

**THE PATTERNS OF TEACHER AND STUDENTS' INTERACTIONS IN THE  
ENGLISH CLASSROOM : A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY AT SMPN 24 MATARAM IN  
ACADEMIC YEAR 2018 / 2019**



**A JOURNAL**

**Submitted as Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for *Sarjana Pendidikan* (S.Pd.) in  
English Education Program Department of Language and Art Faculty of  
Teacher Training and Education University of Mataram**

**By:**

**SILVINA UTAMI  
E1D113140**

**ENGLISH EDUCATION PROGRAM  
LANGUAGE AND ART DEPARTMENT  
FACULTY OF TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION  
UNIVERSITY OF MATARAM  
2018**



KEMENTERIAN RISET, TEKNOLOGI, DAN PENDIDIKAN TINGGI

UNIVERSITAS MATARAM

FAKULTAS KEGURUAN DAN ILMU PENDIDIKAN

JURUSAN BAHASA DAN SENI



Jl. Majapahit No. 62 Telp.(0370)623873 Fax. 634918 Mataram 83125

---

**JOURNAL APPROVAL**

**Entitled:**

**THE PATTERNS OF TEACHER AND STUDENTS' INTERACTIONS IN  
THE ENGLISH CLASSROOM : A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY AT SMPN 24  
MATARAM IN ACADEMIC YEAR 2018 / 2019**

**BY:**

**SILVINA UTAMI**  
**E1D113140**

Has been approved in Mataram on November by:

**First Advisor,**

**Drs. H. Sahuddin, M.A.**  
**NIP. 195912311987031013**

**THE PATTERNS OF TEACHER AND STUDENTS'  
INTERACTIONS IN THE ENGLISH CLASSROOM : A  
DESCRIPTIVE STUDY AT SMPN 24 MATARAM IN ACADEMIC  
YEAR 2018/2019**

**By:**

**SILVINA UTAMI**

**E1D113140**

**ABSTRACT**

The patterns of teacher and students' interactions in the English classroom applied by English teacher of junior high school: A descriptive study, English teacher and students' of SMPN 24 Mataram was aimed to find out the patterns of interaction by English teacher and students' and the interactions between teacher and students' grade 8B in the English classroom. The subject of this study was English teacher's and students' grade 8 of SMPN 24 Mataram. The data were collected through classroom observation and questionnaire. This research was analyzed by descriptive qualitative method. The result of this study shows that the teacher used a two-way process in the learning process. Based on the result of this study, this research is recommended for the next researcher to get more information for this study.

**Key words: Patterns, Interactions, and Descriptive Study.**

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Classroom Interaction is very essential in today's education system because it is a necessity to make a good atmosphere in the classroom. Effective classroom interaction has a big implications; it is concern a pleasant atmosphere in the classroom with friendly relationships among the participants of the learning process (Muntner, M. (2008)). It also encourages students to become effective learners. It can be achieved through various ways: by implementing different student and teacher roles, by exposing students to a varied classroom organization, by employing a variety of activities, by helping students to express themselves and by encouraging their use of communication strategies. If the two implications are joined, we get a pleasant classroom atmosphere in which students are trying to communicate in the foreign language. But, not every teacher is capable of making a good interaction inside the classroom because of their lack information about these kinds of things.

A proliferation of research from Eschenmann (1991) and other scholars suggests that if teachers take the time to build relationships they can motivate their students to learn. Further research (Whitaker, 2004) also suggests that teachers need to have a strong belief that building relationships are important to the motivation process. There is a need to capitalize on these beliefs for the child's benefit. It is important that educators recognize the impact they have on their students, and consider strongly their students' perceptions of them (Eschenmann, 1991).

The reason why I choose this study in SMPN 24 Mataram are: First, as we know about curriculum 2013, a teacher should know the curriculum before he or she teaches his or her students, as curriculum has been made on the basis of students' needs. According to Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English, curriculum is a course of study in school, college, etc. (Hornby, 1987:211). The process of teaching learning in schools is influenced by its environment. Schools in suburbs will be different from schools in urban areas. Therefore, a school needs a curriculum which will give guidance to determine schools' goal by paying attention to the environment. This is stated in the

regulation of government No 20, 2003 article 1 and verse 19, that is curriculum is planning set and rule about purpose, content and lesson material also the method which is used as a guidance to conduct learning activity to achieve certain educational goals.

From the explanation above, we can know that the point is students have to explore more knowledge not only in school or class when the learning process takes place, but students also have to explore outside the class. Students get more information related to the material that will be taught by the teacher and students are more active in giving opinions and so on. Therefore, I examined what interaction patterns used in SMPN 24 Mataram related to the curriculum that is being used in SMPN 24 Mataram because this school was established since 2015. This school has been using K13 which requires teachers to be facilitators and more creative than students more active or still using KTSP 2006 which the learning model is still a teacher more active. So, I want to know what kind of patterns were used if the teacher used the curriculum 2013 or KTSP. Second, the learning process in this new school, precisely in 2015, I want to know what are the patterns of interaction in the new school, and how is the interaction between teacher and students, and interested to identify the patterns that English teacher use in this school. Third, the position of this school is in the midst of society and the rice field is doubt quality by the community.

Based on the explanation above, I choose the teacher and students' at SMPN 24 Mataram as a setting to do research. So, as the result I conduct a research entitled "The Patterns of Teacher and Students' Interactions in The English Classroom : A Descriptive Study at SMPN 24 Mataram in Academic Year 2018/2019.

## **2. Research Question**

Based on background above, the formulated research question as follow:

1. How is The Interaction between Teacher and Students' in The English Classroom?
2. What are The Patterns of Teacher and Students' Interactions in The English Classroom at SMPN 24 Mataram?

### **3. Purpose of The Study**

1. To identify The Interaction between Teacher and Students' in The English Classroom.
2. To identify The Patterns of Teacher and Students' Interactions in The English Classroom at SMPN 24 Mataram.

### **4. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

Classroom Interaction is a practice that enhances the development of the two very important language skills which are speaking and listening among the learners. This device helps the learner to be competent enough to think critically and share their views among their peers. The Cambridge International Dictionary of English defines the verb 'to interact' as 'to communicate with or react to (each other)'. Brown (2001, 165) relates interaction to communication, saying, "interaction is, in fact, the heart of communication: it is what communication is all about". Interaction has a similar meaning in the classroom. We might define classroom interaction as a two way process between the participants in the learning process. The teacher influences the learners.

### **5. Interaction Patterns**

There are some interaction patterns inside the classroom (Cohen, L. and Manion, L. (2011)):

#### **1. Group work**

Students work in small groups on tasks that entail interaction; conveying information, for example, or group decision-making. The teacher walks around listening, intervenes little if at all.

#### **2. Closed-ended teacher questioning (IRF)**

Only one "right" response gets approved. Sometimes cynically called the "Guess what the teacher wants you to say" game.

#### **3. Individual work**

The teacher gives a task or set of tasks, and students work on them independently; the teacher walks around monitoring and assisting where necessary.

#### 4. Choral Responses

The teacher gives a model which is repeated by all the class in the chorus; or gives a cue which is responded to in chorus.

#### 5. Collaboration

Students do the same sort of tasks as in “individual work”, but work together, usually in pairs, to try to achieve the best results they can. The teacher may or may not intervene. (Note that this is different from “Group work”, where the task itself necessitates interaction.)

#### 6. Student initiates, Teacher answers

For example, in a guessing game: the students think of questions and the teacher responds; but the teacher decides who asks.

#### 7. Full-class interaction

The students debate a topic or do a language task as a class; the teacher may intervene occasionally, to stimulate participation or to monitor.

#### 8. Teacher talk

This may involve some kind of silent student response, such as writing from dictation, but there is no initiative on the part of the student.

#### 9. Self-access

Students choose their own learning tasks, and work autonomously.

#### 10. Open-ended Teacher Questioning

There are a number of possible “right” answers, so that more students answer each cue.

## 6. Previous Related Study

Related to this study, there are some previous studies which are similar to or in line with this study. There are three studies. First was conducted by (Marguerite Louise Sibley (1990)) with the title “Teacher-student interactions in the ESL classroom: an investigation of three-part exchanges, teacher feedback, and the role of gender”. Second was conducted by (Sita Nurmasitah (2010)) with title “A Study of Classroom Interaction Characteristics in A Geography Class Conducted in English: The Case at Year Ten of An Immersion Class in SMA N 2 Semarang”. Third research was conducted by Anisah Rizkiani Amin (2015) “Patterns Of Teacher – Students Interaction. A Case Study of Classroom Interaction in Eleventh Grade of Senior High School in Cimahi”.

I would like to mention some differences from three studies with this research. The purpose of this studies are to identify the interaction between teacher and students’ in the English classroom and to identify the patterns of teacher and students’ interactions in the English classroom at SMPN 24 Mataram. But, the differences of purpose from the first previous study are to achieve a greater understanding of interpersonal dynamics in the ESL classroom, and especially to learn more about the nuances of teacher-student interactions. The secondary purpose of this study was to investigated the question of gender bias or equity in teacher-student interactions. Second, to explore the classroom interaction characteristics and to find out whether or not the English interactions as used to teach Geography at year ten of Immersion Class at SMAN 2 Semarang have met teaching effectiveness elements. Third, to analyze the classroom interaction patterns based on the framework developed by Suherdi (2010) which occur in classroom interaction as a part of discourse analysis approach.

Next is research questions from this research are How is The Interaction between Teacher and Students’ in The English Classroom? And What are The Patterns of Teacher and Students’ Interactions in The English Classroom at SMPN 24 Mataram?. The research questions from the first previous study are hat was the frequency of both display and open-ended referential questions asked by the teachers? 2) What percentage of the questions asked by teachers were answered by student

volunteers vs. students selected by the teacher? 3) Were all members of the class called on, and did they volunteer, equally often?, the second whether or not the English interactions as used to teach Geography at year ten of Immersion Class at SMAN 2 Semarang have met teaching effectiveness elements, and third is how does the teacher talk as a part of teacher-students interaction affect the teacher-students interaction patterns in the classroom?.

The last differences of this study about data findings. This research find some interactions between teacher and students and the patterns of teacher and students interactions in the English classroom there were There are some interactions between teacher and students first one is teacher and learners, teacher and learner / group of learners, learner and learner, conversation with Learners, role Play, and choral Responses. There is a two way interaction patterns of teacher and students interactions. The data findings of first previous study was used the coefficient of distribution to show the degree to which students of each sex participated in three-part exchanges proportional to their numbers in the classes, it is shown on Table 9 that women participated a little less often than was expected by their numbers in the classes, and men participated a little more than expected. The actual differences between how often they were involved in these exchanges is small. In fact, if a female student had been involved in just one more interaction in five of the groups, females would have been found to be participating more than or equal to the expected amount in eight out of the ten groups. Therefore this study showed that male and female students were answering questions in three-part exchanges at about the same rate. However, if this question included student questions, comments, or answers to undirected questions, women would have been found to be participating significantly less often than men. Second, The teacher was still the dominant in the teaching-learning Teacher spent more time in teaching learning process than the students. She usually taught the children by using direct influence. However, the students were active enough in the classroom interaction. It can be seen from the results of the students' participation. Third, There was a relation between the occurrences of simple non anomalous K1 –initiated patterns with giving information as a part of Teacher Talk including the fact that display questions are also taken a part of it. The occurrence

of simple non anomalous K1 –initiated patterns as the dominant patterns in all meetings proves that there are many explanations, knowledge, and information conveyed directly by the teacher to the students. Giving explanations, knowledge, and information as the cause of the classroom interaction patterns show that Teacher Talk had taken over the interaction between teacher and students in the classroom. According to Cullen (1998), a good teacher talk means little teacher talk so that the students will have the opportunities to speak. However, from those three meetings, Teacher Talk takes a greater part than the Student Talk. The students' participation in the classroom is still considered low. Even though the students already responded the teacher's questions, Student Talk was still lower than the Teacher Talk.

## **7. Research Design**

This research used qualitative descriptive type. This method was used to examine the events or phenomena about the patterns of teacher and students' interactions in the English classroom. (Bogdan and Taylor (1990)) in Margono (2005) define qualitative research as a research procedure, which produces descriptive data such as word written from the population people and attitude which can be analyzed. The aim of this research is to find out information about the patterns of teacher and students' interactions and how is the interaction between teacher and students in the English classroom at SMPN 24 Mataram in academic year 2018 / 2019.

## **8. Population and Sample**

Population was defined as a generalization of both object and subject of a research, which has a certain quality and characteristic ( Sugiyono, 2013 ). The population of this research consisted of English teacher and students grade 8A and 8B at SMPN 24 Mataram in academic year 2018 / 2019.

Marzuki (1997:43) stated that using sampling method can generate a better research because it can make the research done more specific. Sample is a subset of the population. Regarding the number of population, this reasearch choose an English teacher and students from class 8B consisted of 25 students as a sample.

## **9. Method of Data Collection**

The data collection methods of this study were observation and questionnaire;

### **1. Observation**

In class observation, I used video to prevent the high subjectivity from the researcher when observing data for the condition in the class activity. I made this observation once in class 8B in the first day. The data were described based on activities accoured in classroom by looking at the students through video.

### **2. Questionnaire**

Bogardus (2013) Questionnaire is a list of questions with structured answer sent to the respondents for filling. Questionnaire is something consisting of questions. The data were obtained from a set of questionnaire that was given to the teacher and students of class 8B in SMPN 24 Mataram. I created a list of questions for teachers and students related to the patterns of teacher and students interaction in the English classroom and how is interaction between teacher and students. I gave a questionnaire to the English teacher and students of class 8B on the second day. Before starting the lesson the English teacher helped to asked students to answer all the questions in the questionnaires. The students and teacher answered questions that had been prepared before as a data.

## **10. Data Findings**

The findings were obtained from observation and questionnaire. There were two steps taken during the data collection in this study. First step was observation. Observation was followed the learning process used video and I wrote all activities in the class to find out the patterns of teacher and students interactions and the second steps was giving questionnaire. Questionnaire is for teacher and students of class 8B. Based on explanation in the previous chapters, the sample of this research was only one teacher at SMPN 24 Mataram. SMPN 24 is a new school in Mataram, so there is only an English teacher.

## 11. The Patterns of Teacher and Students Interactions in The Classroom

From the results of observation, it was found that the patterns of teacher and students interaction in the English classroom was a two-way process in the teaching and learning process, based on the observation and questionnaire I got the data. The patterns and interaction was implemented by an English teacher in all second grade of SMPN 24 Mataram. Observation was conducted and facilitated using a camera to take some videos of each activity in the classroom. The class began at 10.40 a.m then the students took break at 12.00 p.m. I took her seat at the back of the class in order that the presence of the researcher did not disturb the teaching and learning process in the class.

## 12. Percentage of Data Questionnaires

1. Question number 1 (Ketika proses belajar mengajar akan dimulai, apakah guru langsung memberikan atau menjelaskan materi pelajaran yang akan diajarkan? Jika tidak, apa yang dilakukan guru sebelum memulai pelajaran?) The presentation of the data as following bellow: the answers from 25 students as we can see **14 students (56%) of students** said “**tidak**”, **10 students (40%)** said “**ya pernah, ya sering**”, **1 student (4%)** said “**tidak tau**”.
2. Number 2 (Apakah guru sering memberikan motivasi kepada siswa sebelum pelajaran dimulai?) The presentation of the data as following bellow: the answers from 25 students as we can see **20 students (80%)** said that “**Ya sering (44%), ya pernah (20%), and iya selalu (16%)**” **2 students (8%)** said “**Ya kadang-kadang**”. **1 students (4%)** of students said “**jarang**” and **2 students (8%)** said “**Tidak tau**”.
3. Number 3 (Apakah guru hanya menjelaskan materi di depan saja atau diselingi juga dengan melakukan interaksi dengan siswa?) The presentation of the data as following bellow: the answers from 25 students as we can see **21 students (84%) of students** directly said “**Ya pernah, ya sering**” with the statement ‘the teacher explained the material in front of the class and was interspersed also by interacting with students. **1 student, (4%)** of students said “**Kadang-kadang (sekaligus)**” it means the teacher did both of interaction and explain the material then also by interacting with students. **1 student (4%)** said “**kadang-kadang**” and the last, **2**

**students (8%)** of students said “**tidak**” with the statement (the teacher only explained the and immediately gave us the material).

4. Number 4 (Apakah interaksi antara siswa dengan guru berjalan secara 2 arah atau hanya 1 arah saja? Misalkan, guru memberi penjelasan lalu meminta tanggapan dari siswa atau bertanya pada siswa, atau hanya menjelaskan materi pelajaran saja di depan kelas?) The presentation of the data as following bellow: the answers from 25 students as we can see **12 students (48%)** directly said “**Secara 2 Arah**”. **8 students (32%) of students** used the words “**Ya pernah (16%)** of students” and “**Ya sering (16%)** of students” but they were followed by a statement that when the teaching and learning process takes place the teacher “**Sering / Pernah**” asked some questions or asked responses to the students about the materials. After that **5 students (20%)** of students answered from questionnaire number 1 to number 6 their answers were so short and there were answered that were exactly the same between one student and another. For example a questionnaire from “Suhartini and Sovianna” answers number 1 to 5 of their answers exactly same. Then the answered from the student named Satria answered “**Jarang**” to question number 4. The answered from Satria was not included in the choice of interaction patterns in two way or one way process. He only answered “**Jarang**” which means the teacher rarely used both patterns, then what interaction patterns did by the English teacher according to satria? Then the student named “Lukman” said “**Tidak Tau**” at point number 4. While we can see the question at number 3, Satria said that “**Iya pernah, Guru pernah menjelaskan hal-hal yang penting dan memberikan pertanyaan kepada siswa**”. He already knew the teacher had interacted by giving questions to students, but at point number 4 he answered he did not know “**Tidak tau**”. Then the last student named Riski said “**Tidak Pernah**” to question point number 4, whereas we can see the question point number 3 he answered “**Ya pernah**”. So it was not synchronized between answer number 3 and number 4, whereas the two questions are very related to strengthen statement number 4, question number 3 was made.
5. Number 5 (Pernahkah guru mengajukan pertanyaan seputar pelajaran yang sudah pernah dibahas, di awal dan di akhir pertemuan ketika berinteraksi menggunakan

bahasa inggris?) The presentation of the data as following bellow: the answers from 25 students as we can see **22 students (88%)** said **“Ya pernah (60%), Ya sering (12%), and Ya (16%)”**. **2 Students (8%)** of students said **"kurang dan jarang"** and the last is **1 student (4%)** of students said **“tidak pernah”**

6. Number 6 (Jika kamu diminta memilih ketika belajar bahasa Inggris di dalam kelas, kamu lebih memilih belajar secara berkelompok atau individu? Mengapa?). The presentation of the data as following bellow: the answers from 25 students as we can see **16 students (64%)** chose **“berkelompok”**. 16 students prefer to study in groups. **4 students (16%)** chose **“individu”**. 4 students prefer by individual learning. There was **1 students (4%)** chose both of them **“berkelompok dan individu”** as the way in learning English., **but 2 students (8%)** of students said **“Karena lebih mudah”**, these two students only answered the reason why they chose to study in groups or individually, without choosing the choice whether to prefer to study in groups or individually.

### **13. Discussion**

Based on the data obtained from the observation and questionnaire, the result was identified to find out the patterns of teacher and students interactions and how is interaction between teacher and students in the English classroom at grade 8B and English teacher of SMPN 24 Mataram.

### **14. The Patterns and Interactions in The English Classroom**

Based on the data above, the interaction between teacher and students, teacher and students interactions patterns in the classroom, questionnaire answers from the teacher, and questionnaire answers from students (questionnaires from number 1 to number 6) can we simplify based on the research questions. There are some interactions between teacher and students based on several experts who are also used and carried out by English teacher when the learning process takes place.

From the results of the questionnaire I got from the English teacher, as we can see the patterns from the answers that the English teacher used as a two ways process interaction, because according to the question point number 4, she said that if only in the learning and teaching process used a one-way interaction pattern: "the teaching process like that makes students feel bored, there should be interaction between

students and teacher”. Therefore, teacher preferred to frequently asked questions and interact with students to made students understand more about the lessons being discussed. Such as according to (Cohen, L. and Manion, L. (2011)) the interaction patterns was used by the teacher is Open-ended Teacher Questioning “There are a number of possible “right” answers, so that more students answer each cue”, Closed-ended teacher questioning (IRF) “Only one “right” response gets approved. Sometimes cynically called the “Guess what the teacher wants you to say”, Full-class interaction “The students debate a topic or do a language task as a class; the teacher may intervene occasionally, to stimulate participation or to monitor.” This interaction is in accordance with the answers to the English teacher questionnaire at SMPN 24 Mataram in question number 3 the teacher answers “Mengarahkan siswa untuk mampu mengeluarkan argumen dan pendapat serta menyanggah pendapat orang lain dengan menggunakan bahasa Inggris yang baik dan benar”.

The questionnaire was designed for the students to find out the patterns of teacher and students interaction and how interaction between teacher and students in the classroom. According to (Cohen, L. and Manion, L. (2011)) there are some statements first is “Self-access” Students choose their own learning tasks, and work autonomously. Second, “Group work” Students work in small groups on tasks that entail interaction; conveying information, for example, or group decision-making. The teacher walks around listening, intervenes little if at all. Third, “Individual work” The teacher gives a task or set of tasks, and students work on them independently; the teacher walks around monitoring and assisting where necessary. The statements correspond to question number 6 on the student questionnaire. Students are ask to choose, preferring to study in groups or individually. Students answer as much as 64% learn English in groups, 16% of students choose individual learning, and 4% of students choose both.

Then, “Closed-ended teacher questioning (IRF)” Only one “right” response gets approved. Sometimes cynically called the “Guess what the teacher wants you to say”, “Open-ended Teacher Questioning” There are a number of possible “right” answers, so that more students answer each cue, “Closed-ended teacher questioning (IRF)” Only one “right” response gets approved. Sometimes cynically called the “Guess what the teacher wants you to say”. Some of these interaction patterns correspond to question

number 3 questions answered by students. 84% of students answered the teacher often through interactions such as giving questions that students should answer when the teacher gave the material, 4% of students answered sometimes the teacher did it simultaneously, gave material and gave questions.

## 15. Conclusion

Based on the data finding and discussion in the previous chapter, I could conclude that:

- a. The patterns of teacher and students' interactions in the English classroom at SMPN 24 Mataram is a two-way process in the teaching and learning process. From the data there are (48%) of students (12 students) said "two way process", there are (32%) of students (8 students) used the words "Ya pernah (16%) of students" and "Ya sering (16%) of students", (8%) of students answered "secara 1 arah", (4%) answered "jarang", (4%) answered "tidak tahu", and (4%) answered "tidak pernah".
- b. From the questionnaire, there are 18 students (72%) choose a group work in learning English to make them easier to study English, there are 4 students (16%) choose study English by individual, there is 1 (4%) students answer "Tidak Tau", and there are 2 students (8%) answer "Karena lebih mudah".
- c. Teacher chose two way patterns of interaction in teaching and learning process based on the questionnaire, question number 4 she said that if only in the learning and teaching process used a one-way interaction pattern: "the teaching process like that makes students feel bored, there should be interaction between students and teacher". Therefore, teacher preferred to frequently asked questions and interact with students to made students understand more about the lessons being discussed
- d. There were 88% of students (22 students) answered questionnaire point number 5 said that "Ya pernah, ya sering sekali, ya, pernah dan selalu, dan iya sering" the teacher asked questions about the lessons that had been discussed when in English classroom, but 12% of students (3 students) answered "Kurang dan jarang, jarang, dan tidak pernah".
- e. There are some interactions between teacher and students first one is teacher and learners, teacher and learner / group of learners, learner and learner, conversation with Learners, role Play, choral Responses, and group work.

## 16. Suggestion

From the result of this study, I would like to give some suggestions as follows:

- a. The teacher should use the media as an interaction tool that can be used to make students more active and enthusiastic during the lesson, because if they only use textbooks as media, students will feel bored faster and less enthusiastic about interacting in the classroom.
- b. The teacher must provide more opportunities for students to interact with other students by forming learning groups, forming groups debate, or making games in the learning model so that students are more active in interacting.

## 17. REFERENCES

- Arikunto, S. (1997). *Prosedur Penelitian : Suatu Pendekatan Praktek* : Jakarta. PT. Rineka Cipta.
- Arikunto, Suharmi. 2002. *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktis*. Jakarta: PT Rineka Cipta.
- Atta-Alla, M.N. (2012). Integrating language skills through storytelling. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 5(12), 1–13. Retrieved from [www.ccsenet.org/elt](http://www.ccsenet.org/elt)
- Berkley. (1983). *Using classroom debates*, University of California.
- Bolman, L., & Deal, T., (2002). *Reframing the Path to School Leadership: A guide for Teachers and Principals*. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press, Inc
- Brown, D. H. 2001. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. White Plains, NY: Pearson Education – Longman..
- Cazden, C. B. (1987). "Relationship between talking and learning in classroom interaction". In Bikram K. Das (ed.), *Patterns of classroom interaction in southeast asia*. Singapore: RELC SEAMEO.
- Cohen, L. and Manion, L. (2011), *Research Methods in Education*, London, Rutledge.

- Departemen Pendidikan Nasional. 2003. Kurikulum 2004: Standar Kompetensi mata pelajaran Bahasa Inggris SMP/ MTs. Jakarta: DEPDIKNAS.
- Douglas A. Grouws, 1981. *The Dynamics of Teaching*. University of Missouri-Columbia.
- Eschenmann, K. (1991). Student Perceptions of Teaching Style in The Health Occupation Classroom. *Journal of Health Occupations Education*, 6(1).
- Falak Samsul, 2014. *The Changing of Curriculum From 2006 to 2013*. <https://bdksemarang.kemenag.go.id/the-changing-of-curriculum-from-2006-to-2013/>
- Gerlach, J. M. (1994). "Is this collaboration?" In Bosworth, K. and Hamilton, S. J. (Eds.), *Collaborative Learning: Underlying Processes and Effective Techniques*, New Directions for Teaching and Learning No. 59.
- Ghosh, Amrita. 2010. Classroom Interaction -Part 1 (Definition, Objectives, Types, Teacher's Role and Merits. (Online). Available at <http://www.examiner.com/article/classroom-interaction-part-1-definition-objectives-types-teacher-s-role-and-merits>, downloaded at May 1, 2014.
- Harger, J. R. E., (1974). *Direct Effect on Both Student Attitudes and Achievement* . The University of British Columbia, Canada.
- Hornby, A.S. 1987. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Jack R Fraenkel, Norman E. Wallen, 1990. How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education. San Francisco State University.
- Key, J. P. (1997). *Research Design in Occupational Education*. Oklahoma State University.

- Leonard Broom and Philip Selznick, 1973. Instructor's Manual to accompany Sociology. A text with adapted readings. Broom and Selznick. 5th Edition. 1973 Edition . New York.
- Marguerite Louise Sibley, 1990. Teacher-student interactions in the ESL classroom: an investigation of three-part exchanges, teacher feedback, and the role of gender. *Iowa State University*.
- Marianne Celce-Murcia 1987. Teaching English as a Second Or Foreign Language. University of California. Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Merriam-Webster Dictionary. Simple Definition of Pattern. <http://beta.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/pattern>. Accessed on February 16, 2015
- Muntner, M. (2008). Teacher-Student Interactions: The Key To Quality Classrooms. The University of Virginia Center for Advanced Study of Teaching and Learning (CASTL)..
- Nurmasitah, Sita (2010). *A Study of Classroom Interaction Characteristics in A Geography Class Conducted in English: The Case at Year Ten of An Immersion Class in SMA N 2 Semarang*. Masters Thesis, Universitas Diponegoro.
- Smith, B. L., and MacGregor, J. T. (1992). "What is collaborative learning?" In Goodsell, A. S., Maher, M. R., and Tinto, V. (Eds.), Collaborative Learning: A Sourcebook for Higher Education. National Center on Postsecondary Teaching, Learning, & Assessment, Syracuse University.
- Taylor, S.J. and Bogdan, R. (1990) Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods. Paidós, Buenos Aires.
- Whitaker, Todd. (2004). What Great Principals Do Differently. Larchmont, NY: Eye On Education, Inc.
- White, Ronald V. 1998. The ELT Curriculum: Design, Innovation, Management. New York: Bail Blackwell Inc.