

ISSN : 0852-1035
Vol. XXXX No. 114 DESEMBER - FEBRUARI 2009



majalah ilmiah **SULTAN AGUNG**

Bismillah membangun generasi khaira ummah

Jantung dan Penyakit Kardiovaskuler
Moch. Agus Suprijono

Penerapan Metode Produktifitas Parsial dan Metode The American Productivity Center (APC) Guna Menganalisa Tingkat Produktivitas di PT. AST Indonesia
Eli Mas'adah

Pengaruh Pemberian Minuman Karbohidrat Berelektrolit Terhadap Daya Tahan Fisik
Muhtarom dan Wijiyanto

Analisis Beberapa Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Keputusan Konsumen dalam Memilih Apotek
Marno Nugroho

Khitan Syariat Sejak Masa Nabi Ibrahim A.S, dan Perkembangannya Hingga Kini
Meidona Nurul Milla

Analisis Probabilistik Resiko Gempa dengan Pemodelan Sumber Gempa 3 Dimensi
Abdul Rochim

Inisiasi Menyusui Dini Langkah Awal Selamatkan Penerus Bangsa
Endang Surani

Pengembangan Model Soft Skill Mahasiswa di Perguruan Tinggi Melalui Program "Leadership dan Enterpreneurship"
Sri Hindah P. dan HM Bedjo Santoso

Manajemen Asuhan Kebidanan Pendarahan Antepartum dengan Placenta Previa
Rr. Catur Leny Wulandari & Endang Surani

The Quality Of Linguistic Input A Teacher Provides For The Students As A Consideration In Evaluating Teachers' Competence.
Hartono

Validitas Skor Sumbatan Hidung Sebagai Alat Ukur Untuk Gejala Hidung Tersumbat
Rochmat Soemadi dan Iswarini

PENGELOLA MAJALAH ILMIAH SULTAN AGUNG
ISSN : 0852 1035
UNIVERSITAS ISLAM SULTAN AGUNG

PENASEHAT : DR. Dr. Rofiq Anwar, Sp. PA (Rektor)
PENANGGUNG JAWAB : Ir. H. Sumirin, MS (W. R. I)
KETUA DEWAN REDAKSI : Prof. H. Ir. Pratikso, MST, PhD
'SEK. DEWAN REDAKSI : Dedi Rusdi, SE, M.S, Akt
ANGGOTA REDAKSI : - dr. H. Muktasim Billah, Sp. S
- Prof. DR. Hj. Sri Sumarwani, SH. M. Hum
- Prof. DR. H. M. Ali Mansur, SH, CN, M. Hum
- DR. Ir. Slamet Imam Wahyudi, DEA
- DR. Ir. Antonius, MT
- DR. Ibnu Khajar, SE, M. Si
- DR. Ghofar Siddiq, M. Ag
- DR. Sahid Sumarno, MS
- DR. H. Abdullah Salim, MA
- Ir. M. Haddin, MT
- Drs. Amrizal Rustam, SU

TATA USAHA : 1. Agus Wahyu Hidayat, SH
2. Umi Hidayah Rahmawati, SH

ALAMAT REDAKSI

UNIVERSITAS ISLAM SULTAN AGUNG (UNISSULA)
JL. KALIGAWA KM 4. PO. BOX. 1054 SEMARANG 50112
TELP. (024) 6583584 ext. 209 FAX. (024) 6582455

Majalah Sultan Agung adalah majalah ilmiah yang diterbitkan oleh Unissula setiap tiga bulan sekali dengan maksud sebagai media informasi dan pengkajian masalah - masalah di berbagai ilmu. Redaksi mengundang para ilmuwan untuk bertukar pendapat secara bebas dan bertanggung jawab. Disamping itu kritik - kritik yang bersifat positif terhadap naskah - naskah yang ditampilkan adalah naskah baru yang bukan kutipan atau pernah ditampilkan dalam majalah lain.

Kata pengantar

Assalamu'alaikum wr. wb.

Persaingan global antar bangsa yang tak mengenal batas antar negara menuntut setiap orang untuk kreatif memunculkan ide-ide baru. Maka mempersiapkan individu agar mempunyai jiwa wirausaha agaknya menjadi satu hal yang penting dilakukan.

Bagi perguruan tinggi mempersiapkan lulusan berkualitas yang memiliki jiwa wirausaha dan kepemimpinan perlu dilakukan, salah satunya dengan pengembangan *soft skill* baik melalui kegiatan intra maupun ekstra kurikuler, melalui program "retooling leadership dan entrepreneurship", yaitu program mencetak pemimpin dan wirausaha dari kalangan mahasiswa.

Topik di atas diangkat dengan judul "Pengembangan Model Soft Skill Mahasiswa di Perguruan Tinggi melalui Program Leadership dan Entrepreneurship", disamping topik menarik lainnya.

Semoga majalah ini dapat memberikan manfaat dan menambah pengetahuan serta wawasan pembaca.

Wassalamu'alaikum wr. wb.

Redaksi

Daftar isi

1. Jantung dan Penyakit Kardiovaskuler <i>Oleh : Moch. Agus Suprijono</i>	1
2. Penerapan Metode Produktifitas Parsial dan Metode The American Productivity Center (APC) Guna Menganalisa Tingkat Produktivitas di PT. AST Indonesia <i>Oleh : Eli Mas'idah</i>	19
3. Pengaruh Pemberian Minuman Karbohidrat Ber-elektrolit Terhadap Daya Tahan Fisik <i>Oleh : Muhtarom dan Wijiyanto</i>	47
4. Analisis Beberapa Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Keputusan Konsumen dalam Memilih Apotek <i>Oleh : Marno Nugroho</i>	57
5. Khitan Syariat Sejak Masa Nabi Ibrahim A.S, dan Perkembangannya Hingga Kini <i>Oleh : Meidona Nurul Milla</i>	77
6. Analisis Probabilistik Resiko Gempa dengan Pemodelan Sumber Gempa 3 Dimensi <i>Oleh : Abdul Rochim</i>	89
7. Inisiasi Menyusui Dini Langkah Awal Selamatkan Penerus Bangsa <i>Oleh : Endang Surani</i>	109
8. Pengembangan Model Soft Skill Mahasiswa di Perguruan Tinggi Melalui Program "Leadership dan Entrepreneurship" <i>Oleh : Sri Hindah P. dan HM Bedjo Santoso</i>	133
9. Manajemen Asuhan Kebidanan Pendarahan Antepartum dengan Placenta Previa <i>Oleh : Rr. Catur Leny Wulandari & Endang Surani</i>	155
10. The Quality Of Linguistic Input A Teacher Provides For The Students As A Consideration In Evaluating Teachers' Competence. <i>By : Hartono</i>	175
11. Validitas Skor Sumbatan Hidung Sebagai Alat Ukur Untuk Gejala Hidung Tersumbat <i>Oleh : Rochmat Soemadi dan Iswarini</i>	189

arang : Staff Pengajar Prodi D III Kebidanan FIK

arang : Rumah Bersalin Darma Husada Semarang

MAN MENGAJAR

I
II
IV
ayanan Kebidanan

Semarang, 23 Januari 2009

Rr. Catur Leny W,S.SiT

THE QUALITY OF LINGUISTIC INPUT A TEACHER PROVIDES FOR THE STUDENTS AS A CONSIDERATION IN EVALUATING TEACHERS' COMPETENCE.

By

Hartono

1 Introduction

It is undeniable that classroom is one of the major contexts of language learning today (Kim, 2006), and even in some cases, it is the only context available for language learners. My survey at SMA Sultan Agung 3 Semarang revealed that 100% of the students being sampled mentioned that they learnt English only at school. Though, there are many English courses in the city, no one takes that course. It is reasonable since the majority of the students at that SMA come from the family with low economic level.

In that condition classroom English teacher is undeniably very important. It could happen that he / she is the only person from whom students can acquire input, ask for clarification and obtain reinforcement. It is true that students may acquire input from many other sources such as English movies, songs or news on radios or televisions, but for beginning learners of English beginners that kind of language is still too difficult to comprehend.

In a language classroom, a teacher has at least two functions. The first is imparting information that his students should know and learn, and the second is providing linguistic inputs for his students who are still in the process of learning. These two functions should be performed in balance. It is not good -while emphasizing on transferring knowledge and to assure that the students understand what he is saying- the teacher presents everything in the students' native language. On the other hand, while emphasizing on providing linguistic input of the target language, he speaks in the target language continuously such as speaking to native

speakers or to his fellow teachers, neglecting his students' proficiency and ability in comprehending the messages he is encoding in.

These two methods will not work for language acquisition. The first method will produce students who know the knowledge of language as grammar and meaning of vocabularies but they probably can not speak. The second method will not work either since that teacher's language may not be processed in the students' internal mechanism.

A good language teacher is, therefore, the one who can impart the knowledge of the language and at the same time providing linguistic input of the target language comprehensible to their students.

The above explanation shows that the language of the teacher in a classroom is very dominant in shaping the students' language. With that reason, I sought to examine the quality of input provided by a teacher in the classroom for the students. The examination covered characteristics of optimal input proposed by Krashen: Comprehensible, Interesting / Relevant, and Given in Sufficient Quantity, and the features of teacher talk which work as input proposed by Wong-Fillmore as clear separation of language, repetitiveness, repeated grammatical forms and learner involvement. This paper starts with reviews of input in second language acquisition and teacher talk followed by the method of data collection, and discussion. Finally it presents conclusion and some recommendations concerning teacher competency.

2 Literature Review

2.1 Input and Second Language Acquisition

Input in second language learning / acquisition has long been a topic of interest in the field of SLA. Input is defined as the language that is addressed to an L2 learner or a foreign language learner either by a native speaker or by another L2 learner (Ellis 1985), or the linguistic information available for the learner. Input may be in the form of exposure in natural setting as learning a second language in the target language environment, or in a formal instruction such as in a language classroom.

One of the theories on input and second language acquisition was proposed by Krashen (1987) known as Input Hypothesis. In that hypothesis, Krashen mentioned that second or foreign language acquisition takes place only when the learner has access to L2 input. This hypothesis was also supported by Ellis (1985) who suggested that in

order for SLA to take place, there must be (1) some L2 data made available for the learner as input, and (2) a set of internal learner mechanisms to account for how the L2 data are processed.

However, not all the language addressed to an L2 learner can work as input and fosters the process of acquisition. The L2 data which can work as input is the comprehensible one, using Krashen's term, the one which is only slightly above the learner's current level of comprehension; the one of 'i + 1' in which 'i' is the level of the learner current competence. In other words, in order for learning and acquisition to take place, the language that an L2 learner is exposed to should not be so far enough beyond the learner's competence as 'i + 2'. Input of this kind will make learners overwhelmed. In the other side, providing learners with input which is totally known will not give anything new to the learners, and will make them tend to neglect it. Krashen stated:

"Certainly, discussing or reading about a topic that is totally unknown will make the message harder to understand. There is a danger, however, in making the input too 'familiar'. If the message is completely known, it will be of no interest, and the student will probably not attend. (1987: 66)

Therefore, 'casual talking' or 'free conversation' is not language teaching, or simply being a native speaker of a language does not automatically qualify someone to be a good language teacher. A good teacher is someone who can make input comprehensible to the learner regardless of his or her level of competence in that target language. He does this by talking at a slower rate and using a clearer articulation to help acquirer identify word-boundaries more easily and allows more processing time; by using high frequency vocabularies, less slang, and fewer idioms; by making syntactic simplification and using shorter sentences.

Although controversial, Krashen's theory of the role of comprehensible input has held a strong position in this field (Kim, 2006). Power suggested that even though comprehensibility is not the 'motor' for second language acquisition, it is still essential and not just in the early stages (www.btinternet.com).

Besides comprehensible, optimal input should have the following characteristics:

- a. interesting / relevant
Optimal input focuses the acquirer on the message and not on the form. The best input should be so interesting and relevant that the acquirers may "forget" that the message is encoded in a foreign language.
- b. not grammatically sequenced
In a language classroom there is no need to deliberately present 'finely-tuned' sequence. If a lesson is focusing on present progressive, for example, it doesn't mean every utterance must be on the form of present progressive. If a teacher focuses on one structure only, it means that he assumes that everyone in the class has the same developmental stage in the target language.
- c. provided in sufficient quantity.
An optimal input for acquisition must be supplied in sufficient quantity, although, it is difficult to determine the amount of sufficiency since it is different from each other.

2.2 Teacher Talk

Teacher talk refers to the variety of language used by teachers when they are in the process of teaching (Richard et al. 1992). This language has been argued as providing a great amount of the language to which students are exposed in the classroom (Cook, 1996). Different from the language in subject lesson, the language used by teachers in the language classroom serves not only as a means of transferring knowledge and information for learning but also as the object of the learning and teaching that students must acquire (Wong-Fillmore, 1985)

In her study on characteristics of teacher talk, Wong-Fillmore raised the point that not all teacher talk worked as input for learners. For teacher talk to serve as appropriate input, it should have the following features:

- a) Clear separation of language;
A language teacher should make no mixing or alternation between the students' native language and the target language.
- b) Emphasis on communication and comprehension;

This is done by making modifications and adjustments in the language the teacher uses.

- c) Grammaticality and appropriateness of language used in the lesson; The language used by teachers is entirely grammatical and appropriate.
- d) Repetitiveness;
There is a high use of repetition.
- e) Repeated use of pattern and routines;
- f) Inviting students' participation;
Teachers may involve students in lesson by using turn allocation procedure.
- g) Richness of language.

The language of the teachers is rich and playful.

A study of teacher discourse in French as a foreign language classroom by Guthrie (1987) revealed further conditions for teacher talk to work as input in the language classroom. The study was based on the premise that optimal linguistic input consists of the co-occurrence of three conditions: "a goal-language sample adjusted to the learner's competence, the encoding of a message in that language sample, and the attention of the learner to the message.

Ted Power mentioned characteristics of teacher talk which will be helpful for acquisition. They are:

- a) Broken into sense groups;
- b) Simplified but not unnatural;
- c) More redundant than 'ordinary speech' and words and structures are naturally repeated or 're-cycled' at regular interval;
- d) Broken into 'short paragraph' segments to encourage or invite students to interrupt, comment and ask questions;
- e) Provided with typical examples when new vocabulary or structure is taught;
- f) Providing opportunities for students to give feedback through questions - especially open questions' or 'two-step question' (closed question + follow-up);
- g) Thought by teachers who use devices to get feedback such as: physical response, to get parallels to get example from the class;
- h) Using a variety of elicitation & explanation techniques, including use of context, enactment, illustration;
- i) It is between 85% and 95% comprehensible.

3 Method

3.1 Respondents and Setting

Respondents of the study were the English teachers and students of grade X and grade XII of SMA Sultan Agung 3 Semarang. In Grade X, there were 34 students participating, while in Grade XII there were 33 students. Both teachers hold S1 Degrees in English Education (S.Pd.) and have teaching experiences of more than 5 years. The topic being presented in Grade X when the study was conducted was a review of the topics presented during the first half of the semester. It covered grammar such as passive voice, direct and indirect speech and vocabularies. While in grade XII, the topic was topic and main ideas of paragraphs. During the lesson, the students of Grade X had their handout / LKS (English work book) with no additional printed materials, and the students of Grade XII had copied materials from their teacher for practice and exercises.

The classes worked as usual. They began with an opening from the teachers followed by topic introduction, topic elaboration and practice. During the lesson, the teachers talked, moved around the class, made questions for their students, and provided feedbacks.

According to the school principal, the majority of the students of that school came from the family of low economic level. Most of their parents are farmers and fishermen.

To keep with the purpose of the investigation, I joined the classes from the beginning until the classes finished, observed how the classes worked, made notes, and finally distributed and collected questionnaires.

3.2 Design

The quality of input in this study was measured by the students' perception. It is because the characteristics of optimal input as proposed by Krashen were different from person to person. The Respondents of the study were required to respond to statements concerning the quality of input in 5-item Likert Scale from *Sangat Setuju (Strongly Agree)*, *Setuju (Agree)*, *Ragu-Ragu (Undecided)*, *Tidak Setuju (Disagree)*, and *Sangat Tidak Setuju (Strongly Disagree)*.

3.3 Procedure

Before collecting the data, first I obtained permission from the school principal, then I met the teacher of each classroom and discussed with her

the purpose of the investigation. Both teachers didn't have any objection and they were even very supportive, (though, it was very clear that in grade XII the teacher was more stressful than the teacher of Grade X, because of the National Exam her students were going to have).

3.3 Data

In this investigation, there were 2 kinds of data. The first data were collected by questionnaires and the second data were notes from the observation. Questionnaires were designed to obtain students' perception about the quality of input they received from their teachers on the issues of comprehensibility, interest and relevance, on the methods / ways of input delivery as the slowing down of talk, repetition, the use of gestures, the language use and so on. Data from observation were mostly concerned with the features of the teacher talk.

4 Results and Discussion

4.1 Students' Perception on the Quality of Input

Concerning the students' perception on the English subject, 58% of the respondents of the study mentioned that English was a difficult lesson, 39% mentioned that it was normal. Only 3% mentioned that the subject was easy. On the question where they study English, all of them mentioned that they studied it only at school.

On the issue of comprehensibility with the statement "In general, I can comprehend what my teacher means when she speaks in English" 6% of the respondents from grade X chose Strongly Agree, 53% of them chose Agree, 32% was undecided, and the rest 9% chose Don't Agree. Nine percent of the respondents from grade XII chose Strongly Agree, 42% Agree, 46% were Undecided and the rest 3% Don't Agree.

Though, the students who comprehended their teacher's language was higher than 50%, the number of them who were undecided both in Grade X and Grade XII was still very high. It was an indication that there were still many students who couldn't understand the English being used by their teacher. The indication was supported with the finding on the statement: "There are many English words / phrases my teacher uses I don't quite understand". For that statement, a big number of the respondents of Grade X (65%) mentioned Agree; which may mean that the majority of them got problems with vocabularies. In Grade XII, the majority of the respondents (58%) chose Undecided (which may be

interpreted as they were still doubtful on whether they had the problem with vocabularies or not), and only 18% mentioned Don't Agree.

Further inquiry on comprehensibility with the statement: "My teacher uses many English words / phrases which I have never heard before," revealed that the majority of the students did have problem with vocabularies. (In Grade X: 9% Don't Agree; 30% Undecided, 44% Agree. In Grade XII: 3% Strongly Disagree; 45% Disagree; 31% Undecided; 21% Agree).

From the above findings, then, it is necessary for the teachers to make adjustments on their languages to suit with the level of the students' competence. Clearer articulation, slower rate of speech, use of easy vocabularies will be helpful. Writing what seems to be new vocabularies on the board will also be an advantage for the students.

On the statement "The English used by my teacher is interesting", 12% of the respondents of Grade X chose Strongly Agree, 56% Agree, 29% was Undecided, and the rest 3% Don't Agree. For respondents at Grade XII, 24% of them said Strongly Agree, 43% Agree, 30% Undecided, and 3% Don't Agree. Here, at least 60% of the students were of the opinion that the English used by their teacher was interesting.

Responding to the statement "The English lesson that my teacher teaches at classroom is relevant to what I need," 38% of the respondents at Grade X was Undecided, 44% said Agree and the rest 18% said Strongly Agree. Eighteen percent of the respondents in Grade XII mentioned that they Strongly Agree, 46% mentioned Agree, 33% Undecided and 3% mentioned Don't Agree.

On the issue of sufficiency with the statement: "My teacher gives me many examples and exercises of vocabulary usage and new grammatical pattern," the finding was the majority of the respondents of Grade X (53%) Agreed with the statement, and even in Grade XII, the majority of them said Strongly Agree. This shows that the input has been provided sufficiently.

On the issue of methods applied by teachers to aid students' comprehensibility at a slower rate of speech, the uses of repetition, gestures, and shorter sentences with statements: "My teacher slows down her speech when she talks in English; To assure comprehensibility, my teacher repeats her sentences; To assure comprehensibility, my teacher uses gestures," and "When talking in English, my teacher uses short

sentences," the findings are presented on Table 1. It shows that the majority of the respondents from both classes agreed with the statement concerning the slowing down of speech rate, the use of repetition and the use of gestures. However, concerning the uses of shorter sentences, they seemed to be not very sure. This was indicated by the high percentage of Undecided (53% in Grade X and 46% at Grade XII).

Table 1
Students' Perception on the Teacher's Methods to Aid Comprehension
Grade X

Methods	SA (%)	A (%)	U (%)	D (%)	SD (%)
Slower rate of speech	20	56	15	9	0
The use of repetition	26	53	18	3	0
The use of gestures	3	50	12	35	0
Shorter sentences	9	29	53	9	0

Grade XII

Methods	SA (%)	A (%)	U (%)	D (%)	SD (%)
Slower rate of speech	0	46	30	12	12
The use of repetition	18	73	9	0	0
The use of gestures	9	64	21	3	3
Shorter sentences	0	42	46	12	0

Notes: - SA : "Strongly Agree" D : "Disagree"
- A : "Agree" SD : "Agree"
- N : "Undecided"

Relating to the use of Indonesia translation with statement: "My teacher uses English followed by its translation in Bahasa Indonesia," 47% of the Respondents in Grade X said Strongly Agree, and 32% said Agree. While in Grade XII, 57% of the Respondents said Agree, 15% Strongly Agree, and 25% Undecided.

The findings show that making translation in the students' native language is a common practice of English language teacher. It is because the teachers want to assure that the information / messages they want to deliver will be understood clearly. It is, of course, not wrong, but as

Wong – Fillmore suggested, this practice is not good under the following reasons:

- Language learning occurs when students try to figure out what their teacher and classmates are saying, when the situation is the one that allows learners to make astute guesses at the meaning of the language being used in the lesson.
- If a teacher uses translation, he tends not to make modification in English. Besides, English used in this lesson will not be properly adjusted, and will be neglected / ignored by students because the information is also provided in their own language.

4.2 Classroom Observation

From classroom observation, there are some findings that can be put forward. The first is about the use of target language during instruction. The use of English during the process of instruction in both classes was still very minimal. English was used limited to the following:

- a) common instruction, such as:
 - OK, sit down!
 - Check your dictionary!
 - Listen to me!
- b) Comprehension checks, such as:
 - Understand?
 - And, what is “staring”?
 - You know “pull”?
- c) Inviting student’s participation, such as:
 - OK, you!
 - Raise your hand!

When it was about concept, both teachers seemed to be not very comfortable in using English. They preferred to explain it in Bahasa Indonesia. When the teacher of Grade XII presented *Topics and Main Ideas of Paragraph* for example, she explained what the topics and main ideas were all about in Bahasa Indonesia. The same thing happened to the teacher at Grade X as she was explaining about *direct and indirect speech*. The concept was almost completely presented in the students’ native language, except examples.

The second important finding was there was no clear separation of language. When talking in English, both teachers always made the Indonesian translation just after the English version, such as:

- OK, raise your hand. *Angkat tangan.*
- Let’s discuss together. *Mari kita bahas bersama-sama.*

The third is no slowing down of speech rate. Though the respondents mentioned on the questionnaires that their teachers slowed down the speech rate when talking in English, the observation showed that it was not very significant. There were no clear signs that the teachers deliberately slowed down their speech rate.

5 Conclusion and Recommendation

5.1 Conclusions

From the discussion above, there are some conclusions which may be drawn:

- For the students of SMA Sultan Agung 3, teacher talks could be very important in shaping the students language since the majority of them didn’t go to any other language classes / courses in which they may listen and talk in English. The majority of them only studied English at school.
- The input provided by the teachers in the classrooms being studied had been good enough, however, the input needs to be better adjusted and modified to suit the students’ level of competence.
- The input provided had satisfied the features of good input as comprehensible, interesting / relevant, and is given in a sufficient quantity.
- The target language use during instruction in the classroom was still minimal.
- Translating English utterances into the Indonesian just after the English utterances were produced is a common practice, though, this is not good for language learning.

5.2 Recommendations

Here are recommendations that I can put forward:

- To be able to provide input in a language classroom, teachers should use more target language during instruction, because

classrooms still serve as the major places where learners can acquire input.

- Teachers need to modify and adjust their languages to make it more comprehensible.
- Concerning the use of target language during instruction, English teachers need to use more in order to be able to provide the students with more various and rich input.
- Since the role played by classroom teachers in providing linguistic input for their students is very central, the skill and practice in the classroom should be taken into account when evaluating teachers' competence.

REFERENCES

- Cook, V. 1996. *Second Language Learning and Teaching*. New York, Arnold.
- Ellis, Rods. 1985. *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford University Press.
- Guthrie, A.M. 1987. Six Cases in Classroom Communication: A Study of Teacher Discourse in the Foreign Language Classroom. In *Research in Second Language Learning: Focus on Classroom*, Norwood, NJ Albex.
- Krashen, Stephen. D. 1987. Principle and Practice in Second language Acquisition. English Language Teaching Series, London: Prentice-Hall International (UK).
- Kim, Yoon-kyu. 2006. *The Teacher and Learners as Language Models for Learning English: Language and Interaction in the Adult ESL Classroom*. Doctoral Dissertation at The Faculty of Graduate School of the University of Texas at Austin. www.lib.utexas.edu.
- Richards, Jack C. et. Al. 1992. Dictionary of Language and Applied Linguistics. Longman Group. UK.
- Ted Power English Language Learning and Teaching. 2008. Teacher-talk in the Language Class. www.btinternet.com
- Wong, Lily and Fillmore. 1985. When does Teacher Talk Work as Input? In S.M. Gass & C.G. Madden (Eds), *Input in Language Acquisition*. Rowley, M.A., Newbury House.