Pedagogic Relations: A Case Study of English as Foreign Language (EFL) Learners in a Special Conversation Program

Welen Friade Sinaga[1*], Harni Kartika Ningsih[2]
[1,2]*Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Indonesia*
Campus UI Depok, Indonesia 16424
*Corresponding author
e-mail address: welen.friade@ui.ac.id[1], harni.kartika@ui.ac.id[2]
DOI : 10.21107/prosodi.v16i1.12523

ABSTRAK

Interaksi antara guru dan murid di dalam kelas merupakan salah satu faktor utama yang mendorong tercapainya tujuan pembelajaran. Namun, penelitian terkait bagaimana suatu pengetahuan dinegosiasikan melalui interaksi guru dan murid masih jarang dilakukan khususnya di Indonesia. Artikel ini bertujuan untuk melihat bagaimana interaksi antara guru dan murid terjadi dalam kelas bahasa inggris di sebuah institusi informal/kursus bahasa inggris di Laguboti, Sumatera Utara. Teknik pengumpulan data yang dilakukan dalam penelitian ini adalah observasi terhadap sembilan orang siswa dan satu orang guru pada pengajaran kelas program Special Conversation yang direkam menjadi video. Video ditranskripsi dan dianalisis menggunakan teori Pedagogic Registers oleh Rose (2018) yang berfokus pada instrumen Pedagogic Relation. Hasil penelitian ini menunjukkan adanya otoritas guru yang kuat dalam proses berlangsungnya kegiatan belajar mengajar. Pola relasi Initiate-Response-Feedback (I-R-F) terjadi dalam setiap moves yaitu guru menggunakan strategi bertanya kepada pemelajar pasif agar terlibat di dalam kelas. Selain itu, di dalam interaksi ditemukan bahwa salah satu move yang paling sering ditemui adalah challenge yaitu berupa keterdiaman siswa. Dalam hal ini, ditemukan bahwa keterdiaman siswa dapat menjadi refleksi bagi guru untuk melihat kesulitan yang dihadapi siswa dalam kegiatan pembelajaran. Terakhir, guru hampir selalu melakukan evaluasi dalam setiap interaksi, baik evaluasi berupa pernyataan afirmatif maupun rejection. Namun, perlu penelitian lanjutan untuk melihat strategi evaluasi yang lebih efektif dalam mendukung proses akuisisi bahasa pemelajar tersebut.

Kata-kata kunci: interaksi, pelajar EFL, relasi pedagogik, wacana kelas

ABSTRACT

Classroom interactions between a teacher and students are integral to the successful outcome of learning. However, studies related to how knowledge is exchanged in classrooms are quite scarce particularly in Indonesia. This article examines teacher and student interactions in a classroom setting during an English language learning organized by an informal institution in Laguboti, North Sumatera. Data were obtained through selected records of lesson demonstrations involving a teacher and nine students. The video was transcribed and examined using the analytical framework of *Pedagogic Registers* (Rose, 2018), focusing on pedagogic relations. The analysis revealed that the teacher conveyed authority throughout the learning process. Patterns of *initial-response-feedback* (I-R-F) were observed in the teaching, in which the teacher posed questions to encourage passive students to talk. In addition, students' silence was identified as the most common challenge in such interactions. The study found that students' silence urged the teacher to reflect on the challenges faced by the students during the learning process. It was also found that the teacher evaluated learning outcomes by affirming and negating the students' answers. A further study should be carried out to generate insights into more effective evaluation strategies for English language acquisition.

Keywords: classroom discourse, EFL learners, interactions, pedagogic relations

BACKGROUND

Teacher and student interactions in a classroom are integral to the successful outcome of learning. Eschenmann (2016) claimed that if teachers take the time to develop interactions with their pupils, they might drive the pupils to learn. Students will be more involved and hence more interested in their classes if their interactions with their teachers are positive (Seidl, 2013). However, learners who believe their teacher is not cooperative with them have lower information concentration and are less engaged in the learning environment (Tyler, & Boelter, 2018). Therefore, building and maintaining positive teacher-student interactions are the primary priority in helping a student become more motivated and interested, and thus educationally successful.

Regardless its importance, however, research related to the complexity of teacher and student interactions has not been widely studied particularly in Indonesia. Because students who do not participate are rarely observed in transcripts of class dialogue, research on student involvement is rarely examined in classroom research. Rose (2018), offers an analytical framework of pedagogic registers, one of which is pedagogic relations instrument that is able to catch the complexity of teacher and student interactions in a classroom. According to Rose (2014), pedagogic relations encompass relations between text producers and students, texts generated by students for evaluation, and instructors' verbal and written evaluations of students' texts, as well as relations amongst students.

Furthermore, pedagogic relations include authority hierarchies between instructors and students, classroom inclusion and exclusion, and evaluation success and failure. This article is a case study that aims to further examines teacher and student interactions in a classroom setting during an English language learning organized by an informal institution in Laguboti, North Sumatera.

RESEARCH METHODS

This research is a discourse study with a qualitative approach because it depends on the ability of the researcher to describe and interpret a phenomenon (Elo et al., 2014). Benson (2013) explained that research with a qualitative approach relies on reducing data into words, such as coding, labeling, categorization systems, narratives, and others. This research is also a case study, particularly exploring a phenomenon in a classroom context (Yin, 2014).

Research related to the learning process in the classroom in general can be analyzed with analytical framework of *Pedagogic Registers* by Rose (2018) using Pedagogic Relations (teacher and student relations), Pedagogic Activities (activities in the classroom) and Pedagogic Modalities (modes used in learning).

In accordance with the aims of this study which focuses on discussing the interaction pattern comprehensively during the learning process, the analytical instrument, pedagogic relations (Rose, 2014) is utilized. The research data are video recording of the learning process which was transcribed by the researcher for analysis. After the transcription, the data are presented in a table with several columns, including numbers, speakers, exchanges, and roles. As for the pedagogic relation column, the 'interact' and 'act' will be analyzed to see the interaction patterns.

Description of the English Course in the Video

This video was taken at a non-formal English course in Laguboti, Sumatera. In the 3-minute video, a teacher asks nine students to review Tense Auxiliary. These students are in grade 3 of Junior High School and are taking the SPC (Special Conversation) program. This institution is chosen because of its distinct levelling of the course program: Primary, Advance, and SPC (Special Conversation); however, because no placement test was required, students' proficiency is categorized based on their education at formal schools. In this case, the Primary class is for Elementary School level. Advance is reserved for Junior High School students and SPC for Senior High School ones. However, suppose a student at a certain class, for example a junior high school student takes the Advanced level curriculum and masters it over a certain time, s/he is eligible to continue to the next level (the SPC class. The students in this video generally have the same case; the 9th grade students in the video are taking the SPC class because they have passed the Advanced level.

In this case, students should already have bonded well with the teacher and have been familiar with the learning systems at the institution since they had already completed the advanced class. Therefore, the pattern of pedagogical relations built in the class is prominent to discuss. Pedagogic relation is used to analyze the video which focuses on the teacher and students interaction. Since the learning activities in the classroom are generally negotiated through teachers and students interaction, pedagogical relations analysis is needed in helping instructors identify the interaction patterns that would help them achieve the learning objectives. In short, the author will specifically discuss several patterns as a result of teacher and student interactions based on the video transcription.

DISCUSSION

Based on the data, the first visible pattern was that the teacher exerted strong authority over their students during the teaching and learning activities. The pattern of dK1-K2-K1 was discernible in every move. In this case, the teacher used to become

the initiator of learning by asking questions, which were then responded to by the students. At the same time, the response of the students was then evaluated by the teacher as shown in the following table.

Table.1 The example o dK1-K2-K1 patterns during teacher and student interaction

4	T	Apa aja?	dK1	inquire	knowledge
	S2	To be Auxiliary	K2	display	knowledge
	T	Ehhh. Nggak ada to be auxiliary	K1	reject-admonish	knowledge
	S3	Tense Auxiliary..	K2	display	knowledge
	T	Tense Auxiliary, To Auxiliary…	K1	affirm	knowledge
	S4	Modal Auxiliary	K2	display	knowledge
	T	Modal Auxiliary	K1	affirm-repeat	knowledge
	T	iya, iya	K1(f)	affirm-approve	knowledge
5	T	Di Tense Auxiliary itu ada berapa?	dK1	inquire	knowledge
	SS	Tiga.	K2	display	knowledge
	T	Tiga	K1	affirm-repeat	knowledge
6	T	Ada apa aja?	dK1	inquire	knowledge
	S4	To be	K2	display	knowledge
	T	Ya, To be	K1	affirm-repeat	knowledge
	SS	To have	K2	display	knowledge
	T	To have, ya	K1	affirm-repeat	knowledge
	SS	Shall or Will	K2	display	knowledge
	T	Shall or Will	K1	affirm-repeat	knowledge

as 19 out of 30 moves. This result showed that the interaction in learning occurred because of the initiative and role of the teacher. This is aligns with Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) identification of the three-part sequence called Initiate-Response-Feedback (I-R-F). At this point, the teacher will initiate the learning activities (I) which can stimulate students' response (R) and feedback (F) will further be given by the teacher based on the students' responses.

In addition, the teacher's authority in the classroom learning process can also be seen when the teacher directly appointed one student to answer a question. In this case, the teacher used her authority to choose certain students to participate in the classroom.

Table.2 The example of how teacher controls the learning activity

12	T	Sekarang miss mau tanya, S5	dK1	invite	attention
13	T	Dari tense auxiliary, do auxiliary yang sudah kita bahas, yang mana nanti yang khusus membantu yang bukan kata kerja?	dK1	inquire	knowledge
	S5	To be	K2	display	knowledge
	T	To be	K1	affirm-repeat	knowledge
14	T	To be ada berapa S5?	dK1	inquire	knowledge
	S5	Delapan	K2	display	knowledge
	T	Hah?	tr	inquire	knowledge
	S5	Delapan	rtr/K2	display	knowledge
	T	Delapan	K1	affirm-repeat	knowledge
15	T	Apa-apa aja?	dK1	inquire	knowledge
	T	is am are untuk?	dK1	inquire	knowledge
	S5	past perfect	K2	display	knowledge

Table 2 showed how the teacher uses her authority to ask the student as much as she wants. The teacher explicitly mentioned S5 to answer a series of questions. In this case, 13 of the 30 moves were only interactions between the teacher and S5. Given to the fact that, the teacher controls who can participate in the interaction. This clearly showed that the role and authority of the teacher was quite strong in the learning process.

The second pattern found was that the learning in the previous meeting was less successful from the interaction between the teacher and students. As mentioned at the beginning of this paper, this class learning activity was to repeat or to review the lessons from the previous meeting. However, based on the interaction, the students seemed to have difficulty answering the questions posed by the teacher, as shown in the table below.

Table. 3 The example of difficulties experienced by the student

22		Pasangannya be bisa sendiri?	dK1	inquire	knowledge
	S5	Nggak miss.	K2	display	knowledge
23	T	Jadi apa?	dK1	inquire	knowledge
	S5	(diam)	ch	display	behavior
	T	shall?	rch	inquire	knowledge
	S5	shall or will	K2	display	knowledge
	T	Iya	K1	affirm-approve	knowledge
24		shall be, will?	dK1	inquire	knowledge
	S5	Be	K2	display	knowledge
25	T	iya	K1	affirm-approve	knowledge
26		Perfect ada berapa?	dK1	inquire	knowledge
	S5	(diam)	ch	display	behavior
	T	To be perfect ada berapa?	rch	inquire	knowledge
	S5	Dua	K2	display	knowledge
	T	Dua	K1	affirm-repeat	knowledge
27		Apa itu?	dK1	inquire	knowledge
	S5	(diam)	ch	display	behavior
	T	My Goshhhh…	rch	insist	behavior
	S5	satu miss	K2	display	knowledge
	T	Haa, satu apa?	dK1	inquire	knowledge
	S5	Been	K2	display	knowledge
	T	Been	K1	affirm-repeat	knowledge

As observed from the interaction, the students did not respond to the teacher's questions several times. The student's silence indicated that the previous learning had not been properly internalized. From all interactions, there were six challenges in which students did not respond to the teacher's questions, as shown in table 3. Moreover, in one of the moves, the teacher ended up answering the questions she asked herself, as shown in the following table.

Table. 4 Teacher evaluates student learning outcome

30	T	Kalo Continuous ada berapa?	dK1	inquire	knowledge
	AS	(diam)	ch	display	behavior
	T	Being	rch	impart	knowledge
		iya kan?	dK1	inquire	knowledge
		Satu..	K1	impart	knowledge
		Dipakai, is being…	K1	impart	knowledge
	S1	Are being	K2	display	knowledge
	T	Are being	K1	affirm-repeat	knowledge

Table 4 showed that the students' silence made the teacher no longer wait for any replies but immediately answered her own questions to remind the student about the lessons. It seemed that the teacher realized that the students had forgotten the previous lesson, hence inability to answer the question. This obviously showed the failure of students to understand the learning at the previous meeting.

The last occurring pattern in the video was the various teacher evaluation strategies. In the video, the teacher evaluated almost every move. There were 21 teacher responses that indicated evaluative statements. Rose (2018) explained that a teacher's evaluation could be in the form of repeating, agreeing or praising the actions of the learner. Meanwhile, refusal was more likely to be implicit by ignoring or qualifying the learner's actions, or explicit by rejecting or admonishing.

Based on table 5, the teacher used the three types of affirmations mentioned by Rose, which were repeating, agreeing and praising the students' actions. In this case, repeating was the most frequent evaluation she used up to about 14 times. Meanwhile, affirmations of agreeing and praising were carried out 5 and 2 times, respectively.

Table. 5 Teacher's evaluation strategies

4	T	Apa aja?	dK1	inquire	knowledge
	S2	To be Auxiliary	K2	display	knowledge
	T	Ehhh. Nggak ada to be auxiliary	K1	reject-admonish	knowledge
	S3	Tense Auxiliary..	K2	display	knowledge
	T	Tense Auxiliary, To Auxiliary…	K1	affirm-repeat	knowledge
	S4	Modal Auxiliary	K2	display	knowledge
	T	Modal Auxiliary	K1	affirm-repeat	knowledge
	T	iya, iya	K1(f)	affirm-approve	knowledge
5	T	Di Tense Auxiliary itu ada berapa?	dK1	inquire	knowledge
	SS	Tiga.	K2	display	knowledge
	T	Tiga	K1	affirm-repeat	knowledge
6	T	Ada apa aja?	dK1	inquire	knowledge
	S4	To be	K2	display	knowledge
	T	Ya, To be	K1	affirm-repeat	knowledge
	SS	To have	K2	display	knowledge
	T	To have, ya	K1	affirm-repeat	knowledge
	SS	Shall or Will	K2	display	knowledge
	T	Shall or Will	K1	affirm-repeat	knowledge

Table 5 above showed the variation of evaluation strategies carried out by teachers. The refusal was not frequent, but in these interactions, the teacher seemed to prefer an explicit rejection evaluation, namely by negating or admonishing the student's statement.

Furthermore, the particular thing regarding one of the teacher evaluation strategies in the video was that the teacher provided an indirect evaluation by continuously repeating the questions until the teacher got the desired answer. It can be observed from the interaction below.

Table 6 Repetitive questions as one of teacher's evaluation strategies

14	T	To be ada berapa S5?	dK1	inquire	knowledge
	S5	Delapan	K2	display	knowledge
	T	Hah?	tr	inquire	knowledge
	S5	Delapan	rtr/K2	display	knowledge
	T	Delapan	K1	affirm-repeat	knowledge
15	T	Apa-apa aja?	dK1	inquire	knowledge
	T	*is am are* untuk?	dK1	inquire	knowledge
	S5	past perfect	K2	display	knowledge
16	T	*is am are* untuk?	dK1	inquire	knowledge
	S5	Perfect	K2	display	knowledge
17	T	*is am are* untuk?	dK1	inquire	knowledge
	S5	present perfect	K2	display	knowledge
18	T	*is am are* untuk?	dK1	inquire	knowledge
	S5	(diam)	ch	display	behavior
	T	*oh my God…*	rch	insist	behavior
	S3	Present	K2	display	knowledge
19	T	*is am are* untuk?	dK1	inquire	knowledge
	S3	Present	K2	display	knowledge
	T	Present!	K1	affirm-repeat	knowledge

Table 6 showed how the teacher evaluated inaccurate answers displayed by the students. Although the teacher did not directly negate the answer, S5 seemed to realize that the reason the teacher asks the same question repeatedly was that his answers did not meet the teacher's expectations. The repeated questions posed by the teacher still encouraged S5 to find out the correct answer although it was S3 who finally got the question right. It means that not only does a teacher's evaluation stimulate students to think, it also enables students to recall their memory and learn from their mistakes.

The patterns of interactions outlined above lead to several findings. First, in relation to the teacher's authority, the data shows the teacher as the initiator of the learning process using his authority to order the less participative students taking part in the learning process. In this case, the teacher appoints one student, S5 who is deemed necessary to participate in the class. Nuthall (2005:919–20) explained that in general, teachers rely on the responses of a small number of students as indicators and remain ignorant of what most of the class knows and understands". That is, most teachers ignore what the learners are learning. However, in this case, the teacher uses her authority because she recognizes the students' ability. She would directly appoint one person she deems as necessary to participate in the class.

In other words, the teacher's recognition of students' ability can provide guidance in using her authority in the classroom to provide impactful learning to students, especially those who participate less in the classroom. Furthermore, it is interesting to know that the issue of inequality in participation is crucial but is rarely studied by linguists. Rose (2014) explained that the inequality of participation is an important factor in the construction of a hierarchy of inclusion and exclusion in classroom learning. Rose further argued that it is very important to include this feature in the classroom analysis. Meanwhile, research related to student participation is rarely considered in classroom research because students who do not participate are usually not seen in transcripts of class discourse (Rose, 2014).

Secondly, the teacher and student interaction patterns indicate that the previous teaching was less successful. In the video, the teacher says *"My Goshh"* (table 3 number 27) because the students challenged the teacher by remaining silent, which indicates as not knowing the answer to the teacher's question. In this case, ideally, in

classroom discourse, students should display and demonstrate their knowledge when the teacher asks for it. This is in accordance with Rose's (2014) statement regarding the roles of teachers and students as follows:

"Students are expected to display their knowledge in response to teachers' dK1 demands and to be evaluated. The display enables teachers to judge the effectiveness of the learning activity; the evaluation enables learners to gauge their success". From this statement, it can be concluded that the student responses can be used as a reference for teachers to identify the success of the learning processes and the evaluation given by teachers can be a reflection for students regarding their performance. Thus, if students do not respond when the teacher asks, it may indicate a challenge that the teacher should further identify. As for this case, students' silence showed an unsuccessful learning process at the previous meeting because students had actually learned the material. When the teacher gives a clue to the next interaction by saying *"is being"*, one of the students (S1) is able to continue and answer what the teacher expects, by suggesting *"are being"* as in the Table 4. It is clear that students know but do not really understand the lesson. In other words, this indicates that learning information has been obtained but the internalization of this knowledge has not yet been perfect.

Finally, the last pattern is related to evaluation. Based on the interact-act analysis, the teacher always evaluates every interaction, using both affirmative and rejection. This is important because as Bernstein (2003:197–99) stated "the essence of the relation is to evaluate the competence of the acquirer". He further said that *"the key to pedagogic practice is continuous evaluation…evaluation condenses the meaning of the whole [pedagogic] device"* (2000:42–50). In other words, continuous evaluation is the key to pedagogical practice itself.

Another primary point from the data reveals an evaluation strategy of repeating questions by the teacher that encourages students to think and remember what they have learned. In this case, although S5 did not succeed in answering the teacher's questions, the answers given by S3 are found to be thoughtful information for S5 and other students in the learning process. What the teacher did is in accordance with Rose's (2014) statement in that students' comments may be rejected in normal classroom conversation until the intended response is proposed and affirmed. That is, the rejection of students' incorrect answers by teachers is natural and important because in this case, not only can students find out their own abilities related to their learning, they also will learn from those mistakes. Thus, based on the teacher and student interaction in the video, although the teacher in general carries out various evaluation strategies, it is important to ensure that the evaluation given is impactful to accommodate a better language learning process.

CONCLUSION

Based on the three points discussed, it can be concluded that pedagogical relations can provide meaningful information regarding the roles of teachers and students and their relationship to the language acquisition process of learners in the classroom. In this study, the teacher's role is quite dominant in controlling the learning activities. The teacher's knowledge related to students' ability can help teachers to better use their authority in providing a chance for least engaged students to be involved in the classroom. Furthermore, the pedagogical relation instrument also provides information on the success of a lesson. It is necessary to identify the meaning

of student silence (challenge) towards the teacher in the classroom. This is important because it can be a reflection for teachers to see the difficulties faced by students in internalizing the knowledge gained from learning activities. Finally, teacher's evaluation are one of the most important parts of the learning process. For example, an evaluation strategy of repeating questions by the teacher will encourage students to think and remember what they have learned. A further study should be carried out to generate insights into more effective evaluation strategies for language acquisition. At this point, teachers are expected to be able to use meaningful evaluations to enhance students' learning and motivation.

REFERENCES

Benson, P. (2013). Qualitative methods: Overview. In C. A. Chapelle (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics* (pp. 1–10). Wiley-Blackwell.

Bernstein, B. 1990/2003. *The structuring of pedagogic discourse, volume IV: Class, codes and control.* London: Routledge.

Bernstein, B. (2000). *Pedagogy, symbolic control and identity: Theory, research, critique. London & Bristol, PA: Taylor & Francis.* (Revised edition Lanham, Maryland: Rowan & Littlefield.)

Elo, S., Kääriäinen, M., Kanste, O., Pölkki, T., Utriainen, K., & Kyngäs, H. (2014). Qualitative content analysis: A focus on trustworthiness. *SAGE open*, *4*(1), 2158244014522633.

Eschenmann, K. K. (2014). Student Perceptions of Teaching Style in the Health Occupations Classroom. *Journal of Health Occupations Education*, 6(1), 6.

Rose, D. (2014). *Analysing pedagogic discourse: an approach from genre and register. Functional Linguist, 1*(11). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40554-014-0011-4

Rose, D. (2018). *Pedagogic register analysis: mapping choices in teaching and learning. Functional Linguist, 5*(3). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40554-018-0053-0

Seidl, S. L. (2013). The Effect of Teacher-Student Relationships on the Academic Achievement of Fifth Grade Students.

Sinclair, J., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils.* London: Oxford University Press.

Tyler, K., & Boelter, C., (2018). Linking Black Middle School Students' Perceptions of Teachers' Expectations to Academic Engagement and Efficacy. *Negro Educational Review*, Spring 2018

Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods (5th edition)*. SAGE.