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Abstract
This study was descriptive qualitative study concerning with Teacher Talk. The objectives of this study were to identify the categories of Teacher Talk found in English teaching and learning process and to identify the dominant category of Teacher Talk found in English teaching and learning process. The data used in this study were the transcripts of teaching and learning process in English classroom. The technique of collecting data in his study was observation. There were four steps in analyzing data namely rereading, coding, tabulating and drawing conclusion. The data were analyzed by using Foreign Language Interaction (FLINT) theory proposed by (Moskowitz, 1976). The results of the study showed that there were only 9 categories from 11 categories of Teacher Talk found in English teaching and learning process, these being: category 2 (praising or encouraging), 2a (making joke), 3 (using idea of the student), 3a (repeating student response verbatim), 4 (asking question), 5 (giving information), 5a (correcting without rejection), 6 (giving directions) and 7 (criticizing student's behavior). Nevertheless, there were also some utterances that cannot be classified into FLINT theory, these being: asalamualaikum, good morning, and good afternoon. The dominant category of Teacher Talk found in English teaching and learning process were asking question (category 4) and giving information (category 5). In this study, both male teachers articulated category 4 more than other categories. On the other hand, the female teacher tended to use category 5 (giving information).

Key words: Teacher Talk, FLINT theory, category of Teacher Talk

1. Introduction
Language is very important to interact and communicate with others. By using language, people will understand what we talk about. Eggins (1994: 3) states that people use language to communicate or interact with others by looking at real examples of language in use. It means that to be able to communicate or negotiate meanings, one should enthusiastically take part in the communication event or interaction in naturally social context. As a second language, English has been an important language to study and concern about. It has been taught at every level of education in Indonesia as the first foreign language (Ramelan, 1994). In teaching and learning process, the languages
used by the teacher is very important to achieve student’s acquisition and comprehension. In this case, Teacher Talk becomes a part of crucial element in English teaching and learning processes.

Allwright and Bailey claim that “talk is one of the major ways that teachers convey information to learners, and it is also one of the primary means of controlling learner behavior” (1991, p. 139). Teacher Talk is an essential part of language teaching in an EFL (English as a Foreign Language) context which can convey about noteworthy instructional benefits for teachers when applied precisely and learning opportunities for language learners when noticed purposefully.

The significant of Teacher Talk, has been seriously investigated in this study. Rod Ellis (1985) claims that Teacher Talk is the special language that teachers use when addressing L2 learners in the classroom. Moreover, the students obtain more language input from teacher talk. Teacher talk can offer useful and applicable language practice which gives benefit to the learner. Both teacher and learner used their talk to interact with one another. It cannot be denied that Teacher Talk and the attitudes when interacting with the learner can influence student outcomes.

Teacher Talk cannot be separated from the process of teaching and learning. That is way, it is important to conduct a study in the school where the process of teaching and learning take place. This study chose vocational school that is SMK Batik 1 Surakarta as the object of the study. This study was conducted in vocational school due to several reasons. The first reason is the vocational school prepares the students to be ready to compete in the world of work so the implementation of English to support their skills is very important. Secondly, vocational school gives a major contribution to society due to supplying the needs of skilled human sources. The last reason is English in vocational school is different from Senior High School. It is formed as specific purpose which is linked to the needs of their future employment.

The focus of the recent study is “Teacher Talk in English Teaching and Learning Process at SMK Batik 1 Surakarta.” Based on that focus, the study was aimed at describing categories and the dominant category of Teacher Talk found in English teaching and learning process in the classroom interaction.

To know the categories of Teacher Talk articulated by the teachers, this study applied the theory from Moskowitz (1997) namely Foreign Language Interaction (FLINT). This theory divided Teacher Talk into 11 categories namely: 1 (dealing with feelings), 2 (praising or encouraging), 2a (making jokes), 3 (using idea of the student), 3a (repeating student response verbatim), 4 (asking question), 5 (giving information), 5a (correcting without rejection), 6 (giving directions), 7 (criticizing student behavior) and 7a (criticizing student response).

There were some previous researches related to this study. The first previous study was conducted by Nafrina (2007). The type of the study was a descriptive qualitative study. The objectives of the study were to describe the interaction between the teacher and learners while they are in the classroom and to identify Indonesian or English language used most by the teacher and students in the classroom interaction. The data in this study were the interaction between the teacher and the learners in the classroom. The researcher analyzed the observed data by using Flanders’ Interaction Analysis System suggested by Allwright and Bailey (1991:10). The result of this study showed that the teacher was more active (or the superior) in this interaction. Meanwhile, the learner was less active than the teacher (or the inferior). The language used in the classroom interaction was mostly in English. Indonesian was sometimes used to translate or explain difficult words.

The second previous study was conducted by Shim (2007). The data in this research were to identify the patterns of Teacher Talk in eliciting, questions, and giving feedback to students during the class. The data were collected from the middle school classrooms in Seoul. The classroom interactions between teacher and students in the two classrooms were recorded on cassette recording tapes without any visual supports. The results showed that teacher utterances are quite dominant in every pattern of tasks during the class, while student responses or other attributes are relatively low in volume in a teacher-focused classroom. The analysis also showed that elicitation, response, and feedback were used systematically by teacher, and students were part of the structure of classroom discourse activities. The pattern, however, can be changed depending on the teacher intention or the periods of lesson that students learn.
The third previous study was written by Nurhasanah (2012). The study aimed at describing types of Teacher Talk and learner talk occur in classroom interaction and finding the advantages and disadvantages of Teacher Talk and learner talk. This research was descriptive qualitative design. The data were obtained through video recorded and interview. The data were analyzed by applying Flander's Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC) focusing on types of Teacher Talk and learner talk. Findings were descriptive analyses with transcribing, coding, and analyzing. The results showed types of Teacher Talk most frequently used were asking question and lecturing. In terms of learner talk, learner talk response and initiation were revealed in this research. According to the results, it can be concluded that Teacher Talk and learners talk categories were important part in classroom interaction and there were found more advantages rather than the disadvantages. The advantages included: 1) giving praises to the learners can motivate them to be more active in classroom interaction; 2) more active learners was motivated the teacher in improving capability in organizing and managing the learners; 3) teachers figuring out the whole description of teaching and learning process. The disadvantage was the learner seldom asking question to the teacher.

The relationship between the present study with the previous studies was that both of the current and the previous studies explore about Teacher Talk. However, the current study has different focus concerning with the object being observed. The previous studies discussed the interaction between teacher and student while they are in the classroom. There is also a researcher who studied the types of Teacher Talk and learner talk and the advantages of Teacher Talk and learner talk. The current study focused on the types of Teacher Talk and finding out the dominant types of Teacher Talk articulated by the teachers.

This study was aimed at describing the category and the dominant category of Teacher Talk found in English teaching and learning process. By conducting this study, it is hoped that the results of this study can convey several advantages: (1) it can give description to the teacher and student about how they are expected in teaching and learning process, (2) it can be used as reference to increase student’s interest in learning English, (3) it can be one of references for other researchers who intend to analyze Teacher Talk in English teaching and learning process.

2. Research Method

This type of research is the descriptive qualitative research because this study described the data by referring the teacher’s utterance and without counting them statistically.

The object of the study in this research was Teacher Talk in English teaching and learning process at SMK Batik 1 Surakarta in 2015/2016 academic year. This study was conducted at SMK Batik 1 Surakarta. It is located in Selamet Riyadi Street, Kleco, Laweyan, Surakarta. SMK Batik 1 Surakarta is one of the vocational schools in Surakarta, Central Java.

This study used one technique in collecting the data namely observation. Marshall and Rossman (1989) define observation as "the systematic description of events, behaviors, and artifacts in the social setting chosen for study" (p.79). This study used direct observation technique because it is useful for the researchers in variety of ways. It can provide researchers with ways to check for nonverbal expression of feelings, determine who interacts with whom, grasp how participants communicate with each other, and check for how much time is spent on various activities (Schmuk, 1997). In this study, the teaching and learning process were audio visual recorded and transcribed.

According to Moleong (2006:280) data analysis is a process to organize and sort the data into patterns, categories, and a description of the basic unit, the themes can be found and working hypothesis can be formulated as suggested by the data. There were 4 steps in analyzing the data in this study including: (1) rereading the transcribed data of teaching and learning process, (2) coding the data based on category of Teacher Talk according to FLINT theory, (3) presenting the data in the form of table and chart, (4) drawing conclusion based on the coded data in the table and chart developed in step 3.
3. Research Result and Discussion

This section presents the results of the study. It elaborates the occurrence of Teacher Talk, the dominant category of Teacher Talk and the discussion of finding.

3.1 The Occurrence of Category of Teacher Talk

This study found that there were 550 utterances articulated by the three teachers during 9 meetings. From that quantity, there were 542 utterances that can be classified into category of Teacher Talk based on FLINT theory. Table 4.1 presented the occurrence of Teacher Talk Category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Teacher Talk</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2a</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3a</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>5a</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>7a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total occurrences:</td>
<td>542</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table 4.1 above showed that category 4 (asking question) dominated the occurrence of Teacher Talk. The categories of Teacher Talk which did not occur at all were category 1 (dealing with feelings), and category 7a (criticizing student response). The other categories which also occurred with big frequency after asking question and giving information were category 2 (praising or encouraging) and category 6 (giving directions). Then, the category of Teacher Talk which always occurred but having less frequency were category 2a (making joke), category 3 (using idea of the student), category 3a (repeating student response verbatim), category 5a (correcting without rejection) and category 7 (criticizing student's behavior).

From that results, it can be pointed out that there were only 9 categories from 11 categories of Teacher Talk which found in English teaching and learning process in 9 meetings. Here were the examples of those nine categories.

1) Praising or Encouraging (Category 2)

This category found in the classroom interaction during teaching and learning process. All of the teachers commonly praised the students when they provided the correct answer. This category usually occurred after the teacher gave the question to the student. It meant the teacher appreciated the student's contribution. Praising can also delineate that what student's said is valued. The dialogue below is quoted as illustration of praising or complimenting.

Obs.2/ 040/ 2/ X-TN/ MT1: I was clever. Kalau jadi kalimat negative gimana? (How will the sentence be if it is changed to negative form?)

S: I was not clever.

TM1: Good. That's right.

Obs.3/ 011/ 2/ X-DKV/ FT: I can sing a song. Artinya apa?

S: Saya bisa menyanyikan sebuah lagu.

TF: Excellent.

From the excerpt above, the teacher showed his or her appreciation to the student participation by praising them. The teacher said the words such as good, that's right, and excellent.
2) Making Joke (Category 2a)

Giving joke sometimes is needed to release the tension or to light up the classroom atmosphere. This study found that the male teacher 1 typically made a joke to the student whilst teaching such as in the following example:


(The English term for kembang is flower. But in Javanese, it’s different. For instance, the name of chili flower is menik, for guava flower is menuk.)

In that excerpt, the teacher was attempting to be humorous. He made a joke by comparing the term flower in English and Javanese. In reality, the guava’s flower is not called menuk but karuk.

3) Using Idea of the Student (Category 3)

In this case, this category found when the student answered the question then followed by the teacher’s clarification. Teacher rephrased the idea of the student but it is still recognized as being student’s contribution. This category can be illustrated as in the following dialogue:

Observation 2: 020/ 3/ XI-TKJ2/ MT2: Tanya dari mana kok jawahannya secretary? (How do you know if the answer is secretary?)

S: Dari kegiatan Pak. Menyusun jadwal, mengetik, dan lain-lain. (From her activity Sir. Arranging schedule, typing, and so on.)

MT2: Okay benar yaa, Yulia Rakhman adalah seorang secretary. Dia biasa menyusun jadwal, mengetik, merawat buku-buku perusahaan, dan lain-lain. Di situ juga dijelaskan yaa, bagaimana kepribadiannya dia. Seorang pekerja keras, rapi, dan juga pintar. (Okay, that’s true. Yulia Rakhman is a secretary. She is usually arranging the schedule, typing, keeping the company’s books, etc. In that text, it is also explained about her personality. She is a hard worker, neat, and smart as well.)

From the excerpt above, the teacher repeated the student utterance. He used some words (arranging schedule, typing) then extended the student’s idea by giving further explanation.

4) Repeating Student Response Verbatim (Category 3a)

According to FLINT theory, repeating student response verbatim means teacher repeat the exact word of students after they participated. This category usually found when the student gave the answer to the teacher then was repeated by the teacher. Here was the example of that category.

Observation 3: 005/ 3a/ X-DKV/ FT: Jadi, contohnya modal ada apa saja di situ? (So, can you mention what kinds of modal displayed in that computer screen?)

S: Can, may, will,

FT: Can, may, will. Oke benar ya. (Okay, that’s true.)

Observation 2: 009/ 3a/ X-TN/ MT1: Oke, hari ini kita akan belajar tentang simple past tense. Biasanya dalam simple past tense, yang dipakai Verb berapa?
Okay, today we are going to learn about simple past tense. What kind of verb commonly used in simple past tense?

Ss: Verb dua Pak. (Verb two Sir.)

MT1: Oke, verb dua ya. (Okay, verb two.)

Teacher used or repeated the exact word of the student’s answer. When the teacher doing this, so it is regarded as repeating student response verbatim.

5) Asking Question (Category 4)

One aspect of language function that has received a lot of attention in classroom interaction is teacher’s question. This study found that this category regularly occurred during teaching and learning activity. The purpose of asking question is to stimulate the students to explore their skills or share ideas. Teacher frequently asked question to the students so that they can speak up and answer the question. Here were examples of question given by the teacher to the students.

Obs.1/ 038/ 4/ XII-TN/ MT1: Kalo makan siang bahasa Inggrisnya apa? (What is the English word for makan siang?)

Obs.2/ 011/ X-TN/ FT: Kalo dalam kalimat present, biasanya keterangan waktunya pakai apa? (In simple present tense, what adverb commonly used?)

The excerpts above clearly showed that the teacher asking question to the student. The teacher asked about translation and adverb of sentence.

6) Giving Information (Category 5)

According to FLINT’s theory, giving information means that the teacher shares information, facts, his own idea or lecturing. In every meeting, this category commonly found during teaching and learning activity especially when the teacher explained the materials to the student. This category can be represented as in the following example.

Obs.1/ 053/ 5/ II-TN/ MT1: Kalimat pengandaian ada tiga yaa. Tipe pertama, kedua dan ketiga. Saya ulangi yaa. Kalimat tipe pertama menggunakan simple present tense. Kalimat tipe dua menggunakan past tense dan kalimat tipe tiga menggunakan past perfect tense. (Conditional sentence is divided into three types. First type, second type and third type. I repeat. The first type uses simple present tense. The second type uses past tense and the third type uses past perfect tense.)

The teacher gave information about conditional sentence to the students. He explained clearly concerning with the types of conditional sentence.

7) Correcting without Rejection (Category 5a)

Correcting without rejection means telling the correct response to the student who have made a mistake without using words or intonation which communicate criticism. This category usually happened when the teacher corrected the student’s pronunciation or when they provided the wrong answer. Here was the example:

Obs.2/ 009/ 5a/ X-DKV/ MT2: Babasa Inggrisnya anak laki-laki apa? (How do you say “anak laki-laki” in English?)

Ss: Boy.

MT2: Bukan boy ya, tapi son. Bacanya san. (Not boy, but son. You read it as san)

Obs.3/ 023/ 5a/ XI-TKJ2/ MT2: The word “me” refers to the?
Ss: The writer.

MT2: *Bukan writer ya bacanya, w nya hilang, riter.* (Don’t read it as writer, but riter.)

In that excerpt, the teachers corrected the vocabulary and pronunciation of the student by clarifying the correct answer. Both of them told it without using words which communicate criticism.

8) Giving Directions (Category 6)

Giving direction is one of the most important roles of the teacher in the classroom. Direction is an order given by the teacher toward the student. It could be a command, request, or order. Teacher directly requested the pupil to do something such as answering a question, doing an exercise, or presenting the result of a discussion in front of the class. Here was an example of this category.

Obs.1/ 015/ X-TKJ1/ MT2: *Okay, sekarang kerjakan soalnya. Ubah menjadi kalimat simple present tense dan juga jawab pertanyaannya.* (Okay, now do the exercise. Change the sentences into simple present tense and answer the question.)

Teacher gave direction by asking the student to do the exercise. In this case, the teacher ordered the student to change the sentence into simple present tense and answer the question.

9) Criticizing Student’s Behavior (Category 7)

In criticizing student’s behavior, the teachers do this by communicating anger, displeasure, annoyance, dissatisfaction with what students are doing. It generally happens when the students showed a non-acceptable behavior such as being noisy in the class, coming late to the class or talking with friends during the lesson. The examples of this category can be seen as in the following excerpts.

Obs.2/ 002/ 7/ X-TN/ MT1: *Perhatikan yaa, kalian itu harus on time. Jangan suka telat.* (Please pay attention, you have to be on time. Don’t be late.)

Obs.2/ 010/ 7/ X-TN/ MT1: *Yang belakang jangan ramai sendiri. Perhatikan! Mbak, Mas!* (Those who sit at the back, please don’t be noisy. Attention please. Boys! Girls!)

Obs.2/ 005/ 7/ X-TN/ FT: *Kok masih ada yang ribut yaa! Yang ribut keluar dulu!* (Please don’t be noisy. If you keep being noisy, leave the class!)

Those excerpts indicated the teacher’s refusal toward student’s behavior. The teacher emphasized prohibition toward student’s negative behavior. In this context, the teachers prohibited the student’s making noise.

Interestingly, there were some utterances that could not be classified using FLINT theory. Table 4.2 displays these utterances.

Table 4.2. The unclassified category of Teacher Talk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher’s utterance</th>
<th>Good morning</th>
<th>Good afternoon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assalamualaikum</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total occurrences: 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The use of Assalamualaikum is possibly due to several reasons. First, since the school being investigated is Islamic school, then Assalamualaikum is commonly used in the school as addressing expression. Second, both the teacher and the students are possibly Moslem so that the teacher address the student using Assalamualaikum. Third, the use of Assalamualaikum may be perceived as a way of the teacher to attract the student’s attention before the lesson begins. In this context, the teachers were aware that it is a must for Moslems to reply Assalamualaikum uttered by other Moslems. Similarly, the expression of good morning and good afternoon are kinds of greetings possibly used for addressing the student and starting the lesson since this two expression were commonly articulated by the teachers before they started the lesson.

3.2 The Dominant Category of Teacher Talk

The dominant category of Teacher Talk articulated by the each teacher during English teaching and learning process is illustrated in the following diagram.

The first pie diagram above indicates that the most frequent category of Teacher Talk articulated by the Male Teacher 1 was asking question (category 4). The percentage was 44.00%. The second category that usually occurred in teaching and learning process was giving information (category 5) with percentage 31.30%. The categories which less than 10% were category 2 (praising or encouraging), 2a (giving joke), 3 (using student’s idea), 3a (repeating student response verbatim), 6 (giving direction), 7 (criticizing student behavior), and 5a (correcting without rejection). The categories which had 0% were dealing with feelings (category 1) and criticizing student response (category 7a).

Male Teacher 2

The Percentage of Each Category of Teacher Talk

The second pie diagram above indicates that the most frequent category of Teacher Talk articulated by the Male Teacher 2 was asking question (category 4). The percentage was 36.80%. The second category that usually occurred in teaching and learning process was giving information (category 5) with percentage 33.30%. The categories which less than 10% were category 2 (praising or encouraging), 2a (giving joke), 3 (using student’s idea), 3a (repeating student response verbatim), 6 (giving direction), 7 (criticizing student behavior), and 5a (correcting without rejection). The categories which had 0% were dealing with feelings (category 1) and criticizing student response (category 7a).
Looking at the second diagram above, it is clear that the most dominant category of Teacher Talk produced by male teacher 2 was asking question (category 4) with percentage 36.80% followed by category 5 (giving information) with 33.30%. The next category which took a big portion was giving direction (category 6) with percentage 15.70%. The categories which did not occur were category 1 (dealing with feelings), 2 (praising or encouraging), 2a (jokes), 3a (repeating student response verbatim), and 7a (criticizing student’s response). The categories which had the same percentage (4%) were category 3 (using idea of the student) and category 5a (correcting without rejection). The teacher also criticized student behavior which is labeled as category 7 with percentage 6.90%.

Female Teacher

The third diagram above shows the results of the category of Teacher Talk produced by the female teacher. Category 5 (Giving information) and category 4 (asking question) arose more than other categories. The percentage was 37.50% and 27.10%. Category 6 (giving directions) also took a much proportion with percentage of 18.70%. The categories which did not occur or 0% occurrence were dealing with feelings (category 1), making joke (category 2a), correcting without rejection (category 5a), and criticizing student response (category 7a). Making joke (category 2a) and criticizing student behavior (category 7) showed 6.20%. Category 3 (using idea of the student) and category 3a (repeating student response verbatim) took 2.10%.

From the findings that have been revealed above, it can be concluded that there were only nine categories of teacher Talk found in English teaching and learning process in nine meetings. It meant that not all of categories or every category of Teacher Talk occurred in every meeting. It can be seen from the results of the percentage that there were several categories of Teacher Talk which had percentage of 0% occurrence during teaching and learning process. The categories which were not articulated by the three teachers including dealing with feelings (category 1) and criticizing student’s response (category 7a). There were no utterances which illustrated those categories. This probably caused by several reasons. First, teacher did not articulate category 1 or dealing with feeling may be because when the lesson started the class was too noisy, hence, it is too attentive towards student feelings. Second, the teacher did not articulate Category 7a possibly because they were aware of teaching teenagers. Therefore, criticizing student’s response will make the student become more aggressive. Another possible reason is the culture of the school being investigated. As this study was conducted in Islamic school, criticizing student’s response may be perceived as violating Islamic teaching.

Based on analysis of the findings, the dominant category of Teacher Talk found in English teaching and learning process were asking question and giving information. Both male teachers had a tendency to ask question while the female teacher preferred to give information. The questions usually asked by the teachers were referential question and display question. Asking question took a very high percentage of Teacher Talk articulated by the Male teachers. This results are not different from the previous studies which conducted by Astiti (2009) and Nurhasanah.
(2010) in which the dominant type of Teacher Talk occurred in teaching and learning process was type 4 (asking question) and type 5 (lecturing). Adapting from Ur (1998: 229), there are various reasons why a teacher might ask a question in the classroom:

1) To provide a model for language or thinking.
2) To find out something from the learners (fact, ideas, opinion).
3) To check or test understanding, knowledge or skill.
4) To get learners to be active in their learning.
5) To inform the class via the answer of the stronger leaners rather than through the teacher’s input.
6) To provide weaker leaners with an opportunity to participate.
7) To stimulate thinking (logical, reflective or imaginative); to probe more deeply into issues.
8) To get learners to review and participate previously learnt material.
9) To communicate to learners that the teacher is genuinely interested in what they think.

There are also some distinctions between the previous study and the current study. First, this study revealed the dominant types of Teacher Talk articulated by the each teacher in which was not presented by the previous study because the participant being observed is only one teacher. Second, the result of the study showed that there was an indication of certain types of Teacher Talk preferred by different gender. This result becomes different since it is more specific in revealing the result of the study gained from more participants.

4. Closing

Based on the research result and discussion, several conclusion can be drawn:

First, not all of categories or types of Teacher Talk proposed by FLINT theory were found in this study. From 11 categories, there were only 9 categories of Teacher Talk found this study, these being: category 2 (making joke), category 3 (using idea of the students) category 3a (repeating student response verbatim), category 4 (asking question), category 5 (giving information), category 5a (corrects without rejection), category 6 (giving directions), and category 7 (criticizing student behavior). The category of Teacher Talk which did not occur in this study were category 1 (dealing with feelings) and category 7a (criticizing student response).

Second, surprisingly, there were some Teacher Talks articulated by the teachers that could not be classified into FLINT category, these being: asalumualaikum, good morning, and good afternoon.

Third, there was category of Teacher Talk preferred by different gender. In this study, both male teachers articulated asking question (category 4) more frequently than the female teacher. On the other hand, the female teacher regularly used category 5 (giving information).

This study is expected to be the major role to explain types of Teacher Talk articulated by the teacher especially in teaching and learning process.

The teachers can use the results of this research as the reference in conducting the lesson in order to consider what role they should play when teaching the students. This is because in teaching and learning process, the teacher should not provide the student with questions and information only but also it is hoped that the teacher can use another kinds of Teacher Talk to enrich their teaching style. This study only focused on the occurrence and the dominant category of Teacher Talk. Therefore, for the future researchers who want to conduct a research about Teacher Talk, they can find out what factors influence the teacher in articulating the certain types of Teacher Talk, what's perspective of the students toward Teacher Talk and providing another theory related to Teacher Talk which is suitable with Indonesian culture.


