

Teacher Planning and Interactive Decisions Concerning Five Aspects of Teacher Language Use

Risna Saswati

English Department, Faculty of Humanities and Design, University of LIA,
South Jakarta, Indonesia
risna.sas@stbalia.ac.id

Abstract

The study investigates teacher decision making while planning the lesson and teacher doing classroom instructions. Additionally, the practice is related to teacher language use: teacher talk, teacher questions, teacher use of Indonesian and metalanguage, and teacher corrective feedback. The research method employed is a descriptive qualitative method by using the theories of teacher decision making (Richards, 2007), and teacher language use (Ellis, 2012) for data analysis techniques. The participant of this study is an experienced English lecturer teaching at a university in Jakarta. The result reveals that the teacher makes some decisions in planning the lesson related to her language use based on the students' capacity, classroom activities, her belief, perception and cognition, and the speaking skills and components. In her instructional teaching, decision making occurs in using her classroom language since she changes some activities. She makes some decisions according to the student's abilities, classroom activities, culture, and the lesson. The decision making made by the teacher can facilitate opportunities for the learners to engage in classroom interaction and improve their speaking skills.

Keywords: Decision Making; Teacher Planning; Instructional Teaching; Teacher Language Use

INTRODUCTION

Classroom communication is a sociolinguistic variety or institutional discourse type. It is different from natural communication. Studies of classroom talk have its own rules and conventions, for the language used there is not natural. Teachers are assigned to make the classroom talk are to resemble to communication outside the classroom. It is to prepare students to transfer knowledge learned to real-life requirements (Van Lier, 1984; Walsh, 2002). Richards (2007) points out that one distinguishing feature of language classrooms is that language is the goal of the lesson and how this goal is achieved. The teachers plan activities to facilitate the learners' and the use of target language in the classroom. Teachers use the target language as the means for giving instructions and directions, modeling target language patterns, and giving feedback on student performance. The students learn the language to negotiate classroom interaction with the teacher and other students and to do the tasks. The language use in the classroom is the language that the teacher uses and the students use. The language used by the teacher is how teachers modify their language and use questions and how teachers give feedback to the students. Preparing the lesson involves decision making. After planning, they bring the material to the classroom to teach. What they plan is subject to change while teaching which depends on the teaching situation, students' readiness and abilities, and time. There are changes in their lesson plan. It needs decisions on what to do. The decisions they make are under investigation. The five aspects of classroom discourse that focus on the teacher's use of language in the classroom are elaborated following as quoted in Ellis (2012): (1) Teacher Talk: Teacher-talk that is adjusted to the level of the students gives the comprehensible input needed for L2 acquisition. Adjustments need to take place at the phonological, lexical, and grammatical

and discourse level; (2) Teacher Questions: Teachers ask students questions to check the learners' understanding about the lesson, to facilitate the learners to engage in classroom interaction and elicit the students' schemata about today's lesson (Saswati, 2022). Teachers are to allow sufficient time for students to respond result the interactional conditions that foster L2 acquisition; (3) Teacher use of L1: Teachers need to maximize the use of target language, in particular foreign language context to make sure that learners have sufficient L2 input. They should minimize the use of L1 in interactions that focus on the framework or social goals; (4) Teacher use of meta language: Metalanguage assists the development of learners' explicit knowledge which facilitates implicit knowledge development. Metalingual explanations serve to prompt learners to experiment with new L2 forms in their production. Teachers using English to explain difficult words can give models of utterances for learners when they need to define the words in English later when teachers do the review; (5) Teacher corrective feedback: Corrective feedback can facilitate the learners in noticing of target features, learner repair errors, and L2 acquisition. Teachers demonstrate a clear preference for recast but these are not noticed by students in a classroom context and is not the most effective for assisting L2 acquisition.

Classroom discourse involves how utterances are combined sequentially through the teacher's and learner's contribution. The strategies teachers choose to communicate are influenced by learner's contributions through learners' language use. Focusing on teachers' use of language is based on a number of reasons. Ellis (2012) mentions three reasons why teachers' use of language become the subject of research: (1) It is the teachers as the ones who contribute to classroom interaction, (2) It is the teachers who give inputs to learners, (3) It allows for detailed examination of key aspects of language use and reflects the common approach to researching the L2 classroom.

Teaching involves making decisions both in teacher planning and instructional teaching. Teachers need to make on-the-spot decisions regarding different aspects of the lesson that are not planned yet in their lesson plan. This kind of decision is categorized as an interactive decision. After teaching, the teachers do retrospection about what teachers have done and use that evaluation for the next sessions. It involves decisions concerning what to use and what to leave for the following class. This type of decision is called evaluative decision. It provides insights into planning decisions for the following class or subsequent occasions.

Interactive decision making is done while instruction. Teachers do it based on the changes needed for the lesson is dynamic. According to Shavelson (1982), this kind of decision is characterized by real-time decisions for teachers do not have allotted time to reflect upon their decisions or to find additional information before deciding on doing an action. He adds that teachers' interactive decisions are influenced by their instructional planning (lesson planning) containing instructional tasks, goals, content, materials, activities, and allotted time. The mental plan design before teaching contains tasks in the form of mental scripts or images which are routinized to be conducted in interactive teaching. Teachers plan before they teach. Planning can make them feel confident for they know what they do. They have a framework for what to teach. The planning has purposes: (a) Planning is done to meet their immediate personal needs. They feel confident and secure when they are prepared to teach their students. They feel sure that they can manage the class based on the plan. By planning, teachers have a sense of direction if they get confused about what to do. (b) Planning is a means to the end of the instruction. They learn, collect, and organize the material, and manage the time and activity flow. (c) Planning can be used to organize students, to get activities started, to aid memory, and to provide a framework for framework for instruction and evaluation (Tessa, 2005).

Interactive decision making is done while teaching. Teachers do it based on the changes needed for the lesson is dynamic. Teachers do actions based on their previous experience or they react spontaneously to manage the problems and continue the routines. In one case, immediate

actions are not taken, teachers keep in memory and use that experience for future planning. Whitfield (1974) in Calderhead (1981) believe that decisions that occur during classroom interaction involve the issues of (1) implementation and/or modification of pre-lesson decisions; (2) language structure: level, vocabulary, illustration, and questions; (3) number and type of examples; (4) error correction and explanation; (5) motivating particular children to participate in the various lesson activities; (6) discipline and social control; (8) pacing the lesson concerning time.

This model of teachers' interactive decision making is synthesized by Shavelson and Stern based on the research conducted by Clark and Peterson (1978), Shavelson (1976), Snow (1972), and Joyce (1979). This model posits that teachers' interactive teaching is characterized by classroom teaching routines. In so doing, teachers monitor the classroom, seeking cues. Teachers can see whether the students can follow the activities or not, they participate actively in interaction or not. Decision-making models of teaching suggest that when problems arise while teaching, teachers can retrieve an alternative routine, react interactively to the situations, and redirect the lesson based on their cognition. It means it is based on their understanding of the problems and how best to address it (Richards, 2014). Therefore, this present study is to investigate decision making teachers make in their plan dan instructional teaching and whether or not the decision making teachers make can improve the learners' language skills. The decision making teachers make is related to the use of language by the teachers in classroom interaction. The previous studies related to decision making are conducted by the following proponents. Smith (1996) conducted a study that concerns with decision-making teachers make in the ESL classroom seen from the teacher's perspective. It is to examine the influence of teacher beliefs, experiential knowledge, and factors on teachers' planning and interactive decisions. Additionally, it is to shed light on how theories of teaching and learning are implemented in practice. In particular, it is to examine if the process-product dichotomy presented in the ESL literature is seen in practice. It is to see them express beliefs and use strategies and techniques related to theoretical perspectives or others. Nine ESL teachers from three college-level settings are participants in the study. The primary data are obtained from observations, post-observations, conferences, and final interviews. The secondary data are gathered through teacher plans, lesson handouts, and institutional course descriptions. The study investigates how individual teachers approach instructional decision-making in the ESL context. She finds that initial curriculum decisions provide an organizational framework and a set of course-level planning. Lessons are not planned in isolation but it is concerning curriculum-level components. Individual tasks have specific goals and processes; however, they are linked by a particular activity theme. Teachers' decisions are not linked sequentially but hierarchically. It means teachers determine the time sequence for curriculum components in a course and for individual tasks in each lesson. They determine how lesson tasks interrelate and build towards several set goals. The second research question is whether teacher decision making is influenced by individually held beliefs about ESL teaching and learning and perceptions of the instructional context and tasks. She finds that theory has little relevance for experienced teachers. Teachers think about theoretical ideas related to their personally held beliefs and experiential knowledge. The third research question deals with how context factors impact ESL teachers' planning and teaching decisions. She finds that contextual factors that are related to institutions are not found to influence teacher decisions. However, teachers with less experience are influenced by administrative expectations. Some students' factors influence their decisions. The last research problem is whether teachers' instructional decisions are consistent with theoretical approaches to planning and instruction. The consistency is related to how teachers practice included language as a product and process. Lesson planning is more process-oriented; however, the organization of course content into structural, functional, or topical components is product-oriented. Teachers display knowledge of theory; however, they

do not accept one theoretical perspective as the best approach. They recognize the value of learning about current theoretical ideas for their professional development and the role of theory is evident in decisions they make. Their previous experiences as teachers and learners and personally held beliefs about the nature of language learning and teaching have significant effects on what theoretical ideas the teachers adopt, modify, and reject for their planning and teaching decisions. The research reveals that there is consistency in what teachers believe with the theoretical ideas. However, she claims that it is more teacher-based theories that are influenced by their previous experiences and held beliefs about the nature of second language learning and teaching. Teacher decisions are of eclectic use of theory but it is an internal consistency between individual teacher beliefs and practices. The second study is conducted by Woods (1996). Woods (1996) conducts a longitudinal study of planning and decision making in ESL classroom in Canada. The study investigates a group of teachers when they go through the process of planning and teaching their courses using interviews, observations, video-based stimulated recall, teacher's log, and document analysis. This study provides detailed insights into teachers' decision making processes and the factors shaping these. He divides the factors into external and internal ones influencing decision making. The external factors are the number of students, the availability of photocopying, the knowledge about students' previous course experience, a recent conversation with another teacher, estimation of the complexity of tasks, estimation of how well students are moving, estimation of what group can handle, estimation of how well individuals in the class are moving, estimation of what individuals can handle, class and individual dynamics in class. Woods defines the external factors as situational which teachers consider in making decisions while internal factors deal with the ones internal to the decision making process itself. Teachers need to organize the instruction chronologically and make decisions on what to come first, what to follow, etc. It is related to the temporal relationship of instructional decisions. The logical relationships deal with the different levels of generality at which planning occurs (e.g., course, lesson, activity, text). Teachers' decisions are shaped by their understanding of the relationship among different levels of course units. Woods proposes BAK (beliefs, attitudes, knowledge) rather than he distinguishing the constructs of belief and knowledge.

The study sheds light on how the knowledge and beliefs of two EFL professionals shape the corrective feedback practices that they provide in Japanese contexts. This study reveals that teaching is a thinking activity and teachers are active, thinking decision-makers. They make decisions based on knowledge and beliefs about learning, teaching, learners, schools, and the world beyond schools. The data collection is conducted in 4 months by non-participant observations of classroom instructions and field notes, interviews, and documents such as textbooks and handouts. The study finds that the two participants provided corrective feedback or not based on factors such as objectives, time, and the frequency of errors made by the students, students' personalities, and communication ability. Both teachers promote and instill the values (independence, confidence, communication ability). The teachers' knowledge related to contexts (school, schooling, and teaching) plays the role in their corrective feedback practice.

Liu & Zhu (2012) conducted a study related to teacher talk. According to them, teacher talk is the major resource of comprehensible input for learners that they receive in the classroom. This current study attempts to investigate teacher talk time, questioning patterns, and feedback patterns. In traditional teacher-centered English classes, teachers pass the knowledge to students. The teacher is dominant in the classroom. In China, teachers play an important role and have high authority. Therefore, this study investigates teachers in terms of teacher talk time, teacher questions, and teacher corrective feedback. The participants in this study are four college English teachers. They are observed and videotaped. This study applies quantitative data collection techniques. The transcriptions are the source of the data analysis.

The results show that teacher talk time is of 36% to 58%. The student talk is of 31 to 56%. The evidence reveals that students talk less. Regarding teacher questions, teachers mostly use display questions instead of referential questions. Accordingly, teachers should apply referential questions more than display questions to promote communicative competence. Moreover, it is found that 70% of feedback is positive and effective. They use praising, repetition, and self-repair. They add that they still find one-way communication in the classroom. It means the class is traditionally teacher-centered. Teachers still dominate the class. They suggest teachers are to enhance their awareness in this respect and relevant training should be organized for teachers to improve their teaching practice. The studies conducted are concerned with teacher decision making in the ESL classroom and classroom interaction which are in the field of teacher cognition. The previous studies conducted in the 1990s are concerned with the influence of the teacher's beliefs, experiential knowledge, factors shaping the planning and decision making (Smith, 1991; Woods, 1996), classroom interaction in terms of teacher talk time, teacher questions and feedback pattern (Liu & Zhu, 2012) and teacher decision making and their corrective feedback (Mori, 2011).

This study investigates teacher decision making in instructional planning and classroom teaching. When teachers plan the lesson, teachers decide what to teach and what activities they select. They decide the materials and activities that facilitate the students' competence. When they plan their talk, their questions, their language, and their corrective feedback, decision making occurs. What decisions they make when planning the lesson related to five aspects of teacher language use are under investigation. However, the plans made can be changed when teaching. If problems occur during interactive teaching, decisions are made. Teachers should decide whether they continue the lesson and change the lesson or go back to the routines. It is probably that they save the problems for the future and do what they plan. What decisions teachers make in classroom teaching and how they implement their decisions in their teaching are under investigation. Therefore, the research questions for this study are: (1) What decisions do teachers make in instructional planning and classroom teaching related to five aspects of teacher language use? (2) Do the implemented decisions promote students' comprehension of the lesson?

METHOD

This study employs a qualitative methodology in which it is considered appropriate to give insights to the understanding of decision making in planning and teaching with reference to five aspects of teacher language use. In addition, whether or not the implemented decisions promote students' understanding of the lesson. The participant is an experienced lecturer teaching speaking in one university in Jakarta. She has more than 10 years teaching. The data for this study is teacher decision making in planning and classroom teaching with respect to five aspects of teacher language use. The data are collected by the teacher participates in pre-observation interview using open-ended questions to find out decisions are made when writing down their instructional planning. To answer the second research problem which is what decisions teachers make when planning and teaching, the observations are conducted. The changes in instructional planning are noted in observation and the implementation of the decisions are observed. Stimulated recall interview is to find what decisions teacher makes in classroom teaching. Therefore, the field notes are used as a guidance to check the stages in video recording. This study uses the files of video recording and stimulated recall interview as techniques to collect the data to investigate the implementation of decisions made by teacher. All recorded data are transcribed and translated into English if the participant uses Indonesian when interviewed. The answers in questionnaire are analyzed based decisions made in instructional planning and classroom teaching related to teacher language use.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

Teacher Planning Decisions

Teacher Talk

In the pre-speaking stage, the teacher modifies the topic by adding one subtopic that is not provided by the textbook: plan. It is her previous plan, she decides to add to one subtopic because there is still time and it is not difficult to express and structure: to be+ going to and will. After this activity, the students do another activity in which they are expected to talk about their made-up weekend plan in pairs. However, there is a change. The teacher needs them to talk about their real weekend for the weekend is coming. In pre-observation interview, she changes by saying that it is not her habit to talk about today's lesson because it is already stated in the textbook. I just write down the agenda for today's lesson on the board. In practice stage, the students are expected to be able to talk about their weekend plan in pairs. She gives direction what to do. Her talk is:

T: Let's make a circle (inner and outer circle). Share with your partner about your future plans. Step aside two times to your right. Re-share your future plans to another partner.

Before she plans this, she asks the students to share in pairs in their seats. It is modified since the book does not provide the exercise that meets her interest. In the next activity, students do a conversation practice in a role-play talking about Jakarta and Indonesia 10 years from now. They talk about predictions. Additionally, she plans to talk about related vocabulary before students do the exercise. However, she changes this activity not as planned. In practice 3, she plans the students to make promises and hope. They are supposed to be able to have a dialogue in the form of role-play based on the situation given. She changes the situation of the marriage proposal since the number of boys is less than the girls. The other situations are added. She does not plan those situations yet when she is asked in the pre-observation interview.

In summing up stage, the plan is there are questions about grammar points and expressions about the future she needs to ask to students. For assessment, she plans to have an activity and needs to have the scores for their performance.

Teacher Question

In pre-speaking, she uses WH-Questions and Y/N Questions to ask the students to have their schemata. In the interview, the question *Do you have a plan for this coming weekend?* is changed into *Have you had any plans for this coming weekend?* The reason is she needs to check whether the students understand the form or not. She opens her presentation with Y/N questions *Have you learned the future tense in your grammar class?* Since there is a change in subtopic, she asks more on to be+ going to and will. Since there is a change of her questions, she asks more based on her new situations. The planned questions are not used anymore since the situation does not meet the number of male students. There is no more marriage proposal in her L/P. In the summing-up stage, she does not provide questions. In the last stage, assessment, she decides that there is no assessment. However, she plans it.

Teacher Use of Metalanguage

The metalanguage planned to talk is the words related to the future: The words are: invent vs. discover, Wonder vs. wander, Probably. Those words are listed in the student's textbook. She needs to talk about this in pre-speaking. However, she drops these words and changes into: *Create* and *Predict* to change invent or *discover* and *predict*.. In practice 1, the word that is to

be introduced is *by the time*. She chooses this because it is not easy to identify the time using this phrase. For this stage, there is no change. In practice 2, she has the word *vow*. The word is related to the situation which she plans 'marriage proposal'. She decides not to use this situation; therefore, this word is deleted in her L/P. She says in the interview that she is to use other words. In summing up, there is no metalanguage she uses. In the next stage, the words used are: *sophisticated* and *technology*. In her plans, the words are used when she talks about the world today. Since there is no assessment, the teacher deletes these words in her metalanguage.

Teacher Use of Indonesian

The use of Indonesian in this pre-speaking stage is *cita-cita*. She plans to use this word to elicit the subtopic of future plan. That is her final decision. Previously, she does not plan to use Indonesian. In regards with the addition of the subtopic, the word *cita-cita* comes up. As she says in the pre-observation interview:

T: Just to make sure they are able to say this word in English because we don't have the exact word in English for *cita-cita* so I just want to make sure if they are able to say that in English because we are talking about Future Plan they will also talk about *cita-cita* so let's see how they express it.

In presentation segment, she introduces the phrase **fortune teller** related to making prediction. If the students cannot guess what it means she plans it to have *peramal* or *dukun* in Indonesian. It is to anticipate students' questions about the people who can make predictions. In practice 3, *sumpah setia* is used to relate this with the situation 'marriage proposal'. If students cannot come up with the word 'vow' she plans to translate it into *sumpah setia*. However, since the situation is eliminated from the L/P, the phrase is not used anymore. There is no plan to use Indonesian for this stage. The word *canggih* is written in her plan for assessment; however, she decides not to have an assessment.

Teacher Corrective Feedback

In her pre-speaking, she plans to correct students' mistakes individually.

I: Do you have any intention to correct your students' speaking?

T: Yes, of course. But not personally or not directly. Usually the way I correct them when I ask them to talk after one part or one session. I usually write on the black board so none of them would realize that they have said that. But we learn together from their errors.

I: OK. So you come to this decision because it is your plan. Actually what you do in class is write down them in the board.

T: I write down the errors they make before on the board and I will ask them. Do you really say this when you want to ask about someone's future plan?

I: OK. You discuss it with them.

At first, she needs to correct student's mistake individually as written in her lesson plan. However, she changes since it is not her routine. She decides to put the mistakes on board after one part or at the end of the session. In the presentation stage, the way she presents the material is by asking and answer. Therefore, she asks Y/N questions to confirm the students about what she says to check whether the students understand or not. She uses another way to correct students' mistakes. It is by asking *Say that again, please*. By saying this again and again students realize that what they say is not correct.

I: Teacher corrective feedback. Do you ask them to repeat for the spelling?

T: The spelling and the sentence until they realize they have made mistakes. So that's why I ask them to repeat. It means something.

I: They know already.

T: Yeah. It's another way to write down their mistakes on the board.

I: I see. Practice.

T: Say it again.... Say it again... when they are aware that I say "Say it again" they know there is something wrong.

I: Do they read your facial expressions?

T: Yeah. They improve it.

There is no change at this stage. She just adds another strategy to correct students' mistakes. In the practice stage, she plans to go around to check students' speaking. She uses the expression 'Can you use that' if students need her input. Some other questions used to correct students' mistakes are not written in her L/P. However, she plans to go back to her routine when needed. In summing up, she does not plan to have the corrective feedback. In the assessment, she plans to have the questions again to give the corrective feedback:

T: Can you say that again?

T: Is it okay?

However, she decides not to have an assessment at the end of the session. She deletes this in her L/P. In summary, the teacher has changes when she writes down her L/P. The changes still occur when she is interviewed. She still revises her work. The changes that she makes are in the vocabulary, the situation in the conversation, the use of Indonesian, activities in the classroom, and the materials. The reasons why there are changes: (1) She adds the subtopic to the material since students need it. There are added exercises and grammar points regarding the new subtopic, (2) She forgets to write down some related vocabularies in her L/P, (3) the students need to speak more, (4) The time constraint is under consideration.

Teacher Interactive Decisions

The following is the elaboration about the changes the teacher makes in teaching and how the teacher implements those decisions in her class. The changes are seen from five aspects of teacher language use.

Teacher Talk

The next step is she elicits students about the plan as the additional subtopic. The students are to do the task in pairs. The task is they have to create a dialog that talks about their plans. It is not written in the L/P. She decides this since the students need to practice about plan and needs to see how students use future tense. In this stage, it is found that the class is still confused about using the forms that are used in their practices. Some of the students miss the word 'go'. They keep saying *I'm going to Bandung* instead of *I'm going to go to Bandung*. It is still in the presentation stage in which it is not stated that there is elaboration of four discussion questions presented in the textbook. She decides to return to it. She explains those four questions by asking and answer strategy. She explains those one by one. The other is vocabulary which are chosen by her as planned. However, she changes what it is planned. She decides to explain all the list of expressions there in the textbook. She does it by ask and answer strategy as her routine. Additionally, the students are trained how to pronounce the words. Actually, the pronunciation practice is not written in her L/P. She provides context in which the words or

expressions occur. As she states in her teaching:

T: How do you differ invent and discover? Do they have the same meaning? Invent or discover?

C: (no response)

T: No. different meaning? What is discover? What is invent? Thomas Alfa Edison Bulb. Discovered or invented?

C: discover

T: Past Tense. Discovered or invented?

C: discovered

In her L/P, this activity is written in practice 1. She moves this to practice 2 in teaching. The reason is students need more practice using all the expressions learned. This activity is more complicated than the previous ones. Therefore, she decides to move this and asks the students to role-play by making a spinner. They can change partners easily in different situations provided by a teacher. There is a change that involves decision making in her talk. One of the situations that she does not want to use in her L/P is a 'marriage proposal'. Her talk is:

T: All number 1 make two steps to the right. Ok, I'll join... All number 1 turn around and face the outer circle. I will give you a situation and you will talk about it. So this is the situation. **You will propose a girl. You want to marry her.**

Ss: Hah... (The class becomes noisy because the situation given.)

T: I'll change the situation. I don't want to promote a homosexual couple. I'll change the situation. I'll assign you to be a partner in a team. Make a promise to each other to be success in a team.

She decides not to have practice 3 since the time is not allowed. The class comes to summing up a segment in which she plans to ask students about what they learned. The next is assessment part in which she decides when planning that there is no assessment.

Teacher Question

In pre-speaking, as planned, she uses display questions more than referential questions. The aim is for students can speak more. It is to establish the students' knowledge of the answer.

T: Have you had any plan for this coming weekend? What is your plan? Do you use 'to be + going to or will? Why 'will'? Why not 'to be + going to'? When do you use 'will'? when do you use 'to be + going to'?

However, she uses more referential questions than display questions. The reason is referential questions is easier for students to answer than display questions. She decided to change the type of question to make students engaged in classroom interaction.

T: **Do you know that we also use present progressive to express future meaning?** No?

Ss: No

T: You never know that. **Have you heard before?** When I say "I'm going to Bandung. Am I in Bandung now?

Ss: No

T: Am I on my way to Bandung?

Ss: Yes

T: Not necessarily. For example, I'm going to Bandung this evening. Am I on my way to

Bandung? That's acceptable. I can say that for future meaning. This evening. I'm going to Bandung this evening. Present progressive with future meaning. How do you differ to be going to and will again? We use this if our plan is already fixed and closed. When I say I'm going to Bandung this evening by train. **Have I had the ticket with me?**

Ss: NO

In the presentation stage, she explains grammar points and vocabulary. As planned, she uses display questions to check whether the students understand or not the difference between 'to be + going to' and 'will'. However, when she finds that there is no response from the students, she decides to use referential questions more. She uses display questions first and changes those into referential questions that need only a Yes or No answer.

T: Unless

C: Unless

T: **How do you use that? Do you have the textbook with you? Can someone make a sentence using this?**

C: (No response)

T: Fadhilah...

C: (No response)

T: I will not come to the party unless you invite me. That's the meaning of unless, if not. The other way to say if not. You will never be able to speak English unless you practice every day. Next, By the time.

C: By the time

T: **When do you use this? When I say "You have to submit your assignment by 12 tomorrow". Can you submit at 1?**

C: No

T: **Can you submit at 11?**

C: Yes

T: **Can you submit at 12?**

C: yes

T: But not more than 12.

Since the presentation teacher uses an ask-and-answer strategy, there are many teacher's questions that are asked depending on the response of the students. If there is no response, the teacher changes the questions to the easier ones to understand. It is decided and the teacher implements this to make students understand and engage in class interaction. There are changes to what it is planned.

T: Are they the same or different in meaning? Different words? How do you read this? wonder [wʌnde(r)] for wonder woman. This one or that one?

C: Left

The teacher has a series of questions. Before students answer her questions, she does not wait but directly changes the questions. Although all the questions are still the same types, evaluative questions, the teacher cannot wait. In the practice stage, students are engaged in the activity and she just controls the class by asking them whether they are finished or not as her routine. She uses attentional questions as social control.

T: I don't know this topic is interesting. This topic is interesting, right? It's like the hottest

issue today.

C: Yes

The interesting one is she uses chunks for Y/N questions to trigger students' answers. She cannot wait so she decides to change into another type of question. It is an evaluative type of question. In summing up, it is not written that she reviews today's lesson. She just asks the students using an evaluative type of question.

T: Ok. This is your last activity. (teacher gives the class an assignment. She delivers the paper). Alright. You'll write down there... in 20 years... ok. **What is your sentence?**

S: In 20 years, We'll be...

T: Am I still alive? It will be 2037. I'm already 59. **What is your prediction in 20 years from now?**

S: You will be still beautiful.

T: Thank you. Using probably

S: You will probably still teach.

S: You will probably retire from teaching.

She decides to have an ask-and-answer strategy for the review and it is not planned. She returns to her routines. When students cannot answer her WH-Question, she changes them into Y/N Questions. If there is no response yet, she uses chunks to simplify her question. What she decides and she implements that decision is to make students understand the lesson and invite them to engage. That's the last activity since there is no assessment stage.

Teacher Metalanguage

Teacher explains the familiar words using Indonesian and metalanguage. It makes the students feel easier to grasp the meaning. The Indonesian is used when the teacher encounters with the cultural words. The other words, the teacher uses metalanguage in order to give examples for the students to learn how to define the words.

Teacher Corrective Feedback

The strategies are changed based on the students' responses. The first decision is the teacher asks the class and goes to individual. The teacher does not call the names of the students but poses the question to class to get the responses. The decision she makes in interactive teaching is she invites the class to answer the questions and give feedback directly to the class not individual. She makes changes since it is more practical.

Discussion

Decision making the teacher makes is related to the classroom activities, students' ability, and teacher belief (Woods, 1996; Smith, 1996; Richards, 2007). Decision made by the teacher with respect to teacher language use in planning is teacher talk is to be used in giving direction, to elaborate the lesson, and to manage classroom. It happens changes in planning and teaching since the teacher modifies the classroom activities. The explanation of the unfamiliar words is used by using synonyms and Indonesian. The teacher decision in planning is not to use Indonesian; however, the Indonesian is needed to explain the words easily. The students can comprehend the lesson quickly. Regarding the questions used in the classroom, the use of display questions dominates in the beginning of the lesson and gradually is replaced by referential questions. It is to improve the students' speaking ability. The corrective feedback strategies are employed and changed based on the students' answers during the interactive

teaching. It is not to discouraged the students to speak.

CONCLUSION

The research reveals that the teacher changes her plan while teaching based on the material, teacher's cognition, interests and , and experiences. learners' competence, and time constrains. The changes in this research is limited to the key aspects of teacher language use. The talk is reduced into simpler language, teacher uses referential questions, teacher changes the complicated vocabulary into familiar ones and translates those words using Indonesian dan metalanguage, and teacher uses simple strategies to give corrective feedback.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author extends her deepest gratitude to the teacher who allowed the author to sit in her class. Additionally, I feel thankful to the institution for giving me the allotted time to finish writing this manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, L. W. (2003). *Enhancing the quality of teacher decision making*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associate, Inc.
- Binnie-Smith, D. (1996). Teacher decision making in the adult ESL classroom. In D. Freeman and Jack C. Richards (eds.), *Teacher Learning in Language Teaching* (pp. 197-216). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bailey, K. M. (1996). The best laid plans: Teachers' in-class decisions to depart from their lesson plans. In K. Bailey and D. Nunan (eds.), *Voices from the Language Classroom*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Clark, M.P. (1983). *Research on Teacher Planning: An Inventory of the Knowledge Base*. Michigan: Michigan State University.
- Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57: 402-23.
- Cullen, R. (1998). Teacher talk and the classroom context. *ELT Journal* 52: 179-187.
- Chew, L. (2012). *An Exploratory Study on the Beliefs and Practices of Teacher-Child Interactions of Selected Early Childhood Educators in Singapore*. Retrieved January 2016 2016, from Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk>
- Drew, Paul and Heritage, J. (1992). Analyzing talk at work; an introduction. In P. Drew and J. Heritage (eds.), *Talk at work: interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2012). *Language Teaching Research & Language Pedagogy*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Farell, Thomas S.C. 2003. Lesson Planning. *Methodology in Language Teaching: an anthology of current practice* (pp.30-39). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harbord, J. (1992). The use of the mother tongue in the classroom. *ELT Journal*, 46: 350-55
- Lier, L. V. (1988). *The Classroom and Language Learner*. London: Longman.
- Littlewood, W. (2011). Communicative Language Teaching. In E. H. ed., *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning Vol.II*. New York: Routledge.
- Nunan, D. and Bailey, M.K. (2009). *Exploring Second Language Research: A Comprehensive Guide*. Canada: Nelson Education, Ltd.
- Polio, C., and P. Duff. (1994). Teachers' language use in University Foreign Language Classroom: A qualitative analysis of English and target language alternation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78: 31-43.

- Richards, J.C. and Lockhard, C. (1994). *Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classrooms*. USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. (1998b). Teacher beliefs and decision making. In J. C. Richards (ed.), *Beyond Training* (pp. 65-85). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. (2014). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Saswati, R. (2022). Teacher Questioning Strategies Employed in Speaking Classes in EFL Setting: A Study of Classroom Interaction. *Scope: Journal of English Language Teaching* 7 (1), 98-104
- Seedhouse, P. (1996). Classroom interaction: possibilities and impossibilities. *ELT Journal*, 16-23.
- Shavelson, Richard. J. (1982). Review of Research on Teachers' Pedagogical Judgments, Plans and Decisions. Washington. DC: USA Department of Education.
- Shavelson, Richard. J. & P. Stern. (1982). Research on teachers' pedagogical thoughts, judgement and behaviors. *Review of Educational Research*, 51 (4), 455-98.
- Tsui, A. B. (2003). *Understanding Expertise in Teaching: Case Studies in ESL Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Walsh, S. (2002). Construction and obstruction: teacher talk and learner involvement in the EFL classroom. *Language Teaching Research*, 6:3-23
- Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating Classroom Discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring Classroom Discourse: Language in action*. Canada: Routledge.
- Woodward, Tessa. (2005). *Planning Lesson and Courses*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Yinger, R. (1980). A study of teacher planning. *Elementary School Journal*, 80(3), 103-127.