

Classroom Interaction in an Online Speaking Class

Rahma Vindiyasari¹, Francisca Maria Ivone², Primardiana Hermilia Wijayati³

¹Keguruan Bahasa-Universitas Negeri Malang

²Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris-Universitas Negeri Malang

³Pendidikan Bahasa Jerman-Universitas Negeri Malang

INFO ARTIKEL

Riwayat Artikel:

Diterima: 10-12-2021

Disetujui: 10-01-2022

Kata kunci:

classroom interaction;
patterns;
features;
online speaking class;
interaksi kelas;
pola;
fitur;
kelas berbicara online

Alamat Korespondensi:

Rahma Vindiyasari
Keguruan Bahasa
Universitas Negeri Malang
Jalan Semarang 5 Malang
E-mail: rahmavindy92@gmail.com

ABSTRAK

Abstract: The qualitative study aims to look into the patterns and characteristics of interaction in an online speaking course. This research was conducted at Sekolah Vokasi Universitas Gadjah Mada (UGM) Yogyakarta's Oral English for Daily Communication Class of the Applied English Study Program. The researcher observed the online learning sessions to learn about the online teaching and learning process synchronously on *Google Meet*. The findings revealed that the teacher and students produced various patterns of interaction involving teacher-class, teacher-student, student-teacher, student-student, and teacher-group interaction, as well as mixed interaction features such as confirmation check, code switching, self-repetition, clarification request, elicitation, completion, other-repetition, and correction.

Abstrak: Tujuan dari penelitian kualitatif ini adalah untuk melihat pola dan karakteristik interaksi yang terjadi dalam kelas berbicara yang dilaksanakan secara daring. Penelitian ini dilaksanakan di Kelas Komunikasi Harian Sekolah Vokasi Universitas Gadjah Mada (UGM) Yogyakarta Program Studi Bahasa Inggris Terapan. Peneliti mengamati sesi pembelajaran daring untuk mempelajari proses belajar mengajar yang berlangsung sinkron di *Google Meet*. Hasil analisa data menunjukkan bahwa guru dan siswa menghasilkan berbagai pola interaksi yang melibatkan interaksi guru-kelas, guru-siswa, siswa-guru, siswa-siswa, dan interaksi guru-sekelompok siswa, serta berbagai macam fitur interaksi seperti *confirmation check*, *code switching*, *self-repetition*, *clarification request*, *elicitation*, *completion*, *other-repetition* dan *correction*.

The digital revolution spread over practically every area and sector in the twentieth century, including education. By utilizing technological help, language learning is continuing to transition from traditional learning to the most recent learning model. This is made even more dynamic in online learning contexts in which the learning process utilizes a computer or other digital devices linked to a network-accessible from anywhere, at any time, and by any means (Cojocariu, Lazar, Nedeff & Lazar 2014). From a technological perspective, previous research by Friedman and Friedman (2013) has indicated that online learning needs to focus on learners' knowledge of collaborative learning skills such as creating context, negotiating together, and understanding each other in a distance learning environment. Language teachers must adjust language teaching and learning to make it more exciting and relevant to their students' daily lives and needs. For example, they can utilize social media platforms for language learning because we live in the fourth industrial revolution. Most of our learners spend a significant amount of time on these platforms.

Schools and teachers are urged to employ interactive and up-to-date instructional media to create a more efficient and appropriate learning environment during online learning. An online speaking course requires interactive learning tools. Teaching online speaking classes has gotten more complicated because the teaching and learning process in schools and universities has been switched to remote learning during the pandemic. A regular classroom, including online speaking courses, must provide a location and medium for the teacher and students to engage and learn the target language. *Google Classroom*, *Edmodo*, and *Schoology* are examples of spaces and media that may be utilized to teach and learn foreign language speaking formally. These are online learning platforms known as Learning Management systems (LMS). Several video conferencing applications are utilized to help with online speaking courses so that interaction can take place synchronously.

Interaction is crucial in second language acquisition. In his interaction hypothesis, Long (1996) asserts that feedback resulting from meaning negotiation is a key factor in second language learning. In addition, Swain and Lapkin (1998) argue in their output hypothesis that learners require chances for output interaction to develop and practice utilizing the target language. As a result, while learning a second language, it is not enough to just supply input; instead, it is necessary to encourage learners

to practice producing utterances in the target language. In terms of classroom interaction, Thomas (1987) defined it as "acting reciprocally, acting upon each other." It denotes the interaction between two persons who have a reciprocal connection. Furthermore, Dagarin (2004) defines classroom interaction as a two-way relationship between classroom participants in which the teacher offers feedback to students and vice versa.

In classroom interaction, the teacher and students' actions and reactions in classroom conversational activities result in a variety of patterns. From the perspective of the doers, classroom interaction consists of various pieces, each of which may be defined and grouped into specific patterns of interaction. Thomas (1987) classified interaction patterns into four categories: teacher-whole class, teacher-individual student, individual student-teacher, and individual student-individual student. The first pattern, teacher-whole class interaction, is created by the teacher to encourage learners to engage actively in the teaching and learning process. Second, the teacher-individual student pattern referred to the interaction between a teacher and an individual student in which the teacher tells something or asks a question and the students respond by responding, discussing, reflecting on a topic, or performing the activities assigned by the teacher. The third category of individual student-teacher interaction urges the teacher to provide information, and students may raise questions about the content if they did not get the point Putri (2014). This type of pattern was observed in the final individual student-individual student interaction when they worked on a peer work activity (Arisandi, 2018). It is considered best practice in classroom education to provide learners with chances for peer interaction (Jacobs & Ivone, 2020). This pattern is also exhibited when a student asked another student in a group discussion about the content.

There are various aspects to classroom interaction. According to Pica (1987), seven interactional elements occur in classroom interactions: confirmation check, clarification request, understanding check, self-repetition, other repetition, completion, and correction. According to Foster and Ohta (2005), a confirmation check is an expression generated by an interlocutor to seek confirmation that the statement is correctly comprehended. The word "clarification request" can thus be defined as any expression used to ask clarification of the interlocutor's earlier remarks. A confirmation check is a teacher's informal assessment of a student's knowledge of the topic. Self-repetition, on the other hand, is characterized as the speaker's speech by either repeating or rephrasing a portion of his or her own utterances (Kasim, 2003). Repetition is described as a recurring interactional one in which a speaker repeats all or part of what another speaker has just said, usually in the next turn (Rossi, 2020). When students are confused, the teacher can use completion to finish what they previously say in either the target or source language. The last one, correction, is a conversational method of repair in which an error is replaced with what is thought to be the correct one.

Some studies on classroom interaction have been undertaken; for example, Kasim (2003) investigated classroom interaction in a speaking class. His research focused on patterns of classroom interaction, prevailing patterns of interaction, and interactional features shared by students and teachers. His study was carried out in the English Department of the State University of Malang. The findings revealed five patterns of classroom interaction: teacher-class (T-C), teacher-group (T-G), teacher-student (T-S), student-student (S-S), and student-teacher interaction. Furthermore, the study discovered nine interactional strategies for negotiating meaning: confirmation check, clarification, self-repetition, other repetition, completion, correction, translation, cose switching, and elicitation.

The similar investigation was also carried out by Sari (2018). Her research looked on the prevailing interaction pattern and teacher-student perspectives of English classrooms at SMAN 2 Bukittinggi, West Sumatra. According to their findings, the most common interaction pattern is teacher-student. However, teachers' and students' perceptions of the dominant interaction patterns are diametrically opposed. The most common interaction, according to teachers, is between students (S-S). The predominant interaction pattern, according to students, is teacher-student interaction.

In relation to interactional features, Lu (2021) researched interactional patterns at a Chinese university. This study found that there is teacher-student interaction in the English classroom, but it is predominantly a teacher-directed interaction. Furthermore, six interactional strategies of meaning negotiation were discovered in this study. There are requests for clarification, confirmation checks, comprehension checks, conversational adjustments, self-repetition, and other repetitions.

According to the literature review, there are many studies on classroom interaction, patterns, and features of interaction in traditional classrooms. However, research on the patterns and characteristics of interaction in online learning is scarce. The current study would like to analyze the patterns and features of interaction in an online speaking course using the prior studies that have been discussed, as well as the study's background. The researcher is interested in this study because the transition of teaching and learning from face-to-face sessions to online ones has not been comprehensively researched and explained. Thus, the purpose of this research is to explain the patterns and features of interaction that occur during teaching and learning in an online speaking course.

METHOD

This study is qualitative in nature. It is, in particular, a case study to reveal a real phenomenon of classroom interactions which was first noticed by the researcher during her teaching and learning in an online speaking course. The aim of the case study research is to provide a complete and in-depth picture of interaction patterns and features in an online speaking course. This case study's data came from observations of online classroom meetings.

This study was carried out at Sekolah Vokasi Universitas Gadjah Mada (UGM) Yogyakarta. In this study, the researchers selected one class, which has 32 students. The subjects of this study were limited to a lecturer and students enrolled in one Oral English for Daily Communication course. The researcher has decided to observe four sessions during the first semester of 2021/2022 academic year and write a report based on the synchronous online teaching and learning process that took place on *Google Meet*.

The researcher employed two research instruments to collect data for this study. First, field notes were employed during the observation for the purpose of taking notes during a single teaching period. The notes included the date, type, practical courses, observer's name, and a note column. Taking notes serves the purpose of recording particular information from classroom interactions that occur during the teaching and learning process. The second research instrument is a checklist. The checklist is in the form of a table that includes the date, meeting, topic, patterns of classroom interactions, and notes. This checklist aids in categorizing the patterns that arose in each session.

FINDINGS

In this section elaborate about patterns and features of interaction that emerged during the observation. To authenticate the findings, researcher point out some excerpt from the observation. These excerpt are transcribed and classified based on the patterns and features of interaction. The excerpts were stated in the form of transcription in which it was adopted from Jefferson (2004). These transcription notation are arranged in order to appearance in the excerpt, as follows: (.) indicates a temporary pause then continues speaking, (0.7) indicate long pause, >text< indicates quicker tempo of speech, <text> indicates slower tempo of speech, ↑ indicates increasing intonation, ↓ indicates decreasing intonation, indicates stretched vowel or consonant, and (h) indicates laughter within the word or utterance. These punctuations used are to intensify and give the whole portrait of observation made.

Patterns of interaction

There were forty-four conversations which indicated patterns of interaction. Then eight of them were selected to be the data stated in the findings after they were identified based on their communicative goals to ensure whether or not the conversation had similar conversational devices. From the identification, there were thirty-six conversation which implied alike conversational devices. On the other hand, eight conversations had distinct intended conversational devices. The selected data were assumed to provide diverse patterns of interaction. Therefore, the data were selected to be shown in this research finding. In this data, the lecturer was coded in 'L', the students in 'S1, S2, S3' etc., and some students (all students in class) in 'Ss'.

Teacher-Class Interaction

This interactional pattern referred to the classroom interaction controlled by the teacher and the teacher's stimulation to make the students get involved. Kasim (2003) contended that teacher-class interaction pattern involved three kinds i.e., teacher-class interaction in which teacher received no response, got only non-verbal response, and obtained verbal response from the students as in the following excerpt.

No-response teacher-class interaction

(Excerpt 1)

- L : Ok, so how's life everyone? Life after midterm ya (h)
 Ss : -Silent-
 L : Ok. No one wants to express what do you feel after the mid-semester exam? So so (.) or great (.) or never been better or terrible? Anyone?
 Ss : -silent-
 L : How many classes do you have? It's like 10 classes? Isn't it?
 Ss : -silent-

It was manifestly stated in the aforementioned data that L had tried to address diverse questions. However, Ss gave no any responses. This situation seemingly might be since many of the students were not on camera. Accordingly, what they were doing when the lecturer gave explanation was unpredictable. Meanwhile, those who were on camera required several times before answering the questions. If viewed from this kind of synchronous online learning, a lecture should obligate all students to be on camera. Then lecturer needed to give several minutes for the students for preparing the answers.

Non-verbal response teacher-class interaction

(Excerpt 2)

- L : Ok. It's on my screen. What about you?
Ss : **(Nodding head)**
L : Yes, Ok
L : Perhaps any questions (.) or comments about the group project? Yuk feel free (0.7) if you have any question (.) Do not hesitate to ask (.) Is it very clear? Cristal clear? (h)
Ss : **(Nodding head and smile)**

It was evident from Excerpt 2 that L proposed some questions for eliciting Ss's verbal. Unfortunately, Ss only showed two verbal responses i.e., nod and smile. This kind of interaction could happen since Ss had no the courage to respond. This might be because of their lack of mastery in certain English vocabulary. In line with this, Wijayati (2009) stated that if there is no verbal language that can be understood by both interlocutors, communication still can be done by using body movements such as smiling and nodding.

Verbal response teacher-class interaction

(Excerpt 3)

- L : Yeah, any other questions? For shopping everyone? So that later on you can get (.) uh (.) full comprehension ya about the vocabularies, the phrases, and the expressions you can use ya for shopping. Meanwhile if you want to say resep, it's, it depends what kind of resep ya because in Bahasa we have resep makanan and resep dokter. >How would you say for resep makanan?< What would you say?
S1 : food receipt?
L : ↑recipe (h) Ga pake food ga papa. Tapi bukan receipt lagi ya. Tapi recipe. How do you spell recipe (.) Anyone?
S1 : R-E-C-I-P-E
L : Is it clear? Cristal ↑clear every one?
Ss : Yes Miss

(Excerpt 4)

- L : No one wants to share (.) >So it means that you are doing great ya< Hopefully (0.7) Ok. So everyone (.)
S1 : (Send a message to the chat box in google meet) It was a rough week

Excerpt 3 shows that L asked about how say *resep makanan* in English. Then she got the verbal response from S1. It seemed that S1 replied the question since she was quite confident with his answer. Moreover, L offered a question whether her explanation has been understood. Ss then replied with the verbal short response "yes". Meanwhile, in Excerpt 4, S1 verbally communicated with L yet through the chat box of the platform. This phenomenon sometimes occurred in asynchronous online learning like this. So, this could be concluded that in verbal-response teacher-class interaction might occur either in direct communication or through a chat.

Teacher-Student Interaction

Teacher-student pattern could be defined as classroom interaction carried out through telling a story and group work yielded in abundant this kind of interactional pattern (Kasim, 2003). One-way traffic teacher-student interaction was demonstrated in Excerpt 5 as follow.

One-way traffic teacher-student interaction

(Excerpt 5)

- L : What's wrong Natasya? It's ok if you can't on cam. Do you want to say ↑ something?
S1 : It was very ↑ tiring.
L : Do you mostly have mmmm (.) What is it like projects or are some like what we have in our speaking class like google meet virtual meeting? What kinds of exams do you have like most?
S1 : Mostly asynchronous meeting miss.
L : Ok directly ya? Directly you will ask that question ya Natasya?
S1 : Ya, I don't like basa basi.

The data above demonstrated that they could be categorized into the teacher-student pattern of interaction with one-way traffic interaction since the conversation was initiated by L and verbally responded by S1. It could be seen in Excerpt 5 that L always initiated the interaction by asking S1's condition.

Student-Teacher Interaction

Student-teacher interaction was when students and teachers were involved in a reciprocal action one another (Arisandi, 2018). Student-teacher interaction was demonstrated in Excerpt 6 as follow.

(Excerpt 6)

- S1 : I want to ask permission to have discussion with you about online learning platform.
 L : Oh ↑ Sure.
 S1 : I think for this online learning method I prefer to have such a asynchronous meeting like that because I really like to get a task done and for the platform I think, I choose google meet because it's more efficient than the zoom. Zoom is a application. So, the google meet is more like a web but for meeting. Meeting that's good for online learning/
 L : Well, Ok! So, basically, it is lighter than the other platform ya, like zoom. Ok than, so perhaps later on in our class we can try to implement that ya Mas Zaqi. Thank you so much for your opinion.
 S1 : Thank you Ms Erlin.

It was obvious from excerpt 6 that it could be classified into student-teacher interactional pattern since the conversation was initiated by S1 and verbally responded by L. It could be viewed in the data that S1 initiated the interaction by asking permission from L to have a discussion and uttering his preference on an online learning method and a learning platform. (Ramli, 2018).

Student-Student Interaction

This kind of interactional pattern was defined as a type of classroom interaction among students when they worked in a peer work task (Arisandi, 2018). Student-student interaction was demonstrated in Excerpt 7

(Excerpt 7)

- S1 : ↑ Yah, that's I mean. The meaning of this. Yap
 S2 : So, shop around (0.7) the shop around is just like (.) you know going around in a: Mungkin kayak mmm tempat, kayak mungkin mall gitu just to look around, to shop around. Shopaholic is someone who loves to shop, someone who loves shopping and maybe the other friends can help me?
 S3 : I want to add from Felita. Shop around is like compare the prize of the (.) before buying the items. And for the shopaholic, I think it's someone who really likes to shopping. And then, Window shopping is mm: someone who just look the item when it's on sale but not buy it, buying it. Maybe the other shopping vocabulary will be explain by another friends? Please help me!
 S4 : I would like to add, uh (0.7) uh (.) So Sivanni already tell the bit of shopaholic, but I would like to add that shopaholic is a combination of shop and uh alcoholic. (h) >If you figure it out < So it's basically like alcohol in generals can make you like addicted, right? Right? Kayak kecanduan. Uh (0.7) the same case from shopaholic, it's basically you kecanduan with shopping. Like every si (.) every single time. You always (.) like, every day, every morning, eh wait no, not every morning. Like >every Monday you go shopping and then tomorrow you go shopping and then the day after you go shopping < just like that. You're so addicted just cannot stop shopping. That's simple of it. Yah that's fom me. Or would you like to add from my group?

It was evident from excerpt 7 that the conversation stated above was conducted by S1, S2, S3, and S4 in which they were all students. Accordingly, the excerpt could be included in student-student pattern of interaction. From this excerpt, seemingly it was more attractive if the class was set in this kind of interactional pattern.

Teacher-Group Interaction

Teacher-group interaction pattern was the one in which the teacher gave a task which had to be discussed in the group (Putri, 2014). In other words, this interactional pattern was carried out when the students were already in groups for their discussion (Kasim, 2003), as in the following excerpt:

(Excerpt 8)

- L : Can you slide show the slide to make it ↑bigger? Ok. Oh ya. Thank you. >Maybe the second slide which contains the bargaining expressions ya<. Ok. Can you group 1, >Felita or any other member of group 1 give me, or give us some other expression instead of 'can you make it lower?' < So, addition to (.) uh (.) ask the seller ya to lower the price? Can we say any other expression?
 S1 : So, I just want this (.) this expression >which is I'm gonna tight budgets so I'm looking for your best price< I think, it's kind of formal. > I'm gonna tight budgets so I'm looking for your best price<
 L : Ok. Very ↑good Felita. Perhaps other member can add some more? Sometimes, ya (.) So what's Felita has mention earlier is also very good example of bargaining in formal style. In formal expression ya (.) Is there any other?
 L : Yes ↑please Akbar. Do you want to say something Akbar?
 S2 : uhm (.) maybe is this the ↑finale price?

Excerpt 8 indicated that it could be categorized into teacher-group interaction because the conversation was undertaken by the lecturer and a group of students. In this case the lecturer only became a facilitator.

Features of Interaction

In the whole of the data there existed thirty-nine utterances which contained features of interaction. Those utterances were identified based on their communicative goals to discover whether or not the utterances had identified conversational devices. From the identification, it was found there were twenty utterances which implied alike conversational devices. On the other hand, the nineteen utterances had distinct intended conversational devices. Those utterances were assumed to provide diverse features of interaction. Therefore, the data were selected to be displayed in this research finding.

Furthermore, the display of data was arranged based on each features of interaction starting from confirmation check, code switching, self-repetition, clarification request, elicitation, and completion. Each excerpt is provided elaboration in three parts. The first part contained the conceptual explanation of each feature directly contextualized with the whole selected data. It then was followed by form of the excerpt i.e., conversations which contained the respective interactional feature. The conversations were presented in the form of transcription. Similarly, the utterances which indicated the feature were bolded. Moreover, the lecturer was abbreviated in 'L'. Meanwhile, the students were coded in 'S1, S2, S3' etc. The claim along with its explanation why the utterances belonged to the feature was provided in the last part.

Confirmation Check

Confirmation check referred to interlocutor's expression produced to elicit confirmation that the utterance had been correctly understood (Foster and Ohta, 2005). The interlocutor in the data of this present study could be both the lecturer and the students -the latter was most dominant. When the lecturer (or vice versa) utters a statement, the students produced a confirmation check to confirm that the lecturer's message could be caught. For confirming the lecturer's statement, the students uttered short answers such as yes miss, alright etc. as in the following excerpts:

(Excerpt 9)

- L : Is it clear mas ↑ Zaqi?
S1 : **I think I can't (.) see the (.) picture clear**

(Excerpt 10)

- L : Do you mostly have:: uh what is it like (.) projects or some are like what we have in our speaking class, like (.) google meet virtual meeting? What kinds of exam do you have like ↑ mostly?
S2 : **Mostly asynchronous meeting miss (.)**

(Excerpt 11)

- S3 : ↑ May I share my screen miss?
L : **Yeah ↑ sure Felita**

The bolded utterances above such as *I think I can't see the picture clear*, *Mostly, asynchronous meeting miss*, and *Yeah sure Felita* could be classified into confirmation check since these utterances were produced to confirm that the interlocutors' s questions had been understood. It was as in excerpt 9. L asks S1 whether the picture was clear. S1 then expresses that he had understood L's question by replying that he could not see the picture clearly. Similarly, in excerpt 10 L questions about what kinds of exam that S2 liked most. S2 shows that she had understood L's question by *saying mostly asynchronous meeting*. Moreover, in excerpt 11 it was obvious that L understands S3's question about offering to share his screen by saying *yeah sure*. To sum up yes-no questions in this ELT setting required short answers like abovementioned bolded utterances as confirmation that the questions had successfully been delivered.

Code switching

Code switching as a condition where the speakers deliberately alter a used code by switching from one to another (Sinaga & Hutahaean, 2020). Similarly, In pedagogical setting, code-switching was the practice of switching between a second language and foreign language (Hamid, 2016), as in the following excerpts:

(Excerpt 12)

- L : >Let me find your picture first< **ya mas (.)** How are you today?
S1 : I'm fine miss

(Excerpt 13)

- S2 : Yah, that's I mean (.) The meaning of this (.)Yap
S3 : So (.) shop around (.) the shop around is [just like](.) you know going around in uh :: **Mungkin kayak :: uh tempat, kayak mungkin mall gitu** just to look around, to shop around.

(Excerpt 14)

- L : Ok directly ya? <Directly you will ask that question ya Natasya?>
 S4 : Ya (.) I don't like **basa basi**

Excerpt 12, 13, and 14 stated above that both the lecturer and the students had switched their code from English to Indonesian. In data 12, L utters "*Let me find your picture first*" directly followed by Indonesian language 'ya mas'. L's reason of combing the statement with the words 'ya mas' might be for achieving language taste.

Self-Repetition

Self-Repetition was defined as the speaker's utterance by either repeating or rephrasing a part-whole of their utterances (Kasim, 2003). In other words, a specific meaning of repetition usually was realized by reproducing the linguistic elements of the previous phrase (words and grammar) in precisely a similar manner. Self-repetition was occurred in Excerpt 15, 16, and 17 as follow:

(Excerpt 15)

- L : **Ok. Ok.** Hmm wait a minute (.) Let me share **my picture**. ↑**Oh sorry, your picture**. Is it this ↓one?
 S1 : Yes miss.

(Excerpt 16)

- S2 : Ok Felita and Hanif you can do the role play! Felita will be A, and **Hanif will be A**. ↑**eh I mean B**
 S3 : Ok. Thank you, Marsha. OK, now, I'm going to explain how to borrow something politely.

(Excerpt 17)

- L : Can we end the QR now? Or (.) hmmm I'm not sure because it says 55 students. <So I guess there are **some**> **Ok let me**
 (.) **Some** are recorded twice. No problem. Ok (.) So I hope everyone is here, but later on, I'll check again ya.
 S4 : -silent-

The data above demonstrated that both the lecturer and the students did self-repetition. It was clear from the data that they used these interactional devices unintentionally. They seemingly repeated what they had just said since they got confused of what to say. Meanwhile, they tried to improve and hid their mispronunciation by saying words like ' Oh sorry, *I mean*, and *Ok let me*'.

Clarification Request

The speech device employed in the existence of ambiguity and incomprehension was called the clarification request (Cicognani and Zani, 1988). Clarification requests were an important and common dialogue device, allowing interlocutors to ask about features like the meaning or form of an utterance (Purver and Mary, 2013). The clarification request could be in the states of questions (e.g., wh- yes/ no questions), undiverted, and tag questions, as well as statements such as 'I don't understand' and 'try again' (Kasim, 2003), as in the following excerpts:

(Excerpt 18)

- L : Ok. <Saya carikan foto dari Mbak SDA dulu ya> Ok (.) **Is this the picture you chose Mbak?**
 S1 : Yes, Miss.

(Excerpt 19)

- L : How many classes do you have? > **It's like 10 classes? Isn't it?**<
 S2 : -silent-

Excerpt 18 and excerpt 19 indicated that L tried to request a clarification from S1 and S2. If seen from excerpt 18, L was unsure about the picture. Then Through a question, *is this the picture you chose, Mbak?* She tried to encourage S1 to clarify whether the picture belonged to her. Similarly, in excerpt 19, L was unsure how many classes her student had. Therefore she tried to ask S2 clarification by asking questions *like 10 classes? Isn't it?*

Elicitation

A technique usually employed by English lecturers for helping students in the interaction process was elicitation. In other words, the only speaker who can produce elicitation was the lecturer. Elicitation was a way to improve students' use of language (Mandasari et al., 2019). It was a conversational device used to elicit students' responses. Elicitation could be undertaken by calling students' names, asking students by question words and yes/ no questions, and doing completion forms through raising intonation (Kasim, 2003). As in the following excerpts:

(Excerpt 20)

L : Ok. **No one wants to express what do you feel after the mid-semester ↑exam? So (.) or great (.) or never been better or terrible? (.) ↑Anyone?**

S1 : -silent-

(Excerpt 21)

L : **What's wrong Natasya? > It's ok if you can't on cam< Do you want to say ↑something?**

S2 : It was very tiring

(Excerpt 22)

L : Ok (.) >Thank you Marsha for presenting the slides< ok (.) **Who will be presenting for the very first speaker? >Perhaps you can start introducing your team ya< Thank you**

S3 : Am I audible?

The abovementioned bolded utterances were evidence that they belonged to interactional features of elicitation. It was because those utterances contained encouragement for the students so that they could be more active in that meeting. For example in excerpt 20, L tried to make S(s) express their feeling after the exam. Similarly, it was evident from excerpt 21 that L mentioned S'2 name to make her speak. Moreover, in excerpt 22 L, S (s), they become the first speaker by asking them who would be the first speaker.

Completion

The lecturer employed completion to complete what students would say either in the target language or the source language when they had confusion in it. This condition was commonly indicated in silent pause (Kasim, 2003). This silent pause in this conversation's excerpt was marked in (0.7). (0.7) shows a long pause. Completion occurred in excerpts 23 and 24 as follows:

(Excerpt 23)

S1 : uh (0.7) I think (0.7) I (0.7)

L : **Do you want to ask about materials from a class? Or about an assignment?**

S1 : Yess (0.7) yes (0.7) I think (0.7) I do so (0.7)

(Excerpt 24)

L : Ok. Which class is it?

S1 : Uh (0.7)

L : **Speaking class ya?**

Excerpt 23 and 24 above demonstrated that S1 was doing hesitation indicated in saying uh and doing silent pause. This hesitation implied that S1 had no idea to complete her utterance. Then L realized S1's confusion and felt sure of the word and expression that S1 required. Therefore, she immediately did the completion by saying, "*Do you want to ask about materials from a class?*"? *Or about an assignment?* (Excerpt 23) and "*Speaking class ya?*" (Excerpt 24) for completing the expression that S1 had been trying to.

Other-Repetition

This interactional device was defined as a recurrent interactional one in which a speaker repeated all or part of what another speaker had just stated, typically in the following turn (Rossi, 2020). In the data of this present study, the one who produced other repetition was the student. In other words, the student repeated what other students had said. Meanwhile, this current study discovered only one other repetition i.e. partial repetition as in the following conversation (excerpt 25).

(Excerpt 25)

S1 : Not yet, Miss. **We are going to :**

S2 : **>We are going** to have some ↑quiz<

It was evident in excerpt 25 that S2 repeated what S2 had just said in the words '*we are going to*'. Accordingly, the excerpt could be classified into other repetition. If viewed from the context seemingly, S1 had confusion in what to say, thus why S2 did the interactional device of further repetition.

Correction

Correction was conversational device of repair in which error was replaced with what was considered as the proper one (Rossi, 2020). Correction was required to encourage students to have capability was a particular skill, as in the following conversation (excerpt 28 and 29).

(Excerpt 28)

L : **How would you say for resep makanan?** What would you say?

S1 : food receipt?

L : ↑repece (h) Ga pake food ga papa. Tapi bukan receipt lagi ya. Tapi recipe. How do you spell recipe. Anyone?

(Excerpt 29)

S1 : R-E-C-I-P-E

L : **Double E ya at the end.** Yes. Recipree. Double E or not? But without T ya. Yes recipe and for (.) uh, the one you get from the doctor whenever you are feeling unwell. How would you say that? Itu juga resep tapi bukan masakan ya

The data above indicated that L had been trying to ensure S1's knowledge of how to say *resep makanan* in English. However, S1 had no proper answer for that. Therefore, L led her to the correct one. In this case, L gave correction in both morphological and phonological correction.

DISCUSSION

This section discusses further elaboration of the preceding findings. This elaboration involves the general trends of the findings, the findings' similarities and differences to those of the previous related studies, and the position of the findings to the existing theories.

Patterns of Interactions

Interactional patterns which manifested in the subject of this current study involved teacher-class, teacher-student, student-teacher, Student-student, and teacher-group interaction with the teacher-student pattern as the most frequently occurring one among those. In other words, the lecturer was the most dominant one in every meeting. Moreover, the findings of this present study had similarities and differences to those of Kasim's (2003) and Hamzah's (2018)

Regarding Kasim's (2003) findings, the similarities lay in the findings on teacher-class, student-student, and teacher-group interaction. Both of these studies discovered no response, non-verbal response, and verbal response from the students of their respective studies. Besides, in teacher-group interaction, their findings showed that the lecturer had the same role i.e., as a facilitator, and offered a particular activity to the students of the group. Additionally, in student-student patterns, both of these findings demonstrated that the patterns occurred in small group work and made the students more attractive.

On the other hand, Kasim's (2003) findings were distinct from the findings of this current study in terms of teacher-class, teacher-student, student-student, and teacher-group interaction. The present study's findings showed that the lecturer received no response from the students because many of the students were not on camera. Accordingly, what they were doing when the lecturer gave an explanation was unpredictable. Meanwhile, those on camera required several time before answering the questions. It was different from the teacher of Kasim's (2003) study, who received no response from the students because some students were looking at their notes to look for what possible answer they should give. In addition, the lecturer of this present study received a non-verbal response from the students, indicated by their nods and smile. In Kasim's (2003) findings, the students' non-verbal response was demonstrated by moving their chairs to form groups, talking to each other, and getting ready for group discussion. Similarly, the present study's findings showed that verbal-response given by the students was initiated by the lecturer who uttered a question for the whole students. While in Kasim's (2003) findings, the students gave a verbal response initiated by the teacher who uttered a question by mentioning one of the students' names. In addition, the subjects conducted the learning virtually and asynchronously in this current study. The lecturer could receive verbal responses from the students directly or from a chatbox. It was different from Kasim's (2003) findings in which the teacher received a direct verbal response.

Furthermore, this current study had similarities and differences in terms of findings compared to those that belonged to Hamzah's (2018) study. The similarity existed in the findings of teacher-class interactional pattern with no response from the students in both of these studies. The next similarity was teacher-student interaction with one-way traffic interaction in both of these studies. Meanwhile, the different finding of this current study from Hamzah's (2018) finding was in the teacher-student interaction. The lecturer of this present study gave a question in full English. On the contrary, the teacher in Hamzah's (2018) study uttered a question combined in Indonesian.

Features of Interactions

Confirmation check, code-switching, self-repetition, clarification request, elicitation, other-repetition, completion, and correction were features of interaction that existed in the subject of this present study. Meanwhile, elicitation was the most frequently occurring feature among those. The lecturer employed this conversational device to stimulate the students to be more active in the meeting. The lecturer did elicitation in various ways, such as greeting, mentioning student's name, and giving them questions about who will do certain activities in the meeting first. Furthermore, the findings of this current study have similarities to those of Kasim (2003). The similarities lie in code-switching, self-repetition, elicitation, and other-repetition. The subjects in both studies produced code-switching was the English language switched to Indonesia. They commonly did code-switching when

they had difficulty and confusion of what to say as well as when the terms were only common in Indonesia. In other words, English had no terms. Moreover, the subjects in this present study and Kasim's (2003) study do self-repetition when they think of what to say. They repeated what they had uttered in some ways, such as repeating only one word, the same words, and some preceding words. Additionally, the lecturer of these studies elicited three ways i.e., by mentioning a student's name, giving a chance to the students, and stimulating them to think about a particular topic. In addition, this current study and Kasim (2003) discovered that their subjects did other-repetition in a similar structure.

On the other hand, Kasim's (2003) findings were distinct from the findings of this present study in terms of confirmation check, self-repetition, and clarification request. The present study's findings showed that confirmation checks done by the subject were in the form of a statement. It was different from the subjects of Kasim's (2003) study who did confirmation checks to propose particular questions. In addition, self-repetition done by the subjects of both of these studies was done when they were thinking of what to say. The subjects of this current study said some short words like sorry, I mean, and okay before they repeated what they had said. Kasim's (2003) study subjects were just silent before repeating their preceding word(s). Similarly, clarification requests done by the subjects of this present study were in the form of tag questions. It was distinct from the issues of Kasim's (2003) study who just requested clarification in conventional questions.

Meanwhile, this present study had differences in terms of findings compared to the findings that belonged to Lu's (2021) study. The differences involved confirmation check. The subjects of this current study employed confirmation checks in the form of statements. It can be distinguished from the subjects in Lu's (2021) study who did a confirmation check in the form of proposing a particular question. The subject seemed to be doing a confirmation check resemblant to a clarification.

Moreover, clarification requests were produced differently by the subjects of this present study if compared to the findings in Lu's (2021) study. Clarification request created by the subjects of this current study was in the form of a tag question. It was different from the subject Lu's (2021) who requested clarification only in common questions. In addition, it was stated in Lu's (2021) study that this clarification request was uttered by the subject since the interlocutor's voice was not audible. Besides, the findings of this present study indicated that the subject did self-repetition in the same words. On the contrary, the ones in Lu's (2021) study demonstrated that the subject employed self-repetition in totally different words yet still in the similar message.

CONCLUSIONS

From undertaking this current study, it was discovered that students of the Applied English Study Program at Sekolah Vokasi UGM, Yogyakarta produced patterns of interaction involving teacher-class, teacher-student, student-teacher. Student-student and teacher-group interaction features include confirmation check, code-switching, self-repetition, clarification request, elicitation, completion, other-repetition, and correction. Based on these patterns and features of interaction, there emerged conclusions that the use of online classroom interaction discovered in the subjects of this present study, to a great extent, implied effectiveness for speaking class. Meanwhile, to a lesser extent, online classroom interaction might be ineffective for speaking class. In other words, online classroom interaction has both benefits and drawbacks depending upon the needs of the students. This current research finding result from several suggestions for future related researchers. First, the next researchers require to analyze interactional patterns and features in the perspective of both lecture and students in different parts to discover rich and comprehensive findings. In addition, because of the limited time, this present study did not provide the possible reasons for both lecturer and students using the patterns and features of interaction. Thus, why the next researchers require to find the possible reasons. Similarly, this present study only stated three data of each pattern and features of interaction. It might be insufficient. So, the next researchers should provide more than three data on each pattern and feature.

REFERENCES

- Arisandi, B. (2018). Classroom Interaction Patterns in EFL Task-Based Classroom. *Journal of ELT Research*, 3(2), 186. https://doi.org/10.22236/JER_Vol3Issue2pp186-192
- Cicognani, E., & Zani, B. (1988). The Clarification Request in Teacher-Child Conversation. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 3(3), 303. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03172736>
- Cojocariu, V.-M., Lazar, I., Nedeff, V., & Lazar, G. (2014). Swot Analysis of E-learning Educational Services from the Perspective of their Beneficiaries. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116(February 2015), 1999–2003. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.510>
- Dagarin, M. (2004). Classroom Interaction and Communication Strategies in Learning English as a Foreign Language. *ELOPE: English Language Overseas Perspectives and Enquiries*, 1(1–2), 127–139. <https://doi.org/10.4312/elope.1.1-2.127-139>
- Foster, P., & Ohta, A. M. Y. S. (2005). *Negotiation for Meaning and Peer Assistance in Second Negotiation for Meaning and Peer Assistance in Second Language Classrooms*. April 2015. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/ami014>
- Friedman, L. W., & Friedman, H. H. (2013). Using Social Media Technologies to Enhance Online Learning. *Journal of Educators Online*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.9743/JEO.2013.1.5>

- Hamid, S. M. (2016). Code-Switching Between The Teachers and The Students of The Conversation. *Exposure: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Inggris*, 5(2). <https://doi.org/10.26618/ejpb.v5i2.846>
- Hamzah, Mukhaiyar, & Nurmala Sari, M. (2018). Classroom Interaction Patterns And Teachers-Students Perceptions On English Classes At SMAN 2 Bukittingi West Sumatra. XIX. <https://doi.org/10.24036/komposisi.v19i2.10037>
- Jacobs, G. M., & Ivone, F. M. (2020). Infusing Cooperative Learning in Distance Education A perspective on student-student and student-teacher interaction. *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language*, 24(1).
- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of Transcript Symbols With an Introduction. In G. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the First Generation* (pp. 13-31). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Kasim, U. (2003). Classroom Interaction In The English Department Speaking Class at State University of Malang. State University of Malang.
- Long, M. H. (1996). The Role of the Linguistic Environment in Second Language Acquisition. *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Academic Press.
- Lu, Y. (2021). The Analysis of The Features of Interaction in Instructed SLA. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 11(4), 447–456. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1104.15>
- Malamah-Thomas, A. (1987). *Classroom Interaction*. Oxford University Press.
- Mandasari, M., Syarif, H., & Refnaldi. (2019). Teknik Elicitasi Dalam Interaksi Kelas Yang Digunakan Oleh Guru Bahasa Inggris Di SMAN 1 2x11 Kayutanam. XX, 1–11.
- Pica, T. (1987). Second-Language Acquisition, Social Interaction, and The Classroom. *Applied Linguistics*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/8.1.3>
- Purver, M., & Mary, Q. (2013). *The Theory and Use of Clarification Requests in Dialogue*. The University of London.
- Putri, F. G. (2014). *An Analysis of Classroom Interaction by Using Flander Interaction Analysis Categories System (Fiacs) Technique at SMPN 13 Kota Bengkulu in 2013/ 2014 Academic Year*. Unpublished Thesis. Universitas Bengkulu.
- Ramli, M. (2018). Classroom Interaction: Teacher and Students Perception on Dialogue in Primary Science Classroom. *Edusains*, 10(1), 127–134. <https://doi.org/10.15408/es.v10i1.8092>
- Rossi, G. (2020). Other-Repetition in Conversation Across Languages: Bringing Prosody Into Pragmatic Typology. *Language in Society*, 49, 495–520. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404520000251>
- Sari, M. N., Mukhaiyar, & Hamzah. (2018). Classroom Interaction Patterns and Teachers-Students Perceptions on English Classes at SMAN 2 Bukittinggi West Sumatra. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa, Sastra, Dan Seni*, 19(2).
- Sinaga, C. R., & Hutahaean, D. T. (2020). An Analysis of Code-Switching Used by Reza Arap on Deddy Corbuzier' s YouTube Channel. 6(3), 31–47.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1998). Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescent French immersion students working together. *Modern Language Journal*, 82(3). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1998.tb01209.x>
- Wijayati, P. H. (2009). Evaluasi Penyampaian Pesan dalam Komunikasi. *Jurnal Bahasa dan Seni*, 37(1).