

INVESTIGATING THE INTERACTIONS BETWEEN TEACHER AND STUDENTS IN AN EFL CLASSROOM

Ely Heldydiana Selamat*

Universistas Katolik Indonesia Santu Paulus Ruteng
ely.selamat@gmail.com

Suseni Monira Melji

Universistas Katolik Indonesia Santu Paulus Ruteng
susenimelji@gmail.com

**Corresponding Author*

Abstract: The purpose of this study was to examine the patterns of teacher-student interaction in an EFL classroom. The researchers conducted this investigation using a quantitative manner. This research enrolled one experienced English teacher and 49 students. Classroom observation, video recording, and interview were employed to obtain data. Additionally, Flanders Interaction Analysis was utilized to identify and evaluate interactions between the teacher and students in the classroom. This study found two distinct types of Flanders interaction in teacher-student interactions, namely Teacher Talk and Student Talk. For the teacher, the categories of talk demonstrated that accepting feelings, praising or encouraging students, accepting or using students' ideas, asking questions, lecturing, giving directions, criticizing or justifying authority all assisted the teacher in eliciting positive responses from the students; and for the students, the categories of talk demonstrated that initiation and silence or confusion demonstrated that the students were not truly engaged in responding to their teacher. This resulted in the researcher concluding that teachers were more dominant in EFL classroom activities, as evidenced by the fact that the percentage of teacher talk was 68.94 percent higher than the percentage of student talk, which was 22.55 percent, and silence or confusion, which was 8.51 percent. The researchers proposed that teachers provide opportunities for students to be more involved in the classroom by asking some critical questions.

Keywords: teacher's talk, the students' talk, and the EFL classroom.

INTRODUCTION

The interaction between the teacher and students in the language classroom is constrained. It is a common action that occurs during the teaching-learning process in the classroom and plays a critical function in fostering communication between the instructor and students. Positive contact between instructor and students in the classroom may encourage kids to talk since it helps them think, grasp, and respond to provided stimuli. Thus, the classroom as a location of communication, and the language classroom as a place of practice for all students, should become a place where they may practice the communicative skills they will need in real-world interaction situations beyond the classroom.

Additionally, classroom engagement encompassed all classroom occurrences, both verbal and non-verbal. According to Meng (2011: 98), "teachers should include both verbal and non-verbal languages." Verbal engagement encompasses both written and spoken communication". Meanwhile, non-verbal engagement refers to behavioral reactions in the classroom that do not include the use of words, such as head nodding and hand raising. Successful contact can increase teacher-student or student-student engagement, improve learning, and inspire students. According to Crago (1997: 246), "teachers and students also build on one another's communication behaviors as they collaborate to accomplish goals, relate experiences, and complete curricular requirements." Whatever goal they bring to the classroom, the conclusion is a collaborative effort between the instructor and students to manage both interaction and learning (Allwright, 1984, as cited in Zhang 2012: 980). Interaction between the teacher and

students, as well as between students and students, is necessary in classroom activities that use a communicative approach. It will ensure that communication occurs in the classroom. It will aid in the seamless operation of the teaching and learning processes.

Interaction is at the heart of communication and is a component of communicative language instruction (Brown, 2000). Interaction is one of the modes of communication used to communicate with foreigners. Wagner (1994) defines interaction as "reciprocal occurrences involving at least two items and two actions, occurring when these things and events naturally impact one another." Thus, contact does not occur just on one side; communication requires reciprocal impact through the exchange of signals. Classroom interaction is the exchange of information between a teacher and a student, or between students. This conversation may develop as a result of a shared problem that motivates both parties to communicate thoughts or opinions on the subject at hand. Classroom interaction occurs when a teacher or a student asks a question or provides responses, comments, and views in response to a posed question. Interaction is critical for everyone, particularly students. The capacity of a student to respond to or express an opinion on a tossed question is an interaction that happens in class as a result of their reciprocity.

Different interaction patterns may be used in the classroom to support the objectives of various types of activities, such as pair work (a student working with another student) and group work (students with students). Changing interaction patterns helps to alter the speed, while selecting the appropriate pattern assists in achieving learning objectives and increasing learning productivity. Brown (2000:165) defines interaction as "the collaborative exchange of thoughts, feelings, or ideas between two or more individuals that has a reciprocal influence on both parties." Interaction happens not just between one party and another, but also between

at least two parties who exchange messages in order to achieve the communication process. This is consistent with Wagner's (1994:8) assertion that "interaction is a series of reciprocal occurrences involving a minimum of two objects and two acts." When these items and events naturally interact, interaction happens. Students who participate actively in class by taking turns may strengthen their language skills. Meanwhile, passive students will have less opportunities to learn a language. It is self-evident that an active involvement on the part of the instructor and students is required to foster positive classroom interaction. They should participate actively in classroom communication events or interactions. Thus, the quality of teaching and learning in the classroom is largely controlled by the instructor and students' active interaction.

Classroom interaction is a circumstance in which instructor and students respond reciprocally; the teacher's actions are impacted by the students' reactions (Malamah, 1987). Additionally, contact fosters mutual awareness of the teacher-student relationship and duties. The instructor may establish a topic and material, issue directions, give and receive replies, choose who participates in teaching and learning activities, provide feedback to students, and so on in order to ensure that the students get the output successfully. The instructor may share personal experiences with his or her students and urge them to share their own. In a classroom taught in this manner, the instructor is meant to stimulate greater student conversation. Thus, the ratio of teacher to student speak should be balanced or student talk should be more dominated, since a healthy percentage of conversation can allow effective and efficient engagement. Due to the fact that teacher talk and student discussion are critical components of classroom engagement, the teacher should not be permitted to dominate the class during the teaching and learning process. The instructor

should provide more opportunity for students to initiate subjects of conversation with others.

Through the classroom interaction pattern, it was extremely beneficial for students to be able to communicate in English. We might describe it as the process of developing language spontaneously. The teacher in the classroom is not only expected to teach well, but also to produce resources that support the right application of approaches, techniques, and patterns of English learning. When teaching English to students, the teacher must encompass the concepts of acquisition and learning. Through interaction in the classroom, students were able to transmit information about English via repetitive practice tasks in the language model utilized for instruction. In this instance, the instructor plays a critical role, since he or she must be more creative in designing learning activities that might enhance language practice interactively. The instructor must incorporate as much English as feasible into the language of teaching in order to increase students' familiarity with the language. The interaction process involves questioning and answering, sharing owned ideas, and conversing.

Therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine classroom interaction patterns using the Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories System (FIACS) Technique. Mardiyana (2018) states that FIACS is an observational method used to identify instructors' and students' interaction patterns during the teaching-learning process in the classroom. Amin (2015) and Fitri & Syafri (2017) performed earlier studies on teacher-student interaction patterns with the goal of determining and quantifying the category of teacher-student conversation time in the classroom.

METHOD

The purpose of this study was to get a concise description of classroom interaction by utilizing Flander's Interaction Analysis Categories System (FIACS) to classify classroom interaction patterns. The researcher will perform descriptive quantitative research in order to ascertain patterns of teacher-student interaction in an EFL classroom. This research featured an English instructor and 22 eighth-grade students from SMP Negeri 3 Reok. The English instructor and eighth grade were chosen to observe the sorts of exchanges that occur during a teacher's various classroom sessions. The teacher has ten (10) years of experience teaching English and possesses an English degree. The instructor is 39 years old. He graduated from STKIP St. Paulus Ruteng in 2008. The students were between the ages of fourteen (14) and sixteen (16). There were 22 female students and 27 male students involved in this research. Furthermore, with regards to this research, data would be gathered using a variety of instruments, including video recording of classroom activities (transcription), as well as note taking. After gathering data, the researcher examined it and worked detailly the transcriptions of the teaching-learning process to deduce the patterns of interaction between instructor and students in the teaching-learning process as outlined by Flanders (1970). Thirdly, after tabulating the different sorts of interaction patterns employed by the instructor and students in the appropriate column, the researcher would compute the data in order to determine the dominant pattern that happens in the classroom using Flanders' framework (1970).

RESULT

The researcher observed two sessions in one of the eighth-grade courses at SMPN 3 Reok utilizing video capturing. The researcher observed on May 4th and 5th, 2021, between the hours of 08.00-09.40 a.m. and 10.00-11.30 a.m. Additionally, to gain a thorough grasp of classroom interaction, the researcher conducted an interview with both of the study's participants, the EFL instructor and students. The researcher combined Flanders' Interaction Analysis Categories with classroom interaction characteristics in order to discover and comment on the patterns of teacher-student interaction that arise in the classroom. According to Flanders' (1970) study, the characteristics of interaction include topic overlap, instructor control, teacher support, and student engagement. The characteristics of classroom interaction may be observed in tabular form via the interaction matrix. Additionally, this investigation examined who dominated this classroom engagement. The following is the study's conclusion:

Teachers Support

Table 1. Teacher Support

Category/ Indicator :	Percentage
Category 1: Accept feeling	1,28%
Category 2: Praises or encouragement	2,98%
Category 3: Accepts or uses ideas of students.	2,55%
Teacher Support	6,81%

Teacher support demonstrates that teachers are reaffirming and encouraging students. Table 2 shows how much of the overall category accepts sentiments; how much of the total category praises or encourages; and how much of the total category accepts or uses student suggestions, as stated by the instructor.

Teacher support is divided into three categories: (1) accepts feelings, (2) praises and encourages, and (3) accepts or incorporates student ideas. After observing two sessions of the teaching and learning process, it was determined that 1.28 percent of teachers acknowledge students' feelings. The teacher demonstrated this behavior with pleasantries such as "good morning," "are you all right," and "how are you today?" Praise and encouragement accounted for approximately 2.98 percent of the categories of teacher assistance in category 2. Teachers frequently applauded or encouraged students by repeating their responses and using praise phrases such as "very good," "good work," and "good." Apart from providing praise and encouragement, teachers occasionally accept or use students' ideas. The proportion of overall category 2; praise and encouragement is 2.98 percent, while category 3; accepts or utilizes the ideas is 3.0 percent. In two meetings, it was discovered that the instructor accepted or utilised 2.55 percent of the students' ideas. The instructor's elaboration, explanation, and adjustment of students' responses (answers or thoughts) to teacher speak mirrored this type of interaction pattern.

Teacher Control

Table 2 Teacher Control

Category	Percentage
Category 6: Giving direction	16,17%
Category 7: Criticizing or justifying authority	1,28%
Teacher Control	17,45%

Teacher control belongs to the direct teacher talk categories and its pattern can be seen from the teacher's behavior of giving direction and criticizing as well as justifying authorities. In the interaction matrix, this characteristic can be seen from the tallies

that mostly appear in category or indicator 6 and 7. The category 6; Giving direction was found in the observation for 16.17% from all of teacher's talk categories. Giving direction was often given if teacher wanted students to work exercise based on materials that had been explain, come to the front of class, and write in the white board, etc. Teacher was also likely to criticize his students incorrectly. Teacher also criticized students' behaviour that he considered unacceptable. Teacher would like to comment students' behaviour and then acknowledge them what was right to be done so that students did not make any more mistakes. This category was identified for 1.28% (criticizes or Justifies). For example "jangan langsung kata sifatnya", "kata sifat harus ada *to be nya*", etc.

Content Cross

Table 3 Content Cross

Category :	Percentage
Category 4: Ask Question	14,89%
Category 5: Lecturing/lecture	29,79%
Content Cross	44,68%

The term "content cross" refers to teachers who are reliant on lecturing and questioning students. This tendency is seen in several instances of questioning and lecturing. Content cross also falls under the teacher discussion category, and it was the category's last entry. According to the observation, 14.89 percent of participants in two meetings asked questions. When the teacher desired to begin the lesson, he asked questions, offered fresh learning material, and stimulated students' understanding about

the topic. For instance, "who is missing today", "do you understand", "paham", and so on. Asking questions appeared to be the most critical component of the teacher's teaching learning process, as it was deemed successful in capturing students' attention, including them in the interaction, transmitting the learning content, and presenting new material. Apart from the category of questioning, the category of lecturing/lecture comprised direct instructor discussion in subject cross areas. According to the observation, the main style was lecturing, accounting for around 29.79 percent of two meetings. The majority of the teacher's lectures were responses to the students' responses. In other words, when students responded to the teacher's questions, the teacher tended to congratulate them when the response was correct. Following praise for the students, the instructor frequently reinforced the learning topic by lecturing the students, in order for the students to get insight from the teacher's explanation.

Students participation

Table 4. Students Participation

Category	Percentage
Category 8: Student talk response	21,28%
Category 9: Student initiation	1,28%
Students participation	22,55%

The final component of classroom engagement was student participation. It encompasses the two most recent forms of student talk, namely student-talk response and student-talk initiation. The

table above demonstrates that students' spoken responses accounted for a sizable part of engagement. The percentage of students that initiate conversation was determined to be around 21.28 percent higher than the percentage of students who initiate conversation based on observation. The topic chosen for the teaching-learning process, such as comparative degree and simple past tense, had an effect on students' motivation to react to the teacher's questions and to answer the questions in order to engage in the teaching-learning process' interaction. This indicates that the pupil was courageous and self-assured enough to respond to the teacher's queries. By multiplying the percentages of overall student talk response and student talk initiation, as well as the percentages of said students' conversation. Kids' conversations demonstrated that students get responses or ask questions of the teacher.

The Predominant Teacher-Student Interaction

To address the study's second research question, the researcher assessed who was dominating in this classroom engagement in this section. The following is the result:

Table 5. Percentage of all categories

No	Categories	Amount	Percentages (%)
1	Accept Feelings	3	1.28
2	Praises and Encouragement	7	2.98
3	Accept or Uses Ideas of Student	6	2.55
4	Asking questions	35	14.89

5	Lecturing / lecture	70	29.79
6	Giving Direction	38	16.17
7	Criticizing or Justifying Authority	3	1.28
8	Students talk response	50	21.28
9	Students talk Initiation	3	1.28
10	Silent or Pause or confusion	20	8.51
Total		235	100

The primary objective of this study was to examine the categories of speech used by the instructor and students during classroom interaction. All components of categorization were implemented in the classroom based on the data analysis above. The teacher's category was used, such as accepting emotion. The teacher seldom utilized this category. This category represented 1.28 percent of the total. The instructor used praise and encouragement since she was so appreciative of the children's behavior. This category has a percentage of 2.98 percent. In approved or used student suggestions, the instructor repeats the student proposal in his or her own way to encourage students to express their opinions. The instructor utilized questioning to encourage students to participate more actively in classroom engagement.

To address the second study topic, the teacher's most often utilized category was lecturing. This category represented 29.79 percent of the total. This category was most frequently used by teachers because students would not understand the lesson without the teacher's explanation or lecture, followed by offering guidance (16.17 percent) and criticizing or justifying (1.28 percent). Occasionally, students will perform something incorrectly or

incompletely, and the teacher must criticize them for their improper behavior. Additionally, the most often utilized category by students was student chat answers. It accounted for 21.28 percent. Students frequently reply to instructor inquiries rather than initiating the delivery of certain thoughts. Students initiated conversation at a rate of 1.28 percent. According to the research data studied above, the researcher discovered an 8.51 percent interval of silence or perplexity. It occurred as a result of the teacher's method of classroom engagement. As a result, the students opt to remain silent and discuss their own group work.

DISCUSSION

As a result of the observation, it is clear that the ten kinds of interaction analysis include the following: (1) accepts feelings, (2) praises and (or) encourages, (3) accepts or utilizes students' ideas, (4) inquires, (5) lectures, (6) gives direction, and (7) criticizes or justifies authority. Students talk is comprised of the following: (8) students talk response; (9) students talk initiation; and (10) silence was used in the classroom throughout the teacher-learning process. The matrix table interpretation indicates that the teacher spoke more than the students, as evidenced by the proportion of teacher talks, which was 68.94 percent. In addition, the result indicated that the teacher was the primary participant in the classroom, providing direction, lecturing, criticizing or justifying authority, and providing praise or encouragement. The instructor was actively engaged in questioning the students; the purpose of the questioning method was to create classroom engagement. This would encourage students to reflect on and apply their previously mentioned ideas. It was critical in fostering classroom engagement, since the teacher's questions compelled students to participate. Because it would result in classroom interaction between the instructor and students, a teacher's ability to ask questions is required. According to Flanders in See and Lim (2006), teachers

have enormous authority in the classroom because their words and actions elicit a strong reaction from students. Teachers chastised children in order to modify their behavior from unacceptable to acceptable. The instructor requested one student to read the responses to the teachers' activities. After a few moments, two children raised their hands, and the teachers indicated that they would want to begin reading with them. The female students, who sat primarily at the rear, made a few sounds. As a result, the teachers chastised the girls' behavior and then began reading to them in order to participate in activities with the other students.

Students' questions can stimulate student-teacher interaction in the classroom because the teacher will be eager to support the students' engagement, identify which parts of the lesson they are still confused or misunderstanding, explain why the lesson material is important to them, and encourage student-student collaboration. This means that the students' questions would prompt them to formulate their own. By observing the teacher using simple sentences or speech modification in English, it was determined that the students would be easily understood.

This study revealed that the most prevalent characteristic of teacher-student interaction was content cross, in which the teacher lectured the students to ensure that they understood the topic being discussed in class. The teacher exercised control by giving directions to students such as reading the module's definition of the topic, asking students to translate the sentence, and asking students to respond to questions given by the teacher in order to increase student interaction with the teacher. The teacher also criticized students who were not truthful when reading the module's definition, did not take the dictionary, and did not complete the assigned work. The last component was student participation, which indicates that students participated actively in questioning and responding to the activity during classroom

interaction. The students were engaged in class. The data indicated that students conversed at a rate of 22.56 percent. Students' conversation is separated into two categories: student reaction and student instigation. As a consequence, students' discussion answers had a greater number of utterances (21.28 percent) than students' initiations (only 1.28 percent). This suggests that students were encouraged to speak more in answer to the questions and accepted the professors' guidance. Additionally, students initiated very little reaction to instructors' explanations of the content and comparison sentences; since they occasionally had doubts or made errors relating to the topic on which the teachers asked them to complete the exercises. The final was silent with a total of twenty sums or 8.51 percent. This indicates that the students participated actively in the discussion with the teachers.

In terms of classroom contact, the study's findings indicate that the classroom interaction that happened in class was positive. The instructor is critical in fostering positive classroom engagement. The instructor and students collaborated to ensure the learning process was effective. While the instructor was conducting the lesson, the students were also listening to the explanation. Students replied personally to their teacher's discourse. Fitri and syafri (2017) discovered similar results when they employed FIACS to collect data. According to their research, not all parts of interaction were utilized in the classroom. The findings indicate that the instructor utilized all FIACS categories and the students talked, however only one category from two categories was used; it was the students' verbal answer. In their investigation, the most prevalent category was instructor discourse. In accordance with Nugroho (2009), the predominant pattern of teacher-student interaction was subject cross. This signifies that instructor discourse predominated over student talk in the classroom engagement. It is reinforced by Amin (2015), who

discovered that the most prevalent style of teacher-student contact in the classroom was teacher speak, which includes directions and questions. However, the dominating mode of classroom engagement in this study was instructor speaking, which included lecturing.

The findings also indicated that the most prevalent type categories were content cross and student talk. As a result, interaction between the teacher and students occurred. The teacher's talk, on the other hand, contained the most utterances of any pattern, followed by the students' talk. The teacher frequently provided more explanation to the students than elicited responses from them. The findings indicated that teachers were chatty throughout the teaching and learning process. The teachers attempted to clarify the content and provided additional examples to get students interested in the class activity. Additionally, the students demonstrated their interest by replying to and initiating responses to the teacher's lectures and queries. This layout of the class benefited the teacher, particularly while explaining the materials. Teachers were able to observe the children, providing them with more opportunity to speak.

The teachers spent the majority of their time speaking and directing students in relation to the activities they had arranged. Teachers dominated contact in this study, outnumbering students. Teachers supervised classroom involvement to ensure that students were engaged in the lesson and had mutual respect for one another. Teacher talks of high quality assist students in locating the proper answer, whereas teacher talks of low quality encourage students to make additional talk. The more questions teachers ask, the more students will respond. In terms of lecturing, teachers provided sufficient explanations in a brief and basic manner to ensure that students understood. Additionally, the professors presented the content in English. To avoid kids being

bored in class, the teachers noted that he utilized basic and brief explanations and constantly applauded them when they were able to answer the questions. Teachers desired to instill a sense of belonging in their students and to urge them to participate actively in class. Additionally, the teachers commended the kids' efforts to encourage them to voice their minds and to reassure them that their opinions and responses to the questions were valid. As a result of the discussion above, it can be determined that contact occurred between professors and students, as well as between students. Therefore, this study found that the EFL Teacher dominated the majority of classroom engagement.

CONCLUSION

The study revealed that both the teacher and students recognized and appreciated the importance of contact in English learning. Additionally, they recognized the importance of practice in order to be effective communicators. However, their comprehension was not backed up by their classroom behavior. There were several opportunities for students to interact with the teacher and with one another. If the professors used an English term, they immediately translated it into Indonesian. According to the professors, if they spoke English only without translation, the kids would know nothing.

The purpose of this study was to determine the types and most prevalent patterns of teacher-student interaction in an EFL classroom at SMPN 3 Reok. The predominant trend in this study was the manner in which the teacher spoke. The proportion of teacher conversation was 68.94 percent, which included both direct and indirect teacher discourse. Direct teacher talk categories/indicators include lectures (29.79 percent), directions (16.17 percent), and criticizing/justifying authority (1.28 percent), while indirect teacher talk categories/indicators include accept

feelings (1.28 percent), praise and encouragement (2.98 percent), accepting or using student ideas (2.55 percent), and asking questions (14.89 percent). It demonstrated that the teacher spent the majority of his or her time lecturing and explaining the materials. Additionally, it demonstrated that the teacher was successfully leading the class through various activities. The results indicated that direct teacher conversations were more prevalent than indirect teacher conversations. It is possible to conclude that teachers attempted to provide explanations or information about the material during the teaching-learning process.

Teacher talk was the most prevalent mode of classroom interaction in this study. As a result, the instructor may include the exercises into the eighth-grade English lesson at Junior High school lesson. According to this study, the teacher can also select an appropriate talk and activities to supplement the teaching that will engage students throughout the lesson, depending on the context and specific conditions. Additionally, the exercise might motivate students to engage more in class, particularly the passive ones. Additionally, teachers must be able to develop and maintain specific patterns of interaction based on their requirements.

REFERENCES

- Allwright, R. (1984). The importance of interaction in classroom language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 5, 156-171.
- Amin, A. R. (2015). Patterns of Teacher-Students Interaction A Case Study of Classroom Interaction in Eleventh Grade of Senior High School in Cimahi. *Journal of English and Education*, 3(1), 14-29.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (Vol. 4). New York: Longman.

Selamat, E. H. & Melji, S. M. Investigating the Interactions between Teachers and Students in an EFL Classroom

Crago, M. B., Eriks-Brophy, A., Pesco, D., & McAlpine, L. (1997). Culturally based miscommunication in classroom interaction. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 28(3), 245-254.

Fitri, S. & Syafri, H. (2017). Utilizing FIACS for Excalating Classroom Interaction as Teaching Inovation. *English Language Teaching and Research*, 1(1).

Flanders, N. (1970). *Analysis Teaching Behaviour* Reading. MA: Adison-Wesley.

Malamah-Thomas, A. (1987). *Classroom interaction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mardiyana, Fitri. (2018). Verbal Interaction in English Classroom Using Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories System (Fiacs). *Thesis*. Medan: English and Literature Department Faculty Of Languages And Arts Medan State University.

Meng, X., & Wang, X. (2011). Action study of teacher's language on EFL classroom interaction. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1(1), 98-104.

Nugroho, K. Y. (2009). *Interaction in English as a Foreign Language Classroom: A Case of Two State Senior High Schools in Semarang in the Academic Year 2009/2010* (2), 76-85.

See, K. H., & Lim, S. B. (2006). Effectiveness of Interaction Analysis Feedback on the Verbal Behaviour of Primary School Mathematics Teachers. *Malaysian Journal of Educators and Education*, 21, 115-128.

Wagner, E. D. (1994). In Support of A Functional Definition of Interaction. *American Journal of Distance Education*, 8(2), 6-29.

Zhang, P. (2012). Interactive Patterns and Teacher Talk Features in an EFL Reading Class in a Chinese University--A Case Study with Communicative Teaching. *Theory & Practice in Language Studies*, 2(5).