



ELITE: English and Literature Journal
Volume 13 Number 1 June 2026 Page 150-171
Print ISSN: 2355-0821, Online ISSN: 2580-5215
Doi: 10.24252/elite. v13i1.62652

INVESTIGATING CLASSROOM INTERACTION IN ELT: A MODIFIED FIACS-BASED STUDY AT ONE ISLAMIC SECONDARY SCHOOL

Khori Putri Ramadhani¹, Adrefiza², Failasofah³

*^{1,2,3} English Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Jambi,
Indonesia*

*^{*1} Khoriputriramadhani@gmail.com
adrefiza@unja.ac.id*

ABSTRACT

In many English Language Teaching (ELT) contexts, students tend to remain passive listeners rather than active participants. This imbalance in the classroom interaction impedes the development of learners' communicative competence and reduces their overall engagement in the learning process. This study aimed to analyze teacher talk and student talk in grade 12 classrooms at SMAS IT Al-Kautsar, which has two classrooms: Annisa's class (female) and Arrijal's class (male). It explored the quantity of teachers and students' talk in ELT and the patterns of increasing students' talk during classroom activities. Using classroom observations, the researchers applied Zhao's modified Flanders Interaction Analysis Category System (FIACS) to analyze interactional patterns and identify the patterns that increase students' talk. Unlike previous FIACS-based studies that focused primarily on university or foreign-language contexts, this study offers a novel insight by applying the modified FIACS to the Islamic Senior High School classroom, revealing interactional dynamics in gender-segregated learning environments. The findings reveal that teacher talk dominates classroom interaction, accounting for an average of 58.42%, while student talk accounts for only 41.58%, indicating a teacher-centered learning environment. Further analysis identified that the pattern of increasing students' talk is the "ask closed questions" subcategory. The "ask closed questions" subcategory is more conducive to fostering student engagement, while the "declarative lecture" subcategory prioritizes structured teacher input. Overall, the study emphasizes the importance of teachers adopting more student-centered strategies to strike a balance between classroom interaction and promoting active student participation in English-speaking activities.

Keywords: *FIACS; Islamic Institution; Student Talk; Teacher Talk*

ABSTRAK

Dalam banyak konteks Pengajaran Bahasa Inggris (ELT), siswa cenderung tetap menjadi pendengar pasif daripada peserta aktif. Ketidakseimbangan dalam interaksi kelas ini menghambat pengembangan kompetensi komunikatif pelajar dan mengurangi keterlibatan mereka secara keseluruhan dalam proses pembelajaran. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis percakapan guru dan percakapan siswa di kelas 12 di SMAS IT Al-Kautsar, yang memiliki dua kelas: kelas Annisa (perempuan) dan kelas Arrijal (laki-laki). Penelitian ini mengeksplorasi kuantitas percakapan guru dan siswa dalam ELT dan pola yang meningkatkan percakapan siswa selama kegiatan kelas. Dengan menggunakan observasi kelas, para peneliti menerapkan Sistem Kategori Analisis Interaksi Flanders (FIACS) yang dimodifikasi Zhao untuk menganalisis pola interaksi dan mengidentifikasi pola yang meningkatkan percakapan siswa. Berbeda dengan penelitian berbasis FIACS sebelumnya yang berfokus terutama pada konteks universitas atau bahasa asing, penelitian ini memberikan wawasan baru dengan menerapkan FIACS yang dimodifikasi ke ruang kelas sekolah menengah atas Islam, menangkap dinamika interaksi di seluruh lingkungan belajar yang dipisahkan berdasarkan gender. Temuan ini mengungkapkan bahwa percakapan guru mendominasi interaksi kelas, dengan rata-rata 58,42%, sementara percakapan siswa hanya 41,58%, yang menunjukkan lingkungan belajar yang berpusat pada guru. Analisis lebih lanjut mengidentifikasi bahwa pola yang meningkatkan percakapan siswa adalah subkategori "Ajukan pertanyaan tertutup". Subkategori "Ajukan pertanyaan tertutup" lebih kondusif

untuk mendorong keterlibatan siswa, sementara subkategori "Penjelasan deklaratif" memprioritaskan masukan guru yang terstruktur. Secara keseluruhan, studi ini menekankan pentingnya guru menerapkan strategi yang lebih berpusat pada siswa untuk mencapai keseimbangan antara interaksi di kelas dan mendorong partisipasi aktif siswa dalam kegiatan berbahasa Inggris.

Kata kunci: FIACs; Institusi pendidikan; Tuturan siswa; Tuturan guru

Submitted: 13 November 2025

Revised: 29 November 2025

Accepted: 06 December 2025

How to cite: Ramadhani, K.P., et.al. (2026). Investigating Classroom Interaction in ELT: A Modified FIACS-Based Study at One Islamic Secondary School. *ELITE: English and Literature Journal*, 13(1), 150-171.

INTRODUCTION

In many English Language Teaching (ELT) contexts, students tend to remain passive listeners rather than active participants. This imbalance in classroom interaction impedes the development of learners' communicative competence and reduces their overall engagement in the learning process. In this process, speaking plays a central role, as it is closely linked to communication and interaction, which are essential components of effective classroom instruction (Ayunda, 2021). Therefore, if the teacher's talk is difficult for students to understand, it can lead to misunderstanding during the teaching and learning process. The teacher's talk is a key component of the teaching and learning process.

Despite the importance of interaction, many Indonesian EFL classrooms still rely heavily on teacher-centered approaches. Teachers often dominate classroom talk, and students are given limited opportunities to speak, ask questions, or express ideas (Suryati, 2015). This imbalance in interaction hinders students' ability to develop communicative competence and limits their engagement in the learning process. Research has shown that in many cases, students remain passive listeners rather than active participants, which negatively affects their confidence and speaking proficiency (Afidawati & Ikawati, 2024).

According to the teacher at SMAS IT Al-Kautsar, preliminary observations at the school reveal a unique multilingual environment that shapes both daily interactions and academic culture. The school actively uses three languages: Indonesian, English, and Arabic, in its daily routines, and it has an English club that is mandatory for all students at SMAS IT Al-Kautsar, reflecting a strong commitment to fostering global competence among students. Within the context of English Language Teaching (ELT), students are encouraged, and in some cases required to use English exclusively in the classroom, thereby creating a focused environment for language acquisition and the development of practical communication skills (SMA IT Al-Kautsar Duri, n.d.). Overall, SMAS IT Al-kautsar's commitment to multilingual education and academic excellence is evident in both its structured programs and the dynamic classroom atmosphere observed during the preliminary visit.

Moreover, while previous studies have explored classroom interaction in general, there remains a lack of research focusing on how interaction unfolds in real-time EFL classrooms in

Indonesia, particularly in schools that adopt full-English policies. Studies that include observation to capture the nuances of teacher-student interaction remain few, especially since there are still few studies in Indonesia that use Zhao's modified FIACS.

Given these issues and gaps, this study aims to analyze the classroom interaction in an Indonesian ELT context using observational data. The study calculates teacher and student talk in the English classroom. Not only does it calculate, but it also identifies the patterns that increase students' talk. By doing so, a classroom interaction analysis can help teachers improve classroom instruction (Zhao, 2022). This study was limited to the analysis of the teacher and students' talk in the English language teaching and learning. The researchers analyzed only one teacher, so the result cannot be generalized to other contexts. The scope of this research was based on the modified FIAC from Zhao (2022), which was analyzed based on the natural interactions in the classroom between the teacher-student and students-students. Lastly, this research focused on one class level, class XII SMAS IT Al-Kautsar, because this level had experience studying with the same teacher. The third level of this school has only two classrooms, separated by gender. Thus, the research questions are formulated into: 1) What are the patterns of teacher-student talks during English language classroom interaction? 2) Which patterns increase the students' talk in ELT?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Classroom interaction has a profound impact on students' social development and learning experiences, making it a crucial component of the educational process. Students' involvement, comprehension, and social dynamics in the classroom can all be strongly impacted by the type of interactions. For example, Zúñiga et al. (2020) emphasize the importance of creating a welcoming and cooperative atmosphere where educators foster student participation and engagement in conversation. In addition to improving academic performance, these activities foster civic engagement by enabling students to demonstrate tolerance and respect in real-world situations (Zúñiga and associates, 2020). It highlights how instructors can shape the classroom environment to foster deep connections.

Another essential component of classroom engagement is the teacher-student relationship. Positive teacher-student connections can improve children's social competence and their perceptions of their peer experiences, according to research by Chen et al. It implies that a supportive teacher can have a significant impact on a child's social dynamics and sense of belonging in the classroom, even when there are no direct peer interactions taking place (Chen et al., 2020). For instance, a teacher who actively interacts with students and helps them feel like they belong may create an atmosphere in which students are more at ease participating in group projects and debates.

Classroom interactions are also significantly influenced by dialogic teaching, which highlights the value of discourse in learning. According to Lehesvuori et al., learning outcomes can be improved by dialogic exchanges in which teachers and students exchange ideas on various points of view. Teachers can encourage critical thinking and collaborative learning by creating an atmosphere where students feel comfortable voicing their opinions and challenging preconceived

notions (Lehesvuori et al., 2018). Examples of dialogic education in action can be observed in classrooms where instructors foster candid conversations and debates, allowing students to delve deeply into complex subjects. In conclusion, various factors, including instructional models, peer connections, and teacher practices, influence classroom interactions. Teachers can create an environment that encourages meaningful connections and enhances learning for all students by fostering positive relationships, employing creative teaching strategies, and being mindful of social dynamics.

In Indonesia, Nurhadi and Ridwan (2024) investigated the role of peer interaction in promoting speaking skills among senior high school students. Using task-based group activities, the study revealed that peer collaboration provided a supportive environment for students to practice language more confidently. Students reported reduced anxiety and increased motivation when engaging with classmates rather than responding directly to the teacher. It aligns with sociocultural theories emphasizing the value of learner-learner scaffolding in language development.

In conclusion, the dynamics of classroom communication in English language instruction are greatly influenced by the interaction elements of grammar, intonation, repetition, quiet, avoidance, and anxiety. Utilizing these elements has already supported various methods for observing interactions in the classroom in ELT. By being aware of these characteristics, teachers may create more engaging lesson plans that encourage language learning. To enhance our understanding of effective ELT techniques, future research should continue to investigate these interactional elements, particularly in multicultural and diverse classroom environments.

Flanders' (1966) Interaction Analysis Categories System (FIACS) provides a broad categorization of classroom verbal behavior, dividing interaction into teacher talk, student talk, and silence or confusion. While FIACS was pioneering for its time, its methodological scope is limited by its relatively coarse classification, particularly regarding student talk. In the original system, student talk is captured only through two categories, which restricts the depth of analysis on how students participate and interact in class.

In contrast, Zhao (2022) extends the analytical framework by offering a more nuanced division of student talk into individual responses, collective responses, and peer-to-peer communication. This methodological refinement allows for a more precise examination of how students engage both with the teacher and with each other. Furthermore, Zhao's inclusion of sub-features within individual responses demonstrates a more detailed operationalization of student talk compared to FIACS. Overall, the findings derived from Zhao's framework are more detailed regarding student talk.

Table 1. The Description of Zhao's Modified Flanders Interaction Categories

Major Category	Second Level Category		Subcategory		Example
Teacher Talk	1	Accept Feeling			"I can see you are excited about this topic."
	2	Praise or encouragement			"Excellent work on your assignment!"
	3	Accept or use the ideas of students			"That is a great example you have brought up."
	4	Comments on students' answers			"Yes, 'gravity' is the correct term."
	5	Giving directions about the classroom tasks and activities			"Please submit your homework by Friday."
	6	Ask questions	6.1	Ask open-ended questions	"How would you solve this problem differently?"
			6.2	Ask closed questions	"Is water a solid, liquid, or gas at room temperature?"
	7	Lecturing	7.1	Declarative lecture	"The capital of France is Paris."
			7.2	Procedural lecture	"First, open your books to page 22, then complete the chart."
			7.3	Technical lecture	"The phonemic structure of this word affects pronunciation patterns."
	8	Other	8.1	Begin the class	"Good morning, everyone. Let us start today's lesson."
			8.2	End the class	"Time is up. Please submit your assignments."
			8.3	Monitor students' behavior	"Please stop talking while others are presenting."
			8.4	Assign homework	"Read Chapter 5 and answer the questions on page 40."
Student	9	Individually	9.1	Response	

Talk			9.1.1	Passively	The student quietly answers, "Yes."
			9.1.2	Voluntarily	"Can I answer this question?"
			9.2	Initiates to ask a question	"Can you explain how this formula works?"
	10	Students respond collectively			Whole class responds: "Yes, teacher!"
	11	Students communicate with each other			"Can you help me with number 3?"

(Source: Zhao, 2022)

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employed a mixed-methods design integrating qualitative observation with quantitative analysis of teacher–student interaction patterns captured in video recordings. Using systematic classroom observation, verbal exchanges were coded based on a tally of teacher talk and student talk, following principles from a modified Flanders Interaction Analysis (Zhao, 2022) and supported by Sociocultural Theory, which emphasizes the role of dialogue in meaning-making (Wenger, 2004). Quantitative data were generated by counting the frequency of each interaction category, while qualitative field notes were used to interpret the context and pedagogical intentions underlying the recorded behaviors. The integration of these data sets allowed for a deeper understanding of communicative dynamics, aligning with mixed-methods procedures that combine numerical trends with interpretive insights (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). The participants in this research are a teacher and students from SMAS IT Al-Kautsar in Duri, Riau, who have already been using full English in the classroom. The students in grade twelve have two classrooms, such as Annisa’s class for females and Arrijal’s class for males. There are 16 students in Arrijal’s class and 12 students in Annisa’s class.

Observations are made to analyze the verbal interactions between the teacher and students. The lessons are video-recorded using a mobile phone camera positioned strategically to capture the verbal and non-verbal communication of both the teacher and students. This method enabled a more objective analysis of teacher talk and student response based on Zhao’s (2022) interactional framework of modified FIACS theory. Recording the sessions also allowed for repeated and detailed observation, facilitating both quantitative coding (e.g., talk frequency).

To ensure the credibility of data, both inter-rater reliability and validation procedures are applied. For inter-rater reliability, another researcher independently coded a portion of the observation transcripts using the same coding framework to check consistency. For validation, the observation checklist was reviewed by two experts in ELT methodology to ensure content and construct validity. In addition, member checking is conducted with selected participants to confirm the accuracy of the interpreted data. This qualitative insight complemented the observation

findings, allowing a triangulated understanding of how teacher-student talk influences students' participation in ELT settings.

In analyzing data observations, based on the video recording, the researcher transcribes and categorizes the utterances of the teacher and students in the observation sheets (see Table 2,3,4) according to Flanders' Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC) that have already been adapted by Zhao (2022). The total number of teacher and student utterances would be calculated and organized using Microsoft Excel to obtain a tally of each category.

After processing the tallies, the researcher analyzes the data to determine the percentage of teacher talk versus student talk in the classroom.

It is the formula for calculating the percentage:

$$\text{Frequency Percentage (\%)} = \text{Tallies of each category} / \text{Total tallies} * 100$$

Tallies of each feature: This is the number of times a specific type of interaction occurs (e.g., teacher talk, student response)

Total tallies : This is the sum of all recorded interaction events during observation

100 : This is a constant to express the value as a percentage

The formula is also used to count the percentage of each subcategory. This analysis offered insights into the dynamics of classroom communication and highlighted potential imbalances in interaction. This process involved several systematic stages—transcription, categorization, quantification, and interpretation—to ensure that both the content and frequency of students' responses are rigorously examined.

Table 2. The Observation Sheet of Indirect Teacher Talk

Utterances	Accept Feeling	Praises or Encourages	Accepting or use ideas of students	Ask open-ended questions	Ask closed questions
Yes, It is.	1				
Etc...					
Total Tally	1				

Table 3. The Observation Sheet of Direct Teacher Talk

Utterances	Comments on students' answer	Giving direction about classroom Task and activity	Declarative lecture	Procedural lecture	Technical lecture	Begin the class	End the class	Monitor students' behavior	Assign homework
Good morning, how do you feel today?						1			
Etc...									
Total Tally						1			

Table 4. The Observation Sheet of Students Talk

Utterances	Passively Response by individual student	Voluntarily Response by individual student	Student initiate to ask questions	Student respond collectively	Students communicate with another students
Morning, Ms				1	
Etc...					
Total Tally				1	

FINDING

This research has already found the results of the research questions in the Previous chapter. This study focused on analyzing the conversations between teachers and students in the context of English language teaching and learning. Moreover, there were some categories from Zhao (2022), it was divided into 11 subcategories; accept feeling, praises or encourages, accept or use ideas of students, comments on students' answer, giving direction about classroom task & activities, ask open-ended questions, ask closed questions, declarative lecture, procedural lecture, technical lecture, begin the class, end the class, monitor students' behaviour, assign, students response passively, students' response voluntarily, students initiates to ask questions, and 3 others were from silence category. Each utterance produced during the interaction from the teacher and students served a specific purpose, thereby describing the roles of both the teacher and students in the classroom. Furthermore, the topic of the lesson was the personality, the appearance, and the clothes.

The Proportion of Teacher-Student Talks

The findings of this research were based on classroom observations at the third level of SMAS IT Al-Kautsar Duri. The teaching and learning used English as the main language in the classroom. The teacher and students' talk became smooth while using English in the class. The table below shows the frequency of teacher and student talk in each class.

Table 5. The Proportion of the Teacher and Students' Talk

Indicator	Annisa's Class (%)	Arrijal's Class (%)	Average (%)
Teacher Talk	54,51	62,33	58,42
Students Talk	45,49	37,67	41,58

The table presented the comparison of teacher talk and student talk in Annisa and Arrijal's classes. In Annisa's class, the teacher's talk accounted for 54.51% of the total utterances. Meanwhile, students' talk represented 45.49%. These results indicate that utterances in Annisa's

class are relatively balanced, with the teacher still talking slightly more, but students are also contributing actively to the learning process.

In contrast, the distribution of talk in Arrijal's class shows a greater dominance of the teacher. Teacher talk corresponds to 62.33%. This pattern suggests that the classroom interaction in Arrijal's class is more teacher-centered, with students participating less frequently than in Annisa's class. Moreover, the findings in line with the previous study of Zhao (2022) had 77% of the teacher's talk that implied the teacher was dominant in the verbal interaction of the classroom. Besides, the students' talks had 6% and 16% for the silence part.

When comparing the two classes, Annisa's class demonstrates a more balanced interaction between the teacher and students, while Arrijal's class reflects a stronger focus on teacher talk. Thus, students in Annisa's class appear to be more engaged in communication, whereas in Arrijal's class, the teacher tends to dominate the discourse.

In general, the teacher's talk is dominant. The pattern still reflects a teacher-centered learning environment with an average 58,42%. This imbalance suggests that opportunities for students to practice and develop their speaking skills remain limited, highlighting the need for strategies that encourage greater student engagement and increase the proportion of student talk during classroom activities.

The Pattern of Teacher-Student Talks

There were 11 subcategories of Zhao's modified Flanders interaction, which described details in the teacher and students' talk in the classroom while using English. The teacher categories had 8 subcategories, while the student categories had 3 subcategories.

Table 5. The Pattern of the Teacher's and Students' Talk in Class

No	Category	Subcategories	Annisa's class		Arrijal's class	
			Utterances	P (%)	Utterances	P (%)
1	Teacher Talk	Accept feeling	11	7.01	7	3.11
2		Praise or encourage	7	4.46	7	3.11
3		Accept or use the ideas of students	19	12.10	25	11.11
4		Comments on students' answer	14	8.92	26	11.56
5		Giving directions about the classroom tasks and activities	12	7.64	26	11.56
6		Ask open-ended questions	4	2.55	6	2.67
		Ask closed questions	46	29.30	28	12.44
7		Declarative lecture	15	9.55	66	29.33
		Procedural lecture	13	8.28	9	4.00
		Technical lecture	1	0.64	3	1.33

8		Begin the class	4	2.55	3	1.33
		End the class	4	2.55	1	0.44
		Monitor students' behavior	5	3.18	17	7.56
		Assign homework	2	1.27	1	0.44
Total			157	100	225	100
9	Students Talk	Students respond passively	7	5.34	1	0.74
		Students respond voluntarily	68	51.91	87	63.97
		Student initiates to ask questions	4	3.05	4	2.94
10		Students respond collectively	43	32.82	41	30.15
11		Students communicate with each other	9	6.87	3	2.21
Total			131	100	136	100

Based on the table above, the most subcategories of teacher talk that increase students' talk are **Ask closed questions** in Annisa's class, with the percentage 29,30%, and **Declarative lecture** in Arrijal's class (29,33%). Meanwhile, the most common subcategories of students' talk are **Students respond voluntarily**, that calculated 51,91% in Annisa's class and 63,97% in Arrijal's class. Therefore, the subcategory of **Ask closed questions** increased the students' participation to be more active. In contrast, the subcategory of **Declarative lecture** cannot increase the students' participation.

1. Accept Feeling

This category involves acknowledging students' emotions in a positive and supportive manner. In Annisa's class, the teacher produced 11 utterances (7.01%), while in Arrijal's class, there were seven (3.11%). The higher proportion in Annisa's class suggests that the teacher more frequently validated students' feelings to create a comfortable learning atmosphere.

(Below is the conversation in Annisa's class)

Teacher: *I give u some words, then you choose whether it is the personality or appearance, or clothes. How about curly hair?*

Students: *Appearance*

Teacher: **Ok**, good

(Below is the conversation in Arrijal's class)

Teacher: *How to describe Ms. Dewi?*

Student: *Ms. Dewi is chubby*

Teacher: **It's ok**

The italicized and bolded words are the teacher's utterances of acceptance from the teacher talk category. Based on the utterances, the teacher acknowledged students' emotions or reactions

to increase their comfort. If the students are comfortable with the learning, their passivity will reduce. However, based on the data, the percentage of teacher talks in the accept feeling was less than the other subcategories. Thus, the students would be more uncomfortable, which would support passivity.

2. Praise of Encourage

This subcategory explained the commendations or encouragement for student participation. Based on observations in Annisa's class, there were 7 utterances, accounting for 4.46% of the total. On the other side, the Arrijal's class had 3.11% of this subcategory. In conclusion, the percentage in this category was higher in Annisa's class than in Arrijal's class.

(Below is the conversation in the Annisa's class)

Teacher: *Dinda, which of the formal clothes? **Come on, guys!***

Students: *T-shirt, Ms*

Teacher: *It's ok if you are wrong, T-shirt in formal clothes?*

(Below is the conversation in the Arrijal's class)

Teacher: *Caring, do you know caring?*

Student: *Peduli*

Teacher: ***Good job***

The utterances of "Come on, guys" and "Good job" are categorized into the teacher talk with the subcategory of praise or encouragement. The teacher gave positive reinforcement for effort or correct response to build the students' confidence. In the data, praise or encouragement from the teacher was limited, which made some students feel less confident. Hence, this subcategory influences the students' passivity.

3. Accept or Use the Ideas of Students

This subcategory captures how teachers incorporate learners' ideas into classroom discussion. Annisa's class recorded 12.10%, compared to 11.11% in Arrijal's class. The small difference indicates both teachers valued learners' contributions, yet Annisa's teacher demonstrated slightly greater responsiveness to student input.

(Below is the conversation in Annisa's class)

Teacher: *Let's describe Latifa! Please complete with her personality and appearance.*

Student: *Latifa is short*

Teacher: ***Yes, short? Is it oke Latifa if your friends tell u short?***

(Below is the conversation in Arrijal's class)

Teacher: *What is this? (gesturing big with hands)*

Student: *Big*

Teacher: ***Ok, what is the opposite of big?***

The bold utterances are the teacher's talk of accepting or using ideas from students. The teacher responds to or builds on students' input to promote the students' participation. The data calculated there are 12% and 11% participations from Annisa's and Arrijal's classes, which means it has an effect on positive participation and reduces passivity.

4. Comments on Students' Answer

This category represents evaluative responses to students' utterances. Annisa's class displayed 8.92% of such interactions, while Arrijal's class reached 11.56%. The higher proportion in Arrijal's class suggests a tendency toward corrective or confirmatory feedback, reinforcing teacher authority during evaluation.

(Below is the conversation in Annisa's class)

Teacher: *Let's describe Latifa! Please complete with her personality and appearance.*

Student: *Latifa is short*

Teacher: *Yes, short? **Is it okay Latifa if your friends tell u short?***

Latifa: *No, haha*

(Below is the conversation in Arrijal's class)

Teacher: *Guys, how do you know the information about the free lunch?*

Student: *Pak Haji Uyun, Ms*

Teacher: ***It's fake information***

The utterance "Is it okay, Latifa, if your friends tell u short?" is from the teacher in Annisa's class, who wanted to comment on the other student's answer. Meanwhile, in Arrijal's class, the teacher said, "It's fake information," in response to the student's answer.

5. Giving Directions about Classroom Tasks and Activities

This subcategory describes the direction of tasks and activities from the teacher. Based on the observation, the percentage of the teacher's talk in this subcategory was 7.64% in Annisa's class. Meanwhile, the Arrijal class had an 11.56% rate. The percentage of teacher talk in Arrijal's class is higher than in Annisa's class. Therefore, the higher percentage in Arrijal's class reflects greater instructional control and directive communication by the teacher.

(Below is the conversation in Annisa's class)

Teacher: ***Choose one of your friends to describe the appearance and personality***

Student: *Ms Dewi*

Teacher: *Miss? It's ok*

(Below is the conversation in Arrijal's class)

Teacher: ***You will learn about describing people appearance and talk about the personality***

Student: *(silent and focusing on the teacher' said)*

Teacher: ***It means at the end of the class you are able to describe about your friends here***

The italic and bold words above are the utterances from the teacher that explain the task and activities. If teachers provide constant directions, it will impact student initiative, hindering their development in learning. However, the data showed that teachers play a dominant role in this subcategory, influencing students to become passive.

6. Ask Open-Ended Questions

Open-ended questions are designed to stimulate critical thinking and elicit extended responses. Annisa's class showed 2.55% of such questions, while Arrijal's class reached 2.67%. Although both figures are relatively low, these instances reveal teachers' attempts to encourage reflective student responses.

(Below is the conversation in Annisa's class)

Teacher: *Who can answer number 1? Raise your hand please!*

Students: *C, Ms*

Teacher: ***How do you know?***

Student: *They say there is a party and there is one picture of the party.*

(Below is the conversation in Arrijal's class)

Teacher: *Ok this is our topic today appearance and personality. **What does it mean?***

Students: *(silent and focusing on the teacher's explanation)*

Teacher: *This is our appearance from top until down (showing her appearance). For example, a sharp nose.*

From the above conversations, the questions of "how" and "what" are mostly used for open-ended questions. Another question can be started by "why". Based on the data, the percentage of teacher talks of open-ended questions was lower than that of others. Hence, the students were encouraged to participate, and it influenced their passivity.

7. Ask Closed Questions

This subcategory describes the poses questions to stimulate student thinking. Based on the observation, the percentage of teacher talks in Annisa's class was 29.30%. Meanwhile, the percentage of teacher talk in Arrijal's class was 12.4%. The dominance of closed-ended questioning in Annisa's class suggests a structured, controlled teaching approach, possibly to check comprehension.

(Below is the conversation in the Annisa's class)

Teacher: ***Do you know clothes?***

Student: *Yes, pakaian Ms*

Teacher: *How about care?*

(Below is the conversation in the Arrijal's class)

Teacher: ***Do you know blonde? So, is blonde appearance or personality?***

Students: *Appearance*

Teacher: *Ok, next*

Closed questions in the above conversations are using auxiliary verbs. Another closed question is a question that can be answered with a short, limited response — usually "yes" or "no," or with a specific piece of information (like a word, number, or fact). If the open questions are higher than the closed questions, the students' participation would be positive and reduce the passivity. Meanwhile, based on the percentage, the closed questions were higher than the open questions. Thus, it influenced the students' participation to be passive.

8. Declarative Lecture

Declarative lectures involve providing factual or conceptual explanations. This subcategory accounted for 9.55% in Annisa's class and 29.33% in Arrijal's class. The greater proportion in Arrijal's class indicates a stronger reliance on teacher-centered delivery and content exposition.

(Below is the conversation in Annisa's class)

Teacher: ***I've told you that our lesson today is about personality and appearance. Do you still remember? The Example of personality is kind, cheerful, handsome, diligent.***

Student: *Oo (response collectively)*

(Below is the conversation in Arrijal's class)

Teacher: ***For example do you know about abid. Abid is not tall but also not short. As I know, Abid is so diligent. What else? He has a good attitude. Almost 3 years, abid there is no cases.***

Students: *(silent and focusing on the teacher's explanation)*

A declarative lecture is the way the teacher explains the material in detail. The above italic and bold utterances are examples of the declarative lecture category. The percentage showed that the teacher has a higher rate of talk in a declarative lecture, which influenced the students' initiation for exploring the materials in ELT. Therefore, the students' participation was passive.

9. Procedural Lecture

This subcategory explained a type of lecture focused on teaching students how to do something. Based on the observation, the percentage of teacher talk in Annisa's class was 8.28%. Meanwhile, the percentage of teacher talk in Arrijal's class was 4%. This suggests that the Annisa teacher provided more procedural scaffolding to guide students' task completion.

(Below is the conversation in Annisa's class)

Teacher: ***Today you are going to describing people. So, what will you do? You choose one of your friend to describe the appearance and personality.***

Students: *(silent and focusing on the teacher's explanation)*

(Below is the conversation in Arrijal's class)

Teacher: ***You will learn about describing people appearance and talk about the personality. It means at the end of the class you are able to describe about your friends here. Your classmates. And then I give u one of the Name of friend here, and then you tell about his personality and appearance.***

Students: *(silent and focusing on the teacher's explanation)*

The teacher explained the steps the student would follow in the classroom in a procedural manner. In this procedural lecture category, students are mostly silent because they have to focus on what the teacher says.

10. Technical Lecture

This subcategory explained a type of lecture focused on delivering specialized content related to a technical field or subject. Based on the observation, the percentage of teacher talks in Annisa's class was 0.64%. Meanwhile, the percentage of teacher talks in Arrijal's class was 1.33%.

Thus, the percentage of teacher talk in Arrijal's class is higher than in Annisa's class. Although infrequent, these moments highlight explicit linguistic instruction within the classroom.

(Below is the conversation in the Annisa's class)

Students: *Ms, can you spell of appearance? (student initiates to ask)*

Teacher: ***A-p-p-e-a-r-a-n-c-e***

(Below is the conversation in the Arrijal's class)

Student: *How to spell fairy, Ms?*

Teacher: ***Do you know the product of fair and lovely?***

Student: *Oh f-a-i-r ya Ms*

In this category, the teacher informed students that the technical, phonemes, and spelling are also included.

11. Begin the Class

This function refers to how teachers open the lesson and build rapport. The percentages were 2.55% and 1.33% in Annisa's and Arrijal's classes, respectively. Greetings such as "Good morning" served to establish a welcoming classroom tone.

(Below is the conversation in Annisa's class)

Teacher: ***Good morning, how do you feel today?***

Students: Morning, Ms. Good, excellent.

(Below is the conversation in Arrijal's class)

Teacher: ***Good morning, guys. Everything is gonna be ok?***

Students: Morning, Ms. Yes...

This category is always the greetings for students and also checks the attendance.

12. End the Class

This subcategory focuses on closing remarks and classroom rituals. The frequency was 2.55% in Annisa's class and 0.44% in Arrijal's. Annisa's teacher's more frequent use of closure language demonstrates greater attention to summarizing and structuring the end of learning sessions.

(Below is the conversation in Annisa's class)

Teacher: ***So, we go continue our study After dzuhur. Thank you guys, let's pray.***

Students: *(students are praying)*

(Below is the conversation in Arrijal's class)

Teacher: ***Ok thank u for today, see you next week. And let's pray.***

Student: *(students are praying)*

This category is always the closing of lecturing.

13. Monitor Students' Behavior

This subcategory describes how teachers monitor students. Based on the observation, the percentage of teacher talk in Annisa's class was 3.18%. Meanwhile, the percentage of teacher talk

in Arrijal's class was 7.56%. The higher frequency in Arrijal's class reflects more teacher intervention in managing students' on-task behavior.

(Below is the conversation in Annisa's class)

Teacher: ***Silent guys, listen to lara please***

Students: *(silent and hearing the lara' speaking)*

(below is the conversation in Arrijal's class)

Teacher: ***Christian what do you eat? Throw away it.***

Student: *(silent and doing the teacher's said)*

The teacher has to monitor the students' behavior for better learning. Hence, those are examples of utterances that use italic and bold words.

14. Assign Homework

This category involves providing after-class tasks. Annisa's class accounted for 1.27%, while Arrijal's was 0.44%. The relatively low percentages in both classes suggest that homework was not a dominant instructional tool in these sessions.

(Below is the conversation in Annisa's class)

Teacher: ***Next meeting, I want you to write 1 page for describing your friends. You have to combine the personality, appearance, and clothes.***

Student: *Easy, Ms.*

(Below is the conversation in Arrijal's class)

Teacher: ***And then for the next meeting, you describe about your generations.***

Student: *Yes*

This category has a special space which is only for homework from the teacher.

15. Students Respond Passively

This category captures minimal or non-verbal student responses. The proportion in Annisa's class was 5.34%, higher than Arrijal's 0.74%. This difference indicates that more students in Annisa's class provided limited responses, possibly due to hesitation or uncertainty.

(Below is the conversation in Annisa's class)

Teacher: Latifa, lara said that u love math, is it true? How about English?

Student: ***No, haha***

(Below is the conversation in Arrijal's class)

Teacher: Rafa are you finish?

Student: ***Not yet, ms.***

The students respond to the teacher indirectly by expressing negative feelings.

16. Students Respond Voluntarily

Voluntary responses indicate learners' initiative in contributing to class discussions. Annisa's class recorded 51.91%, while Arrijal's reached 63.97%. This result suggests that, although teacher talk dominated, students in both classes—especially Arrijal's—actively engaged when prompted.

(Below is the conversation in Annisa's class)

Teacher: *And she usually wears...*

Student: ***She wears glasses***

Teacher: *And she is always using black glasses*

(Below is the conversation in Arrijal's class)

Teacher: *How to describe Ms. Dewi?*

Student: ***Ms dewi is human***

Teacher: *Haha human, excatly i'm a human*

The utterances of "She wears glasses" and "Ms. Dewi is human" are examples of students responding voluntarily. Students in this category are brave to express their thoughts. Therefore, this indicates active engagement.

17. Students Initiate to Ask Questions

This subcategory explained how students initiate asking. Based on the observation, the percentage of teacher talk in Annisa's class was 3.05%. Meanwhile, the percentage of teacher talks in Arrijal's class was 2.94%. The near-equal results indicate that a small proportion of students were confident enough to seek clarification or additional information.

(Below is the conversation in Annisa's class)

Students: ***Ms, can you spell of appearance? (student initiates to ask)***

Teacher: *A-p-p-e-a-r-a-n-c-e*

(Below is the conversation in Arrijal's class)

Student: ***How to spell fairy, Ms? (Student initiates to ask)***

Teacher: *Do you know the product of fair and lovely?*

Student: *Oh f-a-i-r ya Ms*

The students who are confused about something can ask the teacher with confidence. For instance, the students ask for the spelling of the words. Hence, it includes active learning behavior (low passivity).

18. Students Respond Collectively

Collective responses involve group answers given simultaneously. Annisa's class produced 32.82%, while Arrijal's produced 30.15%. These high percentages imply that collective answering was a common interactional pattern across both groups.

(Below is the conversation in Annisa's class)

Teacher: *Hard working is?*

Students: ***Personality***

Teacher: *Yes, personality.*

(Below is the conversation in Arrijal's class)

Teacher: *Do you know the appearance? Can you give me the example?*

Students: ***No***

In this category, it is implied that the students respond to the teacher together.

19. Students Communicate with Each Other

This subcategory explained how students talk with their friends. Based on the observation, the percentage of teacher talks in Annisa's class was 6.87%. Meanwhile, the percentage of teacher talks in Arrijal's class was 2.21%. The data indicate that Annisa's students interacted more frequently with peers, fostering a collaborative learning environment.

(Below is the conversation in Annisa's class)

Student 1: *Bergelombang kayak ikal apa Ms?*

Student 2: *Wavy hair*

(below is the conversation in Arrijal's class)

Student 1: *What is bracelet?*

Student 2: *Gelang*

In this category, the student communicates with other students to obtain detailed information to better understand the topic.

In conclusion, the teacher in this observation has a higher rate of talk than the students. However, the students' participation was not the lowest; they kept confidence and initiated bringing their thoughts into ELT, even though this pattern was still categorized as teacher-centered. It was in line with the average of teacher talk, 58%, compared to students' 42%.

DISCUSSION

The Proportion of Teacher-Student Talks

In light of FIACS and its emphasis on balanced classroom communication (Amatari, 2015; Zhao, 2022), Annisa's class shows greater strength than Arrijal's class. With teacher talk accounting for 54.51%, and student talk accounting for 45.49%, Annisa's classroom shows more balanced interaction. By contrast, Arrijal's class exhibits teacher talk dominance, with a ratio of 62.33%, while student talk accounts for only 37.67%. The weakness here lies in the limited student participation, which may hinder the development of oral proficiency and autonomy. In this sense, Arrijal's class illustrates the concern raised in previous studies that extreme teacher dominance can hinder communicative learning outcomes (Ahmad & Rao, 2013).

Overall, the strengths and weaknesses observed in both classes reaffirm the continuing relevance of FIACS in analyzing classroom interaction. Annisa's class shows promise in creating a learner-centered atmosphere, though it still requires more student-initiated contributions. Arrijal's class demonstrates clear teacher guidance, but its weakness lies in limiting students' opportunities for communication. These findings align with FIACS-based studies advocating a shift toward interactive, balanced classroom communication to promote student motivation, autonomy, and oral proficiency (Rizkiyah & Salamah, 2022; Sainyakit & Santoso, 2024).

However, the results of this study reveal that EFL learning in the Islamic secondary school is strongly influenced by the institution's multilingual environment and its religious-cultural orientation. Although English is taught as a foreign language, students' engagement with EFL tasks appears to be shaped by their daily exposure to Arabic for religious purposes and the national language for general academic communication. This multilingual interplay contributes to differing

levels of linguistic confidence and motivation among learners, suggesting that EFL development cannot be separated from the school's broader sociolinguistic context.

Therefore, this study underscores that EFL learning in Islamic multilingual schools should be interpreted through a socio-cultural lens. Students' English proficiency outcomes are not merely a product of classroom instruction but also of how they navigate their identities as multilingual learners and members of a religious educational community. Recognizing this interplay can guide educators and policymakers in designing EFL practices that are both linguistically effective and culturally responsive. These findings align with recent translanguaging theory, which argues that multilingual learners dynamically draw on their full linguistic repertoires—including Arabic, English, and the national language—to construct meaning in socially and culturally situated learning contexts (Li Wei, 2022).

The Pattern of Teacher-Student Talks

The interaction patterns observed in the classroom are not merely descriptive but pedagogically significant because they determine how learning opportunities are distributed between the teacher and students. Each subcategory within Zhao's (2022) modified FIACS framework—such as praising, questioning, or lecturing—illustrates specific pedagogical intentions that either promote or inhibit student participation. When certain subcategories, particularly asking closed questions and delivering declarative lectures, dominate the interaction.

Excessive teacher explanation, as found in both Annisa's and Arrijal's classes, often contributes to student passivity. In contrast, the subcategory of asking closed questions is helping students talk to be more engaged. Recent theories, such as those proposed by Alexander (2020), emphasize dialogic teaching, stressing that quality interaction involves not only the frequency of exchanges but also the substance, such as open questioning, listening, and building upon student responses to deepen understanding. Thus, dialogic classrooms require reciprocal exchanges in which students construct understanding through dialogue rather than unidirectional explanation. When teachers rely heavily on asking closed questions, students become active. It is in line with Alexander's theory.

Recent FIACS-based studies, such as Novianti et al. (2023), emphasize that effective classroom interaction is typically characterized by a balanced distribution of teacher-student talk and the strategic use of interactional moves—including praising, questioning, and acknowledging student contributions. In the present study, however, teacher talk accounts for the entirety of the recorded interactional categories, reflecting a distinctly teacher-dominated pattern within the two observed classrooms. More specifically, Annisa's class displays a substantial reliance on closed questioning (29.30%), whereas Arrijal's class is marked by a predominance of declarative lecturing (29.33%). Although derived from a limited and context-specific sample, these interactional tendencies align with existing literature that cautions against disproportionate lecturing and underscores the pedagogical value of fostering student agency and dialogic engagement. Accordingly, within the scope of this study, the observed patterns suggest the

potential benefits of shifting toward more dialogically oriented and student-centered practices in the two classrooms examined.

CONCLUSION

This study reveals that the classroom interaction in the observed ELT context reflects both strengths and weaknesses, depending on the class. Annisa's class demonstrated a more balanced interaction, with teacher talk accounting for 54.51% and student talk accounting for 45.49%. This balance indicates a relatively learner-centered environment where students actively contribute to classroom discourse. In contrast, Arrijal's class was dominated by teacher talk (62.33%), leaving only 37.67% for student talk, thus illustrating a more teacher-centered pattern. Such an imbalance restricts students' opportunities to develop oral proficiency and communicative autonomy. However, based on the average, the overall interactions in the class are teacher-centered.

Further analysis of Zhao's modified FIACS categories showed that the most common subcategories of teacher talk are "ask closed questions" in Annisa's class, with the percentage 29.3%, and "declarative lecture" in Arrijal's class (29.33%). Meanwhile, the most common subcategories of students' talk are "students respond voluntarily," which accounted for 51.91% in Annisa's class and 63.97% in Arrijal's class. The pattern of increasing students' talk suggests that the "ask closed questions" subcategory is more conducive to fostering student engagement, while the "declarative lecture" subcategory prioritizes structured teacher input.

In light of these conclusions, several pedagogical and practical implications can be drawn. Teachers are encouraged to adopt strategies that foster more balanced interaction, particularly in teacher-dominated classrooms like Arrijal. It can be achieved by incorporating more open-ended questioning, dialogic exchanges, and peer collaboration activities that allow students to take greater initiative in communication. By reducing reliance on lengthy lectures, teachers can create opportunities for students to develop communicative competence and confidence.

Schools and institutions should also provide professional development programs that focus on interactive teaching strategies, including the use of FIACS-based reflective tools. Such training would equip teachers with the skills to analyze their own discourse patterns and adjust their practices to encourage greater student engagement. Moreover, creating supportive classroom environments that reduce anxiety and promote active participation is essential. Teachers should employ positive reinforcement, scaffolding techniques, and structured peer support systems to help students overcome psychological barriers.

Finally, future researchers are encouraged to expand this line of inquiry by examining larger samples across different educational settings. Comparative studies could further explore how interactional dynamics vary across gender-based classes, subject matter, or proficiency levels. Additionally, integrating non-verbal aspects of communication into FIACS analysis would enrich the understanding of classroom interaction. By addressing these areas, subsequent research can provide deeper insights into how to optimize classroom discourse for effective EFL learning.

REFERENCES

- Afidawati, H., Arrasyid, F. I., & Ikawati, L. (2024). Minimizing EFL learners' speaking anxiety in the post-pandemic era. *JEELS (Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies)*, 11(1), 107-130.
- Ahmad, S., & Rao, C. (2013). Applying Communicative Approach in Teaching English as a Foreign Language: a Case Study of Pakistan.
- Alexander, R. (2020). A dialogic teaching companion. Routledge.
- Amatari, V. O. (2015). The instructional process: a review of Flanders' interaction analysis in a classroom setting. *International Journal of Secondary Education*, 3(5), 43-49. DOI: 10.11648/j.ijsedu.20150305.11
- Amatari, V. O. (2015). The instructional process: a review of Flanders' interaction analysis in a classroom setting. *International Journal of Secondary Education*, 3(5), 43-49. DOI: 10.11648/j.ijsedu.20150305.11
- Ayunda, A., Komariah, E., & Achmad, D. (2021). An Investigation of EFL Classroom Interaction by Using Flanders Interaction Analysis Category System (FIACS). *Research in English and Education Journal*, 6(2), 89-100.
- Chen, J., Jiang, H., Justice, L. M., Lin, T. J., Purtell, K. M., & Ansari, A. (2020). Influences of teacher-child relationships and classroom social management on child-perceived peer social experiences during early school years. *Frontiers in psychology*, 11, 586991.
- Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. P. (2017). Designing and conducting mixed methods research. Sage publications.
- English Conversation Program (ECP) - SMA IT Al-Kautsar Duri. (n.d.). SMA IT Al-Kautsar Duri. <https://smait.yayasanal-kautsar.sch.id/ekskul/english-conversation-program-ecp/>
- Flanders, N. A. (1966). Interaction analysis in the classroom: A manual for observers. Ann Arbor, MI: School of Education, University of Michigan
- Lehesvuori, S., Ramnarain, U., & Viiri, J. (2018). Challenging transmission modes of teaching in science classrooms: Enhancing learner-centredness through dialogicity. *Research in Science Education*, 48(5), 1049-1069.
- Nassaji, H. (2020). Good qualitative research. *Language teaching research*, 24(4), 427-431.
- Novianti, D., & Anugrawati, N. (2023). Class interaction analysis in English learning based on Flanders' interaction analysis category system (FIACS). *English Language Teaching Methodology*, 3(1), 80-97.
- Nurhadi, T., Nugraha, S. I., & Ridwan, I. (2024). Exploring the implementation of task-based language teaching in teaching speaking to secondary EFL learners: A qualitative case study. *PROJECT (Professional Journal of English Education)*, 7(5), 1207-1219.
- Putri, F. A. (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.
- Rizkiyah, F., & Salamah, U. (2023). Analysis of Classroom Verbal Interaction Using Fiacs (Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories System). *Darussalam English Journal (DEJ)*, 3(1), 31-66.
- Sainyakit, P., & Santoso, Y. I. (2024). A Classroom Interaction Analysis of Teacher and Students by Using FIACS. *Acitya: Journal of Teaching and Education*, 6(1), 157-167. <https://doi.org/10.30650/ajte.v6i1.3825>
- Suryati, N. (2015). Classroom interaction strategies employed by English teachers at lower

- secondary schools. *Teflin Journal*, 26(2), 247–264.
<https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v26i2/247-264>
- Wei, L. (2022). Translanguaging as a political stance: Implications for English language education. *ELT journal*, 76(2), 172-182.
- Wenger, E. (2004). Learning for a small planet: A research agenda. Retrieved on, 9(26), 2004.
- Zhao, K., & Boonyaparakob, K. (2022). A Case Study of Chinese Students Learning Thai as a Foreign Language: Flanders Interaction Analysis Category System. *International Journal of TESOL & Education*, 2(1), 145-169. <https://doi.org/10.54855/ijte.222110>
- Zúñiga, C., Cárdenas, P., Martínez, R., & Valledor, L. (2020). Teachers' classroom practices for citizenship education: experiences of teachers rated as outstanding. *Citizenship Social and Economics Education*, 19(1), 3-22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2047173419887972>