Interpersonal meaning negotiated teacher-students classroom interaction in vocational high school

Ghita Aning Tyas[1], Widhiyanto[2]

English Department, Faculty of Languages and Arts, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Article Info

Abstract

Interaction and teaching learning process are two things that cannot be separated. Interaction is a main point or component in communication. A communication skill must be mastered by students, including vocational students because they need this skill as preparation for their professional work in the future. Good communication is when it has meaning in interaction. Halliday & Matthiessen, (2014) stated that there are three potential meanings, one of them is interpersonal meaning. The purpose of this study was to analyze interpersonal meaning between the teacher and students in the eleventh grades of Vocational High School and how it constructs their role in the class through various kinds of interaction. There were two activities in gathering the data of this study: observation and interview. In analyzing the data, the researcher used Mood system proposed by Halliday & Matthiessen (2004). Theory from Harmer (2001) and Johnson and Paulston (1976, cited in Richard and Rogers 1986) also used to analyze the role relationship between teacher and students. The findings showed that teacher and students produced three types of speech functions (Mood clause) besides Non-typical Mood Clause and Minor clause. In the class, both teacher and students applied different types of classroom interaction in which they took many roles. It can be concluded that teacher and students delivered various types of clauses, classroom interaction, and roles during the teaching learning process.

✉ Correspondent Address:
B3 Building FBS Unnes
Sekaran, Gunungpati, Semarang, 50229
E-mail: aningtyasghita@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

In the era of communicative language teaching, interaction is the heart of communication (Brown, 2001). Interaction is the process of conveying and receiving authentic message that contain information of interest to speaker and listener in important situation (Rivers, 1987). Brown (2001) opines that interaction is a collaboration process between two or more people in exchanging of thoughts, feelings, or ideas. Walsh (2006) stated that interaction is a central of teaching learning process. Classroom interaction is an important tool to provide comprehensible input for the students (Lynch, cited in Cehan 2002). Classroom interaction becomes more important, because through interaction the material can be delivered well by the teacher so that students can understand the material and improve their ability to master it. In class-based L2 learning is often enhanced when teachers have a detailed understanding of the relationship between teacher talk, interaction, and learning opportunity (Walsh, 2002**).** In learning English, interaction is important because it needs time to learn new language. However, sometimes teachers are really dominating in the class and can hamper students' ability in communicating English. As a teacher, she/he must listen her/his students when they are speaking and give chance for students to develop their communication skill by letting students be active in class. Sometimes teachers place themselves as the center of teaching learning process. They speak all the time during the lesson. They only now that the essence good communication is just explain all the material without asking/responding/understanding what their students' intent. Teachers consider that the success of teaching learning process is only by finishing all the material. Even when teachers have conversation with their students, students tend to play limited role in interaction because teachers start to choose the topics and control the conversation's direction. Thus, there is no negotiation process between teacher and students. To avoid this case, interpersonal meaning negotiation is the best way to understand what their intent such as the intent of teachers and students in responding each other's utterance's, responding their feeling/message, arguing about something, and many more through the interaction in the class. So, the researcher conducts this study to analyze interpersonal meaning negotiation, kind of interaction, and role relationship between teacher and students in eleventh grade of Vocational High School through interaction in English class.

In the classroom, communicative process happens when there is an interaction between teacher and students, teacher-and each student, or student-student. They interact with others by asking question, responding, sharing the information, and giving opinion. These processes will form a text. When people do negotiation in communication process, they produce a text in it. Halliday & Matthiessen (2004) state that when people speak or write, they produce text and text is what listeners and readers interpret. According to Halliday and Hasan, (1976, cited in Halliday & Matthiessen 2004), text is a linguistic form of social interaction and a continuous progress of meanings, which are selected by from the options that can underlie the potential of meanings. In semantic, there are three potential meanings based on Halliday & Matthiessen, (2014): Ideational meanings, interpersonal meanings, and textual meanings. In this research, researcher focuses on analyses of interpersonal meaning between teacher and students in English class.

Interpersonal meaning negotiation is the ability that teachers must have to manage the classroom and understand their students who come from different background, feeling, habit, and so on. It is really challenging for teachers to solve conflict in the teaching-learning process with different students' problem almost every day. That is why negotiation should be an ongoing process. Qingwen (available at www.celea.org.cn) argues that classroom interaction should not be only an approach or method, but it is a way to make decision about content & learning. Not only teachers, students also must have interpersonal negotiation ability. They must know that good listeners are good responders, so that they have to be encouraged in constructing meaning through genuine linguistic interaction (Brown, 2001).

There have been studies analyzing interpersonal meaning negotiation which focused on classroom discourse. Yuliati (2013) and Setialis & Lukmana (2018) held a study about the role relationship between teacher and students through the use of clause. Those studies revealed that teacher has domination in the class, it is proved by the use of speech function which most produced by teacher. Thus, in both studies has differentiation in the teacher's role. By using type of interaction in the classroom, negotiation process seems hasn't been running properly because some factors besides teacher's authority, such as classroom condition, time management, and material. (Astuti, 2011., Nurmasitah, 2010). Two studies held by Lin (2008) and Walker (2010) found that in the university teacher's control still happened. It realized through the use of speech function from the teacher. In the case of young learners, studies conducted by Keiko (2011) and Sutopo (2014) revealed the same

finding that is child can produce most of speech function when doing the conversation. Most of participant in those research are young learner, secondary school and senior high school. In this research, researcher tries to analyse interpersonal meaning between teacher and students in Vocational high school during English lesson and how it constructs their role in the class.

English is one of subjects which taught in school from kindergarten, elementary school, junior high school, senior high school, and vocational high school. The purpose of English lesson is to give students a skill in communication in both written and orally. Other case, the researcher has seen several teachers, especially teachers in vocational high scholl. They think that English material is too easy for their students, so the teacher tends to teach casually and doesn't want to give more material to their students because of the curriculum. The teacher considers that English is not too important for vocational high school students because most of them choose to work rather than continue their studies after graduating from school. Whereas, if the teacher gives more material it will give benefit for students in understanding and communicating in English.

Communication is an important skill for students to be mastered especially for Vocational students because they need this skill as preparation for their professional work in the future. They are challenged to have more capable abilities in the professional work, one of those abilities is communication skill itself. In the era of globalization, the skill to communicate in English is a very important asset (Khurniawan, Lee, & Wahidiat, 2017). In the professional work, there are many cases which people failed because of the weakness of their English skill. Many smart people cannot deliver their great ideas because of their weakness in English, so that they cannot develop even compete with those who have communication skill in English. To avoid that, it is very important to provide English language learning. Mastering English can open the way for students and graduates to have opportunities to develop in the professional work or further education, both in Indonesia and abroad (Khurniawan, Lee, & Wahidiat, 2017). To master English well, it can be started from learning process at school. Practice interacting in English is one method to improve students' English skills. Students can practice to interact not only with their friends, but also with their teachers. There were many types of interaction that happened in the class such as interaction between Teacher-Students, Teacher-Student, Student-Student, -Teacher-group of students, Student-group of students, and Student-Material (Wibowo, 2017). In this research, the researcher wants to analyze the kind of classroom interaction in vocational high school.

METHODS
This study focuses on interpersonal meaning, kind of interaction, and role relationship between teacher and students. The object of this study was the transcription of interaction between teacher and students, especially from eleventh grade of Vocational High School. The researcher selected this school with some considerations, such as one of the favourite vocational high schools in Purwokerto which has good achievement input from students, have very complete learning support facilities, and the distance which not too far from the researcher's house.

This research used qualitative method with descriptive research type. Qualitative research is a social action form which focused on how people interpret and understand the social reality of individuals through their experiences (Mohajan, 2018). Although this research belongs to qualitative research, it used the simple calculation which it is the characteristic of quantitative research. However, this research still can be called as qualitative research because the data of this study are represented by the explanation, not the numbers. This research requires some data to be analyzed. There are two processes in obtaining the data: observation and interview. Before that, contacting the teacher's coordinator from the school was chosen to get research permissions. After finishing the permissions problem, the researcher got the recommendation about the teacher who teach English in eleventh grade started to contact her. The researcher and the teacher discussed about the class and the schedule to get the research data.

In collecting the data, the researcher used observation. By recording activities and the interaction between the teacher & students during the lesson, the data were got. The researcher also took notes about the condition in the class to complete the data. There were two classes that recommended by the teacher based on their English ability, TP Class (Teknik pemesinan) and MM Class (Multimedia). Both classes had different schedule in observation. Actually, after finished record the first class, the researcher should observe TAV class (Teknik audio video) but the problem happened so the teacher recommends the other class (TP Class) with the same consideration. Another tool for

collecting the data in this research was an interview. After recording all the classes, the researcher asked some questions to the teacher related to her teaching.

After the data was enough and complete, the researcher thanked to the teacher and started to analyze the data. By using the theory from Halliday & Matthiessen (2004), Harmer (2001) and Johnson and Paulston (1976 cited in Richard and Rogers 1986), the data was analyzed step by step. It began with listening to the audio-video recorded, transcribing into the written form, breaking the sentence up into clause, classifying each word in the clause, categorizing, calculating, interpreting, and ended with drawing conclusion. In the step of categorizing clause, the researcher already made code to classify the clause. There were Declarative (D), Interrogative (IN), Imperative (IM), Non-typical Clause mood (NN), and Minor clause (M). The researcher only analyzed clause which in the English form. The researcher used theory from Halliday & Matthiessen (2004) to interpret the data related to interpersonal meaning, Harmer (2001) to draw conclusion about the classroom interaction types, and Johnson and Paulston (1976 cited in Richard and Rogers 1986) as the basic to analyze the role realationship between the teacher and students.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This phase explains the result of the study. It consists of two sub sections. They are findings and discussion . Findings present the result of the analysis from the interaction's transcription between the teacher and students eleventh grade of Vocational High School during English class. Moreover, the findings will discuss further in the discussion section.

The realization of Interpersonal Meaning

Based on classroom observation, the teacher and students applied the interpersonal meaning through interaction in the class. The researcher divided the explanation into two based on the class. In this section, the result of the analysis is elaborated.

The realization of Interpersonal Meaning in TP Class

The first observation conducted on Friday, August 9th, 2019. The participant was an English teacher and students from TP Class. In this class, students were taught the material about telephone handling. This material emphasized more on students' speaking abilities. In this class, the teacher produced three types of clause, there were Mood clause (declarative, interrogative, imperative), Non-typical Mood Clause and Minor clause. Students only produced minor clause during the lesson.

Table 1. Teacher's Clause IN TP Class

Subject	Clause		
	Typical clause mood	Non typical Clause mood	Minor clause
Teacher	Declarative= 34	4	100
	Interrogative= 39		
	Imperative= 49		
TOTAL	122	4	100

Table 2. Summary of Teacher and Students' Clause in TP Class

Subject	Clause			Total ($\sum$)
	Mood Clause ($\sum$(%))	Non-typical Mood Clause ($\sum$(%))	Minor clause ($\sum$(%))	
Teacher	122 (54%)	4 (2%)	100 (44%)	226
Students	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	75 (100%)	75

Table 1 presents number of teacher's clause produced in this class and table. 2 show summary of teacher and students' clause in the TP Class. With the total number of clauses above, it indicated that the result of speech functions made by teacher and students seem to be varied. From the table above, it showed that Mood Clause was the highest clause which produced by the teacher with 122 clauses. Mood Clause was the clause which has mood structure based on Mood system. There were three types; declarative, interrogative, and imperative clause and the teacher produced all of them. Mood analysis of clauses can indicate that the clause grammatically belongs to mood clause because

there were elements of mood system that proposed by Halliday. Those elements were Subject and Finite. The second clause was minor clause with 100 clauses, and the lowest number of clause delivered by the teacher was Non typical clause mood with the total number only 4 clauses. In this class, students only produced minor clause. The total number of this clause was 75 clauses. Students delivered this clause type in responding the teacher's question and mostly were in the form of yes/no responds.

The realization of Interpersonal Meaning in MM Class
The second class that observed by the researcher was MM Class. With same teacher, the researcher also observed students in this class. Students learned about formal invitation letter.

Table 3. Teacher's Clause in MM Class

Subject	Clause		
	Mood Clause	Non-typical Mood Clause	Minor clause
Teacher	Declarative= 86	14	169
	Interrogative= 45		
	Imperative= 31		
TOTAL	162	14	169

Table 4. MM Students' Clause

Subject	Clause		
	Mood Clause	Non-typical Mood Clause	Minor clause
Students	Declarative= 1	1	89
	Interrogative= 2		
	Imperative= 0		
TOTAL	3	1	89

Table 5. Summary of The teacher and Students' clause in MM Class

Subject	Clause			Total (∑)
	Mood Clause (∑(%))	Non-typical Clause mood (∑(%))	Minor clause (∑(%))	
Teacher	162 (47%)	14 (4%)	169 (49%)	226
Students	3 (3%)	1 (1%)	89 (96%)	93

Table 3 presents number of clause delivered by teachers. From the three type of clause, minor clause was the highest clause type which produced by the teacher with 169 clauses and followed by Mood Clause which the total number of clause was 162 clauses. Then non-typical Mood Clause was the lowest number of clause that produced by the teacher with 14 clauses. Table. 4 shows students' clause when joining the English class. Students in this class produced various types of clause. It proved by the clause that they made. The result showed that students produced 3 clauses which belong to the mood type clause and 91 clauses were not included as mood type clause. The researcher also gives the summary of teacher and students' clause represent in table 5.

Type of Classroom Interaction
Type of Classroom Interaction in TP Class
This study aimed to analyze the type of interaction in the class. Based on the observation, there were 4 types of classroom interaction that happened in this class. The first type of classroom interaction was interaction between teacher and students. This type was commonly happen in the classroom, so do this class. The frequency of asking question and lecturing by the teacher were often happened in this class. Question and answer routine by the teacher and students are the classroom behavior and that's how classroom interaction is characterized (Walsh, 2006). The students didn't active enough in this class. They only participated by responding the teacher's question. They didn't practice English by asking question or giving opinion, but they actually know what the teacher said. When reviewing

the previous lesson, the students could mention some expressions easily from the teacher's question. It indicated that students still remember about the previous material. In learning the new material, students also could answer the question from the teacher even though mostly in the form of yes/no response. Actually students understood the lesson. It could be seen when they were asked to do the class activity. They did all the activities well such as write the material on their book, answer the teacher's question orally and written, they practice the dialogue. But students kept silent when they interact with the teacher. They had more willingness to speak when they were in discussion. Students seemed to have confidence to talk with their friend rather than asking or giving opinion from the teacher's question. The second type of interaction was teacher and student interaction. It realized when the teacher asked a student volunteer to practice the dialogue. Even the teacher spent more time in asking and lecturing, it was not mean that the teacher did not give students time to practice in the class. In making students more talk actively, the teacher employed some interactive activities. The use of interactive activities was applied by the teacher to give opportunity to her students to practice so that their English can be improved, especially in speaking skill.

Another example of teacher-student interaction realized when students had a group discussion. The teacher walked and observed all the groups one by one. After observing, the teacher asked to every student in the group whether he has a question about the task and maybe difficulty or not. The third type of interaction that occurred in this class was interaction between one student and the other one student. This interaction realized when two students practice the dialogue. The interaction between student and student also happened when they were in group discussion every student started to talk actively with their partner even they didn't always discuss about the task the task. Each student in every group also talked in Indonesian language.

The last type of classroom interaction that found by the researcher was students and student interaction. The teacher not only involved student individually in delivering the material, the teacher also gave a chance to some students to participate actively in the class. Role play the dialogue was the implementation of this interaction type. Role play which involved group of students had the opportunity to practice the dialogue together. By dividing students based on the row, there were 3 groups. Every group has a turn to read the dialogue after pointed by teacher, Role play the dialogue was the implementation of this interaction type. Role play which involved group of students had the opportunity to practice the dialogue together. By dividing students into groups, every group has a turn to read the dialogue after pointed by teacher.

Type of Classroom Interaction in MM Class

Based on the observation, the researcher found that there were 3 type of classroom interaction which happened during teaching learning process in this class. Not much different with the previous class, the interaction between teacher and students still occurred in this class. Asking question and lecturing were the activities that represent this type of classroom interaction. The second type of classroom interaction that observed by the researcher was the interaction between the teacher and student individually. The situation of this interaction represented when one student asked a question related to the material. The last interaction's type was the interaction that happened among two students. It was found when the teacher asked for students to make a group consist of two members. During the group discussion, student actively interacted with his/her partner.

Discussion

The focus of the discussion section will be on the interpersonal meaning, classroom interaction type, and role relationship between students and teacher, as stated in the research questions.

Halliday & Matthiessen (2004) define 4 primaries of speech function: offer, command, statement and question. That theory applied in the findings of this research. Based on the findings, the teacher produced 3 types of speech function that has mood elements inside. Those were declarative (giving information), interrogative (questioning), and imperative clauses (offering & ordering). In MM Class, declarative clause was the highest clause that delivered by the teacher among the other. From the total clauses, 53% were belonging to declarative clause. Generally, the power of the teacher in this class was dominant. This finding has a similarity with Araghi & Sayegh (2011), which in their study declarative clause was dominant mood used by teachers and students even though they used English as second and foreign language. It different with TP Class, the highest clause produced by the teacher was imperative clause in MM class. It means that the teacher's authority was dominant and also indicated that the teacher tried to decrease their domination as the information source by giving a

chance to students to learn the material with their friends or it's called group discussion. Although the teacher also applied group discussion techniques in MM class, but the frequency of the teacher in giving information was much lower than in TP class. This result was not much different with Yuliati (2013). However she used the theory from Eggins (2004) to analyze the mood clause, her research result showed that the dominant clause from the teacher was in command form, besides the teacher used declarative or interrogative clause to equalize with students.

The different result of mood clause which delivered by the teacher might be caused by the different of learning focus in both classes. In TP class, the teacher said that the teacher wanted students to improve their speaking skill so that the teacher gave more explanation and model how to pronounce the expression well. While, in MM class the teacher tried to improve students' writing, so the teacher often asked for students to do the task in written form. The highest frequency of giving command by the teacher in MM Class indicated that the teacher want students not only understand about the theory, but also they understand how to apply it. The dominant of using command form also happened in the research from Nasir, Wardana, & Yusuf (2019). They held a study about teachers talk in senior high school and they found that the teacher mostly controlled the students with directions, commands, or orders during the learning process.

In giving command, the teacher more often to use "would like you" rather than "want you". The modality that used by the teacher can express the expression, attitude, or the degree of politeness. The use of modals in the clause or sentence can express the degree of possibility, certainty, politeness, and also directness of the speaker (Celce-Murcia & LarsenFreeman, 1999 cited in Widyanti & Yulia, 2016). The use of "would like" by the teacher showed that the teacher seemed to decrease the tendency of domination in the class by softening the force of "want" become "would like". It means that the teacher wanted to curtail the distance between her and students.

The use of "Thank you" by the teacher also showed that the teacher want to build the relationship with student in both classes through showing the emotion feeling. The emotion of gratitude has a function, that is to build a high-quality relationship between a grateful person and the target of his/her gratitude (Algoe et al., 2008 cited in Dewi, Fikri, & Suarnajaya 2014).

The Mood clause results produced by students from the two classes were also different. Students from MM Class produced 1 declarative clause and 2 interrogative clauses. It was different with students in TP class who didn't produce any mood clauses. Based on that result, it indicated that students from MM class were more active in learning the material, even though the clause they produced was ungrammatical but students had courage to talk with the teacher. Based on that result, it indicated that students from MM class were more active in learning the material, even though the clause they produced was ungrammatical but students had courage to talk with the teacher. The grammar was still a problem in speaking (Sari, 2018). The ungrammatical sentence still became a problem not only for students, but also the teacher so they must be aware of this problem.

In doing those activities, both the teacher and students had some errors. Mostly, the error was on grammatical sentence that they produced. Nevertheless, the teachers gave feedback related to grammatical errors in order students do not repeat the same mistake. This finding had similarity with Sundari (2017) which in her study the teacher had domination in the class and sometimes both the teacher and students did error during the lesson. The error that made by students indicated that students need time produce the language without having no fear it would be wrong and corrected.

Error is something that commonly happened when learning new language. Every language learner will do error in their learning process. In learning language, there involved error process (Touchie, 1986). Error is the natural process that will occur in learning something. Some language learner feel fear when she/he doing error. Whereas, error can be called as the development process which they must passed to reach the target language they learnt. The teacher also must pay attention about the error that she/he made. The teacher has to evaluate their teaching performance, so that some error can be prevented in the future. When students do some error, the teacher must respond it as the providing feedback and helping them as the learning process rather that telling if they wrong.

The other clause that produced by the teacher in both class was non-typical mood clause. Non-typical mood clause is the clause which structurally it belongs to one mood clause type and functionally it belongs to another mood clause type. The finding of non-typical mood clause also occurred in the study from Dewi, Fikri, & Suarnajaya (2014). They analyzed mood structure of teacher's talk and found that there were some clauses which didn't belong to mood clause, even though those clauses has mood elements inside.

The last type of clause produced by the teacher and students was minor clause. Minor clause was the clause which didn't have mood or transitivity structure (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). The use of "Okay" was the minor clause that often produced by the teacher beside greeting and compliment. Minor clause also produced by students in both classes when answering the teacher's question. Besides mentioned the answer, students also used yes/no response in answering the teacher's question. The use of yes/no response indicated that students understand or agree with what the teacher said. To enhance English competence, it would be better if the teacher habituate herself and students to answer a question completely. Astuti (2011) conducted a research about classroom interaction in junior high school. She found that the teacher and students could improve their English if both the teacher and students use English in a disciplined manner.

Interaction has a critical role in the teaching learning process. Through interaction, the teacher can deliver the material to the students and students can also ask a question if they have a difficulty about the material. If the material is delivered very well, it will make students understand the material well and has a great impact on their learning progress. Understanding of interaction in L2 classroom is the requirement to success learning a second language (Walsh, 2006). The interaction that happened in both classes has various kinds, there were interaction between the teacher and students, the teacher and a student, a student and another student, and students with students. The use of various interaction types helped the teacher and students to understand the material which being taught and built the interpersonal relationship between them. In teaching both classes, the teacher seemed to pay attention about the time that used to explain the material. The teacher didn't spend all the time to deliver the material from the beginning until the ending of the lesson. The teacher had good time management in teaching both classes. Nurmasitah (2010) found in her research that the teacher's domination in spending time to explain the material because the teacher didn't have a discipline about the time and didn't apply some interactive activities. Although had the same finding about domination of teacher-students interaction, the teacher in this study had balance it by applying some interactive activities to enhance their understanding.

To improve student's English skills, it can also be done by using several learning methods which communicative and easy to be understood by students. Since the learners do not interact in English outside the classroom so the best way for them to practice are through the interactive activities in the class (Khadidja, 2009). In teaching-learning process, the teacher applied some techniques to make students more active n the class. The first was ALM Audio Lingual method is a method which focuses on oral skills and has a purpose to improve students' speaking achievement (Mart, 2013). There are some features of this method, such as repetition, substitution, backward build-up, transformation, chain, and question-and-answer. The second was role play methods. Those methods are good to improve speaking skill. It is related with the theory from Harmer (2001) that role play can be used to encourage students to improve their oral fluency. Another method used by the teacher was CLT (Cooperative Learning Techniques). This method emphasizes on group discussion rather than work individually. This method requires student to do the task independently with their friend. Think, Pair and Share is the activity that requires students to reflect on problem(s) and then share their thoughts with others (Nyunt & Tint, 2015). A group discussion had the advantages not only to make students more confident in conveying their opinion with their friend, but also it is a way for the teacher to get students' understanding progress. Lockhart & Richard (1996) mentioned some benefits about group discussion, there are decreasing the teacher's domination in the class, improving the students' participation in the class, giving a chance for students to practice, promoting collaboration among students, making the teacher to have more roles in the class, and giving a more active role for students in learning.

Basically, in both classes the teacher and students had basic relationship, there were a person teaching and a person learning. The role relationship in the research question means the role of the teacher and students in the classroom. The first role of the teacher was controller. The teacher still has job to transmit the knowledge to students and organize activity in the classroom (Harmer, 2001). It was realized when the teacher deliver the material and manage some activities in both classes. The next role of the teacher in both classes was the teacher act as an organizer when students do classroom activities. The teacher always gave the information about the way students in both classes do the activity, putting them into group discussion, and closing the activity when it is time to stop (Harmer, 2001). The teacher also had a role as a prompter when teaching in both classes. The teacher tried to encourage students to give their opinion even they didn't know to do it. In the end of the lesson, the teacher gave motivation for students to use English in their daily life. The teacher then took the role

as a resource in the class. The teacher was the source of the students' input (Brown, 2001). The teacher must be helpful and available when act as this role.

Students from both classes already had some roles proposed by Johnson and Paulston (1976 cited in Richard and Rogers 1986). First role was members of a group and learning through interaction with others. It represented when students had some interaction types in the classroom, they were not only talking with one students but also all the students. Second role was tutor for other students. They discussed the task together, shared what they understand, and corrected if their friends do mistake. And the last role was learners who learn from the teacher, other students, and other sources. Students also used other source when doing the task, beside from the teacher. They used their mobile phone to search some example about the material or the task that they would do.

CONCLUSION

By conducting this research, it was found that the teacher and students negotiate the interpersonal meaning through their speech function (Mood Clause), besides they also produced the other types of clause. Based on the findings, the most dominant of speech function produced by the teacher and students were Declarative clause and Imperative clause. It reflected that most of the teaching-learning time was devoted to lectures and commands by the teacher.

The classroom interactions occurring in the English class were interaction between the teacher and students, interaction between the teacher and a student, and interaction between a student and another student.

The teacher met the requirements of teacher's roles made by Harmer (2001).The roles applied by the teacher in the class were controller, organizer, prompter, and resource when teaching English. For students, hey had some roles during the lesson as proposed by Johnson and Paulston (1976 cited in Richard and Rogers 1986): (a) members of a group and learning through interaction with others, (b) tutor for other students, (c) learn from the teacher, from other students, and from other teaching sources.

After conducting the research, the researcher gives several recommendations for the English teacher to give more motivation to students to use English in their daily life and apply activities to improve students' interaction in the classroom. In teaching, the teacher should pay attention about their talk and better to take more roles in the classroom so that the teaching learning process can run effectively.

For students, they should be more active to communicate in English and must be confidence and do not feel afraid of making mistakes. It is suggested for other researchers who will conduct the similar research to make some efforts to improve or develop the classroom interaction in EFL class.

REFERENCES

Araghi, S.M. & Shayegh, K. (2011). Interpersonal metafunction of gender talk in ELT classrooms. *Journal of Academic and Applied Studies*, 1(2), pp. 25-32.

Astuti, M.M. (2011). An analysis of classroom interaction in the English teaching and learning process of the bilingual class in the first grade of SMPN 1 Prambanan (Published Thesis). Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta, Indonesia.

Brown, H.D. (2001). *Teaching by Principle An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy* (2nd ed.). New York: Pearson Education Company.

Cehan, D.A. (2002). Interpersonal and pedagogical communication: An argument for natural communication practices in the Romanian EFL classroom (Published Master's Thesis). School for International Training, Vermont.

Dewi, N., Fikri, Z., & Suarnajaya, W. (2014). Mood structure analysis of teacher talk in EFL classroom: A discourse study based on systemic functional linguistic theory. *E-Journal Program Pascasarjana Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha, 2*.

Eggins, S. (2004). *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics* (2nd ed.). London: Continuum International Publishing.

Halliday, M.A.K. & Matthiessen, C.M.I.M. (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (3rd ed.). USA: Oxford University Press Inc.

Halliday, M.A.K. & Matthiessen, C.M.I.M. (2014). *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar* (4th ed.) USA & Canada: Routledge.

Harmer, J. (2001). *The Practice of English Language Teaching* (3rd ed.). UK: Pearson Education Limited.

Keiko, M. H. (2011). *Discourse analysis through interpersonal meaning*, pp. 93-112. Retrieved March 29, 2019, from nufs-nuas.repo.nii.ac.jp

Khadidja, K. (2009). The effect of classroom interaction on developing the learner's speaking skill: The case of third year LMD students of English at Constantine University (Published Master's Thesis). Constantine University, Republic of Algeria.

Khurniawan, A.W., Lee, J., & Wahidiat, S. (2017). *Strategi Implementasi Revitalisasi SMK Melalui Bilingual Learning Ecosystem Untuk Sekolah Menengah Kejuruan*. Jakarta: Direktorat Pembinaan SMK.

Lin, L.F. (2008). Interpersonal engagement in graduate-level classroom discourse: Researching gender-related patterns. *Systemic Functional Linguistics in Use, OWPLC,* pp. 522-546.

Lockhart, C. & Richards, J.C. (1996). *Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classrooms.* USA: Cambridge University Press.

Mart, C.T. (2013). The audio-lingual method: An easy way of achieving speech. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences,* 3(12), pp. 63-65.

Mohajan, H. (2018). Qualitative research methodology in social sciences and related subjects. *Journal of Economic Development, Environment and People,* 7(1), pp. 23-48

Nasir, C., Wardana, A., & Yusuf, Y.Q. (2019). A qualitative study of teacher talk in an EFL classroom interaction in Aceh Tengah, Indonesia. *Indonesian Journal Of Applied Linguistic*, 8(3), pp. 525-535.

Nurmasitah, S. (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 (Published Thesis). Universitas Diponegoro, Semarang, Indonesia.

Nyunt, E.E. & Tint, S.S. (2015). Collaborative learning with think -pair share technique. *Computer Applications: An International Journal (CAIJ),* 2(1), pp. 1-11.

Qingwen, S. (n.d). The Application of Classroom Negotiation. *Anhui Normal University*. Retrieved from www.celea.org.cn [accessed at 16/04/2019]

Rivers, W.M. (1987). *Interaction as the key to teaching language for communication*. Retrieved March 16, 2019, from www1.udel.edu/eli/educ647/rivers/Rivers1.pdf

Sari, R.A. (2018). Students' grammatical error analysis in speaking. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pengajaran,* 5(2), pp. 127-137.

Sundari, H. (2017). Classroom interaction in teaching English as foreign language at lower secondary schools in Indonesia. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies,* 8(6), pp. 147-154.

Sutopo, D. (2014). Negotiation of meanings: A case of an Indonesian young learner of English. *International Review of Social Sciences,* 2(6), pp. 148-162.

Touchie, H.Y. (1986). Second language learning errors their types, causes, and treatment. *JALT Journal,* 8(1), pp. 75-80.

Walker, A.W. (2010). Language diversity and classroom dialogue: Negotiation of meaning by students in an internationalised postgraduate classroom. (Published PhD Doctorate Thesis). Griffith University, Australia.

Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating Classroom Discourse*. USA & Canada: Taylor & Francis e-Library.

Wibowo, Y.R. (2017). Classroom interaction analysis in speaking class at University of Nusantara PGRI Kediri. *Simki-Pedagogia*, 1(3), pp. 1-8.

Widyanti, E.R. &Yulia, M.F. (n.d.). A study on modals used in text your say of the Jakarta post. *LLT Journal,* 16(1), pp. 11-21.

Yuliati. (2013). Interpersonal meaning negotiation in the teacher-student verbal interaction. *The International Journal of Social Science,* 11(1), pp. 52-60.