

INTERACTIONAL MODIFICATION LANGUAGE USED BY THE TEACHER IN ENGLISH CLASSROOM IN MTS PUI CIKASO

Elin Marlina

University of Kuningan
Email: marlinaelin66@gmail.com

Dadang Solihat

University of Kuningan
Email: Dadang.solihat@uniku.ac.id

Nida Amalia Asikin

University of Kuningan
Email: Nida.amalia.asikin@uniku.ac.id

APA Citation: Marlina, E., Solihat, D., & Asikin, N. A. (2021). Interactional modification language used by the teacher in English classroom in MTS PUI Cikaso. *Indonesian Journal of Learning and Instruction*, 4(1), pp.41-48. <https://doi.org/10.25134/ijli.v4i1.4343>

Received: 15-01-2020

Accepted: 10-03-2021

Published: 31-04-2021

Abstract: This research aims at knowing the types of interactional modification language used by the teacher in MTs PUI Cikaso based on Pinter's theory (2017) and also finding out the students' responses toward interactional modification. Qualitative research design is applied in this research. The subject of the data is an English teacher and the students of class VII B MTs PUI Cikaso. The data are collected through observation, interview, and questionnaire. During observation, the researcher uses mobile phone to record the learning process by putting the phone in the corner of the class to get clear visualization. The observation is conducted 8 times (8 meetings) where every meeting spends 40 minutes. Interview used to support the data about teacher's opinion while using interactional modification language. Meanwhile questionnaire is used to support the student's responses. The data are analyzed both qualitatively. The findings revealed that the teacher used 5 types of interactional modifications: 1) Repetition; 2) confirmation check; 3) comprehension check; 4) clarification request; and 5) reformulation. While for the students' responses, it showed that the students gave correct responses, incorrect responses, and no response. However, the students admitted that interactional modification language can help them to comprehend material well. It shows that 85% of the students responded positively toward interactional modification used by the teacher. In addition, the interactional modification is being responded negatively by 15% of the students. Finally, the researcher concluded that the use of interactional modification language is needed to keep students-teacher interaction run well.

Keywords: *Interactional modification; student's comprehension; student's response*

INTRODUCTION

In the learning process, interaction between a teacher and students are a crucial matter. As Loewen & Sato (2018) said that interaction plays a crucial role to develop communication skill for learners. In line with Arguelles & Rosa (2016), the study stressed on the importance of teacher-student interaction in language learning and teaching in which the teacher directs and guides the students to have the best understanding through his/her clarifications. As a result, active interaction with their teacher in a modified input condition works better for participants in comprehending new

vocabulary words. Based on Amin (2015), interaction between teacher and students in the language classroom are bounded with each other. Both of them are dependent on each other. Karima, Suherdi, & Yusuf (2017) professed that classroom interaction as the main source of student's input ought to be comprehended in consideration of better language acquisitions. It means that what teacher said is very influential for student's comprehension. In relation to classroom interaction, teachers play important roles as language input providers and language models to be imitated by the students in teaching and learning classroom. It cannot be denied

that a teacher in teaching carries out some specific communicative acts, such as lecturing, asking and responding questions, explaining, and giving direction or instruction (Nurpahmi 2017).

Based on the researcher's experienced in the internship program at one of senior high school in Kuningan, most of the students still have difficulties to comprehend what the teacher said especially when they communicate in the learning process. They tend to not respond when teacher asked questions, because they think the teacher used complicated sentences. As Pinter (2017) said, when a breakdown or misunderstanding is judged by the speaker, they might simply ignore it and just carry on talking. Several factors were cited as a source of students' poor performance in English; these include a lack of appropriate teaching methods and techniques, a shortage of instructional resources, a shortage / lack of qualified English language teachers, a poor teaching and learning environment in the classrooms, and a limited home-supporting environment (United Republic of Tanzania, 2010; Komba, Kafanabo, Njabili, & Kira, 2012; Mosh 2014 as cited by Mhandeni & Mohamed (2016)). Therefore, appropriate method is needed.

The teacher should have many ways to make students comprehend what is taught. This can be achieved through methods, techniques, models, approach, and other ways customized with the material. When a teacher is wrong in choosing ways in the learning process, finally it will influence student's comprehension.

In teaching process, the teacher must not give equal treatment between young and adult learners. Different level students need different ways. Considering that English is a foreign language, especially for young learners, of course they will face difficulties in inputting comprehension when teachers uses the sentence that students assume as complicated difficult sentence in learning process. It means it does not rule out the possibility of communication breakdown. Thus, to make their students get input comprehensible, the teacher will use some strategies. Sundari (2017) stated that teachers as a key holder of classroom communication, play prominent roles to stimulate language production. One of strategy used by the teacher is interactional modification language. Al-Bargi & Al-Ghamdi (2017) supported those statement from their findings, they revealed that the EFL student comprehension was highest under the

interactional-modified condition and was lowest under the unmodified condition with linguistically-modified text in between. Linguistic modification has a positive impact on learners' comprehension of reading material, and that interactional modification has a stronger impact on facilitating learners' comprehension.

Furthermore, due to the reason above, the researcher investigated the types of interactional modification language that teacher used as one of the ways to make students comprehend the communication, and how the student's responses.

METHOD

The method that researcher used is qualitative approach. According to Rojabi (2020), qualitative research is a research that has elaborating characteristic, researchers are allowed to dig deeper information on research object without relying on numerical measurements. Meanwhile, Aspers (2019) defined that qualitative as an iterative process in which improved understanding to the scientific community is achieved by making new significant distinctions resulting from getting closer to the phenomenon studied

In this research, the researcher used descriptive qualitative design. As Prasetyo (2016) professed that descriptive qualitative research has aim to reveal events or facts, circumstances, phenomena, and variables that occurred during the research by presenting what actually happened. This study interprets and describes the data related to the current situation, attitudes and, views that occurred in a society, the conflict between two or more situations, the relationship between variables that arise, the differences between existing facts and their effect on a condition, and so on. The researcher uses descriptive qualitative method, because the research aims to explore the teacher strategy in the classroom using interactional modification language, where the result was displayed in the form of description. The results show us what types of interactional modification language that teacher used in speaking, listening activities, and how the students' responses. Thus, this method is appropriate with the research.

The main data of this research is obtained from observation, questionnaire, and interview at one of junior high schools in Kuningan, which is MTs PUI Cikaso. The observation is conducted to get the data about the types of interactional. Due to the pandemic

situation, there is a time reduction from 40 minutes into 20 minutes / 1-hour lesson. Another data gets from questionnaire and interview. The questionnaire is used to get data about the students' responses, and interview is used to support observation data related the types of interactional modification used by the teacher.

The data are qualitatively analyzed based on theory the types of interactional modification proposed by Pinter (2017). The steps are as follow: 1) Data collection, the researcher collects the data from observation by using the video recording to collect the teacher's and students' utterances. The phone as media for recording is placed at the back or in front of the class to get the clear visual of the teacher's movement in interacting with the students.

While the camera records the activity, the researcher takes notes related the activity in the class using classroom observation transcript. From observation, the researcher know the types of interactional modification used by the teacher and student responses. After conducted observation, the researcher shares the questionnaire and interview. Those data are changed from audio/video form into transcript. 2) Data reduction, after transcribe observation data, the researcher classifies the type of interactional modification language used by the teacher into a table, complete with its utterances. The utterances that researcher found during the observation, are summarized and put in the table 1. Meanwhile, for the students' responses that the researcher used can be seen in table 2.

Table 1. *Teacher's types of interactional modification language and student responses*
 (Elshadelin, & Mardijono 2017)

No	Types of Interactional Modification Language	Utterances	Students Responses			Notes
			C	I	NR	

Notes:

C: Correct Response

I: Incorrect Response

NR: No Response

Table 2. *The student's responses towards interactional modification*
 (Elshadelin, & Mardijono 2017)

SR	TIM					Reformulation
	Confirmation Check	Clarification Request	Comprehension Check		Repetition	
			DQ	RQ		
C						
I						
NR						

Notes:

TIM: Teacher's Interactional Modifications

SR: Students' Responses

DQ: Display Question

RQ: Referential Question

RSU: Repetition of Self Utterances

ROU: Repetition of Other Utterances

C: Correct responses

I: Incorrect responses

NR: No responses

The data show descriptively about how the students' response toward interactional modification, whether they are correct, incorrect, or no response for each types. 3) Data display, after all the data are obtained, the researcher presents the result in conversation form from each type of interactional modification used by the teacher and

students' responses. The researcher also counts the number of the use of interactional modification distribution. 4). The conclusion is delivered by the description that after the data of types of interactional modification language is classified based on Pinter's (2017) theory and also how the student's responses.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Based on the result from classroom observation, the teacher used these type of interactional modification; 1) repetition, 2) confirmation check, 3) comprehension check, and 4) clarification request, 5) reformulation.

Repetition

During observation, the researcher found some types in repetition that teacher used in learning process. There are repetition request, repetition of self-utterances, and repetition of other utterances. The explanation from those types is as follows:

Repetition request

The teacher asked to the students to repeat what she said, to make the students know how to pronounce the words or phrases correctly. The example is shown below:

T: “*Oke semuanya, ulangi apa yang miss katakan.*

Hi!” (ok all, repeat what I say. Hi!)

Ss: “Hi”

T: “Hi”

T: “Hello”

Ss: “Hello”

T: “How are you?”

Ss: “How are you?”

From the conversation above, the teacher asked the students to repeat what the teacher has been said, by saying “ok all, repeat what I say. Hi!”. The teacher wanted the students to pronounce the greetings.

Repetition of self-utterances

The teacher used this type of repetition in order to repair, retain, and clearance the information or what she has been said. Due to its reason, the students would comprehend more. The example is shown below:

T: “The point is asking how are you, but that so... formal. so formal. Very formal. Like that. But, if only from you to your friend “how do you do?” it cannot be used.”

From the conversation above, the teacher repeated what she said. She repeated her utterances by saying “but that so... formal. so formal. Very formal.” This aimed to emphasize the utterances, thus the students have a better understanding in the function of “how do you do?”.

Repetition of other utterances

The teacher used this type of repetition by repeating some words or paraphrase from the students in order to make sure what students said and their answer is

true. Also to develop the topic of conversation. The example is shown below:

T: “For instance you... meet someone for the first time, usually what do you say?”

S: “Greeting, hi hi”

S: “Introduce self”

S: “Shake hands”

T: “Alright, when you meet someone for the first time, usually you greet them...”

We can see from the conversation above, the teacher asked to the students while explaining the material, the teacher emphasized that student’s answer was already correct by repeating what students said.

Confirmation check

This type is used by the teacher to confirm that what teacher heard is correct. In this type, the teacher asked the students to repeat their previous utterances, because she could not hear the students’ utterances clearly due to the noises in classroom. Also, the teacher repeated the student’s previous utterances with rising intonation to make sure what she just heard. Auquilla, Camacho, & Urgilles (2019) stated that they entail repetition of all or part of the interlocutor’s preceding expression, and they can be answered by a simple positive or negative confirmation, such yes or no. The example is shown below:

T: “What time, Iksan?”

S: “9.00 until 12.00”

T: “9.00 until 12.00?”

S: “Yes”

In the conversation above, the teacher asked the students, but the teacher could not hear the students’ utterances, then the teacher ensured it by asking “9.00 until 12.00?”, then the student said “yes” to confirm that the teacher heard correctly.

Comprehension check

This type is used by the teacher to check whether the students understand the material. Also, to check the students’ knowledge related the material. In this research, the researcher found 2 types of comprehension check. According to William, Inscoe, & Tasker (2014), there are 2 types of comprehension check. The first is display question and the second is referential question. But, in this research, the teacher only used display question while learning process as the explanation that shown below:

Display question

Display question was used by the teacher when the teacher wanted to check the student's understanding, whether or not they have understood the material that has been explained. In this type, the teacher has already known the answer. The example as shown below:

T: "Lukman, if you meet me at 10.00 am, how did you greet?"

S: Good morning

The conversation above shows us that the teacher checked one of student's comprehension by asking to the students "Lukman, if you meet me at 10.00 am, how did you greet?", the students answered correctly by saying "good morning" and it show us that the student comprehended the material.

Clarification request

Abijo, Azeez, & Odinko (2020) said that clarification request is a classroom interaction pattern for expansion of input in detail for students learning. This entails asking for more clearly stated information. This type was used by the teacher when she wanted the students to explain some points further or to clarify/revise their previous utterances, due to the students' answer was not satisfied for her. Also, the teacher felt that the students' answer has not been correct yet. This type can help the student's aware their mistakes. Thus, the example of the clarification request is described below.

T: "When meet or when you go home?"

S: "Go home"

T: "When you meet or go home?"

S: "Go home"

T: "Hm? You sure?"

S: "Uh, right when we meet"

T: "When meet"

The conversation above shows us that the students answered incorrectly the question from the teacher. Then the teacher tried to reassure the students by saying "Hm? You sure?" to make them answered correctly. The student corrected her wrong answer and changed it to the correct answer after the teacher requested for clarifying to her.

Reformulation

The teacher used this type when explaining the material by generating information, building on what the student already knows, giving imagery related the material, and making links with the experiences of the students. The teacher modified

language by offering synonyms and alternatives, gave examples related daily lives. Reformulation was used by the teacher to make students easily comprehend what she just said. The example is shown below:

T: "Okay enough. Take a look here. In Indonesia, usually ... at 11 o'clock. It's already said afternoon well, usually. But actually, after midday it is noon. But before Dzuhur it is actually still early. But ... it's a habit for us, usually at 11 o'clock it is bright, if at 11 o'clock it looks bright, usually it is like being called the..."

SS: "ternoon."

From the conversation above, we can see that the teacher reformulated her sentence when explaining the material. The teacher explained the time of "afternoon" from what time to what time. In order to make the students understand the situation, the teacher gave an example of the situation in Indonesia to describe "afternoon".

Besides that, the teacher reformulated the sentence with another way. While telling the story, the teacher reformulated the sentences with offering synonyms and antonyms, made links with the students' experiences, built on what the students already know and used some body gestures. The example is shown below:

Conversation 1

T: "OK good. Near the hole, there is a shovel (generates information). Shovel mean is *sekop*. He had dug up (gesture dug like hold a shovel), *apa ini? Sedang apa?*"

Ss: "*Menggali*"

Conversation 2

T: "OK... have you ever dig the gold? (make links with the experiences of the students) *Kalian pernah mengubur emas? Hebat yah emas saja saking banyak nya sampe di kubur*. OK continue... He had dug up (dig gesture like hold a shovel) a hole... and used to bury the gold.... Look, where is he burry the gold? (build on what the students already know) *Dimana sih dia mengubur emas nya itu*"

Ss: "*bawah pohon*"

T: "Under the tree... near the tree... in is garden (generates information). Tree, *pohon*. *Kalau banyak pohon biasanya dimana?*"

The use of interactional modification can help the students to comprehend the material. As cited by Munandar (2019), Vivian indicated the

conversational frame such as “we have been talking about”, “now... I will talk about...”, “well...”, “now let’s”, and “so”. These utterances were aimed at emphasizing and giving the points to the learners of what they had learnt and what they would learn in the classroom. As well, they provided explicit

cohesive clues allowing the students to follow the teacher’s speech easily.

Meanwhile, for the response, the students gave 3 responses. The correct, incorrect, and no responses. The table and explanation are as follow:

Table 3. *The student’s responses towards interactional modification (Elshadelin & Mardijono, 2017)*

SR	TIM						
	Confirmation Check	Clarification Request	Comprehension Check		Repetition		Reformulation
			DQ	RQ	Repetition Request	RSU	
C		✓			-		-
I		✓				-	-
NR	-	-			-		-

The students’ correct responses

This is where the students answered correctly as the teacher expectation. The explanation is as described below:

T: “*Apa tadi bilang apa? How are you jawab nya apa? I am...*”

S: “Fine, and you”

T: “I’m fine, and you?”

The conversation above shows us that the teacher tried to confirm it to the students. The teacher could not hear the student’s utterances, and asked “*apa tadi bilang apa? (what did you say?) How are you jawabnya apa (how do you answer “how are you”)? I am...*” to get the answer. And the students answered correctly by saying “fine, and you?”.

The students’ incorrect responses

This is where the students answered the question not in line with the teacher expectation. The explanation is described below:

T: “What about “*tas kamu*?””

S: “Bag you”

T: “Bag you? Same as “bag I””

S: “Bag ...”

Conversation above show us that teacher wanted to confirm to the students’ utterances. First, the teacher asked to the students what is “*tas kamu*” in English, but the students answered incorrectly. Then, teacher tried to confirm to the students by saying “bag you? Same as bag I”, the student could not answer correctly when teacher tried to confirm to him by saying “bag...”

The students’ no responses

This is where the students had no responses when the teacher asked questions. The explanation is described below:

T: “Abi, come on bi, how do you spelling your name?”

Ss: “.....”

T: “You spell your name? how? Spell your name!”

In conversation above, the teacher asked to the student to spell his name, but the student did not give respond or stayed silent.

Below is a table of the number of occurrence of each type of interaction modification used by the teacher.

Table 4. *Interactional modification occurrence*

Types of interactional modification	Number of Occurrences	Percentage
Confirmation check	5	1,81 %
Clarification request	24	8,66 %
Comprehension check	147	53,07%
Repetition of self-utterances	3	1,08 %
Repetition of other utterances	60	21,66 %
Repetition request	25	9,03 %
Reformulation	13	4,69 %
Total	277	100%

CONCLUSION

The research concludes that in order to improve student's comprehension the teacher need to use interactional modification. The teacher used 5 types of interactional modification. The first is repetition that can help the students to comprehend what teacher said. The second one is confirmation check. This type was used by the teacher to confirm what teacher heard is correct. The third is comprehension check, to check student's comprehension towards the material. The fourth is clarification request that can help the students aware their mistakes. The last type is reformulation to make students easily comprehend teacher's explanation.

It is also in line with student's responses. There are 3 responses in this research. The first is correct responses. The students give correct responses to all types used by the teacher, there are confirmation check, clarification request, repetition, comprehension check, and reformulation. The students' correct answer means that they understand teacher's question and also the material. On the other hand, the students give incorrect answer toward confirmation check, clarification request, and comprehension check. This means that students cannot answer question from the teacher correctly or the student's answer is not in line with the teacher's expectation. The last, students give no response toward comprehension check and repetition. This is where the students have no responses when the teacher ask questions.

In conclusion, the use of interactional modification language can make the students comprehend better the material, as we know that each type has its respective functions which aim to make it easier for students to comprehend the material.

REFERENCES

- Abijo, J. A., Azeez, F. A., Odinko, M. N. (2020). Input modification in the teaching of English language among federal university lecturers in South-West, Nigeria. *International Journal of Scientific Research in Education*. 13(2), 259-270.
- Al-Bargi, A., & Al-Ghamdi, H. (2017). The impact of teacher speech modification on the quality of interaction and learning: an analysis of spoken discourse in Saudi EFL classrooms. *International Journal of Linguistics*. 9(3).
- Amin, A. R. (2015). Patterns of teacher – students' interaction: A case study of classroom interaction in eleventh grade of senior high school in Cimahi. *Journal of English and Education*, 3(1), 14-29.
- Arguelles, D. C., & Rosa, J. P. O. (2016). Do modification and interaction work? – a critical review literature on the role of foreigner talk in second language acquisition. *I-Manager's Journal On English Language Teaching*. 6(3).
- Aspers, P. (2019). *What is qualitative in qualitative research*. *Qualitative Sociology*. 42, 139–160.
- Auquilla, D. P. O., Camacho, C. S.H., & Urgiles, G. E. H. (2019). The facilitative role of the interaction hypothesis: using interactional modification techniques in the English communicative classroom. *Pol. Con.* (Ed. 31), 4(3), 03-23.
- Elshadelin, G., & Mardijono, J. J. (2017). Teacher's interactional modifications and the students' responses in intermediate English classroom. *Journal of Language, Literature, And Teaching*. 5(1).
- Karima, N., Suherdi, D., & Yusuf, F. N. (2017). Interactional modifications for comprehensible input: A case study of two EFL teachers. *Journal of English and Education*. 5(2), 170 – 178.
- Komba., Sotco., Kafanabo., Njabili., & Kira. (2012). Comparison between students' academic performance and their abilities in written english language skills: A Tanzanian perspective. *In international Journal of Development and Sustainability* 1, 305-325. (www.isdsnet.com/ijds.: 29.04.2016).
- Loewen, S., & Sato, M. (2018). Interaction and instructed second language acquisition. *Lang Teach*, 51(3), 285-329.
- Mhandeni, A. S., Mohamed, H. (2016). The role of input simplification and interactional modification strategies in the Tanzanian English-language classroom. *Journal of Linguistics and Language Teaching*, 7(1).
- Munandar, I. (2019). The realization of morphosyntax, pragmatics, phonology in Vivian's context of English language teaching. *Jurnal As-Salam*, 3(2).
- Nurpahmi, S. (2017). Teacher talk in classroom interaction. *ETERNAL English, Teaching, Learning, and Research Journal*, 3(1), 34-43.
- Pinter, A. (2017). *Teaching Young Language Learners* (2nd ed.). United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Prasetyo, A. (2016). Pengertian penelitian deskriptif kualitatif. Retrieved from <https://www.linguistikid.com/2016/09/pengertian-penelitian-deskriptif-kualitatif.html>
- Rojabi, A. (2019). *Penelitian kualitatif (research methodology)*. Retrieved from <https://medium.com/@afdanrojabipenelitian-kualitatif-research-methodology-4bfaa9ad2912>

Elin Marlina, Dadang Solihat, & Nida Amalia Asikin

Interactional modification language used by the teacher in English classroom in MTS PUI Cikaso

- Sundari, H. (2017). Classroom interaction in teaching English as foreign language at lower secondary school in Indonesia. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies* 8(6), 147-154.
- William, J. Incoe, R. & Tasker, T. (2014). Communication strategies in an interactional context: the mutual achievement of comprehension. In *Communication Strategies: Psycholinguistic and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. (pp 304-322). New York: Routledge.