

# A Discourse Analysis Of Students-Teacher Pattern Interaction In Elt Classroom

Wiwi Rhamadina<sup>1</sup>

Alek<sup>2</sup>

Nida Husna<sup>3</sup>

Didin Nuruddin Hidayat<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1234</sup>UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta, Indonesia

<sup>1</sup>[wiwirhamadina21@mhs.uinjkt.ac.id](mailto:wiwirhamadina21@mhs.uinjkt.ac.id)

<sup>2</sup>[alek@uinjkt.ac.id](mailto:alek@uinjkt.ac.id)

<sup>3</sup>[nida.husna@uinjkt.ac.id](mailto:nida.husna@uinjkt.ac.id)

<sup>4</sup>[didin.nuruddin@uinjkt.ac.id](mailto:didin.nuruddin@uinjkt.ac.id)

## Abstract

This study aims to find patterns of interaction between students and teachers in ELT classes. Participants involved in this study were 32 students and one English teacher. This research is qualitative research with a descriptive design. This relates to the use of language in a social context, namely interaction or dialogue between students and teachers. The current study uses 2 types of instruments: observation using the blueprint protocol and recording all English learning activities in the ninth grade of SMP N Toboali. Then, after making observations and obtaining all the required data, the authors conducted an analysis using FIAS (Flanders Interaction System Analysis), which consisted of 3 parts: the teacher's indirect influence, the teacher's direct influence, and students' speech responses. The teacher's indirect influence consists of 3 interactions: receiving feelings, praising encouragement, accepting or using student ideas, and asking questions. Then, the teacher's direct influence consists of lecturing or explaining, giving directions, and criticizing or justifying authority. The last is the student's response which consists of the student's speech response, student initiation, and silence. According to the research results, there are four types of classroom interaction research: content traffic, teacher control, teacher support, and student participation. The findings also show that the dominant pattern used in this study is student participation, with 54 or 45% of utterances. Hence, it can be concluded that the students of ninth-grade students at SMPN 3 Toboali were active during the teaching and learning process in class.

**Keywords:** *Discourse analysis, student-teacher pattern, ELT classroom*

## Introduction

Language is essential in communication (Raharja & Ghazali, 2020). It is also a communication method that individuals use to communicate their thoughts, activities, and beliefs. Humans must be able to interact socially with their immediate environment and the larger community to work in life. Because of this, communication is a crucial element of daily life for everyone and cannot be isolated from it. According to Basuki (2015), language serves to exchange information and improve social ties between people and the environment. It aligns with Saptani (2015) that human language is acquired and learned. Language is primarily a skill for spoken and written communication. They have spoken communication, such as active words produced directly by the mouth and usually used in conversations.

Meanwhile, written communication means passive communication. For example, when we meet a friend on the street or in a supermarket, we will automatically greet that

person and provoke the other person to say a few sentences in response to what we have said. Language can be used to express communication in writing, usually found in online media, magazines, newspapers, books, or letters. The significant difference between the two communications is that written communication has a systematic structure of language and writing compared to spoken communication. As long as the other person understands what the speaker is saying, this is fine for users of spoken communication. This is because the speaker and the interlocutor communicate to understand what is being discussed.

Discourse analysis, sometimes known as disco analysis, is a technique for determining the meaning or communication messages in a document, both textually and contextually. So that the meaning retrieved from a text or communication message is observed from more than just the plainly expressed text, discourse may be defined as statements made in society on a specific issue. The discourse context comprises the context of the situation, speaker, listener, time, location, scene, topic, event, message form, code, and methods. According to Darma (2014), discourse is a sequence of words or speech acts representing something linguistically orderly and systematic in one unit (coherent), produced by segmental elements in the most prominent discourse. Non-segmental aspects in a discourse include those connected to the circumstance, time, picture, purpose, meaning, intonation, emphasis on language usage, and a feeling of language frequently recognized by context. Based on the definition above, some aspects need to be considered when performing discourse analysis to achieve the goals of communication.

Moreover, Erawan and Wedasuwari (2021) divided discourse into two types based on the linguistic form: spoken and written. Conversations, speeches, jokes, utterances of declamation, debate, and question and answer are examples of oral discourse. In contrast, advertising, letters, tales, essays, papers, and other forms of written discourse are examples of written discourse. In real-time or in settings, oral speech is made or produced. As a result, in all types of oral speech, we must know who is speaking, to whom, if there is a resemblance in context between the address and the greeter, and what the circumstance is at the time of the discussion. In addition, in Stubbs' opinion, discourse analysis is one of the studies that examines or analyzes natural language use, both spoken and written. According to Stubbs (1983), discourse analysis is applied in social situations, particularly in exchanges between speakers. In addition, Eriyanto (2005) contends that discourse analysis is a study of speech and that discourse is a language used to communicate. Analytical conceptual comprehension refers to efforts to investigate the language order of sentences and more extensive linguistic components. According to Tarigan (2009), the study of the structure of messages in communication is known as discourse analysis. Based on some of the definitions above, the author might conclude that discourse analysis is a method or process that investigates or analyzes natural language, both spoken and written. This is in line with the research conducted by the author. The present study tries to examine speech acts in the classroom which involve spoken and written interactions between the teacher and students.

According to Novianti (2022), classroom interaction is an encounter between an instructor and students in a classroom setting where they may produce interaction with one another. It implies that classroom interaction includes all interactions that occur during the learning and teaching processes. According to Setiananingrum and Saleh (2016), "Interaction in teaching is a fundamental feature that plays a critical role in effective teaching, and in general, the acknowledgment of being weak or strong in teaching is based on how the instructor interacts with the student." Because the teacher

participates in classroom interaction, learners are not the only ones who engage. Classroom interaction refers to student and teacher interactions during learning, such as delivering and receiving ideas or information, exchanging opinions and experiences, socializing, and instructor responses when students make mistakes. Classroom engagement as a communication activity may be investigated further by including numerous language disciplines. Pragmatic studies are concerned with language usage phenomena as well as classroom interaction.

According to Farmida, Ediwarman, and Tisnasari (2021), pragmatics is the study of the meaning of communication in specific contexts. When speakers communicate, they not only emit language sounds but also have a specific goal or goal from the speech conveyed to the speech partner. The pattern of class interaction can be a particular method intended to determine how the interaction between teachers and students is during a class's teaching and learning process. Employing the appropriate interaction patterns is one of the elements or principles of achieving a goal. The writers applied the FIAS (Flanders' Interaction System Analysis) methodology in this study. The technique is used to evaluate and enhance classroom instruction. This approach suggests four different interaction patterns for teaching and learning in the classroom: teacher control, cross-content, teacher assistance, and student engagement. The teacher can monitor verbal exchanges that take place in class as well as the responses that students provide by using FIAS. The FIAS coding system consists of 10 categories between student and teacher interactions. The interaction was divided into two: teachers' and students' talk. Teachers' talk is divided into two, namely direct speech and indirect speech. Meaning of direct speech is when a teacher gives instruction directly to students using specific methods such as lectures, expressing opinions, or directing students to be able to do something. While indirect speech, namely speech given by the teacher, provides opportunities for students to be more active in the classroom when learning occurs. Finding patterns of interaction in the classroom—referred to as teacher support (points 1, 2, and 3), content cross (points 4 and 5), teacher control (points 6 and 7), and student participation—is the goal of using the FIAS coding method.

Furthermore, Sari, Ghazali, and Widiati (2017) stated that language learning in the classroom is an interaction between teachers and students, so reciprocal exchanges occur in an educational setting to meet learning objectives. Learning can take the shape of conversation during the teaching-learning between the lecturer and the students in a classroom. According to Septy (2021), speaking in the classroom is crucial for English learning activities and communication in classroom interaction. Additionally, when the teacher teaches English-language materials, there will be conversational interactions between the teacher and students during the teaching and learning process. To encourage pupils to be more engaged in the learning process, the instructor will try to design an engaging, imaginative, and initiative lesson. It is in line with Bestiara, Arifmiboy, and Lismay (2021), which states that teachers should develop a match between teaching strategies and learning styles to increase students' learning outcomes. Then, rather than waiting for students to respond, the teacher will attempt to encourage them to talk. Interaction is at the center of communication. As an outcome, the teacher and students can use this identification to underscore the importance of two-way communication in the target language. Two-way communication asks the teaching-learning process to use the interaction as a good example for practicing and improving English in the classroom. In addition, the researcher uses this information to determine the teacher's speech features when teaching English to students and the teacher's performance styles during classroom interaction (teaching behavior). It is compatible with the objectives of this

study, which are to identify the various patterns of classroom interaction in ELT and to determine which pattern is more frequently used by the teacher. This study also expected that the teacher could encourage the teaching-learning process in the future.

Regarding the background above, several previous studies are related to this. First, a study by Putri and Putri (2021) titled "The Analysis of Classroom Interaction in English Class utilizing Foreign Language Interaction. The study's objectives included identifying the FLINT category most frequently used in class and why English instructor speaking predominates over student discussion. The design of this study is descriptive qualitative. Students majoring in Office Automation and Governance (OAG) in the tenth grade at State Vocational School (SMKN 2) Bukittinggi served as the study's informants. It was found that instructor discourse predominated over student conversation because there was little student reaction or initiative. Second, research was conducted by Mentari (2021). The research title is "An Analysis of Classroom Interaction in English Foreign Language (EFL) Classroom at the 11th grade of SMAN 1 Bengkulu Tengah". Its goal is to comprehend the process of classroom interaction and to recognize the pattern of classroom interaction in an English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom at SMAN 1 Bengkulu Tengah's 11th grade. The approach employed in this research is qualitative, with data collected from research subjects via observation and questionnaire. Third, research was conducted by Chairunnisa (2020) entitled "Discourse Analysis of Teacher Talks During English Classes at Senior High School Methodist Banda Aceh." This study aimed to examine a spoken discourse created by an English teacher at Senior High School Methodist Banda Aceh. Discourse analysis was used to detect the formation of ideational function, interpersonal function, and textual function in teacher talks. The discourse analysis research approach was utilized in this study, which focuses on spoken discourse to analyze the utterances' underlying meaning. The findings demonstrate that, regarding ideational function, the instructor mainly employed material processes such as writing, replying, speaking, etc.

Furthermore, studies have yet to be conducted on the ninth-grade students of ELT classrooms at SMP N 3 Toboali regarding student-teacher interactions in the teaching-learning process. The school was chosen because no one has researched this topic there yet. Furthermore, the school is located in a transmigration area, which is far from the urban areas, and the learning system used is still conventional learning. As a result of the survey, the authors intend to research how teachers and students interact in the classroom while teaching and learning. Furthermore, the ninth grade was chosen as the subject of research because survey results revealed that this class was more active in participating in learning than other grade levels. Moreover, there have been several previous studies as described above, but none of these studies have examined the interactions between teachers and students in the classroom, especially in transmigration areas. Therefore the authors are interested in conducting further research with regional conditions that are different from previous studies, which means that this topic still needs to be explored there. Hopefully, this study will contribute to the following research on the same topic.

To meet the aim of the study outlined above, the problem of the study can be formulated as the following question:

1. "What are the types of classroom interaction patterns in the ninth-grade students and English teacher of SMP N 3 Toboali?"
2. "What are the predominant classroom interactions patterns between the ninth-grade students and the English teacher of SMP N 3 Toboali?"

## Method

### Research Method and Design

This study employed a qualitative method and used a descriptive discourse analysis design. According to Cresswell (2009), a qualitative study is an assessment of a social or human issue that emphasizes using language to create a complete, holistic picture, presenting the specific points of view of the informants and taking place in a natural setting. Additionally, according to Loeb et al. (2017), descriptive analysis is crucial to this technique. By creating study questions and hypotheses based on the work done without affecting it, the researchers use descriptive analysis to look into the instructors' perspectives. Using Flanders' Interaction System Analysis (FIAS), research data on teacher-student interactions in the classroom were examined. The method was chosen above other methods because it can help the authors to identifying the interactions between English teachers and students by categorizing into three such as teacher talk, students talk and silence.

### Participants and Research Instruments

This research was conducted for 32 ninth-grade students of SMPN 3 in Toboali, South Bangka regency. The sample was determined by using purposive sampling. This study used the instruments such as a video recorder and observation blueprint protocol to help the authors collect the data.

### Data Analysis Procedure

This study's primary source of information is the teaching and learning process of 32 students and one teacher of SMP N 3 Toboali. First, in analyzing research data, the authors made observations and recorded learning activities in class. After getting the data, the researcher coded based on the FIAS matrix. Then, the data that had been coded were counted and calculated into percentage numbers. The data was then interpreted until the research conclusions' results were obtained.

## Results

This research is expected to aim to reveal and describe questions based on the questions asked:

1. "What are the types of classroom interaction patterns in the ninth-grade students and English teacher of SMP N 3 Toboali?"
2. "What are the predominant classroom interactions patterns between the ninth-grade students and the English teacher of SMP N 3 Toboali?"

Table 1. The comparison of teacher talk and student talk

TEACHER TALK		STUDENT TALK		SILENCE	
Quantity	Percentage	Quantity	Percentage	Quantity	Percentage
66	55%	47	39.1%	7	11.6%

According to the results above, there were 120 total utterances. Teacher talk and student talk were the two categories into which the utterances were separated. The quantity of instructor talk and student talk utterances differs significantly. There were 66

utterances, or 55%, of instructor discussion. At the same time, there were 47 utterances, or 39%, of student conversations. The findings of teacher and student discourse are then split into four categories to determine the classroom interaction pattern, subject cross pattern, teacher control pattern, teacher support, and student involvement pattern. The pattern can be seen in Table 2 below:

Table 2. Classroom Interaction Pattern

No	Classroom Interaction	Quantity	Percentage
1	Content Cross Pattern	19	15.8%
2	Teacher Control Pattern	34	28.3%
3	Teacher support	13	10.8%
4	Students Participation Pattern	54	45%

The table above summarizes the types of class interaction patterns in the ELT class. The first, namely the content cross pattern (15.8%), is a pattern that refers to questions number 4 and 5 about the emergence of teaching appearance and behavior. In contrast, the teacher's control pattern (28.3%) results from calculations from questions 6 and 7 about giving directions and criticizing or justifying certain authorities from learning in class. Then the third, namely teacher support (10.8%), is the conclusion of 3 questions (1,2,3) which refers to how a teacher accepts each student's feelings and also gives an appreciation for the ideas raised. Finally, the pattern for questions number 8-10, namely the pattern of student participation (45%). This pattern explains how a student can play an active role in class during the learning process, starting from giving ideas and initiative to do something and responding responsively to everything taught by the teacher in class. From these findings, it can be concluded that the dominant pattern in class IX students of SMPN 3 Toboali is the students' participation pattern, in which students play a more active role in class than the teacher. Furthermore, to find out the number of utterances from each pattern is calculated using the FIAS matrix as shown in table 3 below:

Table 3. Matrix of Flanders' Interaction Analysis

Matrix of Flanders' Interaction Analysis				Total
Teacher Influence	Indirect	Accepting feelings	1	4
		Praise	2	9
		encouragement		
		Accepting or using the idea of students	3	-
Teacher Influence	Direct	Asking questions	4	11
		Lecturing/explaining	5	8
		Give directions	6	23

		Criticizing or justifying authority	7	11
Student Response	Talk	Student talk response	8	32
		Student talk initiation	9	15
		Silence	10	7
		<b>Total</b>		<b>120</b>

The table above is a FIAS matrix distribution table. As can be seen, the table consists of 3 sub-sections, namely teacher talk, student talk, and silence. Teacher talk involves direct and indirect influence (tail numbers 1-7). The student talk matrix includes student responses and initiatives (tail numbers 8 and 9). Then the last one is matrix silence (tail number 10). Each matrix is obtained from observing the learning videos in the classroom. The table shows that when calculated in percent form, the student talk response gets the highest proportion, namely 32 points. This illustrates how engaged the class was in the material covered.

## Discussion

It is common knowledge that classroom interaction greatly influences whether an education advances or stagnates. Both the teacher and the student are participating in this exchange. This in-class engagement will help students become more fluent in their target language and foster positive relationships with their teachers while learning. Additionally, the teacher is an evaluator who assesses students' learning (Dewi, 2021).

Furthermore, teachers and students must be able to carry out their respective roles. We know that the teacher must educate, convey material and act as a facilitator and controller. It is in line with Erlia (2021), which states that the function of teachers in the education system refers to the curriculum's role as a tool for achieving educational objectives during the learning process. The curriculum has auxiliary elements that complement one another. In contrast, students are asked to actively provide responses, responses, and rebuttals and follow various rules given by the teacher. This follows what Rivers (1987) stated by participating in discussions, skits, group problem-solving activities, or dialogue diaries. Students can strengthen their language abilities through involvement as they hear or read real-world English or other students' work. When interacting, students can utilize all the language they know and have either formally studied or casually acquired in actual interactions. It is in line with the statement of Brown in K.I Putri and Putri (2021), who stated that the foundation of second language learning is an interaction involving the students' communicative skills and social. Then based on Thapa and Lin (2013) explained that interactions in class not only grow or increase knowledge but can also increase students' confidence in being competent when communicating.

The data on the research findings come from the FIAS by Flander matrix analysis, in which the matrix describes what components can influence interactions in the classroom. The matrix consists of 10 categories, such as receiving feelings. In this category, the teacher is expected to be able to accept the feelings of each student's feelings, which can be either negative or positive. There are several ways teachers can do when they want to build a warm classroom atmosphere so that students can provide positive energy in class, such as warming up, saying greetings, and ice breaking during learning. Warming up can

be done when the lesson is about to start. A little warm-up can raise students' enthusiasm before taking lessons in class. Then the second said greeting before starting and ending the lesson, such as "good morning or good afternoon," asking how are you? how was your day? did everything go well? or who had breakfast this morning? to boost and give more motivation to the students because students that are very motivated to learn will succeed, whereas those who are less motivated to learn will struggle in their academic endeavors (Febriyani & Haerudin, 2020). In addition, according to the research conducted by Mentari (2021), the teacher gives much hope as a motivation to the students while learning. The last one is ice breaking which aims to overcome problems such as students who are bored or sleepy in class. Ice breaking in studying might be seen as a way for students to deal with their mental or bodily iciness (Adi, Susanti, & Jannah, 2021). As Chairunnisa (2020) found, the students proceed with the information mentally, not physically.

The teacher can apply some ice-breaking in between lessons to make the classroom learning atmosphere feel fresh again. Thus, the second category is the praise of encouragement category, about how the teacher encourages students to learn better and gives positive words of appreciation for each student's answer, such as "good job, great, excellent, etc." These words aim to appreciate every student who succeeds in following the lesson well. By giving words of appreciation, students will feel more valued and enthusiastic about learning optimally in class. In the learning videos used as research data, the researcher found that the teacher was very active in giving a few words of praise and asking other students to give applause to students who dared to come to the front of the class "give applause to him/her." And it can be seen that the other students are happy and also feel motivated to be even better than the performance of their previous friends. Next is about accepting or using the ideas of the students. This category is similar to the first category, but this category emphasizes ideas without regard to feelings. Fourth, asking questions. This category is specifically for active teachers to provide feedback in the form of questions about the material being taught. Then from the feed, students are asked to be able to provide some of their opinions and responses. Suppose students are confused and ask about the material being studied. In that case, students are processing their mindset, and the interaction takes place in the class.

Therefore, a teacher must create unique subject matter and use learning methods or approaches that can trigger the activity or liveliness of every student in the class. The fifth category, namely lecturing or teaching given by the teacher. This can be in the form of direct explanations or using some media in class, such as blackboards, videos, etc. The sixth pattern is giving the direction of the teacher. The teacher asks students to open a page, practice a dialogue in front of the class, or hold a group discussion. The next pattern is criticizing. In this category, the teacher can criticize several things during the lesson, such as asking "what or how" about the material presented in detail and asking what activities students are doing.

Moving on to the next category, namely students talk response, about how students actively respond to learning in class, such as asking questions, expressing opinions, or doing something. It is in line with Naimat (2011), who said that communication activities could be obtained through debates or discussions about the material. It is because all analytical discourse covers respect to the views of language to provide a common base of discussion. Furthermore, related to the student category, the next category is student talk initiation which means students take the initiative on personal awareness to be active in class. In this category, students take the initiative to provide ideas about English lessons in class. Students must participate actively in the learning process through interaction,



engagement, and involvement in order to stop being passive(Özüdoğru, 2020). Furthermore, from the activeness of the interactions could contribute the students being active in the classroom (Mentari, 2021). For example, in the video the researcher got, the teacher in the class asked all students about the present continuous tense material. Then the teacher threw the question, "anyone knows where is the error word in the sentence?" then there were several students who looked active, raising their hands and taking the initiative without being asked by the teacher to answer the question.

Then the next example is when the work in pair activity, each student is given the task of answering the worksheet and making a short dialogue. After that, to test the student's initiative, the teacher asked all students, "who wants to go to the front of the class first?". Methods like these can be used to stimulate student initiative. Moreover, the last category is silence, which means there is no response from students. This can be caused by students being confused or not understanding the material presented by the teacher in class. Moreover, based on the findings obtained earlier, it appears that most students in the class actively participate by giving positive responses about the material presented.

The findings in this study are contrary to research conducted by Putri and Putri (2021), where the results show that the pattern applied is still teacher-centered, where teachers take more active roles in class than students. This is in connection with the findings of Wibowo (2016) and Putri (2014). The research shows that students are less active because the teacher emphasizes content-cross and gives more speech during class. In addition, these findings are similar to Mentari's (2021) and Juniarmi's (2019) research. The research showed that the learning process emphasizes the content of the learning. In this study, four meetings were held to see if there was a change in interaction patterns after the first to the fourth observation. Based on the findings in the study, was found that students were more active in participating in class than teachers. The result aligns with the research conducted by Mentari (2021). The students are more active in responding and initiating ideas to the teacher in the learning process.

Moreover, some of the discussions above show that classroom interaction is essential in teaching and learning activities in the classroom. Good interaction between teachers and students will help foreign language students learn the target language easily (Mercer & Littleton, 2007). In addition, good classroom interaction depends on how the teacher gives a chance to the students to talk. This is in line with this research, in which the teacher always allows them to talk actively by using language as a discourse to communicate (Eriyanto, 2005). Furthermore, Flanders' Interaction Analysis System (FIAS) can help researchers conduct research. It can effectively measure classroom interactions between the teacher and the students during teaching-learning by categorizing them into teacher talk, student talk, and silence.

## **Conclusion**

Classroom interaction provides several advantages for teachers and students. This is because the interaction in the classroom allows students and teachers to practice good communication skills to achieve a good teaching and learning process. The teacher's task here is to provide material content and motivation that builds student interest in learning inside and outside the classroom. The researcher employs Flanders' analysis to respond to the study questions. Four interaction patterns were examined: instructor control patterns, teacher support patterns, student engagement patterns, and content interaction patterns. The teacher is expected to be able to develop lessons to make learning more

interesting as well as maintain patterns of interaction with students in the class based on the discovery of these interaction patterns.

## References

- Adi, M. S., Susanti, R. A., & Jannah, Q. (2021). The effectiveness of ice breaking to increase students' motivation in learning English. *International Journal of English Education and Linguistics (IJoEEL)*, 3(1), 31–38. <https://doi.org/10.33650/ijoeel.v3i1.2256>
- Basuki, R. (2015). Kesantunan berbahasa dalam wacana interaksi komunikasi di lingkungan Universitas Bengkulu. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra.*, Volume 14.
- Bestiara, B., Arifmiboy, A., & Lismay, L. (2021). The students' perception on teachers' basic teaching skills in english classroom. *ELP (Journal of English Language Pedagogy)*, 6(2), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.36665/elp.v6i2.392>
- Chairunnisa. (2020). Discourse analysis of teacher talks during English classes at senior high school Methodist Banda Aceh. *English Education Journal*, 11(1), 34–57.
- Cresswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (Third). SAGE Publication.
- Darma, Y. A. (2014). *Analisis wacana krisis dalam multiperspektif*. Bandung: PT Refika Aditama.
- Dewi, W. P. (2021). *Strategi pemberian reward dalam meningkatkan motivasi belajar siswa pada mata pelajaran akidah akhlak di MTs Negeri 1 Ponorogo pada masa pandemi COVID-19*. IAIN Ponorogo.
- Erawan, D. G. B., & Wedasuwari, I. A. M. (2021). Analisis wacana kritis dalam wacana interaksi kelas. *Bina Patria*, 15(6), 4589–4596. <https://doi.org/10.33758/mbi.v15i6.898>
- Eriyanto. (2005). *Analisis wacana: Pengantar analisis teks media*. Yogyakarta: Lembaga Kajian Islam dan Studi (LKIS).
- Erlia, W. (2021). Roles of the teacher for increasing learning quality of students. *ETUDE: Journal of Educational Research*, 1(3), 77–86. <https://doi.org/10.56724/etude.v1i3.35>
- Farmida, S., Ediwarman, E., & Tisnasari, S. (2021). Analysis of satire and sarcasm in the 2019 presidential debate and its implementation in high school learning. Indonesian Ark. *Journal of Indonesian Language and Literature, Research*.
- Febriyani, A. R., & Haerudin, D. (2020). Motivation of a slow learner in an elementary school. *ETUDE: Journal of Educational Research*, 1(1), 13–18. <https://doi.org/10.56724/etude.v1i1.26>
- Juniarmi, V. C. (2019). *A study of classroom interaction pattern at elementary schools' English class*. Sanata Dharma University.
- Loeb, S., Dynarski, S., McFarland, D., Morris, P., Reardon, S., & Reber, S. (2017). *Descriptive analysis in education: A guide for researchers*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance.
- Mentari, R. S. (2021). *An analysis of classroom interaction in English foreign language (EFL)*

*classroom at the 11th grade of SMAN 1 Bengkulu Tengah. IAIN Bengkulu.*

- Mercer, N., & Littleton, K. (2007). *Dialogue and the development of children's thinking: A sociocultural approach*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Naimat, G. K. (2011). Influence of teacher-students interaction on EFL reading comprehension. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 23(4), 672–687.
- Novianti, D. (2022). *Class interaction analysis in English learning based on flanders interaction analysis category system (FIACS)*. Muhammadiyah University of Makassar.
- Özüdoğru, M. (2020). The use of a student response system in teacher training classrooms and its effect on classroom environment. *Acta Didactica Napocensia*, 13(1), 29–42. <https://doi.org/10.24193/adn.13.1.4>
- Putri, F. G. (2014). *An analysis of classroom interaction by using flander interaction analysis categories system (FIACS) technique at SMPN 13 Kota Bengkulu in 2013/ 2014 academic year*. Universitas Bengkulu.
- Putri, K. I., & Putri, H. P. (2021). The analysis of classroom interaction in English class using foreign language interaction. *Modality Journal: International Journal of Linguistics and Literature*, 1(2), 78–90. <https://doi.org/10.30983/mj.v1i2.5117>
- Raharja, B. J., & Ghozali, I. (2020). Discourse analysis on teacher-students interaction pattern of English teaching learning process. *Journal of Applied Linguistics, Translation, and Literature*, 1(1), 1–6. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.33292/jalintrali.v1i1.53>
- Rivers, W. M. (1987). *Interactive language teaching: Interaction as the key to teaching language for communication*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Saptani, P. (2015). Tindak tutur dalam wacana kelas VB SD Negeri 62 Kota Bengkulu tahun pelajaran 2012/2013. *Diksa: Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 1(2), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.33369/diksa.v1i2.3145>
- Sari, S. K., Ghazali, A. S., & Widiati, N. (2017). Penggunaan negosiasi makna dalam wacana lisan guru dan pengaruhnya terhadap pemahaman siswa kelas IV sekolah dasar. *Jurnal Pendidikan: Teori, Penelitian, Dan Pengembangan*, 2(3), 424–433. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.17977/jptpp.v2i3.8717>
- Septy, A. R. (2021). *An analysis of teacher-students interaction in online classroom by using flander interaction analysis category system (Fiacs) techniques*. (1611040320).
- Setiananingrum, D., & Saleh, M. (2016). Classroom interaction patterns in higher education. *English Education Journal*, 6(2), 10–16.
- Stubbs, M. (1983). *Discourse analysis: The sociolinguistic analysis of natural language*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Tarigan, H. G. (2009). *Pengajaran wacana*. Bandung: Angkasa.
- Thapa, C. B., & Lin, A. M. Y. (2013). Interaction in English language classrooms to enhance students' language learning. Retrieved January 7, 2023, from Nelta Choutari website: <https://neltachoutari.wordpress.com/2013/08/01/interaction-in-english-language-classrooms-to-enhance-nepalese-students-language-learning/>
- Wibowo, L. (2016). *Classroom interaction in an EYL classroom*. English Department Graduate School Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya.