. The percentage of asking question and lecturing were 39% and 21.5%. In other sides, senior lecturer used asking question and giving direction as the most frequent in indirect and direct talks. The percentage of asking and giving direction were 27.5% and 18.5%. Nevertheless, the occurred categories happened naturally with the consideration of learning situation that takes place. In addition the analysis of teachers' talk in the classroom would be beneficial for teachers to plan and conduct enhanced learning situation. It concluded teacher talks of novice and senior lecturer in the classroom using Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC).

**Keywords :** Teacher Talk, Novice Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, FIAC.

### **Introduction**

---

Classroom Interaction is very important for teaching and learning process. It is because classroom interaction involves a collaborative exchange. It includes feeling or ideas between a teacher and student or a student and other student resulting in the classroom interaction. Besides, without classroom interaction, the teaching and learning process will not exist. In this case, teacher and students will speak or communicate in the classroom because communication or speaking is important in the classroom (Syafryadin, et al. 2017; Syafryadin, et al. 2019; Syafryadin, 2020; Syafryadin, et al. 2020; Syafryadin, 2020). There are several aspects of classroom interaction. One of the aspects that take critical role in teaching and learning process is teacher talk.

Teacher talk is everything that teacher says in the classroom. It means that all of words from the teacher are categorized as teacher talk. According to Flanders that there are two categories of teacher talks, direct and indirect talks (Widya, 2015). The first category is direct influence. It consists of lecturing, giving directions, and criticizing or authority. For example, teacher gives directions about the final task in the classroom. The second category is indirect influence. Indirect influences includes accepts feeling, praise or encouragement, accepts or uses ideas of students and asking questions.. For example, in giving praises the teacher mostly uses “very good”, “excellent”, and so on. Those are the categories of teacher talk.

Teacher talk is one of important things, not only for organization and for management of the classroom but also the process of acquisition. In Teaching English Foreign Language’s classroom process, teacher often simplify their speech, giving it many of the characteristics of foreigner talk such as applying slower and louder than normal speech, using simpler vocabulary and grammar. This is in line with Narfrina in addition to this linguistic aspects of teacher talk that linguistics aspects of teacher talk is importants aspects that language teachers can use in their talk not only neutrally to convey comprehensible information but also to express positive attitudes toward their students in the classroom (Astiti, 2014). It means that linguistic aspect of teacher talks is one of important aspects. There are some reasons why linguistics aspects of teacher talks is important. First,

we can find linguistic aspect from our language. Second, the categories of teacher talks is used all linguistics aspects.

However, the research gave an attempt to find proof the use of teacher talk in IAIN Bengkulu. IAIN Bengkulu is an islamic state institution in Indonesia. In this respect, the current research focussed on capturing the use of teacher talk among lecturers in English Study Program.

Moreover, the teacher talk to be investigated employ FIAC. Flanders Interacion Analisis Category (FIAC) by Flanders 1970. FIAC is one of techniques to observe classroom interaction systematically. There are two reasons why the researcher chosen this technique. First, FIAC is one of the technique that very clearly theory in observation the classroom. It made researcher easier to using this technique. Second, FIAC technique has covered all the categories, includes teacher and students. FIAC, the all of classroom interaction is put in three main sections : teacher talk, student talk and silence or confusion. Teacher talk includes : accepts feelling, praises or encourages, accepts or uses ideas of students, asks questions, lecturing, giving directions and criticising or justifying authority.

Based on small observation and interview with some students and lecturers in first and fifth semester of English Study Program in IAIN Bengkulu at September 7<sup>th</sup>, 2017. The researcher found that some students were understanding the lesson but some were not, because some lecturers only used lecturing as the type of teacher talk in the classroom. It includes novice and veteran lecturer. So, the students have a little chance to express their opinion because the teacher speaks all the time. All that they have to do is just listen their lecturer and make notes for useful information, so that students often sleepiness and lazy to study. In other hand, lecturers have another arguments about their style in teaching learning process in the classroom. They used that category/style cause that appropriate for the materials in the classroom.

Based on background above the researcher is interesting to conduct this research, because the researcher want to knowing the characteristics, percentage and the dominant of teacher talk in English Study Program. The title of this

---

research is “An Analysis On Teacher Talk Using Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC).”

Based on the problem above, the aims of this research is to know the characteristics and the category of Teacher Talk in classroom interaction the teacher talk in the classroom using Flanders Interaction Analysis Category (FIAC).

### **Research Method**

This research used qualitative approach, and case study used as the design. The use of case study as the design of the research is based on the following reasons. First, the case study research focuses on one particular object as a case to be studied in depth. It could help the reasercher to observe. In this research the teacher talk in terms of classroom interaction investigated. Second, the case study has limited area. It means that, this research is very specific in context. The researcher could understand more detail in the research because case study is on the type certain cases, in certain places or locations, and within a certain time. It means that the result of this research only for applying in the area of the research. The result of the research can not describe for all of context because in other places it could have different results and responses. Third, the aim of case study is knowing the object of the research. However, unlike other studies, case study research is specifically aimed at explaining and understanding objects that are specifically research as 'cases'. This in line with Cresswell define case study as “researcher explores a program, an event, an activity, a process, or one or more individuals in depth (William, 2007)

Subject of this research is one of novice and senior lecturers who is being assigned to teach students of English Department in one of Islamic Institute in Bengkulu. The subject selected in this research is based on perposive sampling. That means, perposive sampling is chosen by the particular purposes and characteristics of population. This in line with Ted Palys’s statement saying that “one will engage in purposive sample signifies that one sees sampling as a series of strategic choices with whom, where and how one does one's research.”(Plays,

2008). In this research, researcher observed the one novice lecturer and senior lecturer in one of Islamic Institute in Bengkulu. The experience's novice lecturer of teaching is still improvise from veteran lecturer. One of the aims of this research to know the dominant of "teacher's talk" that the lecturer may choose in the classroom.

There are two ways the data collection techniques & three instruments used in this research. There are as follows, observation for data collection technique. For the instruments, there are field note, video recording and observation sheet.

In analyzing the teacher talk, the researcher used Flanders Formula. Flanders formula is the formula to calculated the code of teacher talk. After the researcher got data from observation sheet of Flander interaction analysis, the researcher calculated how much the teacher and students talk time in classroom interaction by using Flander's formulates in order to getting expected data. The researcher used it to find out the percentage of teachers and students talk during classroom interaction.

## Result And Discussion

### Result

First of all, the researcher would like to show summary result of teachers's talk. They are as follows.

#### 1. Teacher Characteristics

##### a. Novice Lecturer

The reseacher would like to show summary result of the teacher characteristics. The characteristics were to know the teacher's characteristics during the observation.

Table 1. The Summary Results of Novice Lecturer Characteristics

No	Characteristics	First	Second	Average
1.	Content cross	42%	48%	45%
2.	Teacher control	0%	0%	0%
3.	Teacher support	2%	0%	1%

a. Content Cross

From table above, it showed that the average of teacher talk characteristics that was content cross was 45%. At the second meeting had higher percentage than first meeting. In contrast, at second meeting nothing had percentage. The reason why at those meeting had high and low percentage of content cross was how much the teacher asked questions (asking questions content or procedures, and calling a student by name) and lectured (giving explanation, citing an authority and asking rhetorical question) during observation had great influence to make high and low percentage.

b. Teacher control

Equally important, the average of teacher talk that was teacher control was 0%. At the teacher control characteristics, the second meeting had same percentage of teacher control with the first meeting. At the second meeting, the percentage of teacher control was 0%. On the contrary, at the first meeting had percentage of teacher control was 0%. The reason why at those meeting had high and low percentage of teacher control. It was how much the teacher gave directions and criticized the students behaviour during observation had great influence to make high and low percentage.

c. Teacher support

The average of classroom interaction that was teacher support was 1%. At the teacher support characteristics, the first meeting had higher percentage than the second meeting. The reason why percentage of teacher support. It was how much the teacher accepted the students' feeling, gave praise to the students, and accepted the students' ideas, whereas it had great influence to make high and low teacher support percentage.

**b. Senior Lecturer**

The reseacher would like to show summary result of the teacher characteristics. The characteristics were to know the teacher's characteristics during the observation.

Table 2. The Summary Results of Novice Lecturer Characteristics

No	Characteristics	First	Second	Average
i.	Content cross	42%	35%	39%
ii.	Teacher control	0%	1%	0.5%
ii.	Teacher support	0%	0%	0%

a. Content Cross

From table above, it showed that the average of verbal interaction that was content cross was 39%. At the first had higher percentage than second meeting nothing had percentage. The first meeting was 42%. The second meeting was 35%. The reason why at those meeting had high and low percentage of content cross was how much the teacher asked questions (asking questions content or procedures, and calling a student by name) and lectured (giving explanation, citing an authority and asking rhetorical question) during observation had great influence to make high and low percentage.

b. Teacher control

Equally important, the average of teacher talk that was teacher control was 0,5%. At the teacher control characteristics, the second meeting had higher percentage of teacher control than the first meeting. At the second meeting, the percentage of teacher control was 1%. On the contrary, at the first meeting had percentage of teacher control was 0%. The reason why at those meeting had high and low percentage of teacher control. It was how much the teacher gave directions and criticized the students behaviour during observation had great influence to make high and low percentage.

c. Teacher support

The average of classroom interaction that was teacher support was 0%. At the teacher support characteristics, the second meeting had same percentage than the first meeting. At the second

meeting, the percentage of teacher support was 0%. In the same, the second meeting was 0%. The reason why percentage of teacher support. It was how much the teacher accepted the students' feeling, gave praise to the students, and accepted the students' ideas, whereas it had great influence to make high and low teacher support percentage.

## 2. Novice Lecturer

### a. Indirect Talk

Table 5. The Summary Results of Teacher Talk's Novice Lecturer

No	Indirect talk	First	Second	Average
1.	Accepts Feelings	11%	9.5%	10.25%
2.	Praise or Encouragement	11%	0%	5.5%
3.	Accepts or uses ideas of students	2.27%	19%	10.6%
4.	Asking question	40%	38%	39%

#### 1) Accepts feelings

The average of accepts feelings that the teacher did during the observation was 10.25%. At the first meeting, the percentage of accepts feelings was 11%. It is higher than second meeting. At the second meeting, the percentage of accepts feeling was 9.5%. The reason why at those meeting has the high and low percentage of accepts feelings. It was how much the teacher accepts the feelings of students during observation.

#### 2) Praise or encouragement

The average of praise or encouragement that the teacher did during the observation was 5.5%. At first meeting, the percentage of praise or encouragement was 11%. It is higher than second meeting. At the second meeting, the percentage of praise or encouragement was 0%. The reason why at those meeting has the high and low percentage of praise or encouragement. It was how much the teacher praises or encouragement students actions or behaviour during observation.



3) Accepts or uses ideas of students

The average of accepts or uses ideas of students that the teacher did during the observation was 10.6%. At the second meeting, the percentage of accepts or uses ideas of students was 19%. It is higher than first meeting. The first meeting, the percentage of accepts or uses ideas of students was 2.27%. The reason why at those meeting has the high and low percentage accepts or uses ideas of students. It was how much the teacher accepts or uses ideas of students during observation.

4) Asking question

The average of asking question that the teacher did during the observation was 39%. At the first meeting, the percentage of asking question was 40%. It is higher than second meeting. At the second meeting, the percentage of asking question was 38%. The reason why at those meeting has the high and the low percentage of asking questions. It was how much the teacher asked questions content or procedures and called a student by name during observation had great influence to make the high and low percentage.

**b. Direct talk**

Table 6. The Summary Results of Teacher Direct Talk

No	Direct Talk	First (%)	Second (%)	Average (%)
5.	Lecturing/lecture	22%	21%	21.5%
6.	Giving direction	9%	9.5%	9.25%
7.	Critizing or justifying authority	0%	0%	0%

1) Lecturing/lecture

The average of lecturing that the teacher did during the observation was 21,5%. At the first and second meeting has the same percentage. At the first meeting, the percentage of lecturing was 22%. While, the second meeting the percentage of lecturing also was 21%. The reason

why at those meeting has the high and low percentage of lecturing. It was how much the teacher gave explanation, cited an authority, and asked rethorical question during observation had great influence to make high and low percentage.

2) Giving direction

The average of giving directions that the teacher did during the observation was 9.25%. At the giving directions, the second meeting has higher percentage of giving direction than first meeting. At the second meeting, the percentage of giving direction was 9.5%. At the first meeting, the percentage of giving directions was 9%. The reason why at those meeting has high and low percentage of giving directions. It was how much the teacher gave direction, command, an order to the students during observation had great influence to make high and low percentage.

3) Criticizing or justifying authority

The average of criticizing or justifying authority that the teacher did during the observations was 0%. At the critizing or justifying authority, at the first and second meeting has the same percentage. At the first meeting, the percentage of criticizing or justifying authority was 0%. While, at the second meeting the percentage of criticizing or justifying authority also was 0%. The reason why at those meeting has high and low percentage of criticizing or justifying authority. It was how much the teacher criticized the students' behavior during observation had great influence to make high and low percentage.

**c. Silence or Confusion**

Table 7. The Summary Result of Silence or Confusion

No	Classroom Interaction	First	Second	Average
1.	Silence	2.2%	2.3%	2.25%

Based on table above, the average of silence during the observation was 2.25%. The percentage of silence in the second meeting was higher

than first meeting. At the first meeting, the percentage of silence was 2.2%. While at the second meeting, the percentage of silence was 2.3%. The reason why at those meeting had higher and lower percentage of silence. It was communication that could not be understood by observer had grrreat influence to make the high and low percentage.

### 3. Senior Lecturer

#### a. Indirect Talk

Table 8. The Summary Results of Indirect Talk

No	Indirect talk	First	Second	Average
1.	Accepts Feelings	0%	12%	6%
2.	Praise or Encouragement	6.6%	4.6%	5.6%
3.	Accepts or uses ideas of students	1%	2.3%	1.65%
4.	Asking question	27%	28%	27.5%

##### 1) Accepts feelings

The average of accepts feelings that the teacher did during the observation was 6%. At the second meeting, the percentage of accepts feelings was 12%. It is higher than first meeting. At the first meeting, the percentage of accepts feeling was 0%. The reason why at those meeting has the high and low percentage of accepts feelings. It was how much the teacher accepts the feelings of students during observation.

##### 2) Praise or encouragement

The average of praise or encouragement that the teacher did during the observation was 5.6%. At first meeting, the percentage of praise or encouragement was 6.6%. It is higher than second meeting. At the second meeting, the percentage of praise or encouragement was 4.6%. The reason why at those meeting has the high and low percentage of praise or encouragement. It was how much the teacher praises or encouragement students actions or behaviour during observation.

##### 3) Accepts or uses ideas of students

The average of accepts or uses ideas of students that the teacher did during the observation was 1.65%. At the second meeting, the percentage of accepts or uses ideas of students was 2.3%. It is higher than first meeting. The first meeting, the percentage of accepts or uses ideas of students was 1%. The reason why at those meeting has the high and low percentage accepts or uses ideas of students. It was how much the teacher accepts or uses ideas of students during observation.

4) Asking question

The average of asking question that the teacher did during the observation was 27.5%. At the second meeting, the percentage of asking question was 28%. It is higher than first meeting. At the first meeting, the percentage of asking question was 27%. The reason why at those meeting has the high and the low percentage of asking questions. It was how much the teacher asked questions content or procedures and called a student by name during observation had great influence to make the high and low percentage.

**b. Direct talk**

Table 9. The Summary Results of Teacher Direct Talk

No	Direct Talk	First (%)	Second (%)	Average (%)
5.	Lecturing/lecture	2%	9.3%	5.65%
6.	Giving direction	2%	35%	18.5%
7.	Critizing or justifying authority	6.7%	2.3%	4.5%

1) Lecturing/lecture

The average of lecturing that the teacher did during the observation was 5.65%. At the first has higher than second meeting. At the first meeting, the percentage of lecturing was 2%. While, the second meeting the percentage of lecturing also was 9.3%. The reason why at those meeting has the high and low percentage of lecturing. It was how much the teacher gave explanation, cited an authority, and asked

rethorical question during observation had great influence to make high and low percentage.

2) Giving direction

The average of giving directions that the teacher did during the observation was 18.5%. At the giving directions, the first meeting has higher percentage of giving direction than first meeting. At the second meeting, the percentage of giving direction was 35%. At the first meeting, the percentage of giving directions was 2%. The reason why at those meeting has high and low percentage of giving directions. It was how much the teacher gave direction, command, an order to the students during observation had great influence to make high and low percentage.

3) Criticizing or justifying authority

The average of criticizing or justifying authority that the teacher did during the observations was 4.5%. At the criticizing or justifying authority, at the first meeting has higher percentage than second meeting. At the first meeting, the percentage of criticizing or justifying authority was 6.7%. While, at the second meeting the percentage of criticizing or justifying authority also was 2.3%. The reason why at those meeting has high and low percentage of criticizing or justifying authority. It was how much the teacher criticized the students' behavior during observation had great influence to make high and low percentage.

**c. Silence or Confusion**

Table 10. The Summary Result of Silence or Confusion

No	Classroom Interaction	First	Second	Average
1	Silence	10%	6.97%	8.48%

Based on table above, the average of silence during the observation was 8.48%. The percentage of silence in the first meeting was higher than second meeting. At the first meeting, the percentage of silence was 10%. While at the second meeting, the percentage of silence was

8.48%. The reason why at those meeting had higher and lower percentage of silence. It was communication that could not be understood by observer had great influence to make the high and low percentage.

#### **d. Report from Interview**

Based on the result from interview with novice and senior lecturer. There were some different and same answer from both of them. The researcher gave 5 questions to both of them. The researcher described the result of novice lecturer first.

The first question is do you usually change the interaction of in this classroom? He answered *“unfoundedly, the interaction must be change able. Why ? because in learning process, the students will not focuss on their teachers or their (..) lecturer or their focus on themselves but also the students, lecturer must focuss both of them..”* He said that the classroom must change able. It could make interaction actively from teacher and students.

The second question is how much do you think you talk in the classroom?. He answered *“I can not measure how long I should talk in the classroom. And how long I should keep silence in learning process. Because the interaction makes our time and learning process flow quickly, flow naturally”*. It means that, novice lecturer did not know how much he talking in the classroom because it happened naturally.

The third question is do you define the activity for the whole class and avoid explaining it to each group individually?. He answered *“I always define class into some groups before the real discussion. It means that (..) before coming my class,my students discuss first what will they learn in my class today. So, they have to prepare themselves..”* he said that explaining in whole class so, all the sttudents could understanding the materials.

The forth question is do you use the shared language/Bahasa to explain the rationale or procedures for an activity if these can not be

explained in target language?. He answered *“unfoundedly, I will use Bahasa when I think if the materials will not come into my students if I explain in English.”* It means that, he used Bahasa Indonesia to make students easier to understanding in some procedures or topic.

The last question is how often do you ask question aimed at determining if students understand your lesson?. He answered *“in every single steps, I mean (..) in transferring the subject or in transferring the knowledge in the classroom. There were some steps, there time step that I have to explain, there time step that I have to reexplain,”* He did not measure he asking the question to students.

In other hand, senior lecturer had different and same answering from interview. The first question is do you change the pattern of interaction, maybe students ask you or you ask the students?. He answered *“as long as I am concern that (..) I do not change anything. I usually use English and Indonesia in teaching English. When I explaining the materi, explaining the lesson. I (..) combine you know (..) English and Indonesia..”* He said that he don't change interaction, because the students did group presentation.

Second question is how much do you think you talk in the classroom?. He said that *“it depend on the case. Sometimes, I speak a long, and sometimes I speak a little.”* He could make sure how much he talking. He said that depend on the case in the classroom.

Third question is do you define the activity for the whole class and avoid explaining it to each group individually?. He answered *“No, I do not. I usually, (..) define into group presentation. I do not make such as the cooperative group.”* He said that he define into group presentation. So he did not make such cooperative interaction.

Forth question is do you use the shared language/Bahasa Indonesia to explain the rationale or procedures for an activity if these can not be explained in target language?. He answered *“yah, sometimes if I (..) explanation is not well understood the students. Particularly on*

*terminology or (...) sub important themes that the students may not be able understand me..”* He said that, he used Bahasa Indonesia to terminology or themes may not be able understand me. He also converted into Bahasa to make students understand.

The last question is how often do you ask question aimed at determining if students understand your lesson?. He answered *“it still depend, if I see my students do not understand me then I ask, I confirm to the student that they understand me or not”* He did not measure how often ask the question.

## **Discussion**

### **a. Teacher Characteristics**

The most frequent that was used novice lecturer is content cross This one got 45%. At the second meeting had higher percentage of content cross than first meeting. Novice lecturer gave more high lecturing and asking question in teaching learning process. At the first and second meeting, novice lecturer gave explanation to the students about how to understand the paragraph and essay. After novice lecturer read the paragraph, novice lecturer asked the students about the meaning of the sentences and related of the text. If the students confused, the teacher explained more about the material.

In other sides, senior lecturer also used content cross as the most frequent in teaching process. This one got 39%. At the first meeting had higher frequent than second meeting. Senior lecturer gave more giving direction and asking question to the students about the materials. After students-group presentation, senior lecturer gave explanation, gave direction and asking question to the students.

### **b. Indirect Talk**

In term of indirect talks, the novice and senior lecturer used them more frequently at the first meeting rather than the second meeting. The indirect talks the teacher employed consisted of accepts feeling, praise or encouragement, accepts or uses ideas of students, and asking question. Among the four mentioned in indirect talks categories. It is revealed that asking questions is the most frequently used by the teacher.



The most frequent of indirect talk that was used novice lecturer is asking question. This one got the highest percentage 39%. Meanwhile, the rest such as accepts feelings, praise or encouragement and accepts or uses ideas of students got  $\leq 15\%$ . The above findings indicated that novice lecturer dominant used asking question categories in teaching. The answer of the questions were not more than one or two responses. It means that the novice teacher used not higher thinking level of questions. This is in line with Charlotte E. Wolff, et al that “novices rarely make predictive statements, probably because they do not have enough prior experience to recognize the spatial and temporal patterns that support formulating observations as predictions about the consequences of events.”(Wolff, et al. 2014).

In contrastly, the lowest percentage of teacher indirect talk in novice teacher is praise and encourage category. This category only got 5,5%. The novice teacher rarely used this category. It means that, the novice teacher rarely gave the motivation or praise to the students. This is in line with (Galton 2000: 5) that “novices seem to be survive to finish their teaching tasks. That is why other aspects of teaching including praise or encouragement to motivation.” (Farrel, 2008).

In other hands, the senior lecturer also used asking question is the highest category in indirect talk. This category got 27.5%. Meanwhile, the rest such as accepts feelings, praise or encouragement and accepts or uses ideas of students got  $\leq 7\%$ . The above findings indicated that senior lecturer dominant used asking question categories in teaching. The most kind of questions from senior lecturer used the understanding in Bloom Taxonomy. It means that, the senior lecturer used higher thinking level of question. This is in line with Charlotte E. Wolff, et al’s finding in their journal that “their richly developed awareness of what is happening is an awareness gained through experience. Experts have developed a sophisticated ability to make observations, recollect and link these to past experience, and phrase interpretations of their observations as predictions about what may arise”

However, the lowest frequent of indirect talk that was used senior lecturer is accepts or uses ideas of students. This one got the lowest percentage 1.65%. Senior lecturer rarely used this category. This is in line with Charlotte E. Wolff, et al's finding in their journal that "Experts also consistently focused and referred to the level of student learning taking place in the classroom."(Wolff, et al. 2014).

**c. Direct Talk**

In term of direct talks, the novice and senior lecturer used them more frequently at the first meeting rather than the second meeting. The direct talks the teacher employed consisted of lecturing, giving direction and criticizing or justifying authority. Among the third mentioned in direct talks categories. It is revealed that lecturing and giving direction are the most frequently used by the teachers.

The lecturing used by novice lecturer is the highest categories in teaching learning. This one got the highest percentage 21.5%. Meanwhile, the rest such as accepts feelings, praise or encouragement and accepts or uses ideas of students got  $\leq 10\%$ . The above findings indicated that novice lecturer dominant used lecturing categories in teaching. Novice lecturer was as teacher-fronted and controlled. The lecturer read and translating the text. This is in line with (see Hayes, cited in Farrell, 2008:63) "being given the textbook as the sole guide to the curriculum was widespread"

In contrastly, the lowest frequent used by novice lecturer in direct talk is criticizing or justifying authority. This category got 0%. It means that, the novice lecturer never used this category. It is because he only focuss in the materials itself. This is in line with (Galton 2000:5) that "novices seem to be survive to finish their teaching tasks."

In other hands, senior lecturer used giving direction is the highest categories in direct talks. This category got 18.5%. Meanwhile, the rest such as accepts feelings, praise or encouragement and accepts or uses ideas of students got  $\leq 8\%$ . The above findings indicated that senior lecturer dominant used giving direction categories in teaching. This is in line with Charlotte E. Wolff, et

al's finding that "experts recognized and referenced typical events and situations significantly more than novices. Moreover, they provided more contextualized commentary regarding possible modifications and/or strategic interventions specific to the events viewed in the recorded classroom situations."

In contrastly, the lowest frequent used by veteran lecturer in direct talk is criticizing or justifying authority. This category got 4.5%. It means that, the senior lecturer rarely used this category. This is in line with Charlotte E. Wolff, et al's finding that "Experts provided significantly more statements themed around lesson modifications" (wolff, et al. 2014)

#### **d. Report from Interview**

The result from novice lecturer's answering, he said that first, the interaction must be change able because the student will not focuss on their teacher. Second, he did not measure how much he talking in the classroom because the learning process flow naturally and quickly. Third, he define class into some group before the real discussion so the students have prepare anythings. Forth, he used Bahasa if he think the materials will not come into the students. The last, he said that every single step ask question to the students.

The result from senior lecturer's answering. First, he did not change the pattern of interaction because students using group-presentation in the classroom. Second, he did not measure how much talking in the class. He said that depend the case. Third, he did not make such as the cooperative group. Forth, he sometimes used Bahasa Indonesia if explanation is not well understood the students. The last, he did not measure how often asking question. He said that still depend with the case.

#### **Conclusion**

Based on previous data and discussion, some conclusions can be drawn as follows. First, this study has shown that both of novice and senior lecturer had the same teacher characteristics. Teacher characteristics consist of content cross,

teacher control and teacher support. The most frequent teacher characteristics that was used novice and senior lecturer is content cross. The percentage of teacher characteristic of novice lecturer was 45%. The percentage of teacher characteristics of senior lecturer was 39%.

Second, the novice lecturer in this case had the percentage of indirect talks higher than direct talks. The percentage of indirect and direct talks were 54.75% and 29.75%. The result of this study that novice lecturer more used indirect teaching for his students like asking question (39%). In this case, novice lecturer used low level of questions such as memorize question and the answer is not more two words. Meanwhile, in direct talks, novice lecturer used lecturing as the most frequent in direct categories. This category got 21.5%. So, in this case novice lecturer dominant used asking question and lecturing in the teaching learning proses.

However, the senior lecturer in this case, indirect talks had the higher percentage than direct talks. The percentage of indirect and direct talks were 40.45% and 28.35%. The result of this study that more used indirect talks like asking question (27.5%). In this case, the most kind of asking questions of senior lecturer used understanding category. Meanwhile, in direct talks, senior lecturer used giving direction as the higher category. This category got 18.5%. So, in this case senior lecturer used asking question and giving direction as the most frequent in the classroom.

## References

- Alfaki, I. M. (2015). University students' English writing problems: Diagnosis remedy. *International Journal of English Language Teaching*. 3(3), 40-52.
- Ariyanti. (2016). The teaching of EFL writing in Indonesia. *Dinamika Ilmu Journal*. 16 (2), p. 263-271.

- Astiti, N.W.W. (2014). *An Analysis Of Teacher Talk In English Classes in SMK PGRI 4 Denpasar*. Unpublished Thesis. UNDIKSHA.
- Barwick, J. (1999). *Targetting text: Recount, procedure, exposition, upper level*. Singapore: Bake Education.
- Brown, H. D. (2004). *Langue and assessment principles and classroom practice*. New York: Longman.
- Burns, A. (2010). *Doing action research in English language teaching*. New York: Routledge.
- Elbow, P. (1998). *Writing with power*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fowler, H. R., Aaron, J. E., Okoomian, J. (2007). *The little, brown handbook*. New York: Longman.
- Harmer, J. (2004). *How to teach writing*. England: Pearson Education Limited.
- Heaton, J. B. (1990). *Writing English language test*. England: Longman UK.
- Hopkins, D. (2008). *A teacher guide to classroom research*. United Kingdom: Open University Press.
- Mutsillah, N. M. (2016). *The effectiveness of diary writing on students' writing recount text*. Unpublished Thesis of UIN Syarif Hidayatullah. Jakarta.
- Nurohmah, I. (2013). An analysis of students' recount text by using systematic functional grammar. *E-jurnal Passage*. 1(2), 89-98.
- Oshima, A., & Hogue A. (2007). *Introduction to Academic Writing*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Pngaribuan, T & Manik, S. (2018). The effect of buzz group technique and clustering technique in teaching writing at the first class of SMA HKBP 1 Tarutang. *Canadian Center of Science and Education*. 11(1), 166.
- Ramadhani, E. F., Lestiono, R. (2015). The use of diary writing to improve eight grade students' writing skill at SMPN 3 Malang. *Journal of Education Innovation*. 3(1), 24-25.
- Sari, K. D. (2014). *Buku penilaian autentik*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Sudijono, A. (2008). *Pengantar statistik pendidikan*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.

- Supiani. (2016). The use of diary in teaching of writing recount texts at SMPN 03 Banjarbaru, South Kalimantan Province. *Ethica Lingua journal*, 3(1), 42-43.
- Syafrayadin, S., Nurkamto, J., Linggar, D. A., & Mujiyanto, J. (2017). ACTIVE, BELIEF, AND CONSEQUENCE (ABC) Model technique in minimizing students' speech anxiety. *Proceedings of ISELT FBS Universitas Negeri Padang*, 5, 320-324.
- Syafrayadin., Nurkamto, J., Bharati, D.A.L., Mujiyanto, J. (2017). The effect of speech training with systematic desensitization on enhancing students' speaking competence. *International Journal Of Management And Applied Science (IJMAS)*. 3(2), 78-83.
- Syafrayadin, S. (2020). The Effect of Talking Chips Technique Toward the Improvement of Students' Speaking Achievement at one of the Senior High Schools in Bandung. *Linguists: Journal Of Linguistics and Language Teaching*, 6(2), 1-13.
- Syafrayadin, H., & Salniwati, A. R. A. P. Digital Storytelling Implementation for Enhancing Students' Speaking Ability in Various Text Genres. *International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering (IJRTE)*. 8(4), 3147-3151.
- Syafrayadin, S. (2020). Students' Strategies in Learning Speaking: Experience of Two Indonesian Schools. *Vision: Journal for Language and Foreign Language Learning*, 9(1), 33-46.
- Syafrayadin, S., Martina, F., & Salniwati, S. (2020). Compensation strategies in speaking activities for non-English department students: poor and competent speakers. *JEES (Journal of English Educators Society)*, 5(2), 109-116.
- Widya, P. D. (2015). *Teacher and Learner's Talk in The Classroom Interaction at Tenth Grade Students of SMA Jawahirul Hikmah Tulung Agung in Academic Year 2014/2015*. Unpublished Thesis of IAIN Tulungagung, 15-16.