



## **A Study of Classroom Interaction Viewed From Information Sources at SMK PGRI 2 Gianyar**

**Ni Kadek Citawati<sup>\*1</sup>, Pande Agus Adiwijaya<sup>2</sup>, Luh Made Dwi Wedayanthi<sup>3</sup>**

[latashaluna2013@gmail.com](mailto:latashaluna2013@gmail.com) , [agusadiwijaya@markandeyabali.ac.id](mailto:agusadiwijaya@markandeyabali.ac.id) , [wedawid06@gmail.com](mailto:wedawid06@gmail.com)

Ilmu Pendidikan, ITP Markandeya Bali, Bangli, Indonesia

### **ABSTRACT**

This study aimed to analyze the implementation of classroom interaction categories in writing classes at SMK PGRI 2 Gianyar from the perspective of information sources and to identify the constraints in applying multi-way interaction. This qualitative descriptive research involved tenth-grade students and their English teacher as participants. Data were collected through classroom observations, interviews, and field notes, focusing on the interaction patterns during teaching and learning activities. The findings revealed that 20 categories of the FLINT System were applied during three observation sessions. From the perspective of information sources, the teaching and learning process tended to be dominated by two-way interaction, with the teacher acting as the primary source of information. Several constraints were identified in promoting multi-way interaction, including limited time allocation, lack of teaching variety, and students' passive behavior during lessons. Interviews also highlighted issues such as students' minimal responses, lack of initiative during discussions, and the perception that English is difficult to learn. These findings indicate the need for strategies to create more balanced and interactive classrooms, where students can actively participate and develop better communication skills. This study is expected to provide insights for teachers in designing more engaging and effective classroom interactions to support the implementation of the Merdeka Curriculum.

**Keywords:** Classroom Interaction, FLINT System, Information Sources.

### **INTRODUCTION**

Classroom interaction plays a crucial role in supporting students' language learning, particularly in developing their communication skills; however, in many EFL classrooms, including those at SMK PGRI 2 Gianyar, teaching and learning activities remain largely teacher-centered, where teachers dominate classroom talk and students are often positioned as passive recipients of knowledge (Brown, 2001; Nunan, 1991). This condition limits students' opportunities to engage in meaningful interaction, thereby reducing the effectiveness of the learning process and hindering the development of essential language competencies.

From a theoretical perspective, effective interaction should involve a balanced exchange between teacher talk and student talk to foster a more engaging and student-centered learning environment (Flanders, 1970; Chaudron, 1988). Recent studies have emphasized the significance of interactive classrooms in language learning. For instance, Arifin (2021) demonstrated that student-centered interaction significantly improved students' participation and language proficiency, while Lestari (2022) and Putra (2023) found that multi-way interaction encouraged students to express ideas more confidently and enhanced their critical thinking skills. Despite these positive findings, existing research presents several limitations. Many studies have focused predominantly on higher education settings, leaving a substantial gap in understanding the patterns and dynamics of classroom interaction at the vocational high school level. Furthermore, most studies have not analyzed classroom interaction from the perspective of information sources, which is crucial to understanding how knowledge flows and how balanced the communication is between teachers and students during the teaching and learning process (Amatari, 2015). Addressing this research gap is essential to generate insights into how classroom interactions can be optimized to create more effective and interactive English learning environments, particularly in the context of the Merdeka Curriculum, which emphasizes student-centered learning and active participation (Kemendikbud, 2022).

Based on this background, the present study seeks to answer two key questions: (1) how classroom interaction categories are implemented in English writing classes at SMK PGRI 2 Gianyar, and (2) what constraints hinder the application of multi-way interaction in these classes. The novelty of this research lies in its focus on analyzing interaction categories using the FLINT System from the perspective of information sources in a vocational high school context, a focus that has been largely overlooked in previous studies. The findings of this study are expected to contribute to the development of more engaging, interactive, and effective teaching strategies that align with the objectives of the Merdeka Curriculum and promote a more balanced and dynamic classroom environment.

## RESEARCH METHOD

This study employed a qualitative descriptive research design to analyze the implementation of classroom interaction categories in English writing classes at SMK PGRI 2 Gianyar. The subjects of the research were one English teacher and a group of tenth-grade students enrolled in the writing class. The data were collected through three primary techniques: classroom observation, interviews, and field notes. Classroom observations were conducted to document the patterns of interaction during teaching and learning activities, with a particular focus on the implementation of the FLINT System categories and the flow of information sources. Interviews with the teacher and several students were carried out to gain deeper insights into their perceptions of classroom interaction and the challenges they faced in creating a more interactive environment. Field notes were also maintained throughout the observations to support and triangulate the data obtained. The research instruments included an observation checklist based on the FLINT System framework, interview guidelines, and field note templates, all of which were developed and validated by experts in English language education to ensure reliability and validity. The collected data were analyzed through a descriptive qualitative approach, involving data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing to identify patterns and themes that addressed the research questions. This approach allowed the researcher to provide a detailed and comprehensive description of classroom interaction phenomena and the constraints observed during the teaching and learning process.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The results of the study indicate that there are 20 categories from the FLINT System implemented during three observations in class X at SMK PGRI 2 Gianyar, where classroom interaction tends to be two-way. In the first observation, the interaction process was dominated by giving directions and answering questions, although some students still exhibited passive behavior and were less actively participating in discussions. This reflects the challenges faced in creating a more interactive learning environment, where the teacher often serves as the sole source of information, resulting in students feeling less engaged. The second observation showed an increase in student participation, with more students taking the initiative to answer questions posed by the teacher. However, there was still a tendency for students to use their native language, which hindered their practice of English. The third observation highlighted the use of teaching media such as LCD, which successfully increased student interest in the material, making interactions more dynamic and engaging. Nonetheless, student-to-student interaction during group discussions remained suboptimal, indicating the need for improvements in teaching methods.

Further analysis revealed that student involvement in class discussions was still low, likely due to several factors. One significant factor was the use of the native language, which made students feel comfortable but also impeded their practice of English. Additionally, psychological barriers existed, with some students feeling anxious or fearful of participating, possibly due to concerns about making mistakes in their responses. To address these issues, teachers need to implement more effective strategies to enhance interaction in the classroom. Strategies that could be applied include encouraging group discussions, allowing students to share opinions and experiences, thus boosting their confidence to speak. The use of more interactive teaching media, such as videos, language games, or other technologies, can also help capture student attention and make the learning process more enjoyable. Furthermore, providing positive feedback for every student participation is crucial, as this can enhance their self-esteem and motivate them to engage more actively in learning.

Overall, this study emphasizes the importance of interaction in English language learning. Despite the challenges faced, the application of appropriate strategies can improve the effectiveness of classroom interaction and ultimately enhance student learning outcomes. By creating a more interactive and supportive learning environment, it is hoped that students will be more motivated to learn English and feel more comfortable using the language in real-life situations. This will not only enrich their learning experience but also prepare them to face communication challenges in an increasingly globalized world.

## CONCLUSION

This part discusses the conclusion of the study based on the research questions, which aimed to analyze the implementation of classroom interaction categories in writing classes at SMK PGRI 2 Gianyar from the perspective of information sources, and to describe the constraints found in implementing multi-way interaction in these classes. The observations were conducted three times, revealing that twenty categories of the FLINT System were implemented during the teaching and learning process, while two categories were not observed. The categories identified were divided into ten categories of teacher talk, including deals with feelings, praise or encouragement, jokes, use of students' ideas, repeating student responses verbatim, asking questions, giving information, giving directions, criticizing student behavior, and criticizing student responses. Conversely, two categories of teacher talk were not utilized during the sessions. The categories of student talk observed included specific student responses, choral responses, open-ended or student-initiated responses, silence, silence-AV,

work-oriented confusion, non-work-oriented confusion, laughter, use of native language, and nonverbal communication. The analysis indicated that the interactions in the classroom tended to remain two-way, with the teacher still dominating the discourse. Additionally, based on the observations and interviews, several constraints were identified in implementing multi-way interaction, attributed to both the teacher and the students. Key constraints included time allocation, variety in teaching methods, and student behavior during lessons. Specifically, when the teacher posed questions, many students were unprepared to answer, leading to silence and lack of responsiveness. Furthermore, during communication, students tended to passively accept information without engaging in discussions or seeking clarification. Lastly, students' perceptions that learning English was too difficult negatively impacted their learning outcomes. To address these barriers, it is essential for the teacher to adopt strategies that promote multi-way interactions and to understand the individual categories of each student to facilitate more effective teaching.

## REFERENCES

- Agusthini, A. (2014). *An Analysis of Classroom Interaction Using Foreign Language Interaction Analysis (FLINT) System in Aura SukmaInsani Bilingual Kindergarten*. (Unpublished Thesis). Ganesha University of Education: Singaraja.
- Alonso, I. (2002). Improving text flow in ESL learner compositions. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 9(2). Retrieved from <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Alonso-ImprovingFlow>
- Barady, B. (2011). *Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories Syeste, (FIACS)*. India: Pondicherry University. Download via slideshare. Accessed on February 23 2013 at 11.am
- Bjorklund, D. F. (2005). *Children's Thinking, Cognitive Development and Individual differences*. Belmont: Thomson Learning.
- Brown, D.H. (2000). Teaching by principles: *An interactive approach to language pedagogy (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.)*. San Francisco: Longman.
- Brown, H. D (2001). *Teaching by Principle*, San Francisco: Longman.
- Brown, H. D. (2001) *Teaching principles: Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Clanchy & Ballard. (1987). *Writing Skill*. Available at <http://www.lingualink.edu> Accessed on August 1<sup>st</sup> 2017.
- Creswell, J.W. (2009). *Design Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches*, third edition, USA: Sage
- Dewi, K. (2012). *An analysis of classroom interaction in teaching learning EFL at RSBI class in SMP Negeri 1 Singaraja*. (Unpublished Thesis). Ganesha University of Education: Singaraja.
- Dewi, A. U. (2011). *A Case Study of Classroom Interaction at RSBI Class in SMP N.1 Tabanan*. (Unpublished Thesis Undiksha)
- Edward. E.S, Christine.E, Michael L. & Bentley. (2013). *Curriculum Definition*. [online] <http://www.education.com/reference/article/curriculum-definition/> (10, June 2017)
- Fraenkel, J.R. & Wallen, N.E. (1993). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. San Francisco: McGraw-Hill Inc.
- Gunawan. (2009). *Tiga Pola Komunikasi Dalam Proses Belajar Mengajar*. Retrieved July 25,

- 2017, from <http://www.blog-guru.web.id/2009/03/tiga-pola-komunikasi-dalam-proses.html>.97
- Gunawan, K.G.W. (2017). *Komunikasi Interpersonal Guru Dan Siswa Dalam Pembelajaran Teks Ulasan Di Kelas VIII 10 SMP Negeri 2 Singaraja*. (Unpublished Thesis Undiksha).
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Harlow: Pearson Education, Ltd
- Hoque, S.R. (2013). .Effect of reinforcement on teaching-learning process.*Journal of Humanities and Social Science*. 7(1), 13-16. Retrieved March 6,2017, from <http://www.iosjournals.org/ccount/click.php?id=5960>.
- Husamah & Setyaningrum, Y. (2013). *Desain Pembelajaran Berbasis Pencapaian Kompetensi*. Jakarta: Prestasi Pustaka
- Jones, S. (2010). Analysis of a Classroom Interaction. Education Article. Available at <http://www.edarticle.com/article.php?id=887> (Downloaded on 16<sup>th</sup> March 2017)
- Kayi, H. (2006). Teaching Speaking: Activities to Promote Speaking in a Second Language. *Internet TESL Journal*. Vol. 12, No. 11. USA: University of Nevada. Available at: [http://iteslj.org/articles/kayi-teaching\\_speaking.html](http://iteslj.org/articles/kayi-teaching_speaking.html) (Accessed on June 10th 2016)
- Majid, A. (2013). *Strategi Pembelajaran Bandung: Pt Remaja Rosdakarya*. Miles, M.B. & Huberman, A.M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.)*. Retrieved April 1, 2017, from [http://books.google.co.id/books?id=U4IU\\_wJ5QEC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=true](http://books.google.co.id/books?id=U4IU_wJ5QEC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=true).
- Nusehudin, (2016). *Pengembangan Pendidikan Melalui Interaksi Pembelajaran Dan Proses Komunikasi*.
- Nurmasitah, S. (2010). *Study of Classroom Interaction Characteristics In a Geography Class Conducted in English: The Case At Year Ten Of An Immersion Class In SMA N 2 Semarang*. Retrieved from [http://www.classroom\\_interaction/uploads/documents.pdf](http://www.classroom_interaction/uploads/documents.pdf) (Downloaded on 6<sup>th</sup> March 2017)
- Ozdemir, E., & Aydin, S. (2015). The Effects of Wikis on Motivation in EFL Writing. *Procedia- Social And Behavioral Sciences*, 191, 2359-2363. Available at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.04.241>. Accessed on July 25<sup>th</sup> 2017.
- Purwa, D.P.A. (2013). *An analysis of classroom interaction in the teaching-learning English in SMA Negeri 1 Seririt* (Unpublished master's thesis). Singaraja: Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha Singaraja.
- Rashidi, N., & Rafieerad, M. (2010). Analyzing Patterns of Classroom Interaction in EFL Classrooms in Iran. *The Journal of ASIA TEFL Vol. 7*. No.3, pp.93-120, Autumn 2010. Retrieved January 25, 2017 from [http://www.asiatefl.org/main/download\\_pdf.php?i=161&c=1419304107](http://www.asiatefl.org/main/download_pdf.php?i=161&c=1419304107)
- Ratminingsih, N.M. (2014). *Teaching English as a Foreign Language 1*. Singaraja: UNDIKSHA PRESS.
- Richards et al. (1992). *Dictionary of Language Teaching & Applied Linguistics*. England
- Richards, J.C. (2013). Curriculum Approaches in Language Teaching: forward, central and backward design. *RELC Journal*. DOI: 10.1177/0033688212473293.44(1).
- River, W. (1968). *Teaching Foreign Language Skill*. Chicago Press
- The Oxford Collocation Dictionary, 2009. Retrieved January 12, 2017.



- Rustandi, A & Mubarak H.A. (2017). Analysis Of Irf (Initiation-Response-Feedback) On Classroom Interaction In EFL Speaking Class. *Journal of English Education, Literature and culture*.
- Shomoossi, N. (2008). *Classroom Interaction Mediated by Gender and Ethnology: The Language Laboratory Course*. Available at: <http://www.novitasroyal.org/shomoossi.pdf>. Download on February 20 2017
- Sofyan, R.R. & Mahmud, M. (2014). *Teacher Talk in Classroom Interaction: A Study at an English Department in Indonesia*. Retrieved on July 12, 2017 from <http://ojs.unm.ac.id/index.php/ELT/article/viewFile/841/139>
- Vilimec, E. (2006). *Developing Speaking Skills*. Retrieved on December 27, 2016 <https://dk.upce.cz/bitstream/handle/10195/21610/D16159.pdf;jsessionid=783848154896252A1B0168089DBA7D87?sequence=1>
- Xiao-yan, M. (2006) *Teacher Talk and EFL in University Classroom*. Unpublished Thesis. China: Chongqing Normal University & Yangtze Normal University.
- Yousefi, A & Koosha, M. (2013). A Descriptive Study of Teacher/Learner Interactions at the MA Level of the Fields of Teaching English as a Foreign Language, General Linguistics, and Translation Studies. *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences Vol,4 (11): 3312-3323*. Retrieved June 24, 2017 from [http://www.irjabs.com/files\\_site/paperlist/r\\_1302\\_130913173558.pdf](http://www.irjabs.com/files_site/paperlist/r_1302_130913173558.pdf)