

Instructor – Cadets Interaction in Maritime English Classroom (A Case Study at Politeknik Pelayaran Barombong)

Fitriani Hilal

fitrihilal05@gmail.com

Muhammadiyah University of Makassar

Abstract

The present study was to explore instructor-cadets interaction in maritime English classrooms. Specifically, it sought to reveal (1) the patterns of the instructor-cadets interaction in the classrooms and (2) cadets' perception on the indicated interaction patterns. Designed to be a single-case study, the research was conducted at Politeknik Pelayaran Barombong, Makassar, one of the leading seafaring education and training institutions in East-Indonesia. The data were obtained through classroom observation and interview. As the results, the findings elucidate that (1) the patterns of the instructor-cadets interaction were categorized into one-way, two-way, multi-way traffic, even there was a new hypothetical traffic proposition "semi multi-way traffic" identified empirically besides the three traffics, and (2) based on the cadets' perceptions toward the indicated patterns, it could be revealed that (a) they were aware of the indicated patterns and (b) there are some determinant factors of the three indicated interaction patterns, especially for the one-way traffic, i.e; having not understood the lesson materials, fear of being underestimated, teacher's negative prejudice behavior, and being exhausted physically and psychologically by the military learning activities.

Keywords: Interaction Patterns, Instructor-cadets Interaction, Maritime English Classroom

INTRODUCTION

Learning a second or foreign language means undergoing the process of acquiring the language (Krashen, 2001). Such a process is just like a journey. Since students are travelers who are still unfamiliar with the streets leading to the destination, they need teacher as a guide. This is how students and teacher become inseparable components in the learning process, particularly in the context of classroom.

As the venue for English as a foreign language (EFL) teaching and learning process, an EFL classroom is essentially a world that provides a lot of interesting phenomena dealing with interaction between teacher and students. How the classroom interaction happens significantly impacts on the learning target achievement (Brown, 2001; Ayeni & Ebong, 2016), therefore, explorations of those phenomena become necessary. This seems to make a sense since such explorations

can culminate in findings that imply fresh ideas of better EFL teaching and learning in the future.

Like other sorts of verbal interaction, an interaction between teacher and students in a foreign language classroom is basically a social interaction through language in which talks are given and heard, ideas are exchanged, feelings are expressed, questions are asked and answered, and instructions are given and followed (Hall, 2003). What makes it so distinctive is that it has teacher and students as its participants and is meant to be students' process of acquiring the target language. In fact, a classroom interaction is constructed of two components; teacher talk and student talk, and it enables its participants (teacher and students) to play their roles effectively in the teaching and learning process (Choudhury, 2005; Ayeni & Ebong 2021). From here, we can see that in the context of foreign language classroom, the thing called classroom interaction is essentially the teaching and learning process itself. This is how the idea that classroom interactions contribute a lot towards learning achievement comes up.

It seems unarguable that positive things derived from a foreign language learning process are mostly due to good interactions among the classroom "inhabitants". The interactions create the opportunity to negotiate, to provide students with increased chances for comprehension of the target language, and to acquire target discourse conventions and practice higher level communicative skills (Stevens, 2011). Completing this idea, Ellis (2008) proposes that through good interactions in the teaching and learning process, teacher constructs interactive learning environments, where students can practice communicating with each other to generate meaning in the target language.

The above-elucidated ideas lead us to understand that teacher-student interaction are chiefly to facilitate a foreign language learning process in the classroom, which is fundamentally intended to enable students to acquire the target language. Conclusively, those ideas are to back Krashen's (2001) notion that a foreign language acquisition always requires meaningful interactions through the target language in real situations with low level of anxiety.

Politeknik Pelayaran Barombong (Barombong Maritime Polytechnic) is one of the east Indonesia's leading seafaring education and training institutions. Situated in Barombong, Makassar, the institution currently has more than a thousand cadets. Projected to become competent seamen who represent the archipelago state in the merchant marine world, those cadets are educated and trained to have all the knowledge and skills required in the merchant marine businesses, including English language. Then demanded to produce ready-to-hire seamen with sufficient English speaking skill, the Barombong Maritime Polytechnic employs some EFL instructors, who are expected to help the cadets acquire the world's number one international language in the learning process. Besides, at this state institution, English is one of the most important courses that the cadets have to take in every semester of their study (Ariani & Arham, 2020). This absolutely implies the institution's solemnity in the effort to create internationally qualified seamen.

Since all the cadets are projected to be competent at maritime English before their graduation, the teaching and learning processes here refer to the IMO's

(International Maritime Organization) curriculum: the IMO model courses, which has been designed to enable learners to communicate in English both on board and at port, in which the purpose of the IMO model courses is to assist training providers and their teaching staff in organizing and introducing new training courses, or in enhancing, updating or supplementing existing training material where the quality and effectiveness of the training courses may thereby be improved. Realizing that the regular meetings are never enough to reach the learning target, the institution provides the cadets, particularly those with low aptitude, with extra classes.

In the results of the researcher's preliminary observation concerning on the research locus, Barombong Maritime Polytechnic, he found that (1) the instructor-cadets interactions in the teaching and learning process within the EFL classrooms interaction at this reputable maritime education and training campus are so typical, and the typicality is generated by at least two factors; the type of English taught and learnt (maritime English) and the general rules applied at the campus (semi-military system); and (2) there have been many previous researches having conducted the researches focusing on the classroom interaction and the patterns of the teacher-student interaction, but as long as the researcher's preliminary observation, there has not been any research conducted the focuses on the maritime field on revealing the classroom interaction patterns using Lindgren's three conceptual interaction traffic patterns (1991), one-way, two-way, and multi-way traffic, concerning on the first type of the classroom interaction proposed by the Moore (1994), the teacher-student interaction.

Thus, based on the so typical maritime conditions happening at the research locus and the focuses of the previous findings having not conducted yet the patterns of the classroom interaction patterns focusing on the instructor-cadet interaction were considered by the researcher as the interesting factors determining him to conduct his research on the interaction traffic patterns occurring within the maritime classroom interaction at *Barombong Maritime Polytechnic*. Having contemplated the research background above, the researcher eagerly intended to conduct a research focusing on the interaction traffic patterns of the instructor-cadets interaction under the title "*Instructor-cadet Interactions in Maritime English Classroom (A Case Research at Politeknik Pelayaran Barombong)*".

METHOD

The research applied a single case research design, in which according to Stake (Heigham and Croker, 2009) explaining that the single case research design is the research conducted focusing on one empirical objective phenomenon that the researcher determined as his research focus. The interaction in Maritime English classroom between Instructor and cadet as a single case study to be investigated qualitatively in order to explore appropriateness of the related theories. It was conducted at Politeknik Pelayaran Barombong. The researcher decided subjects of this research was one class of the first semester nautical cadets. In collecting the data, the researcher conducted two instruments through observation and interview. The data were analysed by qualitative approach based on Miles, Huberman and Saldana

which carried out three steps: data condensation, data display, and drawing and verifying conclusion.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Following the research questions and the data condensation that had been conducted by the researcher on the transcribed data (either from the recorded video and the noted interview data), the findings below are divided into two parts; (1) the narrative data display of the interaction traffic patterns of instructor-cadets interaction occurring in the maritime English classroom and (2) the narrative data display of the cadets' perception on the indicated patterns of instructor-cadets interaction occurring in the maritime English classroom consisting the cadets' interview statements.

1. The Data Display of the Patterns of Instructor-cadets Interaction Occurring in the Maritime English Classroom

There are 8 excerpts found by the researcher from the transcribed data clarifying the three traffics of the teacher-student (instructor-cadets) interaction in the maritime English teaching and learning process, including the display of the 2 excerpts that the researcher assumed being not able to be categorized into the Lindgren's three conceptual interaction traffic patterns; one-way, two-way, multi-way.

a. One-way traffic

The one-way traffic is a kind of patterns within the teacher-student interaction in one topic, in which there are only two participant categories, a teacher and a student, in which the interaction comes from the teacher only and the student is passive (Lindgren, 1991). The data obtained through the classroom observation reveal that there are 41 excerpts clarifying this traffic. There are two categorical contexts where this traffic can be existed; (1) *one-way traffic with cadets' silence* and (2) *one-way traffic with cadets' simple response*. The one-way traffic having with cadets' *silence* category is verified by 3 excerpted data in which those are represented by two of them, E.1 and E.2, while the one-way with cadets' *simple response* category are verified by 38 excerpted data in which those are represented by two of them, E.3 and E.4.

- *One-way Traffic with Cadets' Silence*

Excerpt 1: (E:1, V:2, T: 00':00" – 01':24")

I : (00':00") This is.....yah. So, it means that study, yah. Study is a habit from Hafid and Farhan, Yah. Study is a habit of Farhan and Hafid (0:15). So, what about you? (0:20).

Cs : **(Silence)** (00':21")

I : Rise! Rise! (0:22). Come on! (0:24). Give me one example of habits, yah! (0:25). Or in your day activity, your day activity (0:28) what your day activity? (0:30). In this campus or at your home (0:32). We are.....oke (1:00). Oke anyone else? (1:04)

Cs : **(Silence)** (01':04")

I : Come on! Come on! (1:05) anyone else?

- Cs : (Silence) (01':07")
I : Give me one example. Or one more, one more, one more, one more.
Rahman! (01':23")
C1 : Yes (01':24")

Excerpt 2: (E:2, V:2, T: 02':47" – 03':20")

- I : (02':47") Are you sure? (02':48").
Cs : (Silence) (02':50")
I : Oke, this one. We, oke. and this one verb auxiliary. So, don't need this one. We.....and..... This is talk about habit in your day activity. Tonight is only one night. Not.....oke? (3:18)
Cs : (silence)(03':19")
I : Understood? (3:20).
Cs : (Silence) (03':21")

- One-way Traffic with Cadets' Simple Response

Excerpt 3: (E:3, V:2, T: 03':28" – 04':40")

- I : (03':28") This is talk in about your what.....now. I mean studentor..... Or something like that. Yah. Subject, auxiliary, and..... For example you are student or teacher, oke?. You can say, this is your day activity , right?. Oke, you wake up at.....AM everyday. So, this is your day activity. Yah? (04':35").
Cs : Yes (04':36")
I : is it right? (04':39")
C2 : Yes (04':40")

Excerpt 4: (E:4, V:2, T: 14':47" – 14':56")

- I : (14':47") Air conditioner. Understood? (14':55")
Cs : Yes (14':56")

In Lindgren's (1991) proposition, a one-way traffic interaction is indicated by teacher's full domination in information sharing, and this seems to have been confirmed by the research findings. As described previously, the findings elucidate that one-way traffic instructor-cadets interactions happen in the maritime English classroom in two categories; one-way traffic with cadets' silence and one-way traffic with cadets' simple response. The two categories of one-way traffic interaction mostly appear as the instructor explains the material. When explaining the material, the instructor seems to stand tall as a "commander"; he is the only communicant in the interaction without any response from the cadets, likely to be good listener to her explanation only. Even when the instructor stimulates them to interact, but there is

still no any response (it can be seen in the E.1 & E.2), and this is how one-way traffic interactions with cadets' silence typically occur in the maritime English classroom.

Yet, occasionally, this category of one-way traffic instructor-cadets interaction also occurs as the cadets are unable to give some response despite the instructor's stimulation. On the contrary, in certain conditions in the session of material delivery, the cadets could show their enthusiasm for what the instructor explains through a simple response only, and the simple response is typically an interjection such as "Yes Sir" or "Yes" only (it can be seen in the E.3 and E.4). This is what the researcher calls one-way traffic with cadets' simple response.

Having got the explanation above, the one-way traffic pattern occurring within the teacher-student (instructor-cadet) interaction, no matter the domination of the interaction is initiated by the teacher/instructor or because of the student/cadet's inability to respond will always be able to be identified as long as the two participatory interlocutors (one instructor/teacher and one student/cadet) within a single-discussed topic in which the traffic interactions mostly come from the teacher/instructor toward the student/cadet being able to be passive only, whether with silence only or with simple-short response.

b. Two-way Traffic

Two-way traffic is the second pattern occurring within the teacher-student interaction in one topic, in which there are only two participants, a teacher and a student, in which there is one or more feedbacks occurring in the interaction between the two participants (Lindgren, 1991). There are 13 excerpts clarifying this second pattern, in which having paid attention deeper on them, the researcher found that such a pattern occurs in two categorical contexts; (1) two-way traffic with instructor's stimulation and (2) two-way traffic with cadet's questioning. The two-way traffic having with cadets' response category is verified by 11 excerpted data in which those are represented by two of them, E.5 and E.6, while the two-way with cadet's questioning category are verified by 2 excerpted data in which those are represented by one of them, the E.7.

- *Two-way Traffic with Instructor's Stimulation*

Excerpt 5: (E:5, V:3, T: 07':03" – 08':22")

I : (07':03") How many in this class?. You can tell that. For example yah. For example, my partner is Bob. Yah, for example my partner is Bob. Oke I am going to report my some question with Bob. Bob said that, oke. Bob said that there are twenty five books in this class, and then there is one air conditioner. After that there are two doors in this class. Yah, ceritakan seperti itu!. Understood? (7:47)

C20: Yes (7:48)

I : Oke, repeat again! (7:49)

C20: Farhan said, Farhan said that there are twenty-five table, table in this class in this class (7:58)

I : Tables (8:04)

C20: Tables, and there is one bottle in this class. After that, after that, twenty, twenty four cadet, cadets in this class (8:22).

Excerpt 6: (E:6, V:2, T: 15':11" – 15':41")

I : (15':11") There are and there is we call in Indonesia, ada. Yah. Yah, for example, how many cadets in here?. How many cadets? (15:36).

C4 : Twenty four (15:39)

I : There are twenty four (15:40)

C4: There are twenty four cadets in here (15:41)

- Two-way Traffic with Cadets' Questioning

Excerpt 7: (E:7, V:3, T: 01':47" – 02':29")

I : (01':47") And remember when plural, you have to put "s". For example chair. You can't say twenty-five chair. But you have to say there are twenty-five chairs in this class. Not chair, but you have to say chairs (2:06)

C5 : But, when we put just more than two one if we just say like doors? (2:09)

I : Yah, you can say doors. Yah, if only one, not additional "S". Yah, if more than one you have to give additional "s" (2:25)

C5 : "s" (2:29)

Having analyzed the data (the E.5, E.6, and E.7), this interaction traffic pattern is clarified by the excerpts, in which it was found that it occurs in two determinant factors; stimulation and questioning. This is another point which the previous researches conducted by Li and Jee (2019), Hayik and Westergard (2019), Hoque (2017), arisandi (2018), and Sundari (2017) did not mention in their claims. As described previously, the two categories of two-way traffic classroom interaction (two-way traffic pattern with instructor's stimulation and two-way traffic pattern with students' question) typically happen in the maritime English classroom by the instructor's initiation and cadets' initiative.

While the two-way traffic interactions triggered by instructor's initiation seem to imply the instructor's awareness of the importance of having some interactive communication with the cadets in the material delivery (it can be seen in the E.5 and E.6), those initiated by cadets obviously signal the cadets' big enthusiasm for the instructor's explanation, even in the E.7, one of the cadet involve himself within the explanation that the instructor is explaining by giving him question. Considering the features and determinants, we can now have the claim that a two-way traffic interaction occurs in the maritime English classroom as the instructor's domination in the information sharing decreases, and this seems to be valid for all subsets of EFL classroom. More importantly, it can be inferred that the

two-way traffic interaction occurrence is a “hammer” breaking the “chunk of ice” brought by the one-way traffic. While the one-way traffic interaction stiffens the classroom social atmosphere, the two-way comes to covered it.

based on the explanation above, the researcher assumed a hypothetic argumentation on the two-way traffic pattern occuring within the teacher-student (instructor-cadet) interaction, that as long as there are two participatory interlocutors involving within a single-discussed topic interacting one another, the two-way interaction traffic pattern will always be identified either the interaction is stimulated by the teacher/instructor himself/herself or stimulated by the student/cadet initiative to interact (in the context of the E.7, the initiative is in question form).

a. Multi-way Traffic

As explained previously, multi-way traffic is the third pattern occurring within the teacher-student interaction in one topic, in which one teacher and many students involve within the interaction, in which each of participants give their responses each other on the single topic being discussed, even occurring within the feedbacks being massive enough (Lindgren, 1991). Having conducting data condensation on the transcribed data focusing on this traffic pattern, there is only one excerpt that the researcher could found, the E.8, in which after paying attention deeper on it, the traffic can occur based on (a) instructor’s control and (b) the cadet’s dispute and confirmation. Here is below the contextual description of the E.8 clarifying the existention of this multi-way traffic pattern of the instructor-cadet interaction.

Excerpt 8: (E:8, V:3, T: 03’:38” – 06’:00”)

- I : (03’:38”) That’s easy. So, English is easy. The problem is Lazy. How often do you practice your English everyday? How often?. How often? You know often? (4:00)
- C3 : Yes, sering (4:02)
- I : Yah, seberapa sering kalian berbahasa Inggris melancarkan bahasa Inggris di dalam kelas? How many time? Never? You just come to the class and then sleep (4:16)
- C16: Sometimes (4:19)
- I : With who you practice? (4:25)
- C16: (murmuring)
- C4 : Besari suaraku (4:29)
- I : No no no no. (04’:30”) With who?
- C16: (Silence) (4:36).
- I : With who you practice?(4:39). Amin Rais, do you practice your English everyday? (4:49). Do you practice your English everyday? (4:54). No (4:58). Never (5:00)
- C16: Just sometimes (5:02)
- I : Sometimes yah that’s good (5:03)

- C5 : But sir, sorry I want to confirm that we try to understand what you say but sometimes we don't have time to practice our English here because most of our activities here are physical activities. But for my self, I never stop practicing my English (5:34)
- I : That's good. So, to be a good cadet who has a good English so you have to practice. You have to practice and never stop. If you have some questions or several questions about English. You may ask me too or you just asking to your teacher when you find yah. Understood? (5:59)
- Cs : Yes (6:00)

Besides all of the 8 data on the three traffic patterns of teacher-student interactions above, there are two data, the E.9 and E.10, in which those are not covered within the conceptual definitions of the three traffic patterns of the teacher-student (instructor-cadet) interaction that are proposed by Lindgren (1991).

Excerpt 9: (E:9, V:2, T: 03':21" – 03':28")

- I : (03':21") Oke, this one (3:22). I am be a sailor (3:23).
- C4 : Be a sailor (3:24)
- I : Is it your daily activity? (3:27)
- C5 : No, this is passion (3:28)

As we can see in this E.9, the conversation involved three participants only, the instructor and two cadets (the C4 and C5), in which there are feedbacks but not massive enough.

Excerpt 10: (E:10, V:2, T: 17':17" – 18':17")

- I : (17':17") For example yah. Fajar yah. Fajar come here! and Hafid come here!. So, this is two cadets, yah. This is two cadets will do, how to do this one or how to practice there is and there are as long this all this stage from this class. For example. You say, how many chairs in this class? (17:52)
- C13: How many chairs in this class? (17:53)
- C6 : There are twenty four chairs (17:56)
- I : Oke, next again (17:58)
- C13: How many (18:00)
- I : Switch yah! (18:02)
- C6 : How many doors in this class? (18:05)
- C13: There is one door in this class (18:08).
- C6 : Me? (18:13)
- I : Yes (18:14)
- C6 : How many lamp in this class? (18:15)
- C13: There are four lamp in this class (18:17)

In the context of this E.10, the researcher assumed that it cannot be covered by the conceptual definitions of the three traffics proposed by Lidgren (1991) because even though there are traffic being formed implicitly within the E.10 that is stimulated by the *I*, but the traffic scheme is directed by the *I* in which the interaction occurred among the pairs themselves within a single topic that is bridged and settled by the *I* without directly taking a part within their interaction. the real interaction just takes role within the pairs.

The multi-way traffic pattern within the teacher-student (instructor-cadet) interaction represented in the E.8 was interpreted by the researcher having two determinants; instructor's direction (the way the instructor controls the interaction represented the E.8) and cadets' initiative (the initiative to participate indicated by the cadet's dispute and confirmation represented the E.8). Having analyzed these context deeper within the E.8, the researcher found that the massive interactions through multi-way traffic pattern of the instructor-cadet interaction identified by the number of participants and feedbacks provide the cadets with more opportunities to get engaged actively in the material discussion and to practice communicating their ideas in the target language.

Based on the analysis on the E.9 and E.10 above, the researcher categorized the unique aspects revealed by the reasons on the two factual data formulated by the researcher as the "*semi multi-way traffic*", in which this proposed interaction traffic interaction pattern will always be identified as long as there are more than two interlocutors (involving one teacher "instructor" and more than one participants "students / cadets") in which the traffic interaction is directed by the teacher (instructor) toward the participants (students / cadets) responding (giving feedback but not massive enough) the directed-single topic being interacted based on the students / cadets' dispute and confirmation) from all of participants within a single-discussed topic.

Discussion

a. Cadets' Perception on the indicated One-way Traffic

The questions being used to get the cadets' responses toward the one-way traffic were given to the four cadets decided purposively. The interviewed information being collected started with first question "... *Apakah anda menyadari bahwa dalam interaksi kelas dimana instruktur menyampaikan materi pengetahuan, para cadet tampak pasif, tidak memberi feedback?* (Did you realize that in the classroom interaction where the instructor convied the knowledge materials in which the cadets were passive without being able to give feedback?)". From this question, the all of the cadets answered same "*Yes Mem*" in which they realized the passive condition. Then at the further related question, the researcher give him another question "... *Apakah anda tidak biasa berpartisipasi dalam interaksi kegiatan belajar-mengajar?* (Are you not used to participating in interaction within teaching and learning activity)", in which the response was got as follows:

"... *Sebenarnya mau jaki ikut aktif berpartisipasi. Tapi sadar ki kalau belum punya dasar yang cukup. Saya sendiri pernah ka hanya bicara sedikit, malah diketawai jika* (actually, we want to participate actively also, but we knew

well that we have not got enough basic yet. I had spoken up just little bit, but my friends were laughed at me instead)”

And then with the same question, the other cadet gave his response about the question, as follows:

“... Karena ku suka bahasa inggris, percaya ka kalau ku praktekkan bahasa inggris ku, pasti bisa berkembang. Tapi, kekurangan ku saya itu pada saat percakapan, diketawai teman-teman, malah menurut instruktur, jenis kesalahan ku waktu itu, na anggap kalau ku lupai pelajaran sebelumnya(because I love English, I believe that if I keep practicing it, my English can be better. But, the lackness of mine on it is when I have to speak up, my friends laught at me and the instructor considers my mistakes at the moment that I forget the previous lesson)”

b. Cadets’ Perception on the indicated Two-way Traffic

The questions being used to get the cadets’ responses toward the two-way traffic were also given to the four cadets decided purposively. The interviewed information being collected started with first question *“... Apakah anda menyadari bahwa dalam interaksi kelas dimana instruktur menyampaikan materi pengetahuan, para cadet tampak aktif memberi feedback?(Did you realize that in the classroom interaction where the instructor convied the knowledge materials in which the cadets gave feedback actively?)”*. From this question, all of the cadets answered similarly *“Yes Mem”* in which they realized the active participation. Then at the further related question, the researcher give him another question *“... Apakah anda bisa memberikan feedback jikalau didiberikan pancingan oleh instruktur? (Can you give feedback if you are given stimulation by the instructor?)”*, in which the response was got as follows:

““... “... Iyye mem, kalau dipancing ki dengan penjelasan yang bisa dipahami, saya secara pribadi, akan bisa merespon untuk itu. (Yes Mem. If we are stimulated with the clear explanation that we can understand, I personally will be able to respond about it)”

And then with the further related question on it, the researcher asked him *“... Apakah anda juga bisa berinteraksi dengan pengajar kalau harus ditanyai perihal hal yang dibahas? (Will you be able to interact with the instructor if you will be asked about the discussed material?)”*. Then based on this second question, the C? Answered, as follow:

“... Kalau tentang berinteraksi dengan instruktur dengan bertanya, sering ka juga alami, bahkan kalau ku rasa belum jelas dengan jawaban guru, biasa ka juga atau bisa ka memberi pertanyaan kembali atas penjelasan itu(About interacting with the instructor with a question, I often do it. Even if I have not understood on the explanation yet through the answer the instructor has given to me, I am used to being able to give the further question on it)”

c. Cadets' Perception on the indicated Multi-way Traffic

The questions being used to get the cadets' responses toward the multi-way traffic were also given to the four cadets decided purposively. The interviewed information being collected started with first question "... *Apakah anda menyadari bahwa dalam interaksi kelas dimana instruktur menyampaikan materi pengetahuan, para cadet tampak aktif memberi feedback?*(Did you realize that in the classroom interaction, where the instructor conveyed the knowledge materials, the cadets give feedbacks massively?)". From this question, all of the cadets answered similarly "*Iyye Mem (Yes, Mam)*", in which they realized the dynamic participations. Then at the further related question, the researcher give the C16 another question "... *Kenapa kadet di kelas ini, pada saat tertentu tampak pasif, tidak berpartisipasi, sementara kadet lain aktif berinteraksi dengan instruktur?* (Why were the cadets passive, while the other cadets can interact actively with the instructor instead?)", in which the response was got from the C16 as follows:

"... *...Memang begitulah mem, kalau ditanya ka juga sama instruktur, salah atau benar, pasti merespon ka. Jadi ditanya ka, pasti berpartisipasi semua jadi mau tidak mau* (That is the case Mem. If I were him where I got the same question from the instructor, it does not matter whether my answer would be right or not, I was to respond it. So, if I were asked, I believe that all of us would participate, willy-nilly"

And then with the further related question on it, the researcher asked the other cadet, C5, "... *Apakah hal itu berarti bahwa kadet yang tidak berpartisipasi sudah pasti belum mengerti?*

(Is it right that the cadets who do not participate are the cadets who have not understand yet?)". Then based on this question toward the C5, the answer was got from him, as follow:

"... *Ndk juga ji mem,, karena bisa saja kita, atau contohnya saya, kalau sudah cukup mengerti ka tapi tidak berpartisipasi ka karena sementara mengantuk atau sedang lelah ka*(It is not always like that Mem. Because sometimes we can do it but we do not want. For example myself, even if I have understood enough, I will not participate when i was sleepy or being tired)"

Based on the interview data having been collected by researcher from C1, C2, C5, and C16 (which had been selected purposively), it was found that they were aware of the three patterns of interaction flow occurring. The first is related to the flow of one-way interactions, it can be interpreted that the information from C1 and C2 which reveals that the reason for the passive flow of interactions is that it only focuses on the instructor who makes them feel indifferent to the interaction due to three factors, namely: (a) they have not got understanding yet on the material being interacted with by the instructor; (b) their fear of being underestimated shown by their fellow cadets who laughed when they talked; and (c) the prejudice behavior they usually experience when making mistakes when speaking up about the material discussed in which they are deemed not to remember the material having previously

been given. Furthermore, these conditions were assumed by the researcher as the factors make the one-way traffic is the most interaction traffic pattern occurring at the research locus.

Secondly, in the two-way traffic, which is the perception that cadets express about this traffic through information from C5 that he is able to interact in two directions with the instructor because it is not just the stimulation provided by the instructor who he can understand, but often a two-way interaction with the instructor can occur through questions regarding the instructor's explanation, and even when the explanation of the answer has not been fully captured by the C5, there will be further questions regarding the explanation.

Finally, the cadet's perception of multi-way based on simultaneous answers from C1, C2, C5, and C16 who were aware of the positive dynamics of multi-way traffic interaction patterns, which is based on C16's disclosure through the further questions and also the context is illustrated in E.8 that even though there was a dynamic interaction, in that context there could still be ineffective interactions due to the necessity for them to respond to stimulation from the instructor, even though they did not or somewhat did not understand. Then the ineffectiveness still occurring in this dynamic interaction situation was revealed based on the information from C5 that often even though they were able to play a role in adding to the dynamic of interactions in the multi-way traffic, the physical and psychological conditions they experienced are due to extra learning activities in the form of physical activity, which is a distinctive feature of their educational institutions which adhere to this semi-military system, tends to make them reluctant to interact to add the weight onto the dynamic of the multi-way traffic.

CONCLUSION

Overall, the objective reality of the interaction patterns of the instructor-cadets interaction occurring in the maritime English classroom interaction were one-way, two-way, multi-way interaction traffic patterns. This conclusion was formulated based on each minor hypothetical argumentation determined based on the Lindgren's three interaction patterns (one-way, two-way, multi-way traffic) and the found empirical data at research locus in which the one-way traffic was also revealed as the the most interaction traffic pattern occurring at the research locus. Besides the found empirical data verifying this first research conclusion showing that overall the interaction patterns at research locus are one-way, two-way, multi-way traffic, the researcher also proposed a hypothetical proposition based on the two empirical data being not able to be covered by the conceptual definitions of each Lindgren's interaction traffic patterns, in which the researcher proposed it with the hypothetical proposition term into the Lindgren's as "*semi multi-way traffic*" that was formulated based on the minor hypothetical argumentation determined based on the two empirical data and the conceptual definitions of the Lindgren's: "*The semi multi-way traffic will always be able to be identified as long as there are more than two interlocutors (involving one teacher "instructor" and more than one participants "students / cadets") in which the traffic interaction is directed by the teacher*

(instructor) toward the participants (students / cadets) responding (giving feedback but not massive enough) the directed-single topic being interacted based on the students / cadets' dispute and confirmation) from all of participants within a single-discussed topic".

Based on the cadets' perceptions on the interaction traffic patterns occurring in the classroom interaction where they were involving within, there are some negative determinant factors revealed within the indicated interaction traffic patterns, as follows:

- a. Within one-way traffic: (1) they have not got understanding yet on the material being interacted with by the instructor; (2) their fear of being underestimated shown by their fellow cadets who laughed when they talked; and (3) the prejudice behavior they usually experience when making mistakes when speaking up about the material discussed in which they are deemed not to remember the material having previously been given
- b. Within two-way traffic: the effectiveness of interaction cannot be optimized because the cadets cannot catch up with the instruction's explanation making only few of them participate to stimulate this traffic situation to be occurred.
- c. Within multi-way traffic: the ineffectiveness still occurred in this dynamic interaction situation because of the physical and psychological conditions they experienced are due to extra learning activities in the form of physical activity (the military traditional activities) making them to be unwilling to be more participated within.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, T. D. (2003). Modes of interaction in distance education; Recent developments and research questions. In M. G. Moore & W. G. Anderson (Eds.), *Handbook of distance education* (pp.129-144). Marwah, NJ; Erlbaum.
- Ariani, N., & Arham, M. (2020). An Analysis of EFL Test Takers' Problems in IELTS Writing Task. *Tamaddun*, 19(2), 132-140.
- Arisandi, B. (2018). Classroom Interaction Patterns in EFL Task-based Classroom. *Journal of ELT Research; the Academic Journal of Studies in English Language Teaching and Learning*. https://doi.org/10.22236/JER_Vol3Issue2pp186-192.
- Ayeni, Q. O., & Ebong, O. E. (2016). Le Didactisation de la Tradition Orale dans les Ecoles Secondaires au Nigéria. *Journal of Francophone Studies (RETFRAC)* 14(1), 56 – 70.
- Brown, D. H. (2001). *Teaching by principles; An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (2nd ed.). London, England: Longman.
- Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary* (3rd ed.). (2008). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Chaudron, C. (2003). *Second language classrooms*. Cambridge, England; Cambridge University Press.
- Choudhury, S. (2005). Interaction in second language classroom. *BRAC University journal*, II(1); 77-82.

- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research*. New York, USA: Pearson.
- Dudley-Evans, T. (1997). *Developments in English for specific purposes; A multi-disciplinary approach*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2008). *Instructed second language acquisition; Learning in the classroom*. Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell.
- Esirah, S. B. (2021). Slavery in Postcolonial Africa: The Role of Technology. *Journal of Public Administration and Government*, 3(1), 58-65.
- Evertson, C. & Harris, A. (1999). Support for managing learning-centered classrooms; The classroom organization and management program. In H.J. Freiberg (Ed.), *Beyond behaviorism; Changing the classroom management paradigm* (pp.59-74). Boston, the USA; Allyn & Bacon.
- Havik, T. & Westergard, E. (2019). Do teachers matter? Students' perceptions of classroom interactions and student engagement. *Scandinavian journal of educational research*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2019.1577754>
- Heighm, J. & Croker, R.A. (2009). *Qualitative Research in Applied Linguistics: A Practical Linguistics*. Publisher: Palgrave Macmillan
- Hoque, E. (2017). The effect of teacher-students interaction; An evaluation of an EFL classroom. *The journal of EFL education and research*, I, October 2017.
- Hutchinson, T. & Alan, W. (1994). *English for specific purposes; A learning-centered approach*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Kothari, R. C. (2004). *Research Methodology: Methods and techniques* (2nd ed.). New Delhi, India: New Age.
- Krashen, S. (2001). *The input hypothesis; Issues and implications*. London: Longman.
- Li, G. & Jee, Y. (2019). The more technology the better? A comparison of teacher-student interaction in high and low technology use elementary EFL classrooms in China. *Elseiver*, vol. 84, August 2019, 24-40.
- Lindgren, C. H. (1991). *Educational psychology in the classroom*. New York, the USA; John Willey & Sons, Inc.
- Long, M. (1996). The role of linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition*. New York: Academic Press, 413-468.
- Mackey, A. & Gass, M. S. (2005). *Second language research; Methodology and design*. New Jersey, USA: LEA.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M. & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis; A Methods Sourcebook* (3rd ed.). London, England: Sage Publication.
- Moore, M. G. (1994). Independent study. In R. D. Boyd and J. W. Apps (Ed.), *Redefining the discipline of adult education* (pp.16-31). San Francisco, the USA; Jossey Bass.
- Pinter, A. (2006). *Teaching young language learners*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Storch, N. (2002). Patterns of interaction in ESL pair work. *Language learning*, 52(1), 119-158.

- Sundari, H. (2017). Classroom Interaction in Teaching English as a Foreign Language at Lower Secondary Schools in Indonesia. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 8(6): 147-154.
- Valley, B. A. (2013). Maritime English. *Wiley online library*, <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0746>
- Van Lier, L. (1991). Inside the classroom; Learning processes and teaching procedures. *Applied language learning*, 2, 48-64.
- Wolff, D. (2005). Content and language integrated learning. *HAL*, 5, 1-22.
- Xiao-hui, X. (2010). Analysis of teacher talk on the basis of relevance theory. *Canadian Social Science*, 6(3), 45-50.
- Yin, R.K. (1994). *Case study research; Design and methods* (2nd ed.). Beverly Hills, USA: Sage Publishing.