

## Flanders' Model: A Suggested Approach to Enhance Classroom Interaction In Algerian Middle Schools

نموذج فلاندرز: مقارنة مقترحة لتعزيز التفاعل داخل القسم في مرحلة التعليم المتوسط بالجزائر

Chérifi Ali\*/

University: of Dr. Moulay Tahar - SAIDA Country Algeria

Date de Reçu le: 11/02/2018 date de Accepté le: 02/11/2018 Date de publication : 16/01/2018

**Abstract:** Teaching is based essentially on interaction. In here, the term interaction means the participation of the teacher and the students in the process of teaching / learning. Within this process, the teacher influences the students with the intention to make them actively engaged in classroom. The main purpose of this descriptive classroom centered study is to improve the quality of interaction in middle school classes.

**Key Words:** Competence ; Feedback ; Interaction ; Performanc .

ملخص الدراسة: تهدف هذه الدراسة الى تحسين نوعية التفاعل بين المعلم والمتعلم في القسم، حيث يقوم التدريس أساسا على التفاعل، بمعنى أن مشاركة المعلم والمتعلم ضرورية من أجل انجاح العملية التعليمية-التعلمية ويظهر هذا من خلال تأثير المعلم في سلوك المتعلم، حيث يجعله يشارك بفعالية في القسم. كما أن تفاعل المتعلمين فيما بينهم هو الهدف الأساسي لهذه الدراسة، مما يساهم في تحسين نوعية التفاعل بين المعلم والمتعلم في مرحلة التعليم المتوسط داخل القسم. الكلمات المفتاحية: الكفاءة، التغذية الراجعة، التفاعل، الأداء.

### 1. Introduction:

Generally speaking, analysing teacher students interaction is very crucial in didactics. However, according to these studies and the researcher's views we have noticed that teacher-students interaction is applied in scientific domains, for instance maths and physics but not in teaching and learning foreign languages and more specifically English language.

It is possible to say that most of the previous studies have been subjected to the problem of studying classroom interaction between the teacher and the learner in scientific subjects such as mathematics and physics, which is not the case in the teaching languages such as English language. The present study is concerned with classroom interaction using the Flanders model in English language in Middle school. Therefore, the present research addresses the following question:

How effective is the Flanders model in teaching English in middle school?

\* - cherifiali77@yahoo.fr

The main question research can be broken down into the following sub-questions :

- To which extent is Flanders' model of interaction accomplished by English foreign language (EFL) teachers in Saida middle schools?
- How can classroom interaction be enhanced?

**Objective:** This research aims to analyse classroom interaction using Flanders' interaction analysis model. In this respect, this research advocates the use of Flanders' model as a means to enhance classroom interaction. It tends to illustrate the extent to which the Flanders' model is used by teachers of English language in middle school which may give birth to the following queries:

According to the last mentioned research questions, the following hypotheses are formulated:

### **A- Hypotheses :**

- Even if Flanders' model of interaction is used by the majority of EFL teachers, still they remain unconscious about its use.
- EFL teachers could be the main agent behind classroom interaction's enhancement depending on their gender, experience, training and diploma.

Accordingly, Flanders' model of Interaction offers dual solutions. The first one provides objective feedback about the level of teacher-pupil interaction in the classroom which may allow the teacher to look after the ideal verbal behaviour he exhibits in the classroom as well as students' responses. The second solution that Flanders' model may offer is related to the teacher's knowledge and the way s/he could bring his actual and his desired behaviour into closer alignment. Further, by doing so, the provided feedback by the interaction analysis procedure may enable the teacher to identify the weak points of her/his actual behaviour, and to assess her/his expectations. Finally, it enables the teacher to feel free to take measures and to correct the last mentioned situations.

### **B-Operational Definitions:**

**Competence:** Being able to do something very well.

**Feedback:** The return of its source of part of what a model produces, especially so as to change what it produces.

**Interaction:** (Interact) is to act or have effect on each other.

**Performance:** an action or achievement, considered in relation to how successful it is.

The first part of the investigation is carried out with the use of questionnaire. This questionnaire is the means to identify research problem. Brehob<sup>1</sup> defines a questionnaire to be “a form that people fill out, used to obtain demographic information and views and interests of those questioned”.

### C- Literature Review

Teaching English in a foreign (EFL) or in a second language (ESL) classroom is considered one of the main challenges facing both educators and students. However, language acquisition requires an environment where every student does not only have the opportunity to speak and to interact, but also to feel a real need to do it.

1. According to Walsh (2006)<sup>2</sup>, Second/Foreign Language Acquisition is considered a social content where interaction plays a great role as it is one of the crucial ingredients in language learning and teaching processes. Walsh (2006) also points out that learning opportunities depends greatly on the teacher's method and his understanding of the way process of interaction takes place in the classroom (Walsh, 2002)<sup>3</sup>. Therefore, it could be vital for ELT teachers to become more conscious and well-informed about the importance of the teacher's talk and the process of interaction as well as about their impact on student's learning.

2. Actually, the relationship between second/foreign language acquisition and interaction is so strong as it has been supported by many scholars working in this research literature. Ellis (1990)<sup>4</sup> considers interaction at the core of teaching / learning process. From his part, Johnson also notes that language acquisition is associated to the good perception and understanding of interactional course “The teacher plays a critical role in understanding; establishing and maintaining patterns of communication that will foster to the great extent, both classroom

---

<sup>1</sup> Petter, S. & Davis, A. (2002). Quantitative Research Methods: Questionnaires. Available online on [www.cis.gsu.edu/~dstraub/courses/.../Questionnaire 2002.ppt](http://www.cis.gsu.edu/~dstraub/courses/.../Questionnaire 2002.ppt) : 12

<sup>2</sup> Research, \_ Walsh, S, (2006). *Investigating Classroom Discourse language in Action*. New York: Routledge. P: 6, 3 – 23.

<sup>3</sup> Walsh, S (2002) . Construction or obstruction: Teacher talk and learner involvement in the EFL classroom. *Language Teaching* . p: 31.

<sup>4</sup> Ellis, R., (1990). *Instructed Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Blackwell p : 18

learning and second language acquisition." (Johnson,1995, p.90)<sup>1</sup> Hence, the researcher focuses on the teacher's role in communication process.

3.In relation to classroom interaction , more previously Flanders advocated a model to measure the level of interaction which deals with the effectiveness and the quality of interaction in a classroom situation. Flanders' model of interaction analysis has been widely used as a research instrument since its development. The diversity of investigations using this model are represented in the research sample. A quote from Flanders (1963)<sup>2</sup> concerning the use of his interaction analysis model in teacher preparatory courses seemed appropriate at this level " ...teacher education will become increasingly concerned with the process of teaching itself during the next few decades. Instead of emphasizing knowledge

"we think" teachers will need in order to teach effectively...we will turn more and more to an analysis of teaching acts as they occur in spontaneous classroom interaction. The instructor's role will shift from talking about effective teaching to the rigorous challenge of demonstrating effective teaching. The process of inquiry will create problem-solving activities that will produce more independent, self-directing teachers whose first day on the job will be their worst, not their best. (260).

Nelson (1966)<sup>3</sup> found that pupil achievement on written language tests at the elementary school level was greater in classes where the teacher was more indirect. In addition, she found that direct teacher influence patterns appeared to inhibit pupils' achievement on written language tests. The studies of Furst and Soar (1967)<sup>4</sup> , using interaction analysis, also found that greater student achievement was positively related to indirect teacher influence.

---

<sup>1</sup> Johnson, E.K. (1995). *Understanding of Communication in Secondary Language Classrooms*. (Ed) Richards, J.C. Cambridge University Press. P: 32

<sup>2</sup> Flanders, Ned A. (1963). "Intent Action and Feedback: A Preparation for Teaching," *Journal of Teacher Education*, 14:251-260, September.

<sup>3</sup> Nelson, Lois. (1966). "Teacher Leadership: An Empirical Approach to Analyzing Teacher Behaviour in the Classroom," *Classroom Interaction Newsletter*, 2:31-32, November

<sup>4</sup> Furst, Norma, and Amidon, Edmund. (1967). "Teacher-Pupil Interaction Patterns in the Elementary School," *Interaction Analysis: Theory, Research, and Application*. Edited by Edmund. p : 35

4. Several descriptive studies have attempted to identify patterns of interaction in classrooms. One study conducted by Amidon and Giamatteo (1967)<sup>1</sup> found that the teacher patterns of twenty-three elementary school teachers judged as advanced by their supervisors differed substantially from the teaching patterns of 120 teachers rated as average. The advanced teachers talked approximately 12 per cent less of the total class time. The advanced teachers were more accepting for student-initiated ideas, tended to encourage these ideas more, and also made more efforts to build on these ideas than did the teachers who were evaluated as average. The advanced teachers dominated their classroom less. They used more indirect verbal behavior; however, they used less direction and criticism than did the normative teachers group. The same teachers asked questions that were broader in nature and received more student questions and student participation than did the normative teachers group.

5. Feedback, has been given, as another way of interaction analysis, to student teachers. Studies have been made to determine the effects of training in interaction analysis on both pre-service and in-service student teachers.

Flanders (1967)<sup>2</sup>, using his model of interaction analysis, categorized patterns of teacher influence in two groups composed of junior high school classes of mathematics and social studies. The results of the study indicated that both attitude and achievement scores of the students were superior in classrooms in which the teacher was more indirect. Other findings of the research showed that indirect teachers acted most indirectly when goals were being clarified and new content material was being introduced. The teachers acted most directly after goals had been clarified and work was in progress. It was found also that the teachers of classes in which achievement was above average differed from the teachers of below-average classes in their ability to shift their indirect or direct behaviour as it was necessary.

---

<sup>1</sup> Amidon and John B. Hough , Flanders, Ned A. (1967). "Teacher Influence in the Classroom," Interaction Analysis: Theory, Research, and Application. Edited by Edmund J.. Palo Alto: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co .p : 41

<sup>2</sup> Flanders, Ned A. (1967). "Teacher Influence in the Classroom," Interaction Analysis: Theory, Research, and Application. Edited by Edmund J. Amidon and John B. Hough. Palo Alto: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.p :61

6. Hough and Ober (1967)<sup>1</sup> used experimental treatments in Ohio State University's program for the preparation of secondary school teachers. Results of this experiment revealed that subjects in the treatment groups who were taught interaction analysis were found to use, in their teaching simulations, significantly more verbal behaviours. The latter have been found to be associated with higher student achievement and more positive student attitudes toward their teachers behaviours. These same subjects were found to use less behaviour that has been found to be associated with lower achievement and less positive attitudes of the students.

#### **D. Methodology tools and sample:**

The present descriptive research aims at identifying the consequences of the quality of classroom interaction between learners and their teachers. With this goal in mind, there is a necessity to consider whether there are any differences in the teachers' methods and interactions in the classroom. However, the obtained results concern only a sample of population (internal validity) which cannot be generalized to other classroom contexts (external validity) which may necessitate carrying out other researches sharing similar objectives.

The choosing population of the current work is teachers from different middle schools since they teach English for beginners, as they are expected to give more importance to speaking activities. Moreover; a classroom observation has been conducted in MOKRANI middle school so as to explore the extent to which classroom interaction is accomplished comparing to Flanders' model. What's more, the main goal behind the present work is not to illustrate the level of classroom interaction only, but, even, to analyze its quality. Therefore, this study is considered as a classroom-centered research. Whatever, the interest of teachers in the language classroom, one common characteristic of classroom research is the fact that it is descriptive in its nature. It involves observation, recording and transcription above all which gives it the rank as a descriptive classroom-centered research (Gaies, 1983)<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Hough, John B., and Ober, Richard. (1967). "The Effect of Training in Interaction Analysis on the Verbal Teaching Behaviour of Pre-Service Teachers," *Interaction Analysis: Theory, Research, and Application*. Edited by Edmund. P : 11

<sup>2</sup> Gais, S.J. (1983). *The Investigation of Language Classroom Process*. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17(2), 205-216..

The first part of the investigation is carried out with the use of questionnaire which is a means through which the research problem has been identified as Brehob maintains "[questionnaire represents] a form that people fill out, used to obtain demographic information and views and interests of those questioned" (cited by Petter & Davis, 2002)<sup>1</sup>. The second part of the present investigation is classroom observation, which is the main part. It is carried out using another type of data collection procedure which enables the researcher to assess the research hypotheses, and to try to meet the research question.

### E. The Study Tools :

Two tools were used in this study:

Based on the theoretical framework and previous studies on the subject of classroom interaction between the teacher and the learner, a questionnaire was constructed to measure the interaction between the teacher and the learner. The second tool is the observation that assesses the behavior of the teacher in the interaction process. The study tool that the researcher has used to analyse the questionnaires is called Lickert scale where a quad alternative is included. The data were basically treated using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software.

1. **Description of the Questionnaire:** Questionnaires have been distributed to 20 English language teachers in different middle schools. The questionnaire is divided into two parts. The first one deals with the general information about the teacher whereas the second one includes 21 questions as it is divided into two main parts: the first one deals with classroom interaction and the second one deals with Flanders' Model of interaction. The first axis is named "Classroom interaction" and consists of nine (9) questions. The second axis is named "Flanders model of interaction" and consists of ten (10) questions. The questions are close-ended category. The last question is open-ended question so as to elicit teachers' recommendations, commands and suggestions.

---

<sup>4</sup> Petter, S. & Davis, A. (2002). Quantitative Research Methods: Questionnaires. Available online on [www.cis.gsu.edu/~dstraub/courses/..../Questionnaire 2002.ppt](http://www.cis.gsu.edu/~dstraub/courses/..../Questionnaire 2002.ppt). p : 12

**Table 01: Reliability Statistics.**

Cronbach's Alpha	N of items
0,582	20

The above table shows that the number of items is 20 and the reliability statistics which is estimated by 0. 582 is generally acceptable ratio coefficient for the present research.

**2. Description of the Observation :** The second part of our investigation, which is the main part, is carried out using another type of data collection procedure which may enable the current work to test research hypothesis on the one hand as well as to try to answer our research question on the other. It is based on a structured observation since a coding scheme or previously defined categories such as Flanders interaction analysis categories is used in order to know the quality of interaction and teacher's behaviour. Therefore, this section presents the findings of the classroom observation that investigates the quality of interaction using Flanders interaction analysis model.

### 3. Results:

**A- Questionnaire:** As far as the teachers' answers with regards to classroom interaction are concerned, the above analyses of the questionnaire allow us to draw the conclusion that there are no differences between the teachers in the process of classroom interaction.

**B- Analyses and Interpretations of Questionnaires :** In the main part of our investigation our data is collected using classroom interaction technique. In which we can collect data about the quality of interaction that is involved in classroom, more specifically Flanders interaction analysis.

#### C- Descriptive Statistics

**Table 2: Comparison of Variables.**

		Gender		Experience		Training		Diploma	
		Male	female	0 - 5	6 and above	ITE	University	Secondary level	University level
N	Valid	7	13	9	11	8	12	3	17
	Missing	0		0		0		0	
Mean		1,65		1,55		1,60		1,85	
Standard deviation		0,489		0,510		0,503		0,366	
Minimum		1		1		1		1	



Maximum	2	2	2	2
---------	---	---	---	---

According to the above table it is noticed that the arithmetic mean of the Gender is estimated by 1.65 and for the experience is 1.55, for the training it is 1.60, and for the diploma it is 1.85. The standard deviation for Gender, experience, training, and diploma are respectively: 0.48, 0.51, 0.50 and 0.36. Whereas the smallest value of the variables is 1 and the greatest one is 2.

**D- Test of Independent Samples :** In this part we are going to test the first hypothesis of our research that deals with the differences of teachers in classroom interaction.

**E- Testing Variables with Axes :** The hypotheses in this part are testing the variable of sex, experience, training and diploma individually with the axes .

**Table 3:** Testing variables (gender, experience, training, and diploma) with Axes

		Variables							
		Gender		Experience		training		diplôma	
		male	femal	0-5	6and above	from ITE	from University	Secondary level	University level
Axis 1	N	7	13	9	11	8	12	3	17
	Mean	24,71	25,85	24,89	25,91	25,50	25,42	25,67	25,41
	Standard deviaition	2,928	2,478	3,100	2,212	2,976	2,503	0,577	2,852
	Sig. (bilatérale)	0,372	0,404	0,402	0,421	0,725	0,721	0,880	0,882
Axis 2	N	7	13	9	11	8	12	3	17
	Mean	24,86	24,31	23,56	25,27	24,75	24,33	25,00	24,41
	Standard deviaition	1,345	3,401	3,504	1,954	2,188	3,257	1,732	3,001

	Sig. (bilatérale)	0,689	0,615	0,182	0,214	0,767	0,770	0,744	0,749
--	----------------------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

According to table, it is noticed that there are no statistically significant differences between each of the variables (gender, experience, training, and diploma) with the axes. This means indicates the following remarks:

- Both male and female teachers have the same degree of classroom interaction.
- Both experienced and non experienced teachers have the same degree of classroom interaction.
- Both teachers that are either graduated from institute of technology and education (ITE) or from University have the same degree of classroom interaction.
- Both teachers, either graduated from the secondary or University level have the same degree of classroom interaction.

**F. Testing Variables with Items:** In this part, independent variables are tested with the questions individually in order to know the differences between them.

**Table 4:** Testing the variable of sex with questions.

N of Q	Sex	N	Mean	Standard deviation	Sig. (bilatérale)
Q1	male	7	3,29	0,756	0,725
	female	13	3,15	0,801	0,721
Q2	male	7	2,43	0,787	0,767
	female	13	2,54	0,776	0,770
Q3	male	7	3,29	1,113	0,895
	female	13	3,23	0,725	0,909
Q4	male	7	3,43	0,787	0,576
	female	13	3,62	0,650	0,602
Q5	male	7	2,86	0,900	0,102
	female	13	3,46	0,660	0,150
Q6	male	7	3,29	0,951	0,632
	female	13	3,46	0,660	0,673
Q7	male	7	3,29	0,756	0,886
	female	13	3,23	0,832	0,883
Q8	male	7	2,86	0,690	0,157
	female	13	3,31	0,630	0,178
Q9	male	7	3,29	0,488	0,937

Q10	female	13	3,31	0,630	0,932
	male	7	3,86	0,378	0,195
Q11	female	13	3,31	1,032	0,104
	male	7	3,43	0,787	0,471
Q12	female	13	3,15	0,801	0,473
	male	7	2,57	0,787	0,905
Q13	female	13	2,62	0,768	0,906
	male	7	3,57	0,535	0,112
Q14	female	13	2,85	1,068	0,058
	male	7	3,00	0,816	0,263
Q15	female	13	3,38	0,650	0,307
	male	7	2,71	1,113	0,199
Q16	female	13	3,31	0,855	0,247
	male	7	2,43	0,976	0,348
Q17	female	13	2,85	0,899	0,367
	male	7	3,57	0,787	0,017
Q18	female	13	2,62	0,768	0,022
	male	7	3,43	0,787	0,905
Q19	female	13	3,38	0,768	0,906
	male	7	2,29	0,488	0,951
Q20	female	13	2,31	0,855	0,942
	male	7	1,57	0,535	0,525
Q20	female	13	1,38	0,650	0,501

As far as communication is concerned, a significant difference has been noticed in males' answers comparing to females' one (see table 4) which is estimated by 0.17 in favour of males. This may mean that male teachers are very good in interacting and communicating with pupils.

**Table 5:** Tasting the variable of experience with questions.

N of Q	Experience	N	Mean	Standard deviation	Sig. (bilatérale)
Q1	0-5	9	3,00	0,866	0,304
	6 and above	11	3,36	0,674	0,319
Q2	0-5	9	2,33	0,707	0,390

	6 and above	11	2,64	0,809	0,384
Q3	0-5	9	3,33	1,000	0,703
	6 and above	11	3,18	0,751	0,712
Q4	0-5	9	3,44	0,882	0,548
	6 and above	11	3,64	0,505	0,573
Q5	0-5	9	3,44	0,726	0,330
	6 and above	11	3,09	0,831	0,324
Q6	0-5	9	3,11	0,782	0,124
	6 and above	11	3,64	0,674	0,132
Q7	0-5	9	3,00	0,866	0,207
	6 and above	11	3,45	0,688	0,220
Q8	0-5	9	3,00	0,707	0,380
	6 and above	11	3,27	0,647	0,385
Q9	0-5	9	3,33	0,707	0,821
	6 and above	11	3,27	0,467	0,829
Q10	0-5	9	3,33	0,866	0,463
	6 and above	11	3,64	0,924	0,460
Q11	0-5	9	3,22	0,667	0,891
	6 and above	11	3,27	0,905	0,887
Q12	0-5	9	2,56	0,882	0,819
	6 and above	11	2,64	0,674	0,824
Q13	0-5	9	2,89	1,167	0,392
	6 and above	11	3,27	0,786	0,414
Q14	0-5	9	3,11	0,601	0,448
	6 and above	11	3,36	0,809	0,434
Q15	0-5	9	3,33	0,866	0,343
	6 and above	11	2,91	1,044	0,334
Q16	0-5	9	2,67	0,866	0,888
	6 and above	11	2,73	1,009	0,887
Q17	0-5	9	3,00	0,866	0,827
	6 and above	11	2,91	0,944	0,825
Q18	0-5	9	3,22	0,833	0,354
	6 and above	11	3,55	0,688	0,365
Q19	0-5	9	1,89	0,782	0,039

	6 and above	11	2,64	0,505	<b>0,028</b>
Q20	0-5	9	1,22	0,441	0,131
	6 and above	11	1,64	0,674	0,117

As far as the hypothesis is concerned, table 5 shows that experience may play a great role in enhancing classroom interaction since it has been noticed that there is a significant difference between experienced and non experienced teachers in question 19 in favour of the experienced teachers, which is estimated by 0.28. This may mean that experienced teachers hold the knowhow to control period of confusion in classroom sessions.

**Table 6:** Tasting training variable with questions.

N of Q	Training	N	Mean	Standard deviation	Sig. (bilatérale)
Q1	ITE	8	3,13	0,835	0,732
	University	12	3,25	0,754	0,738
Q2	ITE	8	2,88	0,991	<b>0,070</b>
	University	12	2,25	0,452	0,129
Q3	ITE	8	3,25	0,707	1,000
	University	12	3,25	0,965	1,000
Q4	ITE	8	3,63	0,744	0,701
	University	12	3,50	0,674	0,708
Q5	ITE	8	3,13	0,835	0,576
	University	12	3,33	0,778	0,583
Q6	ITE	8	3,38	0,916	0,907
	University	12	3,42	0,669	0,914
Q7	ITE	8	3,25	0,886	1,000
	University	12	3,25	0,754	1,000
Q8	ITE	8	3,00	0,756	0,429
	University	12	3,25	0,622	0,451
Q9	ITE	8	3,25	0,463	0,759
	University	12	3,33	0,651	0,742
Q10	ITE	8	3,25	1,165	0,317
	University	12	3,67	0,651	0,379
Q11	ITE	8	3,25	0,886	1,000
	University	12	3,25	0,754	1,000
Q12	ITE	8	2,75	0,886	0,482

	University	12	2,50	0,674	0,511
Q13	ITE	8	3,38	0,744	0,312
	University	12	2,92	1,084	0,277
Q14	ITE	8	3,25	0,886	1,000
	University	12	3,25	0,622	1,000
Q15	ITE	8	3,00	0,926	0,717
	University	12	3,17	1,030	0,711
Q16	ITE	8	2,88	1,126	0,504
	University	12	2,58	0,793	0,538
Q17	ITE	8	3,13	0,835	0,486
	University	12	2,83	0,937	0,477
Q18	ITE	8	3,63	0,744	0,288
	University	12	3,25	0,754	0,289
Q19	ITE	8	2,25	0,886	0,811
	University	12	2,33	0,651	0,823
Q20	ITE	8	1,50	0,535	0,772
	University	12	1,42	0,669	0,761

The fact that Flanders' model of interaction and teachers' answers differ in Q2 (see table 6), this may betoken that compared to non trained teachers; the trained ones give more opportunities to their pupils to interact with their peers in classroom sessions. **Table 7:** Testing the variable of diploma with questions.

N of Q	Diplôme	N	Mean	Standard deviation	Sig. (bilatérale)
Q1	Secondary	3	3,00	1,000	0,637
	University	17	3,24	0,752	0,729
Q2	Secondary	3	2,67	1,155	0,692
	University	17	2,47	0,717	0,800
Q3	Secondary	3	3,00	1,000	0,595
	University	17	3,29	0,849	0,670
Q4	Secondary	3	4,00	0,000	0,227
	University	17	3,47	0,717	<b>0,008</b>
Q5	Secondary	3	3,33	0,577	0,848
	University	17	3,24	0,831	0,815

Q6	Secondary	3	4,00	0,000	0,139
	University	17	3,29	0,772	<b>0,002</b>
Q7	Secondary	3	3,33	1,155	0,848
	University	17	3,24	0,752	0,899
Q8	Secondary	3	3,33	0,577	0,621
	University	17	3,12	0,697	0,603
Q9	Secondary	3	3,00	0,000	0,337
	University	17	3,35	0,606	<b>0,029</b>
Q10	Secondary	3	3,00	1,732	0,303
	University	17	3,59	0,712	0,618
Q11	Secondary	3	3,33	1,155	0,848
	University	17	3,24	0,752	0,899
Q12	Secondary	3	3,00	1,000	0,332
	University	17	2,53	0,717	0,505
Q13	Secondary	3	3,33	0,577	0,663
	University	17	3,06	1,029	0,541
Q14	Secondary	3	3,67	0,577	0,286
	University	17	3,18	0,728	0,278
Q15	Secondary	3	3,00	1,000	0,852
	University	17	3,12	0,993	0,864
Q16	Secondary	3	4,00	0,000	<b>0,005</b>
	University	17	2,47	0,800	0,000
Q17	Secondary	3	2,67	1,155	0,563
	University	17	3,00	0,866	0,673
Q18	Secondary	3	3,00	1,000	0,332
	University	17	3,47	0,717	0,505
Q19	Secondary	3	2,67	0,577	0,361
	University	17	2,24	0,752	0,331
Q20	Secondary	3	1,67	0,577	0,516
	University	17	1,41	0,618	0,538

According to table 7 we notice that there is a statistically significant difference between the educational level of teachers in question number 4. It is estimated by 0.08 in favour of those graduated from the university. Although they hold high quality of encouraging silent and shy pupil to interact in classroom sessions, they use only one specific method with them as it is

shown in their answers to Q6 which is estimated by 0.02. At the same time those teachers consider their pupils passive recipients of information as well as in expressing their ideas and viewpoints as it is mentioned in Q9 which is estimated by 0.29. In contrast, the undergraduate teachers, who in Q16 show that they are more authoritarian, are able to control the class and to justify their authority.

- **Correlation** : Correlation is the relationship between the axes of the questionnaire whether they are related or not.

**Table 8:** Correlations Between the Axes

		AXIS 1	AXIS 2
AXIS 1	Correlation de Pearson	1	,138
	Sig. (bilateral)		,561
	N	20	20
AXIS2	Correlation de Pearson	,138	1
	Sig. (bilateral)	,561	
	N	20	20

According to table 8, it could be said that no correlation could be done between the two axes of the questionnaires.

**Table 9:** The Relationship between Questions.

Number of Question	Correlation		
Q1	Q12= 0.600**	Q13= 0.538*	/
Q2	Q8= - 0.464*	/	/
Q4	Q6= 0.468*	Q15=0.626**	Q18= -0.448*
Q6	Q11= - 0.444*	Q20=0.508*	/
Q7	Q9= 0.644**	Q10=0.640**	/
Q8	Q2= - 0.464*	/	/
Q9	Q7= 0.644**	/	/
Q10	Q7= 0.640**	/	/
Q11	Q6= - 0.444*	Q14= 0.444*	/
Q12	Q1= 0.600**	/	/
Q13	Q1= 0.538*	/	/



Q14	Q11= 0.444*	/	/
Q15	Q4= 0.626**	/	/
Q18	Q4= - 0.448*	/	/
Q20	Q6= 0.508*	/	/

The correlation is significant at the level of 0.01 (bilateral) Strong correlations.

The correlation is significant at the level of 0.05 (bilateral) Weak correlations.

Table 9 shows the relationship between the questions where some of them have strong positive correlations like the relationship between question number one Q1 and question Q12, Q7 with Q9, Q7 with Q10, and Q4 with Q15. Others have weak positive correlation like the relation between Q1 and Q13, Q4 with Q6, Q6 with Q20 and Q11 with Q14. And the rest have weak negative correlations like the relationship between Q2 and Q8, Q4 with Q18 and Q6 with Q11.

**G- General Interpretation of the Questionnaire :** As far as teachers' answers as well as classroom interaction are concerned, the above analyses of the questionnaire allow us to draw the conclusion that there are no differences between teachers in the process of classroom interaction.

**1. Observation:** The quality of interaction using Flanders' model in the classroom subject of research allows us to draw the following conclusions. Firstly, the dominator of the class time which may betoken teacher's talk is more effective in this case because the new language is the target and 53% is highly accepted in English language classroom. Secondly, the teacher has an indirect influence on the class since 37% is too much in an FL classroom. According to Flanders (1970)<sup>1</sup>, if the teacher indirectly influences the class it means that he is a talented and competent teacher and this has good results on pupils' achievement. This means that the more the teacher is indirectly influencing the class the better pupils' development and achievement will be. Finally, motivation and its control have been largely indirect as it meets higher standards of language acquisition since in English language learning it is good to have indirect motivation and control because learners can, unconsciously, learn from each other.

<sup>1</sup> - Flanders1970, Ned, Analyzing teaching behavior Massachusetts Addison – Wesley publishing Comthomap.p : 3.

**2. Analysis of Classroom Observation :** English language in Algeria is, officially, the second foreign language. In other words, our learners have no opportunities to interact with native speakers or to use English outside the classroom. The findings and conclusion of this section aims at helping us to focus on the classroom speaking opportunities and the quality of interaction using Flanders' model of interaction.

**3. Flanders interaction analysis model:** Flanders interaction analysis model was created by Ned Flanders in the 1970s, as a model of analyzing classroom interaction. Every three seconds the trainee observer places the communication that is occurring in one of ten numbers of categories. They are as follow:

1. Accept Feeling
2. Praises or Encourages
3. Accepts or Use Ideas of pupils
4. Asks questions
5. Lecturing
6. Giving Directions
7. Criticizing or Justifying Authority
8. Pupil talk—Response
9. Pupil talk —Initiation
10. Silence or Confusion

The last mentioned categories are placed in matrix which allows patterns to become evident. First year MOKRANI's middle school has been the selected population of the current study where Flanders interaction analysis is applied for this class in order to analyze the quality of interaction among them.

In view of that, after data have been collected, the ten by ten matrix is created which could be excellent proof of analyzing the classroom observation. Classroom observation is done for one hour, a minimum length of Flanders interaction analysis is nearly 20 minutes (Flanders, 1967)<sup>1</sup> .

---

<sup>1</sup> Flanders, Ned.(1967). "Some Relationships Among Teacher Influence, Pupil Attitudes and Achievement," Interaction Analysis: Theory, Research, and Application. Edited by Edmund J. Amidon and John B. Hough. Palo Alto: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.

Categories and numbers were signed to the transaction every 3 seconds where 20 numbers per minute and the time is 20 minutes. Therefore, 400 data points ( $20 \times 20 = 400$ ) has been the results of the conducted observation. For each data point the category number signed is put directly with the next data point, so each number is used twice. For instance, if the first data points are 10, 5, 9, 6, pairs would be:

- 10-5
- 5-9
- 9-6

Meanwhile, numbers in the matrix such as the first number is placed in vertical axis and the second number is placed in the horizontal axis and they are placed in cells. After putting all the numbers of categories we count the total number of each cell. These numbers serve to know the following:

- Who dominated time (the teacher or pupils)
- Whether the teacher, directly, influences the class
- Whether classroom control and motivation were direct or indirect

This is the matrix used to analyze classroom observation although this method needs more than one observer as it, also needs trained ones which has caused some troubles for the researcher since he did it alone.

**Table 10:** Flanders' Matrix

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
1											
2		1	2	1	4	1					
3				2							
4		1		1	1				6		
5		1		3	15	3				1	
6					1	4			5	2	
7						1	3				
8				1				1	2		
9		7		3		2	1		31	3	
10					2	1			4		
total	0	10	2	11	23	12	4	1	48	6	117

**4. Analysis and Interpretation of Observation :** The present phase aims at calculating the sum of column so as to meet the following queries:

Who dominates the class time, the teacher or the pupil?

The sum is calculated from:

**[1 to 7] →  $0+10+2+11+23+12+4=62$  data points**

Teacher's talk has 62 data points where the total number is 117 data points so,

$$62 \times 100 \div 117 = 53\%$$

**[8 and 9] →  $1+48=49$  data points**

pupil talk has 49 data points and the total number is 117 data points so,

$$49 \times 100 \div 117 = 42\%$$

Therefore, teacher's talk represents 53% of the class time whereas the pupil's one represents 42% of it. It could be said then that the remaining dominator of the class time which may betoken teacher's talk is more effective in this case because the new language is the target and 53% is highly accepted in English language classroom.

The second step's main goal is to investigate whether the teacher directly or indirectly influences the class

The calculation of the sum of column

**[1 to 4] →  $0+10+2+11=23$  data points**

**[1 to 7] →  $0+10+2+11+23+12+4=62$  data points**

$$23 \div 62 = 0.37 \times 100 = 37\%$$

In view of that; it could be said that the teacher has an indirect influence on the class since 37% which is too much in an FL classroom. According to Flanders (1970)<sup>1</sup> if the teacher indirectly influences the class it means that he is talented and competent teacher and this has good results on pupils' achievement. This means that the more the teacher is indirectly influencing the class the better pupils' development and achievement will be.

The fact that pupils' motivation and its control are concerned; the next step's aim is to know

Whether they are direct or indirect calculating the sum of column from:

**[1 to 3] →  $0+10+2=12$  data points**

**[1, 2, 3, 6 and 7] →  $0+10+2+12+4=28$  data points**

---

<sup>1</sup> Flanders 1970, Ned, Analyzing teaching behavior Massachusetts Addison – Wesley publishing Comthomap. 3.

$$12 \div 28 = 0.43 \times 100 = 43\%$$

From the above calculation, it could be understood that motivation and its control have been largely indirect as it meets higher standards of language acquisition. This can be justified by the fact that in English language learning it is good to have indirect motivation and control because learners can, unconsciously, learn from each other.

**5. General Interpretations of the Observation :** The quality of interaction with the use of Flanders' model in this classroom allows us to draw the following conclusions. Firstly, the dominator of the class time which may betoken teacher's talk is more effective in this case because the new language is the target and 53% is highly accepted in English language classroom. Secondly, the teacher has an indirect influence on the class since 37% is too much in an FL classroom. According to Flanders (1970) if the teacher indirectly influences the class it means that he is talented and competent teacher and this has good results on pupils' achievement. This means that the more the teacher is indirectly influencing the class the better pupils' development and achievement will be. Finally, motivation and its control have been largely indirect as it meets higher standards of language acquisition since in English language learning it is good to have indirect motivation and control because learners can, unconsciously, learn from each other.

#### **k. Genaral Suggestions**

There are some suggestions for both teachers and students, they are as follows:

- The teacher should give more lecturing time (extra lesson) to the students because this also helps them to understand the material better.
- Based on the observation, strategies used by the teachers when asking questions should be fairly distributed, so that every student has the opportunity to answer the questions.
- The teacher should well explain the material and the assignments during the instruction so that the students will not be confused.

#### **4. Conclusion**

To get full insight on the process of classroom interaction, the chapter in hand has used dual research tools in data collection procedure. The first one is questionnaires submitted to teachers of middle schools and the second one is observation where Flanders' model of interaction has been the choosy method to scrutinize the nature of conversation taking place in classroom contexts. Therefore, the investigation allows us to make the following remarks:

The teacher dominates the class conversations and also influences the class indirectly. This helps pupils expressing themselves freely and also developing their performance and achievements in learning English. We do acknowledge that interaction is not easy as a procedure, teachers and learners as well need to do their best to make

it a successful one. In what comes in the subsequent chapter; some further pedagogical implications and recommendations are introduced to help enhancing the quality of performance in classrooms.

##### 5. References:

- Ellis, R., (1990). *Instructed Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Flanders, Ned A. (1963). "Intent Action and Feedback: A Preparation for Teaching," *Journal of Teacher Education*, 14:251-260, September.
- Flanders, Ned A. (1967). "Teacher Influence in the Classroom," *Interaction Analysis: Theory, Research, and Application*. Edited by Edmund J. Amidon and John B. Hough. Palo Alto: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Flanders, Ned.(1967). "Some Relationships Among Teacher Influence, Pupil Attitudes and Achievement," *Interaction Analysis: Theory, Research, and Application*. Edited by Edmund J. Amidon and John B. Hough. Palo Alto: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Flanders 1970, Ned, *Analyzing teaching behavior* Massachusetts Addison – Wesley publishing Comthomap. 3.
- Furst, Norma, and Amidon, Edmund. (1967). "Teacher-Pupil Interaction Patterns in the Elementary School," *Interaction Analysis: Theory, Research, and Application*. Edited by Edmund J. Amidon and John B. Hough. Palo Alto: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Gais, S.J. (1983). The Investigation of Language Classroom Process. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17(2), 205-216..
- Hough, John B., and Amidon, Edmund. (1967). "Behavioural Change in Student Teachers," *Interaction Analysis: Theory, Research, and Application*. Edited by Edmund J. Amidon and John B. Hough. Palo Alto: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Hough, John B., and Ober, Richard. (1967). "The Effect of Training in Interaction Analysis on the Verbal Teaching Behaviour of Pre-Service Teachers," *Interaction Analysis: Theory, Research, and Application*. Edited by Edmund J. Amidon and John B. Hough. Palo Alto: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Johnson, E.K. (1995). *Understanding of Communication in Secondary Language Classrooms*. (Ed) Richards, J.C. Cambridge University Press.
- Nelson, Lois. (1966). "Teacher Leadership: An Empirical Approach to Analyzing Teacher Behaviour in the Classroom," *Classroom Interaction Newsletter*, 2:31-32, November.
- Petter, S. & Davis, A. (2002). *Quantitative Research Methods: Questionnaires*. Available online on [www.cis.gsu.edu/~dstraub/courses/.../Questionnaire 2002.ppt](http://www.cis.gsu.edu/~dstraub/courses/.../Questionnaire 2002.ppt).
- Soar, Robert S. (1967). "Pupil Needs and Teacher-Pupil Relationships: Experience Needed for Comprehending Reading," *Interaction Analysis: Theory, Research, and Application*. Edited by Edmund J. Amidon and John B. Hough. Palo Alto: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Ebel, Robert L. *Essentials of Education & Measurement*, 2nd, New Jersey, Prentice Hall, 1972. 2.
- Stolorow, L and Pahl K: Letter to the Assessment of teaching in America. 1963.
- Walsh, S. (2002). Construction or obstruction: Teacher talk and learner involvement in the EFL classroom. *Language Teaching*
- Research, 6, 3 – 23. \_ Walsh, S, (2006). *Investigating Classroom Discourse language in Action*. New York: Routledge.