A CONVERSATION ANALYSIS OF CLASSROOM INTERACTION IN AN EYL CLASS BY USING UNO CARD

Ayu Tri Nurjanah

(ayutri.nurjanah10@gmail.com)

English Education FKIP Galuh University Indonesia

Etika Rchmawati

(etika.rachmawati@gmail.com)

English Education FKIP Galuh University Indonesia

Abstract

This article aims to determine the principles of conversation analysis contained in conversations between teacher and EYL students during class interactions in an EYL class using UNO cards and to find out how teachers apply the principles of conversation in an EYL class. This research uses descriptive qualitative in the form of conversation analysis. The participants involved in this study were one teacher and four EYL students with the research being conducted in one of the courses in Banjar. Research data were collected using two instruments, namely observation (non-participants observation) and interviews (semi-structured). The research findings were analyzed based on 4 machines of interactional structure practice, namely; (1) turn-taking, (2) sequence organization, (3) turn design, and

(4) repair, show that the teacher dominates the conversation during classroom interactions. This makes the teacher the *first pair part* (FPP) followed by young learners as a *second pair part* (SPP). The results of the interview revealed that teachers must know every psychology that young learners have in order to know the condition of each student so that students' focus does not leave learning. It is also intended that teachers are able to provide appropriate stimuli and methods for young learners. The researcher concludes that the analyzed conversations between teachers and EYL students are in line with the basic principles of

conversation analysis. For further researchers, it is hoped that they will be able to explore more broadly the analysis of conversations that occur in-class interactions.

Keywords: *Conversation Analysis, Classroom Interaction, EYL*

INTRODUCTION

Many years ago, the people of Indonesia, especially teachers in elementary schools were shocked by the elimination of English subjects. This has caused mixed reactions from all levels of Indonesian society. In fact, the introduction of English from an early age helps children's language development to be more familiar with English. The more the child knows English, the easier it will be for the child to learn English at a higher level. However, in the world of education, this does not need to be a problem. It is necessary to take the positive side that learning English from an early age can be done anywhere as needed. Therefore, Oktaviani and Fauzan (2017) argue that over the years, the public is massively interested in English for Young Learners. This is proved by the growing number of non-formal educational institutions in districts and cities across the countries that bid English classes at the primary school level.

In addition, the selection of materials and the learning process must be able to improve the language aspects of the child, and the classroom atmosphere must be adjusted to create a pleasant and comfortable classroom atmosphere. The most important part in the teaching and learning procedure in class is classroom interaction. Interaction in class is a very important achievement in the teaching and learning procedure. According to Sundari (2017), class interaction involves teachers and students as interactions in using the target language. In the classroom, the communication that occurs is mostly carried out and maintained by the teacher.

One of the methodologies to determine the value of conversation in communication is through conversation analysis. As stated by Hutchby (2019) dialog study is an approach to social research that investigates the serial organization of talk as a method of retrieving participants' thoughtful of, and cooperative means of organizing, ordinary methods of social interaction. Conversation analysis is especially useful for experiential research on communication in naturalistic situations where established theories may be lacking or under revision. This is due to the conversation analysis looking for detailed qualitative evidence of how participants work to establish their interactions endogenously within each detailed situation.

The use of games to attract children's attention in learning English is something that must be considered by the teacher. Because teaching English to young learners are not easy. Teachers should find and use interesting, effective, and appropriate games to teach English in the classroom. One of the interesting games to use is the UNO card. According to Sari and Lutfi (2015), UNO is a card game played with specially printed cards. The four-colored card game seems simple but full of tactics and strategies to achieve victory. Strategy and cooperation are also needed when done in pairs. This interesting game is in great demand by all ages, especially young learners.

Many previous studies (Sari & Lutfy, 2015; Sundari, 2017; Kuswandi & Apsari, 2019) carried out the research on the related topic. However, in this study, the researcher focus on the conversation in the interface between teacher and EYL students in the classroom by using a game, namely UNO card. The things that will be investigated are the principles contained in the conversations that occur in the interaction class between teacher and young learners using UNO cards and how the teacher applies the principles of conversation in an EYL class. Therefore, the researcher choose the topic of A Conversation Analysis of Classroom Interaction in an EYL Class by Using Uno Card (A Descriptive Qualitative Study Conducted in One of the EYL Courses in Banjar).

METHOD

This study uses a descriptive qualitative in the form of conversation analysis. The terms qualitative research and descriptive research are sometimes used interchangeably. However, there are differences between the two. One of the fundamental features of both types of research is that it involves naturalistic data. That is, they seek to learn language learning and teaching in a natural manner without intervention or variable manipulation (Nassaji, 2015). A purposive sampling technique was selected in this study to determine the participants. In line with this, Creswell (2014, p. 228) reveals that in purposive sampling, researchers deliberately choose persons and sites to study or understand central phenomena. The participant of this research is a teacher who teaches English for Young Learners and four students of English for Young Learners at one of the courses in Banjar. The researcher chose participants in this study because they had criteria that were suitable for the needs of this study. Furthermore, EYL teachers and students in one of the courses in Banjar were selected as the research location due to several decisions. First, during this pandemic, schools and other places of learning were implemented online. However, in some places, especially where courses have begun to implement direct (face-to-face) learning in accordance with applicable health protocols. In addition, the selected research location also uses games to carry out teaching and learning activities. So that according to the researcher, this is in accordance with the research objectives. The data of the study was collected through the two following instruments, observation (non-participant observation) and interview (semi-structured). As stated by Creswell (2014, p. 236), observation is the procedure of assembling open-ended, first-hand information by observing people and places at a research site. Meanwhile, interview, Seidman (2006, p. 10) stated that providing access to the context of people's behavior thus provides a way for researchers to understand what behavior is. In this study, the researcher makes observations of teachers and students through interactions that occur in the classroom during learning. The observation guide is based on the principles of conversation analysis cited by Hoey & Kendrick (2016). The researcher also conducted interviews with teachers to determine the application of the principles in conversation to EYL in the teaching and learning process in the classroom.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In conversational analysis, speech is seen as a form of vehicle for action. Participants speak not because of their proportional content or as a medium for simple information transference, nevertheless since they care about the actions taken through the conversation (e.g., asking, requesting, noticing, etc.) and the real-life of those actions. Moreover, speech is examined not as isolated speech, but as conversation-in-interaction, and an activity that takes place in real settings between real people (Hoey & Kendrick, 2016 p. 3). In this case, the actions in the interaction are always placed contextually, they are produced by one person, for another, at a certain period, in a particular way. This approach to language and social communication over the past half-century has produced sophisticated descriptive tools for analyzing interactional constructions. Practical machines used for conversation include turn-taking, sequence organization, turn design, and repair.

a. Turn-taking

Table 1 Conversation between teacher and young learners

No	Conversation	Turn-taking and pausing
1	**Teacher**: Hey all, are you ready? **Student**: **Mmm… (3 second)** **Teacher**: Are you ready for say English? **Student**: Ready. **Teacher**: Ok, good afternoon, everybody. **Student**: Good afternoon, Miss.	Turn-taking and pause
2	**Teacher**: How are you today? **Student**: We are fine, thank you, and you? **Teacher**: I'm very well, thank you. *Silahkan berdoa bersama-sama.* **Student**: Before we study, let's pray together. Pray to begin. Finish. **Teacher**: If I call your name, you must answer 'present' or 'here', okay? *Jika Miss manggil nama kalian, kalian harus jawab* 'present' *atau* 'here' *ya.* **Student**: Yes, miss.	Turn-taking

3	**Teacher**: Arka. **Arka**: Here, Miss. **Teacher**: Naura. **Naura**: *Hadir---* **(2 seconds)** eh here, Miss. **Teacher**: Qeanu. **Qeanu**: Present, Miss. **Teacher**: Shahab. **Shahab**: Here, Miss. **Teacher**: Alright, *semuanya hadir ya*. **Student**: *Hadir*, Miss.	Turn-taking and pausing
4	**Teacher**: What you have learned about last Monday?*Pelajaran apa yang dibahas pada minggu kemarin?* **Student**: **Mmm… (3 second)** part of body. **Teacher**: *Jadi…* **(2 second)** *jawabnya gimana?* Students: We have learned about the part of the body. **Teacher**: Good that all of you still remember. **Canwe sing the song about the part of the body now?--- (3seconds) Are you still remember?--- (3 second)** *Kita nyanyi dulu* the part of body *ya*. **Student**: Yes, Miss.	Turn-taking and to pause

Based on the data shown in Table 1, the teacher's turn to speak is dominated. The data shows that there were 27 changes in conversation. The teacher has 14 turns, and the young learners 13 times. In TRP, participants apply the turn distribution technique (other choices / own choice) in a well-ordered manner (other choices by the current speaker, self-selection by others, self-selection by the current speaker) (Hoey & Kendrick, 2016 p. 3). Thus, people commonly are silent immediately; they signify that theyare completed with using a certain phrase.

b. Sequence organization

Teacher: *Sekarang, kita akan beralih ke kursi panas. Apa itu* hot chair? Students: *Kursi panas.*

Teacher: Good job. *Di sesi kursi panas ini,* Miss a*kan membagi siswa menjadi dua kelompok yang terdiri dari dua anggota. Ayo sekarang hompimpa dulu.*

Naura: *Sekarang* Miss *hompimpa nya?*

Teacher: *Iya dong sekarang. Sok hompimpa dulu.*

Students: *Hompimpa alaium gambreng.*

Teacher: *Nah udah langsung jadi kelompoknya*. Naura *sama* Qeanu, Arka *sama* Shahab. *Sekarang* Miss *akan menulis kelompok untuk hasil perolehan point di papan tulis. Silahkan satu orang dari masing-masing kelompokuntuk duduk di kursi panas. Dan permainan akan dibagi menjadi dua sesi. Setiap perwakilan kelompok di tiap sesi harus menjawab pertanyaan sebanyak-banyaknya untuk mendapatkan point yang banyak. Nanti setelah sesi pertama berakhir, dilanjutkan dengan sesi kedua tapi dengan orang yang berbeda. Jadi setiap orang dapat kesempatan yang sama.*

Do youunderstand? *Apakah kalian mengerti?*
Students: *Iya* Miss *mengerti.*

(Excerpt from observation April 7ᵗʰ 2021)

From the excerpt above, it can be seen that the order organization was driven by the teacher. The data shows that the teacher becomes the *first pair part* (FPP) in conversational interactions that occur in class. Young learners play a role as a *second pair part* (SPP) which is shown by the production of stimulus provided by the teacher. Stivers (2017) which is quoted from Sacks (1992) and Schegloff (1968, 2007) stated that the concept of a pair of closeness begins with the 'next' observation and as a consequence, each speech has a spontaneous connection with what came before it, and with the coming ones. The idea of being further crystallized as a pair of closeness - the idea that by certain actions the social actor imposes a normative obligation on his interacting partner to respond accordingly at the first possible opportunity.

Table 2 and Table 3 show the sections for the first and second contiguousness pairs. In conversation, we usually know that (i) two parts are put close together; (ii) the items in the left column were pronounced by a diverse speaker than the things in the right column; (iii) items in the left column lead items on the right; (iv) each row embodies a pair; and (v) items from different lines are not formed as components of one pair.

The adjacency pairs are the basic sequence possible, but must not be expanded in any number of conducts. Some kinds of actions are by convention a two-part sequence like call, invitation, and request-sequence.

c. Turn design

The primary hypothesis in conversation analysis is that participants practice speech and other behaviors to yield familiar actions, often using a specific grammar format as a resource for doing so (Hoey & Kendrick, 2016 p. 3). Thus, the researcher adjusted the turn design with conversations between teachers and young learners with three indicators, namely opening sequences, closing sequences, and conversational routines.

a) Opening sequences

People normally start in conservative ways: greetings, common questions or comments about the climate, music, etc. The following is an excerpt from the conversation opening sequences in classroom interactions between teachers and young learners:

Teacher: Ok, good afternoon, everybody.Student: Good afternoon, Miss.
Teacher: How are you today?
Student: We are fine, thank you, and you?Teacher: I'm very well, thank you.

(Excerpt from observation 7ᵗʰ April 2021)

Table 2 Adjacency pairs

First-pair part action	*Second-pair part* action
Summons	Answer
Invitation	Acceptance/declination
Request for action	Granting/denial
Request for information	Informative answer

The adjacency pairs are the basic sequence possible, but must not be expanded in any number of conducts. Some kinds of actions are by convention a two-part sequence like call, invitation, and request-sequence.

Table 3 Adjacency pairs in conversation

No	*First-pair part* action	*Second-pair part* action
1	Summons: **Teacher**: **Are you ready?** *Jawabnyapake bahasa inggris dong.* **Are you ready?**	Answer: **Students**: **Ready**
2	Invitation: **Teacher**: *Oke sekarang kita mulai permainannya, dan untuk pemain pertama* **silahkan duduk di kursi panas yang sudah** **Miss** *siapkan.*	Acceptance/declination: **Students**: *Iya*, Miss.
3	Request for action: **Teacher**: Good job. *Di sesi kursi panas ini,* Miss *akan membagi siswa menjadi dua kelompok yang terdiri dari dua anggota.* **Ayo sekarang hompimpa dulu.**	Granting/denial: **Naura**: *Sekarang Miss hompimpa nya?* **Students**: *Hompimpa alaium gambreng.*

Teacher: *Iya   dong sekarang.   Sok   hompimpa dulu.*

4	Request for information:	Informative answer:
	Teacher: *Sebelum kita mulai* *permainannya,* **warna apa aja ini?** <u>**What the colour is?**</u>	**Students**: **Green, blue, yellow, and red.**

b) Concluding sequences

People conservatively prepare to complete a conversation by concluding, using other locutions (Okay, all right then; well, that's about it; so umh; fine, then;) shadowed by some recurrences of farewells: okay, goodbye then; okay bye; nice talking' to you; see ya soon; thanks for calling/dropping by; good to see you! Take care! Alright. The following is an excerpt from the conversation closing sequences in-class interactions between teachers and young learners:

Teacher: Ok, it's enough for today. See you next week. Bye-bye.Student: Bye, Miss.

(*Excerpt from observation 7ᵗʰ April 2021*)

c) Conversational routines

Openings and closure are more stylized than are other parts of the dialog, but there may be some other conservative things. In classroom interactions between teachers and young learners, another conventional thing that is routinely done is praying before starting learning and after the lesson ends:
Conversation routines between teacher and young learners before starting the study.

Teacher: *Silahkan berdoa bersama-sama.*
Student: Before we study, let's pray together. Pray to begin. Finish.(*Excerpt from observation 7ᵗʰ April 2021*)
Conversation routines between teachers and young learners after leaningsend.

Teacher and student: Before we go home, let's pray together. Pray to begin.Student: Finish.

(*Excerpt from observation 7th April 2021*)

 d. Repair
Conversation 1 Teacher: Naura.

Naura: *Hadir---* (3 seconds) eh here, Miss. (*Excerpt from observation 7th April 2021*)
Conversation 2
Teacher: *Ok sok beresin dulu kelasnya beresin dulu.* Sit down on your chair everybody. *Sok semuanya berdoa dulu.*
Student: Before we study.
Teacher: *Eh mau study lagi? Kok* before we study.Student: Eh lupa Miss.
Teacher and student: Before we go home, let's pray together. Pray to begin.Student: Finish.
(*Excerpt from observation 7th April 2021*)

If people don't talk about their intention or must edit a former statement, mispronounce themselves, or say about backward thing, they must fix the utterance, i.e., they make repairs.

From the observation results, it was found that conversations that were qualified into the conversation analysis practice machine included turn-taking, sequence organization, turn design, and repair. From the data findings that have been presented, the teacher acts as a conversation controller in the teaching and learning process in the classroom. Where the teacher does the *first pair part* (FPP) and the young learners as the *second pair part* (SPP). According to Hoey & Kendrick (2016) quoted to Schegloff (2007) that order organization refers to how successive turns are connected to establish comprehensible actions. Adjacency pairs are the foundation of this organization; two rounds/actions are produced by diverse participants in which the *first pair part* (FPP) is followed in the next position by the *second pair part* (SPP) match-type, that if not produced will 'feel absent'. Certain types of turns have specific follow-ups: questions are usually followed by a response; invitation with acceptance or an explanation of why it is not acceptable; the evaluation is followed by agreement or disagreement; apology followed by the acknowledgment of apology. The property that unites FPP and SPP is called *conditional relevance* because the importance of the second action counts on the construction of the first action.

Numerous contiguousness pairs can be chained to form a complex sequence of actions by means of a sequence extension process. So the teacher is more active in conversation in class compared to young learners. The results of interviews with the teacher found that there was regularity in the conversation in the interaction, the contribution to the interaction took the form of context and context updating, and the analysis carried out by the teacher was bottom-up and data-driven. This explains that the conversations that occur in the classroom between teachers and young learners are in accordance with the principles contained in conversation analysis according to Sert, Olcay & Seedhouse (2011).

In the conversation analysis using the interactional structure practicemachine, the researcher summarizes the conversation and divides it into four structures.

a. Turn-taking

Turn-taking has one indicator, namely turn-taking and pausing. This technique analyzes the alternations and pauses in conversations encounteredbetween teachers and young learners during the learning process. A pause is a period of silence during which the speaker engages in a dialog. This time always takes 2.5 to 3

seconds (Kuswandi & Apsari, 2019 p. 283). The pause was dominated by the teacher because it was done to wait for a response from the young learners.

b. Sequence organization

The indicators in the sequence organization are adjacency pairs. The sequence organization is driven by the teacher, so the teacher becomes the *first pair part* (FPP) in the conversational interactions that occur in the classroom. Young learners act as a *second pair part* (SPP) which is indicated by the production of stimulus provided by the teacher. Therefore, the teacher's conversation with young learners becomes a close pair because the two are much related.

c. Turn design

Turn design is divided into three indicators, namely; opening sequences, closing sequences, and conversational routines. The turn design builds a conversation that is designed as a sequence of actions that can be accepted by the other person and carried out routinely. In the classroom, it was found that the design of the turns which included the opening sequences were located at the opening when they were going to carry out the teaching and learning process. Closing sequences are found at the close of teaching and learning in the classroom. Conversational routines that occur in class are found in routine activities of praying before and after learning.

d. Repair

The corrective practices found in the conversations between teachers and young learners tend to be few. When students make mistakes in speaking, students will correct them themselves. This represents that the speaker can initiate a repair procedure and/or come up with a repair solution.

CONCLUSIONS

The result of the observation about conversation analysis between teacher and young learners of classroom interaction in an EYL class using UNO card indicates that the conversations that occur in classroom interactions between teacher and young learners are dominated by the teacher. This makes the teacher become the *first pair part* (FPP) followed by young learners as the *second pair part* (SPP). Conversations that occur in class interactions after being analyzed are in accordance with the basic principles of conversation analysis.

As a controller in conversation, the teacher applies repetition techniques in conversation to clarify the material given to young learners. From the results of interviews with the teacher, the teacher is required to understand every psychology of each young learner to know each student's situation. This is so that students focus on the teacher so that the teacher can provide material well in the teaching and learning process. An understanding of psychology is also needed to provide the right approach and stimulus for young learners. This is a challenge that must be faced by teachers in dealing with young learners.

REFERENCES

Creswell, J. W. (2014). Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research. In *Educational Research* (Vol. 4).

Hoey, M. E., & Kendrick, H. K. (2016). Conversation Analysis. *The Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, 120–134.https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203809068-16 https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.alls.v.8n.6p.147 https://drive.google.com/file/d/1d5ZzlgJuCrwAyLpdBeK5dhKMZTpE2HNb/view

Hutchby, I. (2019). Conversation analysis. *AGE Research Methods Foundations*, *ISBN:9781*(October), 185–194. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781526421036

Kuswandi, M., & Apsari, Y. (2019). An Analysis of Pauses, Overlaps and Backchannels in Conversation in Vlog By Nessie Judge. *PROJECT (Professional Journal of English Education)*, *2*(3), 282. https://doi.org/10.22460/project.v2i3.p282-291

Nassaji, H. (2015). Qualitative and descriptive research: Data type versus data analysis. *Language Teaching Research*, *19*(2), 129–132. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168815572747

Oktaviani, A., & Fauzan, A. (2017). Teachers Perceptions about the Importance of English for Young Learners. *Linguistic, English Education and Art (LEEA) Journal*, *1*(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.31539/leea.v1i1.25

Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation. Volume 1 & 2*. Australia: Blackwell Publishing.

Sari, R. R., & Lutfi, A. (2015). Kelayakan Permainan Uno Card Sebagai Media Pembelajaran Pada Materi Pokok Struktur Atom. *UNESA Journal of Chemical Education*, *4*(2), 186–194.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis.* Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511791208

Seidman, I. (2006). Review of Interviewing as Qualitative Research: A Guide for Researchers in Education and the Social Sciences. In *Contemporary Psychology: A Journal of Reviews* (Vol. 37, Issue 7). https://doi.org/10.1037/032390

Sert, Olcay & Seedhouse, P. (2011). *Introduction: Conversation analysis in applied linguistics Olcay Sert * & Paul Seedhouse **. 5*(1), 1–14.

Stivers, T. (2017). *Sequence Organization. August 2012*. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118325001.ch10

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),147.