Teacher-Students Interaction in EFL Classroom: A Study Using Flander Interaction Analysis Categories System (FIACS)

Interaksi Guru-Siswa di Kelas EFL: Studi Menggunakan Sistem Kategori Analisis Interaksi Flander (FIACS)

[1]Supriadin, [2] Nurlaila Wattiheluw [3]Baiq Nurullayali
[1]Universitas Negeri Makassar
[2]Institut Agama Islam Negeri Ambon
[3] Sekolah Tinggi Agama Islam Sumbawa
Corresponding author: supriadin1991@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to look into how teachers and students interact in the EFL classroom. The study was conducted at one of the senior high schools in Indonesia, namely SMA I Monta. This research used a descriptive qualitative research method. The data was analyzed using the Flander Interaction Analysis Categories System (FIACS) to explore the percentage of discussion time between teacher and students during the teaching and learning process. This study's participants include one English teacher and 28 students, 10 of whom are males and 18 of whom are females. The data were collected by monitoring the class 3 meetings with a video recorder, audio recorder, and observation checklist. As shown in this study, students talk more extensively than the teacher talk during the classroom interaction. Based on the results of classroom observation, it was found that in the first meeting, 45.6% of verbal behavior done inside the classroom was student talk. Then, 48.96% was spent by teacher talk verbal behavior, both direct and indirect talk. In the second meeting, 53% of verbal behavior done inside the classroom was student talk, while the English teacher talk only 41.07% in both direct and indirect talk. In the third meeting, students talk increased with a percentage of 53.33%, while the teacher talk only 40.42%. From the three meetings of classroom interaction, the average of students talk was 50.64%, teacher talk was 43.48%, and silence or confusion was 5.84%. Therefore, it can be concluded that students talk is more dominant in verbal classroom interaction than the teacher talk in the context of EFL classroom.

INTRODUCTION

For EFL students, using the English language in class interactions is crucial. A classroom is an educational setting where English as a foreign language (EFL) learner can practice their language skills. In actuality, classrooms are the typical settings for teaching English to speakers of other languages. They hardly use the language outside of the classroom because they don't have a partner with whom to practice. According to Supriadin (2022), EFL students do not use English as a foreign language in the classroom for social purposes outside of the classroom. Since they don't have a companion to practice the language with outside of the classroom, they will likely find it difficult to do so. For this reason, EFL teachers must allow their students to practice the language in the classroom since it will boost their learning and enhance their communication skills.

In addition, it is mandatory for EFL students to practice their language skills in the classroom as much as they can. In is in line with Derin et al., (2020) state that educational institutions would rather have English as a second language (EFL) students practice the language than have the students not practice it in the classroom. It implies that they became more proficient and self-assured in their language use the more they practiced. Actually, communication is the main goal of language learning and instruction. It is true that the educational establishment values the EFL students who put their language skills to use. Furthermore, Mouhanna (2009) argues that it was a contentious pedagogical issue to use mother's tongue in the classroom. This indicates that a large number of EFL instructors do not require their pupils to develop their language skills in class. As a result, it will render language instruction and acquisition useless. For the EFL students, however, it is crucial that they practice the language in the classroom interaction.

In this study, classroom interaction was defined as how the teacher and students communicated during the teaching and learning process. Classroom interaction, according to Lestari et al., (2022), refers to the actions that the teacher and students undertake during the teaching and learning process in the classroom. In addition, Radford (2011) states that classroom interaction will facilitate the learning process among students since they will exchange knowledge or understanding with one another. It indicates that classroom engagement gives pupils the confidence to share what they know and learn from one another. In addition, according to Chaudron (1998) stated that Classroom interaction covers classroom behaviors such as turn-taking, questioning and answering, negotiation of meaning and feedback. However, the gap found from the previous studies that teacher talk is dominant in classroom interaction (Novianti et al., 2023; Sharma et al., 2021; Lestari et al., 2022; Pratiwi & Fithriani, 2023). However, another finding proposed by

Ayunda et.al., (2021), the study of An Investigation of EFL Classroom Interaction by Using Flanders Interaction Analysis Category System (FIACS), claimed that students' talking dominates classroom engagement when they learning English. Therefore, based on this gap, the researcher re-examines the previous studies related to the teacher-students interaction in EFL classroom. This study would analyse using using Flander Interaction Analysis Categories System (FIACS).

The Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories System (FIACS) Technique is an observing technique that classifies the speech behavior of teacher and students as they interact in class. According to Flanders' test was created to observe just verbal interactions in the classroom, while nonverbal gestures cannot be used. Historically, Flanders developed a system of interaction analysis to study what is happening in a classroom when a teacher teaches which is called Flanders Interaction Analysis Category System (FIACS). It is developed at the University of Minnesota, U.S.A. between 1955 and 1960.

Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC) is a ten-category system for communication possibilities. There are seven categories used when the teacher speaks (Teacher Talk), two when the students speak (Students Talk), and a tenth category for quiet or perplexity. Flanders (1970) divides that teacher talk (accepting feeling, accepting or using students' ideas, praising or encouraging, asking questions, giving directions, lecturing, and justifying authority or criticizing) student talk (student talk response and student talk initiate) and silence (periods of silence or confusion).

As a result, the researchers attempt to investigate classroom interactions using Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC) in EFL classroom. Through this investigation, the researcher would know the percentage of teachers' and students' talking time during classroom interaction in EFL classroom. This study observed during the teaching and learning process at SMA 1 Monta, the High School in Bima Regency, West Nusa Tenggara Province, Indonesia. The way teachers spoke in the classroom actually had a big impact on getting the pupils to talk. This was the main motivation behind the researcher's interest in finding out how much time the teacher and students spent conversing during the teaching and learning process.

METHODS

The current study used a descriptive qualitative method. Hurt & McLaughlin (2012) define qualitative research as a strategy that uses techniques to provide a thorough and contextual depiction of educational or social phenomena. To study classroom interactions, the researchers used the Flanders Interaction Analysis Category (FIAC), a methodology created in 1970.

The study was carried out in SMA 1 Monta, a senior high school in Bima, West Nusa Tenggara Province, Indonesia, which included an English teacher and 28 students (18 females and 10 males). Although the population of students in this school consist of 367 students, but the researcher only taken one class as the sample of the study. This study focuses on talks between the teacher and the students during teaching and learning in EFL classroom. This study uses classroom observations to find actual phenomena that occur in the context of learning. According to Chuntala (2019) the act of witnessing can be conducted via a variety of modalities, including visual, aural, perceptual, and sensory. The last, video and audio recording devices were used to capture the classroom atmosphere precisely.

The findings of the observations and video transcript were evaluated using the Flanders Interaction Analysis Category (FIAC) to determine the type of interaction that occurred in the classroom, and the percentages were calculated. Finally, the audio transcript of the interview was evaluated and labeled to support the findings derived from the observation. After collecting the data, it was analyzed through some procedures. In this case, the researcher conducted data analysis by following three steps adopted from Flanders (1970), namely: 1) the researcher transcribed the interaction among the teacher and students in the recorder video and put code on the particular the teacher and students talk in order to get expected data, 2) The researcher put the plotting of the coded data into matrix of Flanders interaction analysis, 3) the researcher Analyzed Teacher Talk, Student Talk, Silence.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

RESULTS

After analyzing the data, it can be presented the result of this research into of classroom interaction analysis. Have look in the following table:

Table 1. The Result of Classroom Interaction Analysis in the First Meeting

Categories	Categories	Amount	Percentage	Total of Percentage
Teacher Talk (Indirect Influence)	Accepts Feeling	6	2.49	29.46
	Praises or encourages	14	5.81	
	Accepts or uses ideas of students	15	6.22	
	Ask questions	36	14.94	
Teacher Talk (Direct Influence)	Lecturing	23	9.54	19.49
	Giving directions	17	7.05	
	Criticizing or justifying authority	7	2.90	
Student Talk	Students talk response	43	17.8	45.6

	Students talk initiation	67	27.80	
Silence	Silence or confusion	13	5.39	5.39
Total		**241**		**100%**

Table 1 shows that in Teacher talk in indirect influence (category 1-4) the teacher spent most in Ask question, with 14.94%. These number represented that the process of question-answer between students and teacher was many enough although it only focused on short answer and 'yes/no question'. Besides that, Teacher talked which indicates direct influence (category 5-7), he spent more time to give lecture 9.54%. The aspect of Giving direction was in the third place with the percentage 7.05%. Accepts or uses idea and Praise or encouragement was in the fourth and fifth place with the percentage 6.22% and 5.81%. The two lowest tallies in Teacher talk category was Accepts feeling and Justifying authority with the percentage 2.90% and 2.49%. In Student talk category (8-9) the percentage of Student talk initiate and Student talk response dominated classroom with each total was 27.80% and 17.8%. The Initiation aspect is the talk that is initiated by the students themselves. The last category (10), Silence or confusion with the percentage 5.39%.

Table 2. The Result of Classroom Interaction Analysis in the Second Meeting

Categories	Categories	Amount	Percentage	Total of Percentage
Teacher Talk (Indirect Influence)	Accepts Feeling	4	1.5	27.7
	Praises or encourages	10	3.9	
	Accepts or uses ideas of students	12	4.7	
	Ask questions	45	17.6	
Teacher Talk (Direct Influence)	Lecturing	17	6.7	13.37
	Giving directions	14	5.5	
	Criticizing or justifying authority	3	1.17	
Student Talk	Students talk response	55	21.6	53
	Students talk initiation	80	31.4	
Silence	Silence or confusion	15	5.9	5.9
Total		**255**		**100%**

Table 2 shows that in Teacher talk in indirect influence (category 1-4) the teacher spent most in Ask question, with 17.6%. These number represented that the process of question-answer between students and teacher was many enough although it only focused on short answer and 'yes/no question'. Besides that, Teacher talk which indicates direct influence (category 5-7), he spent more time to give lecture 6.7%. The aspect of Giving direction was in the third place with the percentage 5.5%. Accepts or uses idea and Praise or encouragement was in the fourth and fifth place with the percentage 4.7% and 3.9%. The two lowest tallies in Teacher talk category was Accepts feeling and Justifying authority with the percentage 1.5% and 1.17%. In Student talk category (8-9) the percentage of Student talk initiate and Student talk response dominated classroom with each total was 31.4% and 21.6%. The Initiation aspect is the talk that is initiated by the students themselves. The last category (10), Silence or confusion with the percentage 5.9%.

Table 3. The Result of Classroom Interaction Analysis in the Third Meeting

Categories	Categories	Amount	Percentage	Total of Percentage
Teacher Talk (Indirect Influence)	Accepts Feeling	2	0.83	29.16
	Praises or encourages	15	6.25	
	Accepts or uses ideas of students	18	7.50	
	Ask questions	35	14.58	
Teacher Talk (Direct Influence)	Lecturing	15	6.25	11.25
	Giving directions	10	4.17	
	Criticizing or justifying authority	2	0.83	
Student Talk	Students talk response	43	17.92	53.33
	Students talk initiation	85	35.42	
Silence	Silence or confusion	15	6.25	6.25
Total		**182**		**100%**

Table 2 shows that in Teacher talk in indirect influence (category 1-4) the teacher spent most in Ask question, with 14.58%. These number represented that the process of question-answer between students and teacher was many enough although it only focused on short answer and 'yes/no question'. Besides that, Teacher talked which indicates direct influence (category 5-7), he spent more time to give lecture 6.25%. in this third meeting, teacher accepts or uses ideas of students more dominant than before, with 7.50%. The aspect of Giving direction was in the fourth place

with the percentage 4.17%. Praise or encouragement was the percentage 6.25%. The two lowest tallies in Teacher talk category was Accepts feeling and Justifying authority with the percentage 0.8%. In Student talk category (8-9) the percentage of Student talk initiate and Student talk response dominated classroom with each total was 35.42% and 17.92%. The Initiation aspect is the talk that is initiated by the students themselves. The last category (10), Silence or confusion with the percentage 6.25%.

Table 4. Summary of Teachers Talk and Students Talk

No	Meeting	Teacher Talk		Students Talk		Silence	
		Quantity	%	Quantity	%	Quantity	%
1	First	118	48.96	110	45.6	13	5.39
2	Second	105	41.07	135	53	15	5.9
3	Third	97	40.42	128	53.33	15	6.25

Based on the summary of table 4 above, it can be found that the percentage of teacher talk in the first meeting is more than the percentage in the second and third meeting both in direct and indirect influence. It is the different to the students talk time where they perform more talking time or more speaking interaction in the third meeting compare to the first and second meeting. It is 53.33%, 53%, and 45.6%. It showed that students are more active when did the Discussion Task in the third meeting.

DISCUSSION

This study was set out to figure out the percentage of teacher talk and student talk during the classroom interaction in the teaching and learning process by using Flanders Interaction Analysis Category System (FIACS) framework. The data was collected through observation in teaching and learning process inside the classroom which used two instrument of data collection, namely video and audio recording. The research was conducted three meetings in EFL classroom at first grade students of senior high school which is located in SMA 1 Monta. The data gathered from the observation was analyzed through 1) the researcher transcribed the interaction among the teacher and students in the recorder video and put code on the particular the teacher and students talk in order to get expected data, 2) The researcher put the plotting of the coded data into matrix of Flanders interaction analysis, 3) the researcher Analyzed Teacher Talk, Student Talk, Silence.

The data also outlined that the increasing participation for students in the third meeting with the percentage 53.33%. it means that the classroom interaction was dominated by the students which the presentation more than 50%. In the third meeting of this research shows that Students talk initiation is higher performed with the percentage 35.42% than students talk response with the percentage 17.92%. On the other hand, the teacher speaking interaction in EFL classroom is dominantly happen in first meeting with the total percentage 48.96%. The remain two categories of FIACS, teacher talk direct and indirect influence were increase first meeting, with the percentage respectively 29.46% and 19.49%. and decrease in the third meeting, with the percentage 29.16% and 11.25%. Therefore, based on the teacher and students talk percentage, the classroom verbal behavior was fulfilled by most of students talk in every meeting. However, two-side communication was also built in the first meeting. While the second and last meeting teacher tend to give time to students to speak in EFL classroom.

Further analysis of the first meeting shows that in indirect teacher talk category, the teacher spent most in asking question with 14.94%. The second position was accepting or uses ideas of students, with the percentage 6.22%, the praise or encourages was 5.81%, and the last position was accepting feelings, with the percentage 2.49%. For direct teacher talk category, the aspect lecturing was in the first position spent by the teacher, with the percentage 9.54%. It was understandable since the teacher has to deliver perfect material explanation so that the students have better understanding about the material. According to the data for the first meeting, the aspect of asking question was in the first place, with the percentage more than 14.94%. it indicated by the data from video recorder questions were asked by the teacher was aimed intentionally asked and expected students to answer the question. The inanition aspect in student talk category was the highest percentage. It was 27.80% by the percentage. The initiation aspect is the talk that is initiated by the students themselves in response to the statement made by the teacher. It can be unpredictable statement.

The increasing number of indirect teacher talk category was in the second meeting and third meeting. For example, it happens when teacher asking question, with percentage up to 17.6%. It is the same as the aspect of accepts or uses ideas of students which increased in the third meeting, with the percentage 7.50% compared to the first and second meeting only 6.22% and 4.7%. in addition, the praises or encourages also increased in the third meeting with 6.25% compared to the first and second meeting was only 5.81% and 3.9%. Meanwhile, the other aspects of indirect teacher talk category namely Accepts Feeling were decreased in the second and third meeting, with the percentage from 2.49% decreased to 1.5% and 0.83%. the decrease percentage always happen to the direct teacher talk categories from the second and third meeting. First, the aspect of giving lecture, in the first meeting was 9.54%, then decrease to the second and third meeting with the percentage 6.7% and 6.25%. this also happen to the other aspects of direct teacher speech categories, namely giving directions and criticizing or justifying authority.

On the other hand, further analysis to the students talk time which always increase from time to time particularly in the aspect of students talk initiation. In the first meeting, students talk initiation was in 27.80%, then increased in the second and third meeting with the percentage 31.4% and 35.42%. It also happens to the students talk response which

increased in the second meeting with the number of percentages is 21.6%. Meanwhile, the situation of silence or confusion was also increased in the second and third meeting with the percentage 6.25%. Therefore, this research can be taken a conclusion that the percentage of students talk in the second meeting and third meeting was more than 50% than the teacher talk categories.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of classroom observation which verified by the video recording and audio recording, it was obtained that in the first meeting, 45.6% of verbal behavior done inside the classroom was student talk. Then, 48.96%% was spent by teacher talk verbal behavior, both direct and indirect talk. In the second meeting, 53% of verbal behavior done inside the classroom was student talk, while the English teacher talk only 41.07% both direct and indirect talk. In the third meeting, students talk was increased with the percentage 53.33%, while the teacher only 40.42%. Therefore, the average of students talk during the three meetings was 50.64%, while the average of teacher talk during the three meetings was 43.48%. The average of silence or confusion was 5.84%. therefore, it can be concluded that the percentage of students talk is more dominant than the percentage of teacher talk during the classroom interaction.

REFERENCES

Ari Ayunda, Endang Komariah, and D. A. (2021). An Investigation of EFL Classroom Interaction by Using Flanders Interaction Analysis Category System (FIACS). *Research in English and Education*, *23*(4), 1–16.

Chuntala, A. D. W. (2019). Scientific approach in 21st century learning in Indonesian language learning vocational school of pharmacy. *International Journal of Active Learning*, *4*(2), 71–77. http://journal.unnes.ac.id/nju/index.php/ijal

Derin, T., Susilo Putri, N., Nursafira, M. S., & Hamuddin, B. (2020). Discourse Analysis (DA) in the Context of English as a Foreign Language (EFL): A Chronological Review. *Elsya : Journal of English Language Studies*, *2*(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.31849/elsya.v2i1.3611

Flanders, N. (1970). Analysis teaching behavior. MA: Addison-Wesley

Hurt, R. L., & McLaughlin, E. J. (2012). An Applied Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods in Academic Advising. *NACADA Journal*, *32*(1), 63–71. https://doi.org/10.12930/0271-9517-32.1.63

Lestari, E., Yufrizal, H., & Prakoso, G. H. (2022). An analysis of classroom interaction in speaking class. *U-Jet: Unila Journal of English Language Teaching*, *11*(3). https://doi.org/10.23960/ujet.v11i3.202201

Mouhanna, M. (2009). Re-examining the role of L1 in the EFL classroom. *UGRU Journal*, *8*(1), 1–19.

Novianti, D., Hijrah, & 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. https://doi.org/10.56983/eltm.v3i1.222

Pratiwi, A., & Fithriani, R. (2023). an Investigation of Teacher-Student Verbal Interaction in an Indonesian El Classroom: a Flanders Interaction Analysis Category (Fiac) System. *Journal of Language*, *5*(1), 45–54. https://doi.org/10.30743/jol.v5i1.6969

Radford, L. (2011). Book Review: Classroom Interaction: Why is it Good, Really? Baruch Schwarz, Tommy Dreyfus and Rina Hershkowitz (Eds.) (2009) Transformation of knowledge through classroom interaction. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, *76*(1), 101–115. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10649-010-9271-4

Sharma, M., & Tiwari, P. N. (2021). A Study of Class Interaction Analysis Using Flanders's FIAC. *International Journal of Scientific Research in Science, Engineering and Technology*, *4099*, 171–179. https://doi.org/10.32628/ijsrset218432

Supriadin. (2022). The Students and Teachers' Perspectives on Using Bima Language in Teaching English. *JIIP - Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Pendidikan*, *5*(4), 1009–1017. https://doi.org/10.54371/jiip.v4i5.527