

**AN ANALYSIS OF STUDENTS' INTERACTION IN ORAL
COMMUNICATION IN ENGLISH SPEAKING CLASSROOM AT THE
STATE POLYTECHNIC UJUNG PANDANG**



A THESIS

*Submitted to the Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Hasanuddin
University as Partial Requirement to Obtain Sarjana Degree in
English Department.*

By:

Aqilah Nurjihan Paramudia

F041201053

ENGLISH LITERATURE STUDY PROGRAM

FACULTY OF CULTURAL SCIENCES

HASANUDDIN UNIVERSITY

2024

LEGITIMATION

THESIS

AN ANALYSIS OF STUDENTS' INTERACTION IN ORAL COMMUNICATION IN
ENGLISH SPEAKING CLASSROOM AT THE STATE POLYTECHNIC UJUNG
PANDANG

BY

AQILAH NURJIHAN PARAMUDIA

Student ID Number: F041201053

It has been examined before the Board of Thesis Examination on 16th Feb 2024
and is declare to have fulfilled the requirements.

Approved By

Board of Supervisors

Chairman



Dr. Abidin Pammu, M.A., Dipl. TESOL
NIP. 196012311986011071

Secretary



Hidayatullah Yunus, S.S., M. TESOL
NIP. 199210072022043000



Dean of Faculty of Cultural Sciences
of Hasanudin University

Prof. Dr. Akin Duli, M.A.
NIP. 196407161991031010

Head of English Literature Study Program



Prof. Dra. Nasmilah, M.Hum, Ph.D
NIP. 196311031988112001

ENGLISH LITERATURE STUDY PROGRAM

FACULTY OF CULTURAL SCIENCES

HASANUDDIN UNIVERSITY

AGREEMENT

On 20th, 2024, the Board of Thesis Examination has kindly approved a thesis by Aqilah Nurjiha Paramudia (F041201053) entitled *An Analysis of Students' Interaction in Oral Communication in English Speaking Classroom at The State Polytechnic Ujung Pandang* submitted in fulfillment of one of the requirements to obtain Sarjana Degree in English Literature Study Program, Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Hasanuddin University.

Makassar, 20.02, 2024

BOARD OF THESIS EXAMINATION

- | | |
|--|-------------------|
| 1. Dr. Abidin Pammu, M.A., Dipl.TESOL. | Chairman |
| 2. Hidayatullah Yunus, S.S., M. TESOL | Secretary |
| 3. Prof. Dra. Nasmilah, M.Hum, Ph.D. | First Examiner |
| 4. Sitti Sahraeny, S.S., M.AppLing | Second Examiner |
| 5. Dr. Abidin Pammu, M.A., Dipl.TESOL. | First Supervisor |
| 6. Hidayatullah Yunus, S.S., M.Tesol. | Second Supervisor |

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.

ENGLISH LITERATURE STUDY PROGRAM

FACULTY OF CULTURAL SCIENCES

HASANUDDIN UNIVERSITY

DECLARATION

The thesis by Aqilah Nurjihan Paramudia (F041201053) entitled *An Analysis of Students' Interaction in Oral Communication in English Speaking Classroom at The State Polytechnic Ujung Pandang* has been revised as advised during the examination on
and is approved by the Board of Undergraduate Thesis Examiners:

1. Prof. Dra. Nasmilah, M.Hum, Ph.D. First Examiner
2. Sitti Sahraeny, S.S., M.AppLing Second Examiner

1.

2.

STATEMENT LETTER

The undersigned,

Name : AQILAH NURJIHAN PARAMUDIA

ID : F041201053

Title of Thesis : An Analysis of Students' Interaction in Oral Communication in English Speaking Classroom at The State Polytechnic Ujung Pandang

Department/Faculty : English Literature Study Program/ Cultural Sciences

Hereby, the writer declares that this thesis is written by herself. This thesis does not contain any materials which have been published by other people, and it does not cite other people's ideas except quotations and references.

Makassar,



AQILAH NURJIHAN PARAMUDIA

ENGLISH LITERATURE STUDY PROGRAM
FACULTY OF CULTURAL SCIENCES
HASANUDDIN UNIVERSITY

APPROVAL FORM

With reference to the letter of the dean of Faculty of Cultural Sciences Hasanuddin University No. 2184/UN4.9.1/KEP/2021 regarding supervision, we hereby confirm to approve the undergraduate thesis draft by Aqilah Nurjiha Paramudia (F041201053) to be examined at the English Literature Study Program of Faculty of Cultural Sciences.

Makassar, 20 02, 2024

Approved by

First Supervisor



Dr. Abidin Pammu, M.A., Dipl.TESOL.
NIP. 196012311986011071

Second Supervisor



Hidayatullah Yunus, S.S., M.Tesol.
NIP. 199210072022043000

Approved by the Execution of Thesis Examination by
The Thesis Organizing Committees

On Behalf of Dean
Head of English Literature Study Program



Prof. Dra. Nasmilah, M.Hum, Ph.D
NIP. 196311031988112001

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

First and foremost, all praises and gratitude to Allah SWT for His blessings and mercy given to the writer to successfully complete her research under the title *An Analysis of Students' Interaction in Oral English Communication in Speaking English Classroom at The State Polytechnic Ujung Pandang*.

Second, a sincere appreciation and gratitude is extended to **Dr. Abidin Pammu, M.A., Dipl. TESOL** and **Hidayatullah Yunus, S.S., M. TESOL**, the writer's supervisors, for all the guidance and encouragement in carrying out this research project. It was a precious thing to be able to discover new knowledge from both supervisors in the process of finishing this study.

Third, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to **Prof. Dra. Nasmilah, M.Hum, Ph.D.** and **Sitti Sahraeny, S.S., M.AppLing** as examiner one and examiner two of the authors, for all directions, input, and improvements given during the exam period. It is very valuable for the writer to be able to gain new knowledge from both of them in the examination process.

Furthermore, a special thank goes to two special people in this my life, the writer's parents, **Drs. Paramudia, M.Ed, Ph.D** and **Sunardila, S.E** for all their love, prayers, caring, sacrifices, and all their mental support and financial support in helping the writer to reach her future. A million of thanks would never be enough to repay all their kindness.

It is also my grateful to all lecturers and administrative staffs of English Department and Faculty of Cultural Sciences for the knowledge, guidance and sincere service provided during the writer's undergraduate education and the process of finishing this thesis

Next, the writer would like to deliver her sincere thanks to all her family members; Taruna Mulia, M. Sc, Ph.D., Nur Ahmad, S.T, M. S, M. M.AB., Yuya, Raid, Lala, Aisyah, Tante Ita, Tante Lina, Lek Indra, Lek Manul, and Budhe Ati. Also, VERDADERO's members Ical, Pute, Imma, Pika and Alm. Ekki. And last for BTS members, thank you for being an encouragement and motivating the writer's life. All of them are meaningful and unforgettable in her life.

Then, the writer 's deepest thanks are also expressed to my beloved friends Rismang, Rio, Ugga, Riri, and Angell. Thank you for a being part of the writer 's wonderful story in English Department.

Finally, the writer would say her apology to all other unnamed who helped the writer in various ways to accomplish this study.

Makassar, Januari 2024
The Writer,



Aqilah Nurjihan Paramudia

TABLE OF CONTENTS

COVER	i
LEGITIMATION.....	ii
AGREEMENT	iii
DECLARATION	iv
STATEMENT.....	v
APPROVAL.....	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ix
LIST OF TABLES	xii
LIST OF CHARTS.....	xiii
ABSTRACT	xv
ABSTRAK.....	xvi
CHAPTER I.....	1
INTRODUCTION	1
A. Background	1
B. Identification of The Problem	5
C. Scope of The Problem.....	6
D. Research Question.....	6
E. Objective of Research	6
F. Significance of Research.....	7
1. For Teacher	7
2. For Student	7
CHAPTER II	8
LITERATURE REVIEW	8
A. Previous related research findings.....	8
B. Theoretical Background	14
1. Oral English Communication.....	14
2. Oral English Communication in Speaking English Classroom	17
3. Factors Affecting Oral English Communication Interaction	24

CHAPTER III.....	29
METHODOLOGY.....	29
A. Research Design.....	29
B. Research Etiquette.....	30
C. Data Collection Procedure	30
D. Population and Sample.....	34
1. Population	34
2. Sample	35
E. Method of Collecting Data.....	36
1. Quantitative Analysis.....	36
2. Qualitative Analysis.....	38
F. Method of Analyzing Data.....	39
1. Quantitative Analysis.....	40
2. Qualitative Analysis.....	40
CHAPTER IV	41
FINDING AND DISCUSSION.....	41
A. The Findings.....	41
1. Quantitative Finding.....	41
2. Qualitative Finding.....	53
B. Discussion	75
CHAPTER V.....	83
CONCLUSSION AND SUGGESTION.....	83
A. Conclusion.....	83
B. Limitation.....	84
C. Suggestions	85
BIBLIOGRAPHY	87
APPENDICES	90

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.1 Demographic characteristic of age, tribes, study program and class.....	37
Table 4.2 OECI frequency level during the ESC learning activities.....	39
Table 4.3 OECI frequency level in the lecturing presentation learning activity.....	40
Table 4.4 OECI frequency level in the group discussion learning activity.....	41
Table 4.5 OEC interactions frequency level in the role play activity.....	43
Table 4.6 OEC interactions frequency level in the pair work learning activity.....	44
Table 4.7 OEC interactions frequency level in individual presentation activity.....	46
Table 4.8 Lack of ability in using language expression.....	49
Table 4.9 Impeding factor regarding to lack of ability in developing and organizing ideas.....	51
Table 4.10 Impeding factor regarding to lack of ability of using vocabulary.....	54
Table 4.11 Impeding factor regarding to lack of grammatical knowledge.....	56
Table 4.12 Impeding factor regarding to lack ability to pronounce particular words.....	58
Table 4.13 Impeding factor regarding to feeling concern about lecturer's error treatment.....	62
Table 4.14 Impeding factor regarding to the lecturer's lack of acknowledgement.....	64
Table 4.15 Impeding factor regarding to feeling concern about not losing face.....	66
Table 4.16 Impeding factor regarding to consideration for others.....	68
Table 4.17 Feeling Anxiety.....	70

LIST OF CHARTS

Chart 1. Factors impeding OECI ability.....	48
Chart 2. Five types of Non-Communicative Impeding Factors.....	61

ABSTRACT

Aqilah Nurjihan Paramudia, 2024, An Analysis of students' interaction in Oral Communication in English Speaking classroom at the state Polytechnic Ujung Pandang (Supervised by Abidin Pammu and Hidayatullah).

The research aimed to determine the levels of interaction of learners in using oral English communication (OECI) and to identify the factors affecting student interactions when using Oral English in Communication in speaking English classroom at the state of Polytechnic Ujung Pandang. This research emphasized the factors affecting negatively at Students' OECI based on I-R-F in Speaking Class Room.

The researcher employed qualitative and quantitative research method design involving 60 questioner respondents and 9 interview and classroom participants selected from four English speaking classes in the period 2023 and 2024 as the research purposive samples. Data was collected by using class room observation, semi-structured interview and questioner from 6 class room meetings. The sample in this study were students of class II A, B and C of D4 Business Study program, Commerce Administration Department, State Polytechnic Ujung Pandang totaling 60 students. The data analysis used were descriptive statistic data analysis for analyzing quantitative data and content analysis for involving data reduction, display and verification for analyzing qualitative data.

The quantitative study results showed that the oral English communication interactional communication frequency levels of learner when performing the speaking classroom activities were moderate. This can be seen from the overall statistical analysis data results only reached 2.74 (56%) from the expected ideal results. The qualitative study results found 10 factors affecting negatively including 5 lack of communicative competency and 5 non-communicative communicative impeding factors. Based on the research results, it can be concluded that the level of oral English communication interaction of learners from the perspective of learners following I-R-F interactional pattern was not optimal to achieve the expected ideal results. Developing or selecting appropriate teaching strategies were suggested to increase the oral English communication frequency levels to gain the expected ideal results.

Keywords: Classroom Oral English Communication, Affecting Factors

ABSTRAK

Aqilah Nurjihan Paramudia, 2024, Analisis Interaksi Mahasiswa dalam Komunikasi Lisan di Kelas Berbicara Bahasa Inggris di Politeknik Negeri Ujung Pandang (Dibimbing oleh Abidin Pammu dan Hidayatullah).

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui tingkat interaksi siswa dalam menggunakan komunikasi bahasa Inggris lisan (OECI) dan untuk mengidentifikasi faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi interaksi siswa ketika menggunakan bahasa Inggris lisan dalam komunikasi di kelas percakapan Inggris di Politeknik Negeri Ujung Pandang. Penelitian ini menekankan pada faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi secara negatif pada OECI Mahasiswa berdasarkan I-R-F di ruang kelas percakapan.

Peneliti menggunakan desain metode penelitian kualitatif dan kuantitatif yang melibatkan 60 responden kuesioner dari 115 populasi dan 9 peserta wawancara dan observasi kelas yang dipilih dari empat kelas berbicara bahasa Inggris pada periode 2023 dan 2024 sebagai sampel penelitian. Data dikumpulkan dengan menggunakan observasi kelas, wawancara semi-terstruktur dan kuesioner. Sampel dalam penelitian ini diambil dari mahasiswa kelas II A, B dan C program studi D4 Bisnis, Jurusan Administrasi Niaga, Politeknik Negeri Ujung Pandang. Analisis data yang digunakan adalah analisis data statistik deskriptif untuk menganalisis data kuantitatif dan analisis isi (content analysis) yang meliputi reduksi, display dan verifikasi data untuk menganalisis data kualitatif.

Hasil penelitian kuantitatif menunjukkan bahwa tingkat frekuensi komunikasi interaksional bahasa Inggris lisan para pembelajar ketika sedang melakukan kegiatan berkomunikasi Bahasa Inggris secara lisan di kelas percakapan Bahasa Inggris. Hal ini dapat dilihat dari hasil analisis data statistik secara keseluruhan hanya mencapai 2,74 (56%) dari hasil ideal yang diharapkan. Hasil penelitian kualitatif menemukan 10 faktor yang berpengaruh secara negatif yang meliputi 5 faktor berhubungan kurangnya aspek kompetensi dalam berkomunikasi dan 5 faktor penghambat lain diluar faktor aspek tersebut. Berdasarkan hasil penelitian, dapat disimpulkan bahwa tingkat interaksi komunikasi bahasa Inggris lisan peserta didik yang mengikuti pola interaksional I-R-F belum optimal untuk mencapai hasil ideal yang diharapkan. Perbaikan mata kuliah pra-syarat dan pengembangan atau pemilihan strategi pengajaran yang tepat disarankan untuk meningkatkan tingkat frekuensi komunikasi bahasa Inggris lisan untuk mendapatkan hasil ideal yang diharapkan.

Kata kunci: Komunikasi bahasa Inggris Lisan di kelas, faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Background of the study

English as an International language has played an important role as a medium of communication over the world. Crystal (1997) stated that the number of people in the world who communicate in English with international speakers is steadily rising compared to other language speakers. This statement is supported with the fact that approximately 380 million people speak in English as an international language. Furthermore, Neely (2012) stated that English has become the global language of business. Now, round about 1.75 billion of us speak English at a helpful level. The facts have proven that English is a global tool of communication.

In Indonesia, English is used as a very important foreign language for both educational and economic development. Regarding to economic development, many people use English as a tool for communication for performing international business activities such as exporting and importing commercial goods in the global market. The country engages in international trade when it purchases goods and services from another nation; by contrast, the nation engages in international trade when it sells goods and services to other nations. In term of educational development, many people need English for studying in the native speaking English countries such as Australia and America. Indonesia, being a populous country in the non-English-speaking world, continues to become an important market for English language education. Thus,

English has played important role in developing economic and educational sectors of the country.

Despite the importance roles of the foreign language in Indonesia, Indonesian learners usually find mastering the language is a challenging task because they have limited or even no opportunity to use oral English communication (OEC) in their daily routine. The learners are usually exposed with their mother tongue and national language. The only place for them to practice using oral English communication is when interacting in the English language classroom. Therefore, it is important for the teachers to encourage the learners to practice using Oral English communication maximally when interacting in the English classroom. According to Cook (2001) that English classroom could be implemented in one of three ways such as banning the use of mother tongue or first language (L1) in the classroom, minimized the use of L1 in the classroom, and maximized the use of target language in the classroom. The discouragement of mother tongue use in the classroom is created to enhance students' ability and reach communicative English classroom goals. In addition, it is also to create an atmosphere where the students could use the target language as much as possible in the learning process. Hence, it is necessary for the teachers to make sure that the learners have sufficient opportunity to perform oral English communication interaction optimally in English classroom.

Conceptually, Pamela Krish (2001) stated that to enable learners to practice using English in an English classroom, they should practice using English with various interactions in the classroom such as interacting between one student to the other

students in group discussion, to their lecturer when asking questions about a lesson and to the other student or students when performing a role play. The interactions can give opportunities to the learners to improve their English proficiency. Brown (2000) states that the interaction between teacher and students in classroom become a central in teaching and learning process. The reason is the teacher plays an important role to initiate the exchange of thoughts, feelings or ideas and the learners are required to respond the inputs and finally, the teachers provide feedbacks to output of language from the students. The pattern of interaction is called by Sinclair and Coulthard in Peterson (2008) called it as the I-R-F pattern. Based on the pattern, the researcher is able to analyze communication between teachers and students. The communication between teachers and students must happen when teaching English in the classroom. This kind of interaction in the classroom can provide opportunity for students to practice speaking English optimally.

Several studies in Indonesia have used the pattern to evaluate the teaching and learning in Indonesia. Putri (2021) investigated the dominant initiation- response and feedback [IRF] patterns and its impact on the interaction between the teacher and the tenth-grade students during classroom spoken discourse. The findings of the study showed that in the IRF pattern, the most dominant pattern was initiation. The study did not use feedback much when students responded to the initiation from the teacher. Another study was conducted by Vebriyanto (2015) focused on describing the types of questions that the teacher usually applies in the classroom during teaching and learning

process and the study found that the teacher utilized more display questions than referential-open questions.

Based on the two previous studies, it can be concluded that the oral English communication interaction (OECI) in the speaking classroom cannot be produced easily and naturally. Learners still have problems to perform OECI in the speaking classroom contexts. Some factors may hinder the learners in performing the OECI between the teacher and the students. Teachers need to be aware of the impeding factors to increase the level of OECI of learners. Celce-Murcia & Olshtain (2001) stated that lack of the OECI competency aspects may affect the perceived ability of learners to perform OECI when the teacher initiates and provides feedbacks to students. The factors such as lack of ability of using language function and of using grammatical knowledge. Minghe and Yuan (2013) furthermore claim that some affective factors may affect the perception of learners when the lectures ask them to perform OECI or provides feedbacks on their OECI performance in the speaking English classroom. The affecting factors include personality, motivation and attitude, self-esteem and anxiety, cross-cultural awareness and some external affective factors such as learning environment aspects.

Based on the explanations above, the previous related researches have focused on and found types, effectivities and impacts of I-R-F oral communication interaction pattern both in secondary school, senior high school and university contexts in Indonesia. In contrast, the current study focused on the perceived OECI frequency level of learners and the factors affecting them when performing the OECI in the English-

speaking classroom (hereafter is called ESC) at D4 business administration study program of commerce department of PNUP. Thus, the current study is different from the other previous studies in Indonesia. There were several reasons why the researcher focused on the topics. One of them was that the researcher had got informal and formal approval to get access for collecting research data due to her professional relationship had been built with the lecturer A who was teaching the intermediate speaking subject before conducting the current research and also as the head of the commerce department. The lecturer A had previously involved the researcher as one of the data collectors in his both community service and research projects. The next reason was that when performing a teaching practice as one of the requirements of the researcher's teaching methodology subject in the period of 2023/2024 and doing initial research in September 2024, she noticed the negative behaviors; silence and passiveness, of learners when performing OECI during the English classroom speaking learning activities. The last reason was that the results of the current research was could give positive contribution to the institution. Hence, the researcher believed investigating the issue urgent.

B. Identification Problem

Based on the background of the study, the problems of the study can be identified as in the following:

1. Identifying the factors affecting the learners' level of interactions when using OEC in speaking English classroom?

C. Scope of the problem

This study will focus on three classes of speaking English class at the D4 study Program, Commerce Department, in the State Polytechnic of Ujung Pandang (PNUP). Since, the interactions of learners when performing the learning activities in the class were required to use oral English communication. The study also focused OECI communication following I-R-F pattern. The aspects analyses were also focused on the factors affecting negatively the learners' oral English frequency level when the teacher asked or instructed the learners to perform OECI in the classroom activities in the speaking English classroom.

D. Research Question

1. What are the levels of interaction of learners in when using oral English communication (OEC) in the speaking English classroom?
2. What are the factors affecting the learners' interactions when using OEC in the speaking English classroom?

E. Objective of the study

1. To determine the levels of interaction of learners when using OEC in the speaking English classroom at the state of Polytechnic Ujung Pandang
2. To identify the factors affecting student interactions when using Oral English in Communication in speaking English classroom at the state of Polytechnic Ujung Pandang.

F. Significant of Study

The writer hopes this research can give contribution to the English teaching and learning. It has two major significances:

1. Theoretical Significance

The writer hopes that the research will be helpful in understanding factors impeding negatively the level of Indonesian students' interactions when using OEC in the speaking English classroom. The theories used can provide a better understanding the communicative competence and noncommunicative competency aspects having negative effects on oral English communication interactional frequency levels when performing the learning activities in the speaking classroom.

b. Practical Significance

a. For Reader

The results of this study can be useful information as the basis for selecting and improving the teaching strategies and the content of syllabus and teaching materials.

b. For the learners,

The study findings can provide useful information for developing their learning strategies to practice optimally in the speaking English classroom.

b. For another researcher

This study will provide benefits and inspire other researchers to find the new issues in the teaching and learning process relating to OECI for further research.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Previous Related Research findings

This section reports several previous studies that are relevant to the topic being studied. First, Carolina Magalhães Pinto (2022) conducted a study on “Employing formative feedback to enhance primary students’ oral interaction: Exploring formative assessment”. The study ran from late-September to mid-December involving a group of 24 children aged nine to ten in year 4 at primary level. The research methodology tools used were two questionnaires, the teacher’s feedback on pair work tasks, a teacher’s journal, observation of pair work tasks and two observation grids. The data collected was analyzed qualitatively and quantitatively, as part of a small-scale, classroom-based action research project. The research results indicated that teaching tasks can serve as effective assessment tools, capable of considering the learner’s present competence as well as skill development in order to progress students’ language learning. The data gathered demonstrated students’ new awareness of the benefits of pair work, which can be influenced by the relationship between the members of each dyad. The study also concluded that over time, timely and descriptive feedback, in combination with the explanation of expected learning goals, can benefit the learner to progress in their language learning and achieve the proposed learning goal.

Second, a study done by Makhoulf (2022) at Makhoulf University Center of Nour Bachir in Algeria on “Classroom Interactional Competence: A Reflective Practice

to Classroom Interaction”. The aim of the present was to analyze the major features of classroom interactional competence in order to better describe and explain how classroom interaction is used. The study employed a quantitative research design approach. The oral class was audio-taped and analyzed in terms of turns, and also was subjected to a categorization and coding procedure for the purpose of delineating quantitatively the interactional features (interactomes). The interactional features were adapted following Walsh’ (2011) Self-Evaluation of Teacher Talk (SETT) model, some interactional modifications involved in the negotiated meaning based on Pica and Daugherty (1985) and students’ meaning negotiation with no teacher intervention adapted by the researcher. The finding results indicated that classroom interactional competence was mostly featured with more opportunities for negotiation of meaning that were supported with the students’ attempt to negotiate meaning with no teacher intervention, comprehension check, and confirmation check. In addition, it was revealed that the various communicative practices in classroom created more opportunities to have better learning space through extended learner turns. The results also showed the existence of a more balanced teacher and students’ talks amount, which were associated with more questions asked by the teacher.

Third, the most relevant and current study in Indonesia was investigated by Putri (2021) based on the phenomenon of classroom interaction in enhancing students’ language skills in English classes using the 2013 curriculum. The study investigated the dominant initiation- response and feedback [IRF] patterns and its impact on the interaction between the teacher and the tenth-grade students during classroom spoken

discourse. This research was qualitative research involving a teacher of English and four classes. The data were collected via classroom observations and semi-structured interviews. The findings of the study showed that implementing the IRF pattern, the study revealed that the most dominant pattern used was initiation. The teacher dominated the classroom during the lesson and the IRF pattern had positive impacts on students' English when the teacher asked questions. The teacher needed to understand what questions students needed to ask to respond well because it must be in line with the 2013 curriculum, which places students at the center of learning. Teachers needed to use more various feedbacks from the IRF pattern. It can be seen from the observation that the teacher did not use feedback much when students responded to the initiation from the teacher because feedback is essential to increase student motivation, confidence, and evaluation.

Fourth, in Singapore, a study conducted by Kiss and Wang (2017) in a Singapore primary school investigating teacher questions within the framework of knowledge building Pedagogy. This study aimed at investigating the impact of teacher experience and cognition on teacher questioning in the framework of Knowledge Building (KB) pedagogy. The study revealed that teaching experience of the teacher effect powerfully on implementing questioning strategy in their classrooms. Furthermore, the implementation of Knowledge Building pedagogy positively affected and contributed positive impacts on the learning environment.

Fifth, in Indonesia, a study by Irawan & Salija (2017) investigating "Teachers' Oral Feedback in EFL Classroom Interaction (A Descriptive Study of Senior High

School in Indonesia)". This research aimed at identifying types and ways of oral feedback used by teachers in EFL classroom interaction based on the theory of Tunstall & Gipss (1996), Lyster & Ranta (1997), Cullen (2002), and Mackiewicz & Thompson (2013). It also investigated teachers' reasons for using oral feedback and students' perceptions of oral feedback used by teachers in EFL classroom interaction. This research was conducted at Senior high school in Indonesia. The researcher applied descriptive qualitative research method. The subjects of this research were 2 English teachers and 12 students. All of them were chosen by using purposive sampling technique. The instruments of this research were audio recording, field notes, and interview. The results of this research showed that the teachers used 5 types of oral feedback. They were evaluative feedback corrective feedback, descriptive feedback, interactional feedback, and motivational feedback. The teachers used oral feedback through providing evaluative statements to students' work or performance, indicating and correcting students' errors explicitly or implicitly, informing students' achievement and the improvement strategies of learning, clarifying and embellishing some ideas on students' responses, and providing motivational statements to students. The teachers employed oral feedback because of teachers' responsibility and obligation to provide it, the effective and efficient feedback mode, the utility of oral feedback, positive effect to students, and consequences of none of oral feedback. Mostly, the students perceived positively to oral feedback. Some students found felt sensitive to oral feedback. Nevertheless, they still realized to its positive effect on the result of their work or performance.

Sixth, another research was conducted in Indonesia by Rustandi and Mubarak (2017) investigating on the analysis of IFR (initiation-response-feedback) in EFL English speaking classroom. This study aimed at analyzing the reflection of IRF (Initiation-Response Feedback) in speaking class and investigating the dominant sequence among I, R and F. The IRF is a pattern of classroom interaction found by Sinclair and Coulthard in 1975 that stands for teacher initiation, students' response and feedback by teacher. Initiation is the movement in which teacher initiates an interaction to get the response of the students, then teacher gives feedback to the students' response. To collect the data, the researcher conducted a classroom observation in speaking class in one university in West Java. The result showed that students' responses become the dominant sequence of IRF in speaking class. Furthermore, it is recommended that the teachers should maintain the effectiveness of classroom interaction and give much opportunity to the students to take role in classroom verbal interaction through reflecting the IRF pattern in teaching learning process particularly in speaking classroom.

Seventh, Lucha and Berhanu (2015) investigated in their study on Classroom Interaction in Communicative Language Teaching of Public Secondary Schools in Nepal. The purpose of the study was to identify students' classroom interaction in EFL speaking classroom at Sire Secondary School in East Wollega. It employed a descriptive research design. The data were collected using random sampling technique from 182 students and availability sampling from 5 teachers of the school. The instruments used were classroom observation, interview for teachers, and questionnaire

for students. The collected data were quantitatively and qualitatively. The findings of the study revealed that English language classroom oral interaction was not properly implemented in the stated grade level, and teachers and students did not perform the roles expected of them astoundingly. Furthermore, lack of students' interest to orally interact, lack of English teacher's commitment to create atmosphere for their learners to freely interact, teachers' not budgeting enough time for students' interaction, large class size to moderately keep an eye on oral interaction and students' insufficient in English language background at lower schooling core setbacks for effective implementation of oral interaction. teachers should make their maximum effort by encouraging students whose English oral proficient becomes below the required grade level to in teachers should also be aware and implement that their friendly approach to their students plays its own role in boosting up students' interaction. Therefore, teachers ought to approach their students in providing professional support during classroom interaction. Furthermore, teachers should provide maximum opportunity to students to participate in oral interaction so that they could play the roles expected of them. Finally, the school community and other concerned body should also create favorable classroom environment to minimize the problems encountered and to maximize the implementation of students' oral interaction in EFL classroom.

Based on the previous related researches were concerned about types, effectivities and impacts of I-R-F oral communication interaction pattern implemented both in secondary school, senior high school and university contexts. The difference between this research and the previous researches is the current study

focused on determining the perception of learners regarding to their oral English communication frequency level in the higher vocational school; the State Polytechnic of Ujung Pandang (PNUP) and exploring the factors affecting negatively when performing various oral English communicative activities in English Speaking Classroom (ESC).

B. Theoretical Background

This present research has three main topics that were used as the research variables. They are:

1. Oral English Communication

Communication in the classroom has two main purposes: Pedagogic and social purposes Malamah & Thomas (1987). The pedagogic purpose is referred to the teacher's reasons for undertaking communication in the classroom. For example, he presents a new structure, explaining new words, providing a model of pronunciation, and so on. She further comments that although learning is the focus of classroom communication, not all the matters is pedagogic in nature. Both teachers and students have their own reasons for communicating in the classroom. They need to maintain personal relationship. The teacher, for instance, needs to establish a rapport with the class, and with individuals of which the class is composed. Individual students form different sorts of relationship with each other, and take up different attitude to the teacher. Thus, teacher can integrate between the pedagogic purposes in the classroom. For example, a teacher may really want some furniture to be removed but he may

choose to give students instructions in the target language to move furniture so as to provide some listening practice for students at the same time.

Each communicative purpose is achieved through a context. The context comprises who says what to whom, and why, where, when and how Hymes (1962), Malamah & Thomas (1987) breaks the context into eight factors as follows.

- a. Addresser: a person trying to transmit a message.
- b. Purpose: the addresser's reason for transmitting the message.
- c. Addressee: the person to whom the message transmitted.
- d. Context: how the message is delivered, the actual form of words
- e. Form: how the language is delivered.
- f. Medium: The medium of delivery, spoken or written.
- g. Setting: the place and the time. Delivered
- h. Code: the language in which the message is delivered such as English or France

These factors above, in fact, explain Hymes' formulation as previously stated: Who (addresser), what (content), whom (addressee), what (content), Whom (addressee) Why (purposes), Where (Setting), and how (form, medium and code).

Similarly, in the ELT classroom, eight factors will also emerge as in the example given below:

- a. Addresser: teacher
- b. Content: syllabus items/teaching points
- c. Addressee: students
- d. Purposes: teaching aims/objective

- e. Settings: classroom setting, semester 4
- f. Form: activities/tasks
- g. Medium: verbal (spoken and/or written) non-verbal (pictures/mime/demonstration, etc.)
- h. Code: English

The first eight factors are referred to the factors of learning event, and those in the second ones are called to be factors of the speech event. In a communicative view of teaching and learning, the eight factors can be associated with who teaches to whom and why, where, when and how. This is to say that the teacher has a teaching objective, a definite purpose to communicate to the students. He then has to choose a form of activity which will convey his teaching point most effectively in his situation and thus achieve the set objective. He then can use both verbal and non-verbal media. This particular classroom setting will affect his choice of form, depending upon the physical conditions and resources, and the particular time day, week, academic year at which the learning event in question takes place. Oral communication takes place in the classroom involving the teachers as a n addressor as the sender of a message, instruction or teaching materials to students as addressee who receives message, instruction or teaching materials. The process of communication the classroom involves the interaction between the teacher and the student that take place in the communicative learning activities. The current study focuses on the use of oral English communication during the interaction between the teacher and the students, a student or some students and the other students in the English-Speaking Classroom (ESC).

2. Oral English Communication Interaction in Speaking English Classroom

The Oral English communication Interaction (OECI) is very interesting to discuss because it occurs every day in the teaching and learning process in the speaking English class room. According to Kaltari (2009), the interaction involves teacher-students and students-students when using OEC in the classroom. In addition, Brown (2001, p. 167), pointed that the OECI when students interact with each other, they receive input and produce output through language which is acquired by them as their communicative competence. It is the exchange of thoughts, feelings, and ideas which is conducted by two or more people, and mutual effect will be produced in both communicators.

Furthermore, Walsh (2011) emphasizes that the use OECI can be identified by investigating the class room talk when the teacher initiates, responds and gives feedbacks to the student called IRF. The IRF is performed between the teacher and the learners, or among the learners themselves either in individual or in group. Typically, a teacher initiates talk by asking a question (I). A student then responds (R) and the teacher follows up with some feedback (F) regarding how well the student's response meets the teacher's expectation.

Here, Hargreaves, McCallum & Gipps (2000) classified elements of OEC interaction into verbal questioning, responding and giving feedbacks in the classroom. The three elements were explained in the following sections.

a. Questioning

Galls as cited in Richard (1996) state that questioning or Initiating (I) is one of the elements of OEC interaction in the classroom. They further explain that more than a half of classroom talk is dominated by questioning and answering. The questioning is the movement in which the learner or the teacher initiates a class room interaction. Similarly, Dayag et al. (2008, p.5) explained that an initiation is done by the teacher by asking a question or action to initiate OEC interaction in a classroom. (Harmer, 2009) the interaction cannot be produced easily; it requires initiatives or efforts from both the students and teachers. Learners need to constantly increase the willingness and ability to practice performing OECI both with the teacher and the other students in in the classroom interaction. Therefore, creating the interactive language classroom is necessary because it provides the stimuli for the student to interact continually.

a. Types of questioning

Shomoosi (2004) and Husein (2004) classified the questioning into two types. They are display and referential questions. Shomoosi claims that display-closed questions sometimes produce short responses. The purpose of this question is to acquire some information that teachers do not know from students (Husein, 2012). Ellis as cited in Al-Farsi states that closed questions are types of questions which produce only one acceptable answer or response from students. These types of questions have the purposes of demanding confirmation or agreement with factual or opinion information. The form of closed questions are commonly realized by polar (yes-no) interrogatives.

The second type of question is the referential-open questions, this is usually used by the teacher to ask further or longer explanations from the learners (Brock as cited in Lynch (1991), also Al Mu'aini (2012). Thus, open questioning is the question in which the teacher inquiries about long answer that can help the learners to develop their understanding. In consistent with what Torrance and Pryor's (2001) state that questions have been found to require further cognitive input from students (Chin 2006).

From the reviews above, we can see that there is different between display-closed or referential-open questions used by the teacher to help students to perform OECI in in the process of English-speaking teaching learning in the classroom. The difference means that the study on learners' level of frequency of using question or classroom questioning is still worth investigated. Therefore, the study employed the two types of questions as their indicators for measuring the perceptions of learners regarding to their OECI levels when performing OECI following under various activities in the English-Speaking Classroom (ESC).

a. Learners' Response

According to Dayag et al (2008), learners' response moves (R) is actually performed by the students following the initiation which produced by the teacher. They further state that response is represent the teacher initiate in response of initiation move by participants act. It means that the students are expected to interact by responding the teacher's stimuli question. Students' responses are classified into two types.

b. Types of response

Shomoosi (2004) explains that there are two types of responses. one of response them is used for responding display questions. The display question is the type of question requiring short answer. In this case the learners are expected to perform OECI by responding the questions provided by the lecturer. The second type of question is referential question. This question used by the lecturer to elicit a long answer or explanation from the students. With this regard, the learner is expected to perform OECI by producing the long expected by the teacher. For example, when the lecturer asked a question or asks to perform OECI under various activities in the speaking class room activities, the learners are expected to actively perform long response either in the form of explanations or response in the form of long performance such as delivering a class room presentation or a role play learning activities. Thus, type of response is responding teacher's referential questions which were significantly longer and syntactically more complex. The referential question is used by the lecturer to encourage the students to produce longer responses from students.

From the literature reviews, we can conclude that there is different result on the effect of employing either employing display-closed questions or referential-open questions to students' language production. This means that the study on long and the short question is worth investigated.

c. Teachers' Feedbacks

According to Dayag et al, (2008) that feedback/follow up (F) is the last exchange of a turn which aims to give feedback to students' response or other students' responses. They further explain that feedback completes the cycle as it provides closure to the initiation and response. It means that students get immediately the correction or evaluation for their response. There are three types of OECI performed in the classroom were identified as feedback in this study.

a. Types of feedback

Dayag et al (2008) classified feedbacks into three types. They are types of OECI performed in the classroom were identified as feedback in this study. They are they are discrepancy comments, sharing success criteria and open questions feedback. Torrance and Pryor (2001).

Anderson and Palm and Heitink (2017), pointed out that feedback is an important component of formative assessment as it refers to the information provided to students in order to promote their learning. In other words, feedback is a necessary but insufficient feature of formative assessment. Feedback can also be provided outside a formative assessment situation, i.e. outside the intentional situation in which a teacher

gathers information and evidence in relation to what a student knows or is able to do, in everyday classroom talk. In their review, Black and Wiliam (1998) found that students learnt more when feedback contained specific information about strengths and weaknesses and how to improve. Research in language education has found that the most effective feedback contains the correct answer and that explanation feedback is better than correct answer feedback (Butler et al. 2013). Furthermore, positive environments should be more conducive to constructive feedback.

However, Deci et al (1999) stated that some studies have identified feedback practices which may be ineffective or even detrimental to learning. For example, a negative correlation has been found between rewards and performance on task and the feedback in the form of praise may lead to children with low self-esteem avoiding important learning experiences.

Based on the conceptual framework, the study constructed the following dependent variable and operational definitions of. this study as in the follows:

1. Independent variable of this study:

The dependent variable of this study is the level of oral English interaction of learners when using oral English communication in the speaking English classroom. Based on the dependent variable and the I-R-F and the results of initial observations, the researcher developed the following six indicators of the study:

- a. The lecturer asks **(I)** the students using the question or questions requiring short answer or answers to encourage learners to perform oral English communication interaction (OEI) following pattern of interaction **(I-R-F)** in the speaking

English classroom learning activities (role-play, class room individual presentation, pair-work and group discussion **(Indicator 1)**)

- b. The students reply the question or questions requiring short answer **(R)** to perform OECI following pattern of interaction **(I-R-F)** in the speaking English classroom activities (role-play, class room individual presentation, pair-work and group discussion **(Indicator 2)**)
- c. The lecturer provides feedback or feedbacks on the short answer question or questions **(F)** following pattern of interaction **(I-R-F)** to encourage the learners to perform OECI in the speaking English classroom activities (role-play, class room individual presentation, pair-work and group discussion)
- d. The lecturer asks **(I)** the students using the question or questions requiring long answer or answers to encourage learners to perform oral English communication interaction (OECI) following pattern of interaction **(I-R-F)** in the speaking English classroom learning activities (role-play, class room individual presentation, pair-work and group discussion **(Indicator 4)**)
- e. The students reply the question or questions requiring long answer **(R)** to perform OECI following pattern of interaction **(I-R-F)** in the speaking English classroom activities (role-play, class room individual presentation, pair-work and group discussion **(Indicator 5)**)
- f. The lecturer provides feedback or feedbacks on the short answer question or questions **(F)** following pattern of interaction **(I-R-F)** to encourage the learners to

perform OECI in the speaking English classroom activities (role-play, class room individual presentation, pair-work and group discussion)

- g. The lecturer asks **(I)** the students using the question or questions requiring long-answer or answers to encourage learners to perform oral English communication interaction (OECI) following pattern of interaction **(I-R-F)** in the speaking English classroom learning activities (role-play, class room individual presentation, pair-work and group discussion **(Indicator 1)**)

Oral English communication frequency level of learners is defined as the oral English communication interaction occurs when the lecturer provides feedbacks on the short response or responses of learners to the question or questions.

Based on the six indicators, the researcher constructed 25 criteria and 25 items of the research questionnaire (See the example in Appendix A)

2. Factors affecting Oral English Communication Interaction

In this part the literature review, the factors affecting the learners in performing oral English communication interaction (OECI) are classified into two broad area including communicative competency and non-communicative competency impeding factors. The communicative impeding factors may occur due do to the lack of communicative competency (Dudley-Evans & St.John, Munby, Hutchinson and Waters, Celce-Murcia,M., & Olsgtain, E and Al-Tamimi & Shuaib, 2010). The first

type of impeding factors concerning the lack of the communicative competency including several aspects of competency:

First, lack of linguistic competency aspects is referred as the perception of learners regarding to their lack of ability to apply linguistic aspects such as grammatical rules, vocabularies, language expressions and pronunciations. The linguistic competence is, indeed, important because without it learners of English will not be able to use the language correctly. Hence, if the learners perceived lack of one of the linguistic competency, they may feel hindered to perform OECI in the various classroom learning activities initiated by the teacher.

Second, lack of discourse competence is defined as the ability of connecting several ideas together appropriately and maintaining an extended exchange of messages. For example, before getting the learners involved in the academic discourse such as group discussion, delivering an individual presentation and debates. For example, lack of ability of organizing ideas in delivering a presentation or getting involved in a group discussion. Thus, if the learners perceived to be lack of the aspect of the discourse competency, they perceive themselves are not able to develop and connect the ideas.

Third, lack of sociolinguistic competence is referred as the perception of lack of ability to use choosing language functions or expressions according to the social situations including aspect of time, place, and social relationships. The sociolinguistic competence is necessary, for learners to get exposed to and engaged in various uses of English in the various activities in the class room context. Thus, if the learners perceive

that they are not able to use language expressions perform OEI in the English-speaking classroom (ESC), they may consider themselves lack of ability to use language expressions or function in the ESC.

Fourth, lack of strategic competence, the perception of lack of ability to understand a basic meaning or to be understood, even when adequate vocabulary and structures are lacking. The strategic competency is important for the learners to avoid communication breakdown, especially when words cannot sustain the communication flow. Thus, if the learners perceive that they are not able to use the strategy for avoiding communication breakdown or conveying message with limited strategy, they may consider that lack of communicative strategy as one of the impeding factors.

Fifth, lack of cultural knowledge of the language used. The cultural knowledge is the aspect competency that can make the speakers be able to use the language appropriately in the particular context. So, if the learners do not have cultural knowledge, they may consider lack of cultural knowledge as one of the impeding factors.

The second type factors relating to non-communicative competency impeding factors. Several studies discovered the non-communicative factors. Sato (1981) revealed that cultural background influenced the language learning behavior exhibited by learners in an ESL classroom. Sato conducted an exploratory study to examine her own learners' turn-taking behavior in university ESL classroom and identified the familiar stereotype of Asian Learners as being more passive and quieter than non-Asian

learners. Further, the Asian learners took fewer initiatives and were more independent on teacher located turn. From the results, Sato concluded that Asian learners have more constraints on their notions of permissible classroom participation patterns than they do from other cultures. Liu (1996) revealed gender, personality, content knowledge, prior experience communication skills, lesson type, and class size hindered the learners to participate in EFL classroom. In Taiwan context, a study was conducted by Chiu-Ping Huang (2010) in Lugwa University of Science and Technology found that self and oral proficiency, the frequency of and motivation in speaking English were significantly correlated with the use of oral communication strategies. In U.S context a study was conducted by Jun Liu (1996) in Ohio State University to explore and explain possible the possible relationships between the possible relationship between ESL learners' linguistic knowledge and language performance. The background of the study was based on a problem of growing concern in U.S. higher education and foreign language education is the inability of international graduate students in English as Second Language (ESL) settings to adequately adapt to an active oral classroom participation mode in their content courses. The study revealed among affective, cognitive, linguistic, pedagogical/environmental, and socio-cultural factors, cognitive as well as pedagogical/environmental factors facilitated oral classroom participation. Also, socio-cultural as well as affective factors were regarded as debilitating. Particularly the study concluded that socio-cultural factors are mainly responsible for the participants' reticent behavior in terms of oral classroom participation.

Santo (1981) reveals that cultural background influenced language learning behaviors exhibited by learners in an ESL classroom. Santo conducted an exploratory study to examine her own learners' turn-getting behavior university and identified the familiar stereotype of Asians learners as being more passive and quieter than non-Asian learners. Furthermore, the Asian students took fewer initiatives and were more depended on time teacher allocated turn-taking.

To answer the research question 2, the structured interview questions were developed by the researcher to explore the dimensions of the factors affecting the learners when using OEC the learners based on Youngjoo Bang (1999) and Celce-Murcia & Z. Dornyei (1995). Based on the dimension, the study constructed the interview criteria and the items of the research interview questions (See the example in appendix C2)