TEACHER'S ELICITATION TECHNIQUES IN ENGLISH CLASSROM INTERACTION AT SMK NEGERI 13 MEDAN

AN ARTICLE

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement For the Degree of the Sarjana Pendidikan

By:

Khairiana Fitri

Registration Number: 2141121022



ENGLISH EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

FACULTY OF LANGUAGES AND ARTS

STATE UNIVERSITY OF MEDAN

2020

ARTIKEL

TEACHERS' ELICITATION TECHNIQUES IN ENGLISH CLASSROOM INTERACTION AT SMK NEGERI 13 MEDAN

Disusun dan Diajukan oleh:

Khairiana Fitri NIM. 2141121022

Telah diverifikasi dan dinyatakan memenuhi syarat

Untuk diunggah pada jurnal online

Medan, Juli 2020

Menyetujui

Dosen Pembimbing Skripsi I

Dosen Pembimbing Skripsi II

No

Neni Afrida Sari Harahap, S.Pd., M.Hum. NIP. 19820416 200801 2 012 Johannes Jeiria Gultom, S.Pd., M. Hum. NIP. 19810301 200312 1 003

Diketahui oleh,

Ka. Program Studi Rendidikan Bahasa Inggris

20

Nora Ronita Dewi, S.Pd., S.S., M.Hum. NIP. 19800552 200812 2 003

TEACHERS' ELICTATION TECHNIQUES IN ENGLISH CLASSROOM INTERACTION AT SMK NEGERI 13 MEDAN

*Khairiana Fitri

**Neni Afrida Sari Harahap

**Johannes Jefria Gultom

Abstract

This research was dealt with elicitation techniques used by the teacher in English Classroom Interaction. The objectives of this study were (1) to identify the subcategory of elicitation techniques used by the teacher in English classroom interaction at SMKN 13 Medan (2) to find out the reasons which affect the use of elicitation techniques in English classroom interaction at SMKN 13 Medan. A descriptive qualitative design was used in this study. The data were collected by recording the utterances of teacher. The data were analyzed by data condensation, data display, conclusion drawing/verification. (1) There were 259 elicitations used by the teacher in the classroom interaction for confirmation, elicitation for agreement, elicitation for commitment, elicitation for repetition, and elicitation for clarification. (2) For the reasons which affect the use of elicitation techniques. There were six reasons, they were lack of skill and knowledge of teacher, lack confidence of students in class participation, passive recipient of information, reluctant students, large class size, and low level of learners. Meanwhile, the short duration of class and late arrival of students in class were not the reasons which affect the use of elicitation techniques.

Keywords : *Teachers' Elicitation Techniques , Classroom Interaction, Descriptive-Qualitative.*

*Graduate Status **Lecturer Status

INTRODUCTIONS

Classroom interaction refers to the interaction between teacher and learners in the classroom. Interaction is very important in the classroom. According to Brown (2001), interaction is at the heart of communicative competence. It is because to achieve communicative competence, the interaction must be carried out actively in the classroom.

Meng in Rohmah (2017) states that teachers should include both verbal and nonverbal languages. Verbal interaction covers written interaction and oral interaction. Meanwhile, non-verbal interaction refers to behavioral responses in classroom without using words such as head-nodding, hand-raising, and so on. Moreover, successful interaction may promote involvement between teacher and student or among students, enhance learning, and motivate students.

In inviting students to participate in the classroom interaction, the teachers usually use some techniques. One of important techniques employed by teachers to invite students engagement is elicitation techniques. Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) add that an elicitation is an act the function of which is to request a linguistic response, although the response may be a non-verbal surrogate such as a nod or raised hand. By using this technique, the teacher no longer keeps the centre position in the class because the students are encouraged to actively take part in the lesson by interacting with the teacher.

Based on observation in SMKN 13 Medan during teaching and learning process of English classroom, researchers found that students have limited opportunities to speak in class where they are not invited to engage in teacher-student interaction. As a result, they tend to be quiet and listen to most teacher talks conducted by the teacher in the class. Because of this, students cannot practice interacting skills in English. Finally, the classroom interaction becomes monotonous and it was dominated by the teacher, whereas in English learning, students must be able to be active in the classroom.

Based on the problems of using elicitation techniques by the teacher in the classroom interaction above, it is considered to analyze the elicitation occur to the teacher into the classroom. This study deals with "Teachers' Elicitation Techniques in English Classroom Interaction at SMK Negeri 13 Medan".

Classroom Interaction

According to Brown (2000) the teacher and students maintain interaction in the classroom. While the interaction between the teacher and the students are running in the classroom, the teacher gives the material of language learning and the students get it and use it in their real life. In the teaching and learning condition, classroom interaction defines as an action which is performed by the teacher and students during instruction such as exchanging ideas or information and sharing feelings or experience. Interaction plays an important role in language teaching. The students learn how to communicate with others through interaction with teacher andothers students in the classroom.

Elicitation Techniques

Elicitation technique is a technique used by teachers to build student's participation in teaching English. The term 'Elicitation' is first introduced by Sinclair and Coulthard to describe utterances in the classroom which elicit verbal response. Coulthard (1992) states that an eliciting is an act in which has a function to request a respond from the students, although the response may be a nonverbal surrogate such as a nod or raised hand.

Subcategories of Elicitation Techniques

According to Coulthard (1992) also classifies eliciting techniques into six subcategories as follow:

1. Elicitation for Information

This is the kind of elicitation which invites the addressee to supply a piece of information.

2. Elicitation for Confirmation

The second subcategory is Elicitations which invite the addressee to confirm the speaker's assumption. It can be realized by tag interrogatives, declaratives, positive and negative polar interrogatives.

3. Elicitation for Agreement

The third subcategory is those which invite the addressee to agree with the speaker's assumption that the expressed proposition is self-evidently true. It is most commonly

realized by tag interrogatives and negative polar interrogatives, both spoken with a falling tone.

4. Elicitation for Commitment

There is yet another subcategory of Elicitation which differs from the above three subcategories in that it elicits more than just a verbal response from the addressee. It also elicits commitment of some kind. Let us identify it as 'Elicit: commit' for want of a better label.

5. Elicitation for Repetition

This subcategory prospects a repetition of the utterance preceding the Elicitation. It is may laber the former Elicit: repeat. The former is realized by wh-interrogatives such as 'Who/When/Where/What did you say?', 'Say that again?' or words such as 'Sorry?', 'Pardon?' or 'Huh?'.

6. Elicitation for Clarification

This subcategory of elicitation has a greater variety of realizations. It can be realized by wh-interrogatives such as 'What do you mean?', 'Which room?', 'Where?' or a high key repetition of a word or phrase in the preceding utterance.

Reasons which Affect the Use of Elicitation Techniques

There are some factors which affect the teachers in using the elicitation techniques stated by Halim, S., & Halim, T. (2019). They are:

- a. Lack of skill and knowledge of teachers.
- b. Lack of confidence of students in class participation.
- c. Passive recipients of information.
- d. The short duration of a class.
- e. Late arrival of students in class.
- f. Reluctant students.
- g. Large class size.
- h. Low level of learners.

METHODOLOGY

This study was conducted by using descriptive qualitative design. Ary et al (1985) states that the qualitative inquirer deals with data that are in the form of words or pictures rather than numbers and statistics. Moleong (2007) further argues that descriptive

research emphasizes data in the form of words, images, and not the numbers caused by the application of qualitative methods.

The data for the first problem was the English teacher utterances produced during the teaching and learning process which consist of elicitation. Manwhile, the data for the second problem was the teachers utterances during interview. The source of the data was the English teacher of SMK Negeri 13 Medan. In order to fulfill the objectives of this research, the instruments were used to obtain the data. The supporting instruments of data collection in this research were field note, video recorder, question sheet, and voice recorder.

According to Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014), there are three activities to analyze data in descriptive qualitative research. Those activities are data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing/verification.

- 1. Data condensation referred to the process of selecting, focusing, simplifying, abstracting, and/or transforming the data that appear in the full corpus (body) of written-up field notes, interview transcripts, documents, and other empirical materials.
- 2. Data Display were the second activity. This research was designed by table to arrange the data utterances by the teacher in the classroom interactions in the form of table and show into the clearly explanation. Counting realization elicitation technique that mostly used by teacher to find out the subcategories.

 $X = \frac{F}{N} \ge 100 \%$

3. Conclusion drawing and verification are the last process . In qualitative research, the characteristic of conclusion is temporary.

FINDINGS

Based on the analysis of the transcription of the teaching and learning process, the amount of elicitation which posed by teacher are 259 elicitations. There were six Subcategories of elicitation that was applied by the teacher namely elicitation for information, elicitation for confirmation, elicitation for agreement, elicitation for commitment, elicitation for repetition, and elicitation for clarification. The following table will show the distribution of teachers' elicitation techniques.

No	Subcategories of Elicitation	Observation			F	%
	-	1st	2nd	3rd	•	
1	Elicitation for Information	36	48	44	128	49.4%
2	Elicitation for Confirmation	19	24	16	59	22.8%
3	Elicitation for Agreement	9	7	3	19	7.3%
4	Elicitation for Commitment	14	13	12	39	15.1%
5	Elicitation for Repetition	1	3	2	6	2.3%
6	Elicitation for Clarification	3	2	3	8	3.1%
	Total	82	97	80	259	100%

Table 1: Total Number and Percentages of Teachers' ElicitationTechniques Used by Teacher.

Reasons which Affect the Use of Elicitation Techniques

There were some factors which affect the teachers in using the elicitation techniques stated by Halim, S., & Halim, T. (2019). They were: 1) Lack of skill and knowledge of teachers. 2) Lack of confidence of students in class participation. 3) Passive recipients of information. 4) Reluctant students. 5) Large class size. 6) Low level of learners.

DISCUSSIONS

According to Walsh (2011), elicitation techniques are the strategies used by teachers to get students to respond with typical entails asking questions. In this study found as many as 236 elicitations in the form of questions. Based on the results of the study, it was found that the teacher used all the elicitation subcategories of malcolm coulthard at the first, second and third meeting. This is similar to previous study by Analido (2018), Usman (2018) , Marbun (2017) which investigated the types of elicitation techniques in the teaching process, found that elicitation for information was the dominant utterances used by the teacher in the learning process.

In regards with the first problem of the study, it was found that the dominant subcategory of elicitation technique used by the teacher in English classroom interaction are Elicitation for information about 128 (49.4%) elicitations. Elicitation for confirmation

are about 59 (22.8%) elicitations. Elicitation for commitment are about 39 (15.1%) elicitations. Elicitation for agreement are about 19 (7.3%) elicitations. Elicitation for clarification are about 8 (3.1%) utterances and elicitation for repetition are about 6 (2.3%) utterances.

In regards with the second problem of the study, it could be seen from research based on the interview with the teacher. There were some reasons which affect the use of elicitation in the learning process. The teacher assumes that some of this is the lack of skills and knowledge of the teacher, Furthermore, the lack of confidence of students in class participation was also affected by the use of elicitation. Then, passive recipient of information can also affect the elicitation of the teacher. Reluctant students also affects the elicitation used by the teacher. Lastly, the low level of learners, it also affects the elicitation which is done by the teacher. According to the teacher there are two things that did not affect the elicitation of a class, and late arrival of students in class.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Based on the research finding and discussion in the previous chapter, it could be drawn the conclusion of the present study which were designed to suit the objectives of the study. There are two objectives in this study; (1) To identify the subcategories of elicitation techniques used by the teacher in English classroom interaction at SMKN 13 Medan; (2) To find out the reasons which affect the use of elicitation techniques in English classroom interaction at SMKN 13 Medan. So, the researcher makes these following conclusions: 1. Dealing with the subcategories of teachers' elicitation techniques, it was revealed that the teacher used elicitation for information totally 128 (49.4%) elicitations. On the other hand, elicitations for confirmation were about 59 (22.8%) elicitations. Then, elicitations for agreement were about 19 (7,3%) elicitations. Meanwhile, elicitations for commitment were raised about 39 (15.1%) elicitations. Elicitations for repetition were about 6 (2.3%) elicitations. Then, elicitations for clarification were about 8 (3.1%) elicitations. The most dominant used by the teacher was elicitation for information. 2. There were 6 reasons which affect the use of elicitation by the teacher in English classroom interaction; (1) Lack of skill and knowledgeof teacher, (2) Lack confidence of students in class participation, (3) Passive recipient of information, (4) Reluctant students, (5) Large class size, and (6) Low level of learners.

In the relation to the conclusion, the researcher humbly suggests: 1. The teacher is expected not to answer the question herself. Teacher can give more time to students for answering the question or teacher do more elicitation to direct students to the answer. 2. The teacher is expected to be able to change the reluctant students into active students in the learning process, by giving those students many opportunities to answer questions from the teacher.

REFERENCES

- Achadiyah, R. (2016). Teachers' Elicitation Question In English Class At Man Sidoarjo. Sunan Ampel State Islamic University. Surabaya. Retrieved on March 24, 2019, from http://digilib.uinsby.ac.id/5669/
- Alsubaie, S. (2015). An Analysis of Classroom Discourse: Elicitation Techniques in EFL Classroom. International Journal of English Language Teaching Vol. 3, No. 8, pp. 29-39
- Analido. B. (2015). An Analysis Of Teacher's Elicitation Technique In Teaching English. STKIP PGRI Sumatera Barat. Retrieved on March 24, 2019, from http://jim.stkippgri-sumbar.ac.id/jurnal/view/Dy4d
- Ary, D, Jacobs, L., C., Razavieh. (1985). Introduction To Research in Education. New York: Holt, Rinehart.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). Principles of Language Learning and Teaching. 4ThEdition. New York: The Free Press.
- Brown, H. D. (2001). Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy. Second Edition. New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc. New York.
- Coulthard, M. (1992). Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis. New York: Routledge. New York.
- Creswell, J.W. and Poth, C.N. (2018) Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design Choosing among Five Approaches. 4th Edition, SAGE Publications, Inc., Thousand Oaks.
- Dagarin, M. (2004). Classroom Interaction and Communication Strategies in Learning English as a Foreign. Ljubljana : ELOPE

- Drew, C. J., Hardman, M. L., & Hosp, J. L. (2008). Designing and Conducting Research inEducation. LA: Sage Publications.
- Gay, L. R and Peter, A. (2000). Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Company.
- Halim, S., & Halim, T. (2019). Elicitation: A Powerful Diagnostic Tool for Actively Involving Learners in the Learning Process. Arab World English Journal, Special Issue: The Dynamics of EFL in Saudi Arabia. 115- 126
- Lee, J. et al. (2017). Strategi Implementasi Revitalisasi Smkmelalui Bilingual Learning Ecosystem. Direktorat Pembinaan Sekolah Menengah Kejuruan. Jakarta.
- Mingzhi. (2005). Enhancing interaction in our EFL classroom. CELEA Journal Vol. 28 No. 2, pp. 56-62.
- Miles, M.B., Huberman, A.M., & Saldana, J. (2014). Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook. CA: SAGE. London.
- Moleong, L. (2007). Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif. Bandung: Remaja Karya
- Murtiningrum, S. (2009).Classroom Interaction In English Learning. Sanata Dharma University. Yogyakarta. Retrieved on March 24, 2019, from http://library.usd.ac.id/Data%20PDF/S2/Kajian%20Bahasa%20Inggris/056332023 _full.pdf
- Nguyen, L. T. (2017). Teachers' Perceptions Towards Teacher-Student Interaction In EFL Classes. IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education. Vol. 7, Issue 3 Ver. III (May - June 2017), PP 81-86.
- Nisa, S. H. (2015). Classroom Interaction Analysis In The Efl Speaking Class. University of Kuningan. Retrieved on March 24, 2019, from https://journal.uniku.ac.id/index.php/ERJEE/article/view/99
- Nugraha, I.S. & Suherdi, D. (2014). Scientific Approach: An English Learning-Teaching (ELT) Approach In The 2013 Curriculum. Journal of English and Education Vol. 5 No. 2, October 2017, pp. 112 – 119

- Nunan, D. (1992). Research Methods in Language Learning. Cambridge University Press. USA.
- Rohmah, I. I. (2017). Classroom Interaction in English Language Class for Students of Economics Education. Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Volume 8 Number 2. Pp. 192-207.
- Saputri, N. (2015). An Analysis Of Elicitation Techniques Used By English Teachers In Classroom Interaction (A Descriptive Study At Sman 7 Padang). STKIP PGRI Sumatera Barat. Retrieved on March 24, 2019, from http://jim.stkip-pgrisumbar.ac.id/jurnal/view/J2Q8
- Sasmita, D. et al. (2013). An analysisofTeachers' ElicitationTechniques in the Classroom at SMA Pembangunan Laboratorium UNP.Journal of English Laguage Teaching, Vol. 2, No. 1. Padang.
- Setiawati, E. (2017). A Study on Elicitations for Students' Talk in English Classes. Muhammadiyah University of Purwokerto. Retrieved on March 24, 2019, from http://repository.ump.ac.id/1799/
- Sugiyono. (2017). Metode Penelitian Pendidikan Pendekatan Kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D. Bandung: Alfabeta
- Usman, Bustami. (2018).Teachers' Elicitation: Inviting Students to Speak. Syiah Kuala University. Banda Aceh. Retrieved on March 24, 2019, from http://jurnal.unissula.ac.id/index.php/edulite/article/view/2149
- Quenan, T. M. (2014). The Incidence of Classroom Interaction on te Development of the Speaking Skill in EFL Settings. University of Narinon.