

Interaction Patterns of Lecturer and Student in Online Lectures in Introduction to Linguistic Course

Rusdiah ^{1*}, Rizkariani Sulaiman ²

¹⁻² Universitas Muslim Indonesia, Indonesia

*rusdiah.rusdiah@umi.ac.id

Abstract

The lecture system on campus has undergone changes to adapt to new-normal conditions. Previously, lectures were carried out face-to-face as a whole, currently lectures are carried out using blended learning by combining face-to-face and online meetings. It is urgent to study online lectures because various challenges arise from both lecturers and students in their implementation. The aim of this research is to determine the interaction patterns of lecturers and students in online lectures in the Introduction to Linguistics course. This research uses qualitative methods, especially conversation analysis. The research will be carried out in the English Literature study program, Faculty of Letters, UMI, with research subjects being one English Literature lecturer, Faculty of Letters, Indonesian Muslim University, who teaches the Introduction to Linguistics course and class C1 students consisting of 32 students. Data in this research will be collected using audio/video recordings and interviews and analyzed using the IRF and FLINT models. The results of the research show that the IRF (Initiation, Response, Feedback) interaction pattern consists of complete IRF patterns of eighty-two (82) frequencies or 76.63%, IR which is a semi-complete pattern of 25 frequencies or 23.37% and none IF or incomplete patterns were identified starting from video transcripts of meetings one to five. Meanwhile, based on identification according to the FLINT model from video transcripts 1 to video 5, the dominant one is providing information, namely 71 frequencies (25.08%), then giving directions 68 frequencies (24.02%), giving questions 54 frequencies (19.08%), providing encouragement to increase student self-confidence 41 frequency (14.48%), facilitating student ideas 37 frequency (13.07%), conveying corrections 7 frequency (2.47%), accommodating student feelings 5 frequency (1.76%), and no interaction was found in the form of criticism of student behavior.

Keywords: *interaction patterns, online class*

Introduction

Online learning/lectures are a policy established by the leadership of educational institutions to adapt during and after the Covid-19 pandemic. Online classes are a distance or non-face-to-face learning method between teachers and students in the classroom. Rusman (2011) states in his theory that online learning features consist of interactivity, accessibility and additional devices. Students and teachers do not meet directly, but by utilizing technology, they can carry out the learning process interactively. Learning can be done through various applications, such as using video or audio or message-based programs. Easy access to learning can enrich knowledge and understand the essence of learning.

Several methods that can be implemented for learning activities include WhatsApp, Google Classroom, Edmodo, Zoom Meeting, Google Meet, LMS (Learning Management System) (Janah, 2021).

However, there are several obstacles faced by teachers and students in online learning, as explained by Hew & Cheung (2014 in Zhihao & Mustapha, 2021) that there are many factors that influence the effectiveness of online learning, including low learning motivation factors and low levels of interaction. low[3], according to Jie, Ming & Hao (2012 in Zhihao & Mustapha, 2021) there are many problems in online classes at home and abroad, such as high dropout rates, difficulties in evaluating the learning process, and low satisfaction with the process learning[4], then explained by Farrah & Jabari that the factor in reducing student interaction and participation in online learning is that some students do not have the confidence to speak and participate in online lectures; poor internet connection and sometimes they don't have an internet connection; students do not take online lectures at all and rely on recordings; students do not have the devices needed to access courses such as smartphones, laptops, iPads, and so on; lecturers do not/do not provide opportunities for students to participate; and some lecturers do not have the skills.

Lecturer-student or teacher-student interaction significantly decreases during online lectures/learning, even though the quality of lectures is largely determined by the smooth interaction of lecturers and students. Interaction is a collaboration between the exchange of thoughts, emotions or ideas between two or more people, thereby influencing each other in various ways. The interaction of teachers and students in the teaching process is interrelated and is used to share information and knowledge, especially in language classes. Interaction does not only occur in one direction, but also occurs in at least two or more directions to achieve communication practices by giving and receiving information to each other (Janah, 2021). Maelasari (2023) explained that interaction contributes significantly to the language teaching and learning process. Through interaction, students can increase language acquisition when listening to or reading reading material and students will have the opportunity to develop language output when various interaction patterns occur in the classroom.

Method

This research uses the conversation analysis method. Regarding conversation analysis (CA), Hyland and Paltridge (2011) state that conversation analysis is the study of conversation-in-interaction, and is a theoretically and methodologically different approach to understanding social life.

This research was carried out at the English Literature Study Program, Faculty of Letters, UMI. The research subjects were 1 (one) English Literature Lecturer, Faculty of Letters, Indonesian Muslim University who taught the Introduction to Linguistics course and class C1 students consisting of 32 students. The data in this research was collected using audio recordings. Audio recordings are used to collect interaction patterns between lecturers and students during online lecture sessions. Data collection was carried out in three stages, namely knowing the schedule, recording and observing the lecture process online via zoom meeting. Next, the data obtained from recordings were analyzed into three stages, namely data reduction, data presentation, and drawing conclusions. The instruments used in data collection were class observation lists and audio recorders,. To obtain data, researchers

recorded data and follow the lecture process online (zoom meeting). The recorded data is transcribed into written transformations, then identified, selected, and also classified or explored based on analytical needs that are relevant to this research topic. Transcription was analyzed using IRF and FLINT model analysis.

Results

Interaction Pattern Sinclair and Coulthard's IRF Model

The research question of how the interaction patterns of lecturers and students in online lectures in the Introduction to Linguistics course are obtained through recording and observing the online lecture process via zoom meetings. Next, the recording results are transcribed into written form. The resulting transcripts were identified and classified using IRF and FLINT model analysis.

The following are the results of the classification of interaction patterns based on Sinclair and Coulthard's IRF model:

Table 1. Interaction Patterns based on Sinclair and Coulthard's IRF Model

Interaction Patterns	Frequency	Percentage (%)
IRF (Complete Pattern)	82	76,63
IR (Semi Complete Pattern)	25	23,37
IF (Incomplete Pattern)	0	0
Total	107	100

Based on the results from table 1, it shows that the IRF (Initiation, Response, Feedback) interaction pattern consists of IRF complete patterns with eighty-two (82) frequencies or 76.63%, IR which is a semi-complete pattern with 25 frequencies or 23.37%. and no IF or incomplete patterns were identified from the video transcripts of meetings one to five.

Interaction Pattern Flanders and Moskowitz's FLINT Model

Results of classification of interaction patterns based on the FLINT model adapted from Flanders and Moskowitz:

Table 2. Interaction Patterns based on Flanders and Moskowitz's FLINT Model

Teacher Talk			
No.	Indirect Influence	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Deals with feelings: in a non- threatening way, accepting, discussing, refereeing to or communicating understanding of past, present or future feelings of students.	5	1,76
2	Praises or encourages: praising, complimenting, telling students why, what they have said or done is valued. Encouraging students to continue, trying to give them confidence, confirming that their answers are correct	41	14,48
3	Uses ideas of students: clarifying, using interpreting, summarizing the ideas of students. The ideas must be rephrased by the teacher but still be recognized as being students' contributions; repeats students response verbatim: Repeating the exact words of students after they participate	37	13,07
4	Asks questions: asking questions to which the answer is anticipated	54	19.08

Teacher Talk		
No.	Direct influence	Frequency Percentage (%)
1	Gives information: giving information facts, own opinion or ideas: lecturing or asking rhetorical questions; correct without rejection: telling students who have made a mistake the correct response without using words or intonations which communicate criticism;	71 25,08
2	Give direction: giving directions, requests or commands that the students are expected to follow; directing various drills; facilitating whole class and small group activity;	68 24,02
3	Criticizes student behaviour: rejecting the behaviour of the student; trying to change the non-acceptable behaviour; communicating anger, displeasure, annoyance, dissatisfaction with what students are doing;	0 0
4	telling the students his or her response is not correct or acceptable and communicating, criticism, displeasure, annoyance, rejection by words or intonations.	7 2,47
Total		283 100

Table 2 shows the lecturers' Teacher Talk starting from the transcript of video 1 to video 5, the dominant one is providing information, namely 71 frequencies (25.08%), then giving directions 68 frequencies (24.02%), giving questions 54 frequencies (19.08%) , providing encouragement to increase student self-confidence 41 frequency (14.48%), facilitating student ideas 37 frequency (13.07%), conveying corrections 7 frequency (2.47%), accommodating student feelings 5 frequency (1.76%), and no interaction was found in the form of Teacher Talk by lecturers in the form of criticism of student behavior.

Discussion

The dominant interaction pattern applied by lecturers and students is the IRF (Initiation, Response Feedback) pattern which is obtained through audio recordings of the lecture process online via zoom meetings. During these five meetings, it was shown that the lecturers often initiated conversations which were then responded to by students and given feedback by the lecturers, also known as complete IRF. In line with research by Ginting & Dewi (2023) that the pattern most often used by lecturers is IRF as a full pattern, followed by IR as a half-complete pattern and IF as an incomplete pattern.

The next pattern found was the IR pattern, namely the lecturer initiated the conversation and then the student responded without any further feedback from the lecturer. In this research, no IF pattern was found, namely the lecturer initiated the conversation without a response from the student and stepped in to the lecturer's feedback. In general, interactions during the lecture process ran smoothly because most of the interactions in the form of discussions, questions and answers between lecturers and students went well and most of the initiation - response - feedback patterns were formed. Apart from that, by not finding an IF pattern, most of the instructions, questions and discussions were responded well by students. This is in line with the results of research by Maelasari (2023) which states that students are quite positive during online teaching.

After obtaining the interaction patterns of lecturers and students in online lectures, namely the majority of complete IRF patterns, a small number of IR patterns and no IF patterns according to the IRF model, in this research the interaction patterns were also identified based on the Flanders and Moskowitz FLINT Model to understand clearly

interaction between lecturers and students. Identification of the FLINT model in this research revealed that sequentially the types of lecturer interactions were providing information, providing direction, asking questions, providing encouragement to increase student self-confidence, facilitating student ideas, conveying corrections, accommodating student feelings and no interactions were found in the form of criticism of behavior. student behavior. These results show that the role of the lecturer in online learning is as the main initiator who provides information, direction and questions to students related to lecture material with the aim of providing understanding, smoothing the flow of discussion and interaction and maintaining student attention during online lectures.

Conclusion

The dominant interaction pattern applied by lecturers and students is the IRF (Initiation, Response Feedback) pattern and the types of lecturer interactions are providing information, providing direction, asking questions, providing encouragement to increase student self-confidence, facilitating student ideas, conveying corrections, accommodating student feelings and no interactions were found in the form of criticism of behavior. student behavior.

In suggestion, the dominants role of lecturers in the class should be minimized to varied the class interaction.

Acknowledgment

Grateful thanks to to LP2S (Institute for Research and Development of Resources) Universitas Muslim Indonesia which has funded this research. Thank you to all participants involved in this research.

References

- Almusharraf, N. M., Costley, J., & Fanguy, M. (2020). The Effect Of Postgraduate Students' Interaction With Video Lectures on Collaborative Note-Taking. *Journal of Information Technology Education, Research*, 19.
- Farrah, M. A. A., & Jabari, S. M. G. (2020). Interaction in Online Learning Environment during Covid-19: Factors behind Lack of Interaction and Ideas for Promoting it. *Bulletin of Advanced English Studies (BAES)*, 5(2), 47-56.
- Maelasari, R., Ratnawati, & Tarwana, W. (2020). An Analysis of Teacher-Students Interaction in Cross-Cultural Understanding Online Teaching. *JALL: Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literature*, 4(1).
- Hyland, K., & Paltridge, B. (2011). *Continuum Companion to Discourse Analysis*. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Janah, M. R. (2021). An Analysis Of Students' Interaction In Learning English During Online Class At Junior High School 17 Kota Jambi. Skripsi, Fakultas Tarbiyah dan Keguruan Universitas Islam Negeri Sulthan Thaha Saifuddin Jambi.
- Rusman. (2011). *Pembelajaran Berbasis Teknologi Informasi dan Komunikasi, Mengembangkan Profesionalitas Guru [Information and Communication Technology*

Based Learning, Developing Teacher Professionalism]. Jakarta: PT. Rajagrafindo Persada.

- Turley, C., & Graham, C. (2019). Interaction, Student Satisfaction, and Teacher Time Investment in Online High School Courses. *Journal of Online Learning Research*, 5(2), 169-198.
- Youru, X., et al. (2022). Design and effects of the teacher-student interaction model in the online learning spaces. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, 35(1), 69–90. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12528-022-09348-9>
- Zhihao, D., & Mustapha, S. Z. (2021). The Relationship between Online Teacher-Student Interaction and Online Academic Performance: The Mediating Effect Of Academic Optimism. *International Journal of Infrastructure Research and Management*, 9(2), 1–10.