
Effective Classroom Management in English as a Foreign Language Classroom

Burhanuddin Yasin, Faisal Mustafa¹, Ayu Mentari Sarani Bina²

^{1,2}Universitas Syiah Kuala, Banda Aceh, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Classroom management is an essential element of the teaching and learning process which determines the quality of instruction. This research aims to investigate the elements of classroom management which can be effectively applied in EFL classrooms. This study is a review research study, where the data were collected from 43 previously published materials, restricted to books, dissertations, and articles published in academic journal. The data were analysed using data condensation, data display and conclusion drawing. The results of this study show that there are three elements of classroom management, i.e. seating arrangements, engagement, and participation. The seating arrangement has three effective components including u-shaped, sitting in a group, and orderly row. Further, student engagement consists of cognitive, behavioural, academic, emotional, social, intellectual, physiological, affective and relational engagement approaches. Meanwhile, participation includes classroom talk, teacher talk, collaborative talk, exploratory talk, disputational talk, and learner-managed talk. Therefore, it is recommended that teachers utilize effective classroom management components based on the results of this study to improve the quality of instruction.

ARTICLE INFO

Paper type:
Review Article

Article history:
Received : 31/07/2021
Revised : 02/03/2022
Accepted : 02/03/2022

Keywords:

- classroom management
- seating arrangement
- engagement
- participation

1. Introduction

English taught in the two levels of high schools in Indonesia covers the four English language skills, i.e. listening, speaking, reading and writing. In an English classroom, teacher's ability and skills is highly required to manage classroom situation in order to stay conducive to reach lesson goals (Carroll, 1978). Malik et al. (2011, p. 784) define classroom management as an effective and efficient use of time, space and resources to achieve some educational objectives. Another definition of classroom management is proposed by Ming-Tak and Wai-Shing (2008, p. 4) who state that classroom management is all about teacher's actions in creating an efficient atmosphere and the one who facilitates an effective learning process. The most likely effective way to manage the classroom might be hard to mention, however it seems that rules and classroom procedures become the most obvious aspects of effective classroom management (Marzano, 2000).

The fact that students in classroom nowadays are not easy to organize (Wright, 2005) requires teachers to apply one or more effective ways such as commands, requests, and suggestions to manage the classroom effectively (Carroll, 1978). However, there are several factors that affect the success of classroom management such as space, class size, and students' behavior (Wright, 2005). Several research studies have found some factors that might affect the effectiveness of classroom management. One of those studies were conducted by Habibi et al. (2017, p. 178-183) who found that, in applying classroom management, teachers experienced several problems during the learning activities, such as large class size, making it time consuming for teachers. In addition, a study by Astuti (2015) investigated the use of classroom management in a senior high school in Panjura Malang, Indonesia, and found that classroom management use was highly important to support the teaching and learning process. They analysed the use of five aspects of classroom managements, i.e. physical

¹*E-mail addresses: faisal.mustafa@unsyiah.ac.id (Faisal Mustafa)

²

arrangement, instructional time, instructional strategies, behavioral consideration, and social climates. Based on their observation, teachers had fulfilled the characteristics of the five aspects. Also, Marmoah and Denmar (2017) analyzed classroom management employed by English teachers using observation, questionnaire, and interview. From the observation result, the English teachers applied classroom management elements effectively. Based on the questionnaire, the students enjoyed all learning activities. Based on the interview result, the English teacher employed the classroom management effectively. They always put efforts to create a good climate to achieve the learning goals. Finally, another study was conducted by Mudianingrum et al. (2019), who analyzed teacher's classroom management in teaching English. The findings of the study revealed that teachers used classroom strategies from the beginning to the end of the activities. During the teaching learning process, the teacher employed good seating arrangements, clearly communicated the topic, provided motivation, maintained a positive attitude, and developed relationships with the students.

Various studies have been conducted in the area of classroom management in foreign language classes, and one of the most significant current discussions on classroom management is how the classroom should be managed effectively (see Debreli & Ishanova, 2019; Al-Khazaali, 2021; Aliakbari & Bozorgmanesh, 2015). Some studies also reviewed previous studies on classroom management in a foreign language class (e.g. Macías, 2018). Those studies found that foreign language classroom management has specific characteristics, such as the use of target language as a medium of instruction, the emphasis on interaction patterns, and diverse use of teaching methods to promote of student involvement. In addition to the aforementioned review research, there is an urgent need to find out the most effective classroom management applicable for a foreign language class. This information will assist teachers in selecting the most appropriate classroom management for better student learning experience. However, prior review research has not addressed this area. Therefore, the current research reviewed previous publications related to classroom management in English language classrooms to find out the effective classroom management in this type of classroom for each area of classroom management, which includes seating arrangement, engagement, and student participation.

2. Methods

This study is a library research study. According to Harahap (2014, p. 68), library research is a research study which uses all types of primary data obtained from libraries in the form of books, encyclopedias, dictionaries, journals, documents, and even magazines. However, for this study the writer collected data consisting of information related to the topic of the study only from books, dissertations, and articles published in academic journals.

After the sources were collected, the writer wrote or took a note of all findings from the selected sources, followed by data analysis. Furthermore, the selected data were organized into tables to be able to make conclusion from the data. For the purpose of answering the research question, three tables were created, each of which contains elements of classroom management, namely seating arrangement, participation and engagement. The writer clearly cited the source for every element of classroom management, created standardized name and type of data sources, be it books, dissertations, or articles from journals and conference proceedings.

In analysing the data, the writer re-analysed the links between all the raw data that had been collected based on the procedure outlined above. The writer analysed these findings to find links or relationships between one source and another and to determine strengths and weaknesses of these sources. According to Miles et al. (2014, p. 12), there are three steps in analysing data for a qualitative research study, namely condensation, data display and conclusion drawing. In the condensation step, the writer simplified, selected and determined category of the data. In the data display, the reduced data were displayed to find out the best step to conclude the research. Thus, the writer took the final step in researching data sources, that is conclusion drawing in which the writer made conclusions based on the findings. In addition, all three steps were repeated multiple times to draw accurate conclusions.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Result

The objective of this research was to identify the effective classroom management for an EFL classroom. After the data were collected from 19 books, 22 articles, and 2 dissertations, the data were categorized into

relevant elements of classroom management proposed by Wright (2005, p. 289), i.e. seating arrangement, engagement and participation. The three core elements support teaching and learning process in the classroom, especially in a language classroom, and they will be shown separately in each of the following category.

3.1.1 Seating arrangement

According to Scrivener (2011, p. 61), seating arrangement is about how teacher arrange or rearrange seating, decide where the teacher stands or sits and while presenting the materials. Therefore, teacher's decision in arranging the classroom greatly affects how successful they are in delivering the materials. Based on the sources of data, the models of seating arrangement in English language classrooms are organized into the following table.

Table 1. Data sources for seating arrangement

No.	Source	Seating arrangement	Standardized Term	Type
1.	McLeod et al. (2003)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Group of six/corner work ● Traditional row 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Group ● Orderly Row 	Book
2.	Ming-Tak and Wai-Shing (2008)	Circles and long tables	Circular	Book
3.	Scrivener (2011)	Horseshoe (U-shaped)	U-shaped	Book
4.	Richardson and Fallona (2010)	Group of four	Group	Article
5.	Littlewood (1981)	Pair	Pair	Book
6.	Sarwar (2001)	Permanent small 'friendship' groups of four	Group	Book
7.	Harmer (1998)	Circles and horseshoes (U-shaped)	Circular	Book
8.	Ruhl and Wannarka (2008)	Small and medium-sized traditional row	Orderly Row	Article
9.	Falout (2014)	Circular	Circular	Article
10.	Simmons et al. (2015)	Row seating	Orderly Row	Article
11.	Denton (1992)	Semicircle	U-shaped	Article
12.	Supratman (2015)	Circular seating arrangement	Circular	Article
13.	Stephenson and Kniveton (1978)	Face-to-face	Face-to-face	Article

As shown in Table 1, there are six different seating arrangements for a language classroom that have been found in previous publications, which include circular model, U-shaped model, orderly row seating model, face-to-face model, group of six model, and group of four model. Falout (2014), Harmer (1998), Ming-Tak and Wai-Shing (2008), and Supratman (2015) presented the circular seating. A "model with a pattern forming the letter O" is another name for this model. To create this seating arrangement model, a table can be used, but it is still possible when a table is not available. The teacher sits at a desk in the center of the class, and the students are seated near one another. However, teachers are not flexible to walk around the class because of limited walking space. Therefore, the teacher can sit in a desk outside the circle to make it easy to present the materials for the students. This method is frequently employed in group projects where each group forms a circle. The second model, which is very identical to the circular model, is the horseshoe or u-shaped model, which appeared in Denton (1992), Harmer (1998), and Scrivener (2011, p. 62). A U-shaped model is one in which the chair and table are both formed like the letter U. As with the circular model, students sit close to each other. Consequently, this model is often known as a semi-circle model. The teacher is in the middle, with plenty of room to stroll to the whiteboard and keep an eye on the students while they work.

The next model is orderly row seating model found in Denton (1992), Harmer (1998), McLeod et al. (2003), Ruhl and Wannarka (2008), and Simmons et al. (2015). In this model, teachers sit a desk placed before the blackboard or projector screen. There are four or five rows, and each row consists of five or more tables that lined up to the back. In addition, students are assigned to seat in small groups consisting of two students at each table. Therefore, the two rows are separated by an aisle and another aisle is at each end of the rows. These aisles can be used by teachers to monitor students. Another model is almost similar to the orderly row, namely face-to-face seating arrangement, which was proposed by Stephenson and Kniveton (1978). In this model there is only one aisle that allows the teacher to walk around. Face to face is a model characterized by double rows, and the tables and chairs are arranged to face each other, which is suitable for task involving debates or discussion.

Finally, the other model was grouping. There are two types of grouping which can be effectively used in an English language classroom, i.e. group of six and group of four. McLeod et al. (2003) proposed the first type, and the other is found in Sarwar (2001) and Richardson and Fallona (2010). In these groupings, students are assigned to work in a table with groups involving six and four students. In this seating, the chairs and table can have different shape, such as a circle, a square, or other possible shapes. In addition to the variety of seating

models that can be applied to the grouping model, students can also sit in pair, as found in Littlewood (1981). In this seating arrangement, students sit at two tables that are linked to make them look like one. Each of them are occupied by a pair of students, and each group are required to sit far from the others. Students are asked to sit at the front side of the class, and the teacher may simply roam about the room and supervise students by using all of the aisles.

3.1.2 Engagement

Engagement is the second element that Wright (2005, p. 289) proposed as one of the core elements of classroom management in a language classroom. Taylor and Parsons (2011, p. 2) describe engagement as “students (who are not learning) to engaged learners (who are learning)”. The types of engagement which teachers can make in the classroom are summarized in the following table.

Table 2. Data sources for engagement

No.	Source	Characteristic of Engagement	Standardized Term	Type
1	Wright (2005)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Creating and managing classroom climate ● Managing the group ● Dealing with ‘troubles’: from control to care ● Managing the emotions of learning ● Managing affect in online learning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Social engagement ● Social engagement ● Emotional engagement ● Emotional engagement ● Emotional engagement 	Book
2	Brockbank and McGill (1998)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● ‘Presence’ – verbal and non-verbal signals (posture, expression, gesture, etc.). ● Self-disclosure. ● Attending and accurate listening. ● Basic assertion. ● Emotion management. ● Questioning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cognitive engagement ● Behavioural engagement ● Cognitive engagement ● Behavioural engagement ● Emotional engagement ● Cognitive engagement 	Book
3.	Philp and Duchesne (2016)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cognitive engagement ● Behavioural engagement ● Emotional engagement ● Social engagement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cognitive engagement ● Behavioural engagement ● Emotional engagement ● Social engagement 	Article
4.	Fredricks et al. (2004)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cognitive engagement ● Behavioural engagement ● Emotional engagement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cognitive engagement ● Behavioural engagement ● Emotional engagement 	Article
5.	Windham (2005)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Discovery ● Importance ● Interactive ● Guidance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Social engagement ● Social engagement ● Social engagement ● Social engagement 	Book
6.	Taylor and Parsons (2011)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Interaction ● Exploration ● Relevancy ● Multimedia ● Instruction ● Authentic assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cognitive engagement ● Cognitive engagement ● Cognitive Engagement ● Cognitive engagement ● Social engagement ● Cognitive engagement 	Article
7.	Dunleavy and Milton (2009)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Physiological engagement ● Social engagement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Physiological engagement ● Social engagement 	Book
8.	Claxton (2007)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Relevancy ● Responsibility ● Reality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cognitive engagement ● Behavioural engagement ● Behavioural engagement 	Article
9.	Skinner et al. (1990)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Behavioural intensity ● Emotional quality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Behavioural engagement ● Emotional engagement 	Article
10.	Pekrun and Linnenbrink-Garcia (2012)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Emotional engagement ● Behavioural engagement ● Social engagement ● Cognitive engagement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Emotional engagement ● Behavioural engagement ● Social engagement ● Cognitive engagement 	Book
11.	Furrer and Skinner (2003)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Attention ● Effort ● Verbal participation ● Persistence ● Positive emotion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cognitive engagement ● Behavioural engagement ● Cognitive engagement ● Cognitive engagement ● Emotional engagement 	Article
12.	Ames and Archer (1988)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mastery ● Performance goal climates 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cognitive engagement ● Cognitive engagement 	Article
13.	Kormos and Csizér (2014)	Behavioural Engagement	Behavioural engagement	Article
14.	Storch (2008)	Cognitive Engagement	Cognitive engagement	Article
15.	Svalberg (2009)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cognitive engagement ● Social engagement ● Affective engagement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cognitive engagement ● Social engagement ● Affective engagement 	Article

16.	Lambert, Philp, & Nakamura (2017)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cognitive engagement ● Behavioral engagement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cognitive engagement ● Behavioral engagement 	Article
17.	Baralt et al. (2016)	Cognitive engagement		Book
18.	Willms et al.(2009)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Transforming Classrooms through Social ● Academic Engagement ● Intellectual Engagement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Social engagement ● Academic Engagement ● Intellectual Engagement 	Book
19.	O'Rourke (2017)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Academic engagement ● Cognitive engagement ● Behavioral engagement ● Relational engagement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Academic Engagement ● Cognitive engagement ● Behavioral engagement ● Relational engagement 	Dissertation

As in Table 2, nine types of engagement used in an EFL classroom are suggested by past publications, i.e. cognitive engagement, behavioral engagement, academic engagement, intellectual engagement, physiological engagement, affective engagement, emotional engagement, social engagement, and relational engagement. Cognitive engagement which was found in many previous publications is related to students' thinking skills (Ames & Archer, 1988; Baralt et al., 2016; Brockbank & McGill, 1998; Claxton, 2007; Fredricks et al., 2004; Furrer & Skinner, 2003; Lambert et al., 2017; O'Rourke et al., 2017; Philp & Duchesne, 2016; Pekrun & Linnenbrink-Garcia, 2012; Storch, 2008; Svalberg, 2009; Taylor & Parsons, 2011). This type is cognitive engagement, which is related to students' thinking skills. This engagement comprises sharing ideas, exchanging information, and giving feedback. It is the student's enthusiasm to express their thought, to concentrate to learn the material and to establish their purpose to develop their understanding of the material and deal with problems related to the materials, and all are independently managed by the students.

Another type of engagement found in the literature presented in Table 2 was behavioral engagement (Brockbank & McGill, 1998; Claxton, 2007; Fredricks et al., 2004; Furrer & Skinner, 2003; Kormos & Csizér, 2014; ; Lambert et al., 2017; O'Rourke et al., 2017; Pekrun & Linnenbrink-Garcia, 2012; Philp & Duchesne, 2016; Skinner et al., 1990). Behavioral engagement can be physically observed, such as students' attendance and participation, as can it be trained and shaped. Therefore, all students' interests and the like will be shown through their behavior. The teacher can use behavioral engagement to attract students to participate actively in the learning process. For example, using reward and punishment can motivate students to show obedient behavior because they know there will be rewards in the form of score or punishment. This is an example of how expected behavior can be shaped.

The third type was academic engagement, as proposed by O'Rourke (2017) and Willms et al. (2009). It displays how students can actively participate in all academic tasks, including learning, increasing skills, and researching and doing research. Teachers play a significant role in making students interested in engaging themselves in the academic activities by using appropriate learning methods and strategies. Another type of engagement almost similar to academic engagement is affective engagement, which was found in Svalberg (2009). This engagement describes students' interest in learning. It illustrates the willingness of students to learn and knows the purpose of learning. Furthermore, another type of student engagement related to academic engagement is intellectual engagement, introduced by Willms et al. (2009). Intellectual engagement is a collection of students' abilities and intelligence whether it is in writing, listening, reading or speaking.

The next type was physiological engagement, which was found in Dunleavy and Milton (2009). It shows that it is the physical conditions of students that influence them in achieving learning outcomes. It is also related to another type of engagement, i.e. emotional engagement, which was proposed Brockbank and McGill (1998), Fredricks et al. (2004), Furrer and Skinner (2003), Pekrun and Linnenbrink-Garcia (2012), Philp and Duchesne (2016), Skinner et al. (1990) and Wright (2005). Emotional engagement is defined that student's reaction to the learning environment, which can be observed from the students' interest, learning satisfaction, curiosity, or even tediousness and anxiety when they are participation in learning activities.

Another type of engagement was social engagement (Dunleavy & Milton, 2009; Pekrun & Linnenbrink-Garcia, 2012; Philp & Duchesne, 2016; Taylor & Parsons, 2011; Windham, 2005; Wright, 2005). Social engagement is where students enjoy participating in a study group and become part of the group. In an EFL classroom, interaction among students guarantees better success in learning (Karabiyik, 2019, p. 281) because they have opportunity to share their ideas and learning experience, which facilitates them to archive the learning objectives. Finally, the last engagement is relational engagement, introduced by O'Rourke (2017). It refers to the student's sense of belonging and how well they feels linked to the school environment, be it with group members, teachers or everyone else involved.

3.1.3 Participation

The last core element of classroom management is participation. Mercer (2002, p. 1) states that “classrooms are thus social discourse worlds”, which suggests that participation is about students having a good relationship with all involved in a learning environment. Furthermore, there are several types of participation in language classroom, summarized in the table below.

Table 3. Data sources for student participation

No.	Source	Characteristic of Participation	Standardized Term	Type
1.	Wright (2005)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Teacher talk ● Classroom talk ● Learner-managed talk ● Turn-taking organization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Teacher talk ● Classroom talk ● Learner-managed talk ● Classroom talk 	Book
2.	Sinclair and Coulthard (1975)	IRF: initiation-response-feedback	Classroom talk	Book
3.	Barnes (1976)	Exploratory talk	Exploratory talk	Book
4.	Hickey and Schafer (2006)	Collective participation	Collaborative talk	Book
5.	Mercer et al. (1999)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Disputational Talk ● Cumulative talk ● Exploratory talk 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Disputational Talk ● Cumulative talk ● Exploratory talk 	Article
6.	Lee (2005)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Answering teacher’s and another student’s question ● Asking question ● Make comment ● Join in discussion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Classroom talk ● Classroom talk ● Classroom talk 	Article
7.	Tsui (1995)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Contact in classrooms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Classroom talk 	Book
8.	Marzano (2000)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Participating in classroom activities and discussion without being asked 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Learner-managed talk 	Book
9.	Hymes and Gumperz (1972)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Communicative competence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Learner-managed talk 	Book
10.	Xu (2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Contact in classrooms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Classroom talk 	Article
11.	Philips (1972)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The teacher interacting with the whole class ● The teacher interacting with a group of pupils ● Students’ individual work where the teacher is available for help ● Student group work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Classroom talk ● Classroom talk ● Learner-managed talk ● Learner-managed talk 	Book
12.	van Lier (1998)	Collaborative talk	Collaborative talk	Article
13.	Mortensen (2008)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Classroom competency ● Classroom interaction ● Turn-taking organization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Classroom talk ● Classroom talk ● Classroom talk 	Dissertation
14.	McHoul (1978)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Classroom talk ● The organization of turns. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Classroom talk ● Classroom talk 	Article
15.	Markee and Kasper (2004)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Contact in classrooms ● Classroom talk 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Classroom talk ● Classroom talk 	Article

The table above shows that there are seven possible forms of participation in a language classroom. First type of participation is classroom talk, which was proposed by Lee (2005), Markee and Kasper (2004), McHoul (1978), Mortensen (2008), Philips (1972), Sinclair and Coulthard (1975), Tsui (1995), Wright (2005), and Xu (2006). Classroom talk is found in many leaning activities in the classroom, such as listening to teacher explaining the materials, working on task, answering questions asked by the teacher, discussing a topic in the group, asking questions and asking for assistance and using allocated time efficiently. Furthermore, another component of participation is teacher talk, proposed by Philips (1972), and Wright (2005). Teacher talk is shown when teachers communicate with their students in class, which comprises asking questions, explaining the tasks or learning activities, giving advices and responding to questions between the teachers and students.

The third type is learner-managed talk, which was addressed by Hymes and Gumperz (1972), Marzano (2000), Philips (1972), and Wright (2005). Learner-managed talk occurs when students create student talk or when they write, when they can work autodidactically without teacher assistance. Another is collaborative talk, which is still related to learner-manage talk, and this talk is found in Hickey and Schafer (2006) and van Lier (1998). Collaborative talk in an EFL class can be observed during classroom discussion when English is used.

Another type of participation was found in Barnes (1976) and Mercer et al. (1999) – exploratory talk. Exploratory talk occurs in an environment that encourages students to share and develop their thought. When the learners work together with others, their thought concepts must be critically established to help them draw accurate conclusions. Mercer et al. (1999) proposed the next sort of participation, disputational talk, which

contrasted with exploratory talk. Disputational talk is characterized as solo decision-making, implying that it does not allow learners to discuss and make decisions in a group setting. The last type of participation was cumulative discussion, which was also proposed by Mercer et al. (1999). This participation differs from exploratory talk in that each learner obtain the ideas from their classmates so they do not need to establish the idea through critical thinking process. Specifically, each person has their own thought, and they may also establish other ideas, but they do that without rigorous forethought.

3.2 Discussion

This section discusses the analysis results of the data that have been summarized in the previous section. For systematicity, each element of classroom managements is discussed separately.

3.2.1 Seating arrangement

Managing seating arrangement is another important point for teachers besides their teaching skills. After reading and researching related sources, it is possible to determine which form of seating arrangement is effective in a language classroom. Based on previous studies, it can be concluded that u-shaped, sitting in a group and orderly row are the most effective seating arrangements of the others. U-shaped is effective to use in language classroom because it enables teachers to make an eye contact with all students, so that students have little opportunity disregard the learning activities. The benefit of u-shape arrangement is also emphasized by Lestari et al. (2016, p. 4) who believe that in u-shaped model a teacher has a greater chance to control all students because the teacher is in the middle of the classroom. They add that this style also gives students space to help one another as they all sit close together and have a narrow space for them to play during the learning process. This is necessary to create a chance for good collaboration among students, and between teachers and students. This style is different from the circular style, where there will be some students who are likely to be ignored by the teacher, which seems less effective. Furthermore, Currie and Ly (2016, p. 2-3) state that u-shaped style provides more opportunities for students to discuss rather than the other styles do.

Another effective form of seating arrangement is sitting in a group, which is very suitable for building good communication because students who sit in groups tend to have a higher sense of togetherness compared to other styles. Lestari et al. (2016, p. 5) believe that working in group provides an effective place for students to work together in practicing what they have learned, and students can communicate using the target language in this effective atmosphere. As Lestari et al. (2016, p. 5) mention, this style is suitable in a class which has students who are less eager to speak. Especially in language classes, communicating using the target language is one of the most important goals; therefore, a comfortable seating style needs to be encouraged.

Meanwhile, Norazman et al. (2019, p. 32) say that some research results show that orderly row style is the most popular model to give students opportunity to learn individually and be responsible for their own assignments. In the learning process, building good relationships and socializing with peers is an obligation, but teachers also need to provide space for students to learn independently. In language classes in particular, there are activities that encourage students to always learn in groups. Therefore, a suitable seating arrangement is necessary. Ruhl and Wannarka (2008, p. 91) demonstrate that orderly row model enables students to interact less with their peers, and this is very necessary when students are instructed to complete independent assignments. Moreover, when learning individually, Gremmen et al. (2016, p. 752) suggest orderly row to increase student' on-task behavior in individual tasks. This is reinforced by the similar results of study from Hastings and Schweiso (1995, p. 279), Simmons et al. (2015, p. 51), where they found students' on-task behavior increased significantly by applying this arrangement. Moreover, they also show that orderly row style can give maximum results in the on-task behavior of students.

3.2.2 Engagement

Engagement is an important part in teaching and learning process. Based on the data obtained in this study, there are nine characteristics in engagement, namely cognitive, behavioral, academic, emotional, social, intellectual, physiological, affective and relational engagements. All characteristics are essential because they are related to one another in contributing to meaningful students learning experience.

Cognitive engagement is related to students' thinking skills and their motivation to participate in learning activities. Morris et al. (2017, p. 496) report that one of the indicators in cognitive engagement is that students have the motivation to learn and achieve learning target. Casimiro (2016, p. 442) also claims that cognitive

engagement is the desire and motivation of students to put their best effort to understand a concept and cope with difficult learning activities. Therefore, a teacher must be able to stimulate students' enthusiasm to participate in learning activities and solve problems related to learning. In addition to cognitive engagement, social engagement is another type that is not less significant to ensure students succeed in their learning. Jones and Thomas (2012, p. 6) point out that interacting with peers and teacher in an academic setting can help students possess a sense of belonging, which can potentially increase their success in learning. Peer interaction enable students to share knowledge and ideas, and it motivate students to use the target language. The nature of social engagement is closely related to relational and affective engagements where a student feels connected to others involved in the learning activities. Thus, students will find it easier to socialize, resulting in internal motivation to learn. With regard to affective engagement, Svalberg (2009, p. 6) states that in the context of language learning, it makes students interested to learn and use the target language. In addition, attracting student's interest is closely related to behavioral engagement. Behavior can be developed using an appropriate method to help students find their interests to make it easier for students to maintain cognitive, academic, social, relational or even intellectual engagements. Furthermore, teachers also need to pay attention students' physiological engagement. Sesmiyanti (2016, p. 49) asserts that before the lesson starts, teacher can create physical activities to make students ready to start learning activities.

Moreover, the overall results of the combination of these types are shown through emotional engagement as well as behavioral engagement in the form of positive reactions given by students and maximum learning outcomes. Sesmiyanti (2016, p. 49) concludes that emotional engagement is a way to help students show positive behavior towards lessons and minimize negative behavior. Behavioral engagement is reflected from simple action such as listening carefully to teacher's instruction, doing a given task and involving in learning activities (Pagan, 2018, p. 4).

3.2.3 Student participation

In the participation elements, the writer found seven forms of participation relevant to a language learning classroom, i.e. classroom talk, teacher talk, collaborative talk, exploratory talk, disputational talk, learner-managed talk and cumulative talk. All forms of participation are important in language classrooms, but one of them does not seem to offer significant effect on the development of students' language skills, namely cumulative talk. The six forms of participation that have a significant role for an effective language learning are comprehensively discussed in this section.

In a language learning classroom, classroom talk always occurs. Markee and Kasper (2004, p. 492) point out that classroom talk is the teachers' most vital role where they have the power to manage all interactions which occur during the teaching and learning process. Therefore, classroom talk needs to be maintained considering that classroom talks is one of the supporting factors for successful learning. Boblett (2018, p. 261) claims that exploratory talk is part of classroom talk which plays a role in promoting a learning process. Elber and Haan (2013, p. 1398) say that exploratory talk is a critical but constructive reasoning process where students concentrate on building a critical knowledge. Furthermore, classroom talk is also related to another type of participation, i.e. teacher talk. If a teacher can apply teacher talk properly according to the context and class characteristics, the classroom talk will run effectively. Putri (2015, p. 16) claims that teacher talk is an important part that cannot be separated from a classroom interaction. Moreover, Yanfen and Yuqin (2010, p. 77) believe that teacher talk has an impact on the classroom atmosphere that a teacher creates, as well as the collaboration between all involved in the classroom, which means the success of all activities and learning objectives is determined by how the teacher uses appropriate teacher talk. There are several activities that Putri (2015, p. 18) discusses related to teacher talk, i.e. asking questions, giving instructions, direction and suggestions, and providing feedback. Thus, using appropriate teacher talk, a teacher can create an effective learning atmosphere in the language classroom.

Another form of participation is collaborative talk. Laal (2012, p. 491) defines it as a learning process where students work together with peers to solve a problem. Thus, collaborative talk is a tool that a teacher can use to encourage collaboration between students. This collaboration will greatly help students improve their learning achievement. Several activities such as exchanging ideas, sharing knowledge and information should be done collaboratively so that students can get experience and obtain knowledge from their peers. Rao (2019, p. 8) strengthens the benefit of collaboration by a claim that students achieve better results in learning when it is done together with peers. Especially in learning foreign languages, all students start from a basic level, so it is necessary for them to get involved in sharing knowledge. Unlike collaborative talk, according to Arcidiacono

and Gastaldi (2011, p. 3), disputational talk is not focused on solving a problem, but it is based on individual decision-making. Furthermore, in learner-managed talk, Wright (2005, p. 390) states that it is an activity where students are able to work independently (be it in group or individually) and teacher only facilitates the learning process.

4. Conclusion

After analyzing information obtained from the data sources, the writer can finally conclude that EFL teachers may apply the three elements of classroom management in language classroom so that the classroom can be effectively managed. The three elements are seating arrangement, engagement and participation. The most effective seating arrangements to be implemented in language classes are u-shaped, sit in groups and orderly row. In the engagement element, all models in this element are effective in language classes, namely cognitive, behavioral, academic, emotional, social, intellectual, physiological, effective and relational engagement. Finally, the components of student participation effective for an EFL classroom include classroom talk, teacher talk, collaborative talk, exploratory talk, disputational talk, and learner-managed talk. Based on these results, it is significant that teachers understand the role of classroom management and how to apply it optimally by implementing the elements of classroom management that are most effective in language classroom. Because each component of classroom management element has its own characteristic, the teacher can apply different models of classroom management, depending on the language skills being taught.

The results of this research have shown some gaps which need to be addressed in future research. Empirical research can be conducted to find out the most effective component of classroom management element for each language skills. Thus, it is recommended for future researcher conduct experimental study to directly practice the elements of classroom management adjusted to each skill to see a more detailed impact on students' development in mastering the target language as well as to see their perceptions of applied classroom management. The results of such study will be a great help for teachers in switching between classroom management model, which can improve student motivation in learning. In addition, this study has not considered levels of students' English proficiency and made categories accordingly. Therefore, a specified approach focused on varied English levels needs further studies such as English language specially designed for children in primary and lower-secondary school.

References

- Al-Khazaali, H. M. K. (2021). The influence of interactive classroom management strategies on Iraqi EFL students' academic performance at secondary school. *International Journal of Early Childhood Special Education*, 13(2), 114–119. <https://doi.org/10.9756/INT-JECSE/V13I2.211046>
- Aliakbari, M., & Bozorgmanesh, B. (2015). Assertive classroom management strategies and students' performance: The case of EFL classroom. *Cogent Education*, 2(1), 1012899. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2015.1012899>
- Ames, C., & Archer, J. (1988). Achievement goals in the classroom: Students' learning strategies and motivation processes. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 80(1), 260-267.
- Arcidiacono, F., & Gastaldi, F. G. M. (2011). "What do you say?" The analysis of classroom talks from a sociocultural perspective. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 2(1), 1-15.
- Astuti, A. D. (2015). *The effectiveness of classroom management in English language teaching and learning for tenth graders of SMA Panjura Malang* (unpublished undergraduate dissertation). Universitas Brawijaya, Malang, Indonesia.
- Baralt, M., Gurzynski-Weiss, L., & Kim, Y. (2016). Engagement with language: How examining learners' affective and social engagement explains successful learner-generated attention to form. In M. Sato & S. Ballinger (Eds.), *Peer interaction and second language learning. Pedagogical potential and research agenda* (pp. 209-240). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Barnes, D. (1976). *From communication to curriculum*. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin.
- Boblett, N. (2018). Doing exploratory talk in the language classroom: A sequential account. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education (HUJE)*, 33(special issue), 261-277.
- Brockbank, A., & McGill, I. (1998). *Facilitating reflective learning in higher education*. Buckingham: SRHE.
- Carroll, J. B. (1978). *The teaching of French as a foreign language in eight countries*. New York: Wiley.
- Casimiro, L. T. (2016). Cognitive engagement in online intercultural interaction: Beyond analytics.

- International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, 6(6), 441-447.
- Claxton, G. (2007). Expanding young people's capacity to learn. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 55(2), 1-20.
- Currie, J., & Ly, J. (2016). An exploration of student perspectives of primary classroom desk configurations. *International Online Journal of Primary Education*, 5(2), 1-14.
- Debrei, E., & Ishanova, I. (2019). Foreign language classroom management: Types of student misbehaviour and strategies adapted by the teachers in handling disruptive behaviour. *Cogent Education*, 6(1), 1648629. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2019.1648629>
- Dentn, P. (1992). Seating arrangements for better classroom management. *Adventist Education*, 54(5), 29-32.
- Dunlavy, J., & Milton, P. (2009). *What did you do in school today? Exploring the concept of student engagement and its implications for teaching and learning in Canada*. Toronto: Canadian Education Association (CEA).
- Elber, E., & Haan, M. D. (2013). Key words and the analysis of exploratory talk. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 28, 1397-1415.
- Falot, J. (2014). Circular seating arrangements: Approaching the social crux in language classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 4(2), 275-300.
- Fredicks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School Engagement: Potential of the Concept, State of the Evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, 74(1), 59-109.
- Furr, C., & Skinner, E. (2003). Sense of relatedness as a factor in children's academic engagement and performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95(1), 148-162.
- Gremen, N., van den Berg, Y., Segers, E., & Cillesen, A. H. N. (2016). Considerations for classroom seating arrangements and the role of teacher characteristics and beliefs. *Social Psychology of Education*, 19, 749-774.
- Habbi, A., Mukminin, A., Sofwan, M., & Sulistiyo, U. (2017). Implementation of classroom management by English teachers at high schools in Jambi, Indonesia. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 4(2), 172-189.
- Harahap, N. (2014). Penelitian kepustakaan [Library research]. *Jurnal Iqra'*, 8(1), 68-73.
- Harmer, J. (1998). *How to teach English: An introduction to the practice of English language teaching*. Harlow: Longman.
- Hatings, N., & Schweiso, J. (1995). Tasks and tables: The effect of seating arrangement in primary classrooms. *Educational Research*, 37(3), 279-291.
- Hicky, D. T., & Schafer, N. J. (2006). Design-based, participation-centered approaches to classroom management. In C. Evertson and C. Weinstein (Eds.). *Handbook for classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues* (pp. 887-908). New York: Merrill-Prentice Hall.
- Hyes, D., & Gumperz, J. (1972). *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Wiston.
- Jones R., & Thomas, L. (2012). *Promoting social engagement*. Birmingham: The National HE STEM Programme.
- Karbiyık, C. (2019). The relationship between student engagement and tertiary level English language learners' achievement. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET)*, 6(2), 281-293.
- Koros, J., & Cszér, K. (2014). Age-related differences in the motivation of learning English as a foreign language: Attitudes, selves and motivated learning behaviour. *Language Learning*, 58(2), 327-355.
- Lal, M. (2012). Collaborative learning: What is it? *Procedia - Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 31, 491-495.
- ambert, C., Philp, J., & Nakamura, S. (2017). Learner-generated content and engagement in second language task performance. *Language Teaching Research*, 21(6), 665-680.
- Lee, P. (2005). Students' personality type and attitudes toward classroom participation. *Proceedings of the CATESOL State Conference, California State University, Los Angeles, USA*.
- Lestari, M., Hati, G. M., & Harahap, A. (2016). Seating position in English language learning: Does it really matter? In *International seminar BKS-PTN West Region 2016 on language, literature, arts, and culture* (pp. 1-10). Palangka Raya: Palangka Raya University.
- Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Macías, D. F. (2018). Classroom management in foreign language education: An exploratory review. *Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 20(1), 153-166. <https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v20n1.60001>

- Malik, M. A., Murtaza, A., & Khan, A. M. (2011). Role of teachers in managing teaching learning situation. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 3(5), 783–833.
- Markee, N., & Kasper, G. (2004). Classroom talks: An introduction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(1), 491-500.
- Marmoah, S., & Denmar, D. (2017). The analysis of classroom management in teaching English. *Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 22(1), 72-78.
- Marzano, R. J. (2000). *Classroom management that works: Research-based strategies for every teacher*. Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- McHoul, A. (1978). The organization of turns at formal talk in the classroom. *Language in Society*, 7(2), 183-213.
- McLeod, J., Fisher, J., & Hoover, G. (2003). *The key element of classroom management*. Virginia, USA: ASCD.
- Mercer, N. (2002). Developing dialogues. In G. Wells and G. Claxton (Eds.), *Learning for life in the 21st: Sociocultural perspectives on the future of education* (pp. 141-153). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Mercer, N., Wegerif, R., & Dawes, L. (1999). Children's talk and the development of reasoning in the classroom. *British Educational Research Journal*, 25(1), 95–111.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: SAGE Publication.
- Ming-Tak, H., & Wai-Shing, L. (2008). *Classroom management: Creating a positive learning environment*. Hong Kong, China: Hong Kong University Press.
- Morris, J. E., Lummis, G. W., & Lock, G. (2017). Questioning art: Factors affecting students' cognitive engagement in responding. *Issues in Educational Research*, 27(3), 493-511.
- Mortensen, K. (2008). *Instruction and participation in the second language classroom* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Southern Denmark, Denmark.
- Mudianingrum, R. A., Evenddy, S. S., & Rima, R. (2019). An analysis of teachers' classroom management in teaching English. *JEES: Journal of English Education Studies*, 2(1), 1-11.
- Norazman, N., Ismail, A. H., Ja'afar, N. H., Khoiry, M. A., & Ani, A. I. C. (2019). A review of seating arrangements towards the 21st century classroom approach in schools. *Malaysian Journal of Sustainable Environment*, 7(2), 21-46.
- O'Rourke, C. J. (2017). *Academic engagement and learning experience of English learners: A case study of Chendler Magnet Elementary School, Worcester, MA* (Master's thesis, Clark University, Worcester, Massachusetts, USA). Retrieved from https://commons.clarku.edu/idce_masters_papers/103/
- Pagan, J. E. (2018). *Behavioral, affective, and cognitive engagement of high school music students: Relation to academic achievement and ensemble performance rating* (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Florida, Florida, USA). Retrieved from <https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd/7347>
- Pekrun, R., & Linnenbrink-Garcia, L. (2012). *Academic emotions and student engagement*. In S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 259–282). New York, NY: Springer.
- Philips. (1972). Participant structures and communicative competence: Warm springs children in community and classroom. In C. Cazden, V. John, & D. Hymes (ed.), *Functions of language in the classroom* (pp. 370-394). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Philp, J., & Duchesne, S. (2016). Exploring engagement in tasks in the language classroom. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 36, 50-72.
- Putri, D. S. (2015). The analysis of teacher talks and the characteristics of classroom interaction in English a foreign language classroom. *Journal of English and Education*, 3(2), 16-27.
- Rao, P. S. (2019). Collaborative learning in English language classrooms. *An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 9(2), 1-12.
- Richardson, V., & Fallona, C. (2010). Classroom management as method and manner. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 33(6), 705-728.
- Ruhl, K., & Wannarka, R. (2008). Seating arrangement that promote positive academic and behavioural outcomes: A review of empirical research. *Journal Compilation*, 23(2), 89-93.
- Sarwar, Z. (2001). Adapting individualization techniques for large classes. In Hall, D.R. & Hewings, A. (Eds.), *Innovation in English language teaching: A reader* (127-136). London: Routledge.
- Scrivener, J. (2011). *Learning teaching: The essential guide to English language teaching* (3rd Ed.). Oxford, UK: Macmillan Publishers Limited.
- Sesmiyanti. (2016). Students' cognitive engagement in learning process. *Journal Polingua*, 5(2), 48-51.

- Simmons, K., Carpenter, L., Crenshaw, S., & Hinton, V. M. (2015). Exploration of classroom seating arrangement and student behavior in a second grade classroom. *Georgia Educational Research*, 12(1), 51-68.
- Sinclair, J., & Coulthard, R. M. (1975). *Toward an analysis of discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Skinner, E. A., Wellborn, J. G., & Connell, J. P. (1990). What it takes to do well in school and whether I've got it: The role of perceived control in children's engagement and school achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82(1), 22-32.
- Stephenson, G. M., & Kniveton, B. K. (1978). Interpersonal and interparty exchange: an experimental study of the effect of seating position on the outcome of negotiations between teams representing parties in dispute. *Human Relations*, 31(6), 555-566.
- Storch, N. (2008). Metatalk in a pair work activity: Level of engagement and implications for language development. *Language Awareness*, 17(1), 95-114.
- Supratman, L. P. (2015). A case study of classroom seating arrangement to promote student's communication interactivity in Telkom University. *International Journal of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences*, 1(3), 130-133.
- Svalberg, A. (2009). Engagement with language: Developing a construct. *Language Awareness*, 18(3-4), 242-258.
- Taylor, L., & Parsons, J. (2011). Improving student engagement. *Current Issues in Education*, 14(1), 1-33.
- Tsui, A. B. M. (1995). *Introducing classroom interaction*. London: Penguin.
- van Lier, L. (1998). The relationship between consciousness, interaction and language learning. *Language Awareness*, 7(1), 128-145.
- Willms, J. D., Friesen, S., & Milton, P. (2009). *What did you do in school today? Transforming classrooms through social, academic and intellectual engagement*. Toronto, ON: Canadian Education Association.
- Windham, C. (2005). The student's perspective. In D. Oblinger & J. Oblinger (Eds.), *Educating the Net generation* (pp. 5.1-5.16). Boulder, CO: EDUCAUSE.
- Wright, T. (2005). *Classroom management in language education*. New York, US: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Xu, J. (2006). Gender and homework management report by high school students. *Educational Psychology*, 26(1), 73-91.
- Yanfen, L., & Yuqin, Z. (2010). A study of teacher talks in interactions in English classes. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 33(2), 76-86.