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ABSTRACT


Because teacher talk is very important, Sinclair (1982:4) puts forward that all teachers should study teacher talk to check and improve their own way of teaching. The objectives of this research are: to analyze and describe the functions of teacher talk that are used by the English teachers in the classroom, to describe the functions of student talk that mostly appear in the classroom as the response of teacher talk, to analyze who dominates the classroom talk during the lesson. In order to get the result, the writer applied non-participant qualitative descriptive research. In her study, where she involved herself in the research by observing the teaching learning activities in four classes of two different teachers at SMA Negeri 9 Surabaya, recording the teachers’ and students’ utterances during the lesson in form of audio-recording, transcribing the data into conventional writing and analyzing the data by classifying the teachers’ and students’ utterances.

Analyzing the data under the light of Tsui bik-may, it was found out that there are some categories that both teachers mostly used. They are: Elicit, Inform, Starter, and Direct. For the teacher response, there are two categories that mostly used by both teachers. They are Accept and Comment. The first teacher, teacher A, liked to give elicitation to stimulate students to answer (El = 40.8 % of total elicitation) and give information (26.3 % of total information). She also liked to do starter in the beginning of the sentence (14.3 % of total starter). The second teacher, teacher B, also liked to give information (19.3 % of total information), and asked questions to see her students’ understanding (50.9% of total elicitation). She also liked to give direction to her students so she could control the students (28.9 % of total direction). For the student talk, using the data of Flanders, there is one category that mostly appear, Expected / Predictable Response (57.3 % in teacher A’s class and 57.4 % in teacher B’s class).