

## ENGLISH EDUCATION TEACHING PRACTICE PROGRAM: CLASSROOM INTERACTION AND CLASSROOM LANGUAGE ANALYSIS

**Nuroida Ainun Azizah<sup>1</sup>**  
Universitas Negeri Semarang

**Christianti Tri Hapsari<sup>2</sup>**  
Universitas Negeri Semarang

[nuroidaainunazizah@students.unnes.ac.id](mailto:nuroidaainunazizah@students.unnes.ac.id)<sup>1</sup>

*Submit*, 29-01-2026

*Accepted*, 10-04-2026

*Publish*, 13-04-2026

### ABSTRACT

This paper aimed to fill this gap by analyzing the forms of interaction during classroom learning among English Education students while they were conducting teaching practice in junior high schools for a period of two months. The researchers used a quantitative descriptive approach to analyze seven teaching videos ranging from fifty minutes to one hour in length using Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC, 1970) and Salaberri's (1995) eight classroom language categories. Data were coded using Microsoft Excel and were analyzed using SPSS to find the frequency, mean, and proportion of occurrence. The key findings show that interactions were dominated by teacher-dominated or direct influence, with an average of (68.83%, SD=13.61) and indirect influence, with an average of (31.17%), with only one video focusing on student-centred interaction (I/D ratio=1.11%). Between Salaberri's (1995) categories, the spontaneous situation category was dominant (48.78%), followed by social interaction (18.36%) and basic instruction (13.09%), whereas error handling was not found at all or was non-existent (0%). These findings indicate that prospective teachers are overly reliant on direct instructional use of language, which limits opportunities for communication. The conclusions of this study can be used to inform teacher training programs to improve indirect influence strategies and error correction skills for a more effective EFL classroom interaction.

*Keywords: Classroom Language, Classroom Interaction, EFL Indonesia, Teaching Practice, Preservice Teachers*

### INTRODUCTION

The language used in the classroom plays a significant role in the learning process. A proper manner to communicate with others in the classroom can help teachers and students communicate with each other better. According to Kurniatillah & Hidayat (2022), classroom engagement is critical to the success of both the teaching and learning processes. The use of classroom language by the teacher is very important so that students get used to using English expressions in interactions (Sumarni & Firman, 2023). Classroom language helps with speaking

exercises, according to Rao (2019), speaking is the most important skill among all four language skills to communicate well in this global world. However, empirical evidence linking classroom language to students' speech development remains limited.

Interaction between teachers and students in the classroom will be dynamic, especially in the learning process, which will harmonize the interactions created by both parties and be more effective. The use of interaction in the classroom will encourage students to learn a new language and facilitate their learning process (da Luz, 2015; Riwayatiningsih, 2024). This also highlights the important role of teachers as language learning facilitators who need to have good communication skills during the learning process. It is to give students exposure to a language so that teachers can use the English methodically to help their students perceive it. Teachers need to motivate students to learn English by improving their teaching techniques as well as their speaking competence in class (Yuyun, 2013). Classroom interaction using a foreign language in learning will help students gain a broad understanding of the foreign language itself, such as students acquiring new vocabulary when teachers explain learning materials or outside the context of learning materials. On the other hand, teachers can employ a variety of classroom language, such as interactive learning materials, games, and songs. Incorporating games and interactive activities into lessons has been shown to increase student engagement and reduce anxiety associated with speaking (Laila et al., 2023)

Less thought is given to classroom language usage in some schools, which makes instruction seem uninteresting and unstructured. Teaching English as a Foreign language to EFL students presents additional difficulties for language teachers, particularly concerning the speaking proficiency of the students. Due to the fact that classroom interactions and communication can demonstrate an active learning environment, students learn how to apply these interactions in group discussion activities and build relationships with teachers and friends in English as a second language.

Language is a linguistic instrument and way of communication used by instructors to manage learning, deliver instructions, ask questions, provide feedback, explain, make transitions, offer encouragement, and facilitate communication (Riwayatiningsih, 2024). The context of English as a foreign language in non-English-speaking countries like Indonesia is crucial for crossing the divide between classroom education and real communication. Language acts as the primary medium of classroom communication and significantly influences the learning process. In English as a Foreign Language (EFL) settings, the use of classroom language by teachers not only facilitates instruction but also shapes students' motivation and confidence to speak. In EFL settings like Indonesia, classroom language bridges formal instruction and real-world communication, shaping students' motivation and confidence to speak (Mustamir, 2024; Sumarni & Firman, 2023).

Although several studies have explored language use in classrooms, there remains a limited focus on English major students who have undergone teaching practice in Indonesia as a framework and part of the teacher education curriculum,

integrating teaching practice with real-world school environments to prepare prospective teachers comprehensively. Despite the existence of general studies, there is minimal quantitative analysis of student teaching practice in Indonesian junior high schools. The main focus of research is the use of classroom language and classroom interaction used by English students in teaching practice programs. This gap highlighted the need to explore how these preservice teachers were using classroom language during their actual teaching practice.

Teaching practice is an important program for education students to apply their academic knowledge and practical teaching skills (Sulistiyo et al., 2017). Direct teaching experience in schools can help prospective teachers develop more effective teaching skills, such as competencies, pedagogical and increase their professionalism in facing challenges in the classroom (Ariawan et al., 2016; Hasanah et al., 2022). Many studies explore their perspectives and experiences through classroom observation. This gap highlights the need to investigate how these students apply and use classroom language in the actual teaching context.

In light of this information gap, this paper will focus on identifying the types of language used by students in the teacher practice program in the English language education program during their two-month teaching practicum in junior high school. The focus of this study is to examine how teachers use classroom language in classroom learning and interaction in junior high school. This study analyzes classroom language by English Education preservice teachers during two months practicum in junior high schools, using: 1) How is the proportion of communication generated through direct and indirect influence used during learning? 2) What kinds of classroom language are used by preservice English teachers according to Salaberri (1995) categorize during teaching practice? And, 3) From the 8 categories, which are the most dominant and which are the least dominant?

This includes the teacher managing the class, encouragement, instruction, and how the student teacher explains material to the real class situation. Subsequent sections cover literature review, methodology, findings, and conclusions of research relevant to teaching English as a Foreign Language (EFL).

## **LITERATUR REVIEW**

Classroom language is a form of expression used by teachers with students during the learning process. EFL as a classroom language helps students become accustomed to communicating in English, thereby encouraging motivation to learn the language. Teachers also need to provide good input (Lestari et al., 2023). Through assistance or scaffolding, interactions between teachers and students in a classroom setting generate learning opportunities. Walsh (2006) emphasizes that teachers' use of language structure, scaffolding, and meaningful feedback has a direct impact on students' oral communication skills. Richards (2006) defines Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) as an approach that prioritizes communicative competence over grammatical accuracy. Changes in interaction, such as paraphrasing, repetition, and simplification of complex ideas, can help students understand and produce language well. Constructivism is a psychological

theory proposed by Piaget. This theory explains how people acquire knowledge and learn (Olusegun, 2015). Therefore, the theory has a relationship to the field of education. This theory states that humans construct knowledge and meaning from their experiences.

Several studies have highlighted the importance of classroom language in developing students' speaking skills. The classification of classroom language has also been studied by several experts. According to Swanson (1971), through Flanders' Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC) theory, there are 10 categories divided into two parts, namely indirect influence and direct influence. This theory is based on Flanders (1970). Brown (2007) identifies six types of classroom speaking performance, such as imitative, intensive, responsive, interactive, serial, and extensive, that highlight diverse oral production tasks in language classrooms. According to Walsh (2011), language that can be focused on by teachers through learning has several contexts, namely managerial, material, skills & systems, and classroom context.

Therefore, this study will adopt Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC, 1970) by dividing teacher talk into direct influence and indirect influence to analyze the interactions provided by students during teaching practice. This study also focuses on Salaberri's (1995) categorization through his book that title *Classroom Language: The Handbooks for the English Classroom*, which holds eight categories: basic instructions, spontaneous situations, social interaction, pair/group work, question types, audio-video aids, error handling and evaluation.

Considering the teaching practice program for English education majors demands functional skills to manage language interaction in the classroom during teaching practice at partner schools, this classification is particularly relevant to this study. According to Mustamir (2024), the categories of instruction are related to classroom management, while evaluation plays a crucial role in boosting the speaking confidence of students in Indonesia who experience speaking anxiety.

Although the classification presented is clear, its application to prospective EFL teachers in Indonesia is still minimal, especially in the context of teaching practice students. Therefore, this study can fill this gap by measuring the proposition and categorization of classroom language use by English study program students in the program during teaching practice in the classroom.

## **METHOD**

This research uses a quantitative approach. According to Ghanad (2023) quantitative research describes the specific qualities and rather important differences to generate conclusions in research. Quantitative describes a characteristic by collecting data from a sample using standardized instruments to provide summaries (frequencies, averages, and percentages) of attitudes, behaviours, or conditions.

The point is to analyze how classroom language use affects teachers practices student ability in junior high school. The purpose of this study is to analyse language methods or strategies that teachers use in classroom interactions. The data was collected using quantitative descriptive methods. RQ 1 was answered using Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories based on Swanson

(1971) theory to measure the proportion of communication generated through two categories, namely direct and indirect influence, from 7 learning videos. Then RQ 2 and 3 were answered through eight categories of classroom language based on Salaberri (1995), which had been modified to determine the emergence and dominant categories.

The data was obtained through instructional videos created by students majoring in English who had conducted teaching practice with EFL students in several schools. The researchers analyzed 7 videos of English Education students teaching at the junior high school and high school levels or equivalent. The videos analyzed were approximately 15 minutes to 1 hour in length, with each video analyzed individually.

Using the theory from Flanders' Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC, 1970). Quantitative descriptive analysis, when applied in research methodology, assists in the systematic description and analysis of numerical data without making generalizations. This interpretation makes it easier for readers to provide orderly and systematic explanations.

Microsoft Excel was needed to compile the occurrences in the frequency table (Adri et al., 2024). This also made it easier for researchers to systematically distribute the classroom language explanation categories according to the collected data. As an explanation of the analyzed data, the proof of RQ1 to RQ3 uses SPSS to calculate accurate results that have been analyzed through 7 learning videos.

## FINDING

***RQ1 How is the proportion of communication generated through direct and indirect influence used during learning?***

As for answering RQ1, the researcher will focus on seven categories of teacher talks in accordance with Flanders' Categories of Interaction. The following are seven categories of classroom interaction, divided into two categories of teacher talks:

**Table 1. Flander's Categories for Interaction**

Teacher Talks	
Indirect Influence	Direct Influence
1. Accepts Feeling	5. Lecturing
2. Praises or encourages	6. Giving Directions
3. Accepts or uses ideas of students	7. Criticizing or Justifying Authority
4. Asks Question	

This study will focus on teacher talks that occur during classroom learning. To calculate the proportion of interactions by analyzing seven learning videos step by step, the researcher analyzed the learning videos using Flanders' Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC, 1970), consisting of the seven categories

listed above. Then, the researchers began analyzing the data using Microsoft Excel tables for raw coding and filled in the video codes, sentences, indirect/direct codes, and category codes.

**Table 2. Raw Data Distribution on Microsoft Excel**

Video	Indirect	Direct	Total	% Indirect	% Direct	Ratio I/D	Interpretation
V1	5	25	30	16.67%	83.33%	<b>0.20</b>	Teacher-Dominated
V2	10	9	19	52.63%	47.37%	<b>1.11</b>	Student-Centered
V3	24	77	101	23.76%	76.24%	<b>0.31</b>	Teacher-Dominated
V4	1	6	7	14.29%	85.71%	<b>0.17</b>	Teacher-Dominated
V5	6	10	16	37.50%	62.50%	<b>0.60</b>	Teacher-Dominated
V6	11	19	30	36.67%	63.33%	<b>0.58</b>	Teacher-Dominated
V7	11	19	30	36.67%	63.33%	<b>0.58</b>	Teacher-Dominated

Then, the data was entered into the frequency analysis data review in SPSS by including the mean, standard deviation, minimum, maximum, and range to determine the proportion that matched the analyzed data.

**Table 3. Description Statistic on Proportion and Communication Ratio (N=7)**

Statistik	Indirect	Direct	Ratio
Mean	<b>31.17%</b>	<b>68.83%</b>	<b>0.51</b>
Std. Deviation	13.61%	13.61%	0.32
Minimum	14.29%	47.37%	0.17
Maximum	52.63%	85.71%	1.11
Range	38.34%	38.34%	0.94

Through descriptive statistical analysis of SPSS results from seven instructional videos, it was found that patterns have a direct influence that dominates the percentage of communication generated by teachers. Meanwhile, indirect influence communication had an average of only 31.17% (SD=13.61), while direct influence communication had an average of 68.83% (SD=13.61). The proportion of interactions dominated by teachers was shown in the average indirect or direct ratio of 0.51 (SD=0.32). The highest direct ratio was 0.17 in the V4 (video 4) analysis, while the only video that showed a student-centred pattern had a ratio of 1.11, namely V2 (video 2).

**RQ2** *What kinds of classroom language are used by preservice English teachers according to Salaberri (1995) categorize during teaching practice?*

To determine the use of classroom language by English teachers in this program, the researcher used video transcripts of lessons to analyze the eight categories identified by Salaberri (1995) in seven video lessons. Using the video

transcripts, the researcher then distributed the data through Microsoft Excel to calculate the total number of occurrences in the learning video analysis, then computed the mean using the SPSS application to obtain accurate results.

**Table 4. Calculations using SPSS**

Category	N	Minimum (%)	Maximum (%)	Mean (%)	Std. Deviation
Basic Instruction	7	0.00	32.00	13.09	11.830
Spontaneous Situations	7	32.00	76.00	48.78	16.324
Social Interaction	7	3.00	31.00	18.36	9.721
Pair/Group Work	7	0.00	10.00	2.09	3.821
Question Types	7	6.00	14.00	9.46	3.328
Audio Visual Aids	7	0.00	3.00	0.94	1.601
Dealing with Error	7	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.000
Evaluation	7	0.00	21.00	7.28	7.856

Based on descriptive analysis of the data calculated from seven instructional videos, it was found that prospective teachers used the eight categories of classroom language identified by Salaberri (1995) during their teaching practice. However, there were variations in the frequency of occurrence and duration in each video analysis.

The results in Table 2.1 show several important patterns in the use of classroom language in the video analysis. The eight categories identified in the instructional video analysis confirm that prospective English teachers utilize all eight categories of classroom language functions. However, the distribution levels vary across categories, with some categories dominating the classroom while others are less prevalent.

The spontaneous situation in the table shows the highest average of 48.78%, which indicates that this is not only one of the most frequently appearing categories but also the most varied. Examples of sentences used by preservice teachers in the learning videos include “*the next is orientation,*” “*the lion was angry,*” “*it is a difficult work,*” “*purpose is to entertain the reader,*” “*okay, that’s all for today,*” and so on. Basic instructions show significant inconsistency, with an average of 13.09% and some interactions reaching 32%, such as “*please pay attention,*” “*use English please,*” “*we will move to the next picture,*” “*let’s sing together,*” “*now repeat after me,*” and others. Then there is the emergence

of a category currently owned by the ‘asks question’ category, which shows relatively stable usage, namely an average of (9.46% and SD=3.328) between sessions. Then there is evaluation, whose emergence is inconsistent (average 7.28%, ranging from 0-21%), which identifies the variability of prospective teachers in providing feedback and assessing student learning.

Meanwhile, the other categories show no interactions at all (0%). The social interaction category has an average occurrence of 18.36% and a range of 3-31%, which means it has a moderate but relatively consistent occurrence. Examples of sentences that are often used are “*Good morning/afternoon, everyone,*” and “*How are you today?*” “*Before we start our lesson today, let's pray together*” “*Thank you, everyone*” “*See you next time*”.

The use of specific categories, such as pair group work, was very low, with an average result of 2.09% and only a few sessions (0-10%). Audio-visual aids were rarely used, with an average of 0.94% and maximum usage in the analysis reaching only 3% in one session. The most striking finding is in the error handling category, which recorded 0% of the seven analyses, indicating that error handling is completely absent in the video analysis.

***RQ3 From the 8 categories, which are the most dominant and which are the least dominant?***

Furthermore, to determine the most dominant and least dominant categories according to Salaberri (1995) through the eight categories in the analysis of the learning videos of prospective English teachers, the researcher distributed the category analysis in the table below for clarity.

**Table 5. Most dominant and non-dominant categories**

Category	Mean (%)	Std. Deviation	Range (Min-Max)	Dominance Level
Spontaneous Situations	48.78	16.324	32.00-76.00	<b>Most Dominant</b>
Social Interaction	18.36	9.721	3.00-31.00	High
Basic Instruction	13.09	11.830	0.00-32.00	Medium-High
Question Types	9.46	3.328	6.00-14.00	Medium
Evaluation	7.28	7.856	0.00-21.00	Medium-Low
Pair/Group Work	2.09	3.821	0.00-10.00	Low
Audio-Visual Aids	0.94	1.601	0.00-3.00	Very Low
Dealing with Error	0.00	0.000	0.00-0.00	<b>Not Observed</b>

According to the data analyzed in the table, the most dominant category of classroom language according to Salaberri (1995) is the spontaneous situation category used by prospective English teachers, with the highest average percentage of 48.78% and the largest range between 32-76%. Analysis of these findings from the seven videos shows that this category accounts for almost half of all interactions initiated by teachers in the learning process, especially in the use of improvisational language.

The second least frequent category in the analysis of the learning videos is pair/group work, which has an average of 2.09% with a range of 0-10%. followed by audio-visual aids, which showed an average result of 0.94% with a range of 0-3%. The least dominant category, or the one that showed no interaction in the learning video, was dealing with errors, which showed a percentage of 0.00% in the learning video analysis, placing it at the bottom or lowest. This indicates that there were no corrections of errors made by the teacher to the students.

## **DISCUSSION**

The findings of this study provide a specific and detailed description through quantitative data on classroom conversations among prospective English teachers as foreign language teachers in Indonesia, showing a consistent pattern of teacher-centred teaching accompanied by specific language use in the classroom. This discussion explains the findings that are related to existing theories in previous studies, highlighting both supporting evidence and differences that need to be considered through significant implications for teacher education.

### **The Persistence of Teacher-Centred Interaction**

The dominance of direct influence from teachers (average = 68.83%) over six of the seven sessions observed shows that preservice teachers had a tendency to use traditional models of instruction focused on knowledge transmission. This finding is consistent with a number of studies documenting teacher-dominated classrooms in the context of teaching English as a foreign language (EFL) in Asia, including Indonesia (Yuyun, 2013; Riwayatiningih, 2024). The high proportion of lecturing and directive language indicates that these student teachers perceive their role primarily as deliverers of information and organizers of classroom activities, rather than as facilitators of communicative interaction.

These patterns are in alignment with the concept of “managerial mode” proposed by Walsh (2011), in that teachers’ speech is primarily used to manage the learning environment and deliver content. Despite being effective for controlling the class, relying too much on this mode significantly limits students' opportunities to produce meaningful language output and engage in negotiation, which are at the heart of developing communicative competencies (Richards, 2006). The single deviation session (V2), showing a student-centred ratio, proves that a more interactive approach can be achieved within the same practical framework. This may reflect that the preservice teachers received more effective guidance, had a stronger innate orientation toward communicative teaching, or taught lesson plans specifically designed for student interaction. Unless this

highlights the potential for change and serves as a model for what should be the goal of systematic practice.

### **The Profile of Classroom Language: Explanatory Dominance and Critical Gaps**

The implementation of Salaberri's (1995) theoretical framework provides a deeper and clearer understanding of how teachers' speech is used. The most notable finding is the dominance of the spontaneous situation category (48.78%). This high percentage indicates that most of the teacher's language is intended for spontaneous explanations, narratives, and procedural connectors (e.g., “*next is orientation,*” “*okay, that's all for today*”). Although this shows a high level of fluent improvisation, it often functions as a long teacher monologue that describes or explains concepts rather than stimulating student language. This is in accordance with previous observations by Lestari et al (2023) regarding the tendency for classroom language in Indonesia to be more explanatory than interactive.

A moderate and consistent use of social interaction language (18.36%) is a positive finding, showing that preservice teachers actively build and maintain a good relationship. The exchange of routines such as greetings, prayers, and farewells is essential for creating a safe and predictable classroom atmosphere, which Laila et al (2023) identified as a key strategy for minimizing student anxiety, a considerable obstacle in the context of Indonesian EFL (Mustamir, 2024).

However, the study exposes two critical and interrelated deficits:

#### **1. The Near-Absence of Collaborative Language**

The very low frequency of language use in group work (2.09%) is perhaps the most direct linguistic evidence of teacher-centered dynamics. The language necessary to organize, monitor, and evaluate collaborative tasks was almost never observed. This indicates a significant deviation from the principles of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and cooperative learning, which are widely adopted in teacher education curriculums (Brown, 2007; da Luz, 2015). The presence of this kind shows that preservice teachers may lack the practical skills to manage group work, may fear losing control of the classroom, or underestimate peer interactions as a valid space for language learning.

#### **2. The Total Omission of Error Correction**

The 0% result in error handling is a notable and significant finding. This demonstrates a total avoidance of corrective feedback throughout the observed teaching process. There are several possible reasons for this: a well-intentioned but mistaken desire to protect students' confidence and avoid causing anxiety; excessive emphasis on fluency over accuracy; or, most likely, a lack of instruction in effective and pedagogically appropriate correction techniques (e.g.,

repetition, elaboration, or metalinguistic feedback). This gap is particularly concerning because, as Walsh (2006) argues, adapted feedback is not only corrective but a fundamental source of learning and a meaningful form of interaction in itself. By avoiding all corrections, teachers miss crucial learning moments and may inadvertently crystallize errors.

### **Connecting Interaction Patterns to Language Functions**

FIAC and Salaberri's combined analyses reveal an integrated teaching approach: teacher-dominated interaction patterns are manifested through language focused on explanation (spontaneous situations), classroom control (basic instructions), and relationship development (social interaction). In contrast, language that facilitates collaboration among classmates (pair/group work) and provides learning feedback (error handling, evaluation) is significantly underrepresented.

This suggests that preservice teachers prioritize classroom management and content delivery over communicative language teaching principles. They rely on a safe discursive repertoire that maintains their authority and lesson flow, but they fail to create adequate opportunities for student language production, interaction, or corrective feedback essential elements for developing communicative competence in learners of English as a foreign language (EFL).

### **Implications for Teacher Education and Future Research**

The findings of this study highlight specific and actionable areas in English as a foreign language (EFL) teacher education programs, particularly in the Indonesian context. Firstly, the practice element should go further than general teaching evaluations and include targeted training in micro-skills. This would involve structured practice in classroom language that facilitates collaboration among learners (e.g., directing and monitoring group/pair work) and providing constructivist and formative feedback (error correction). Supervising teachers and mentors should demonstrate and guide these strategies explicitly.

Second, the research methodology may itself be converted into a pedagogical tool. Preservice teachers can be trained to conduct self-reflective video analysis of their own teaching using an analytical framework such as FIAC and Salaberri's categories. In addition to encouraging an intentional modification towards more student-centred discourse, this activity will also encourage metacognitive awareness of interaction patterns.

Third, there is an urgent need to improve curricular direction and alignment between partner schools and teacher education institutions. The university courses that promote communicative language teaching (CLT) should be strengthened consistently during field practice in schools. Teacher partners in schools should be involved as co-mentors who explicitly embrace and exemplify interactive teaching approaches.

For future research, a mixed-methods approach is recommended to further investigate the causes of the observed teacher domination patterns, for example, through interviews or stimulated recall sessions with prospective teachers. Studies can also assess the efficacy of training programs intended to improve language

use and classroom interaction. Research of this kind will offer further empirical evidence in support of enhanced teacher preparation programs.

In conclusion, this study highlights specific educational and instructional program enhancements in addition to identifying teacher-centered speech patterns. Future EFL teacher educators can better educate EFL instructors to establish an engaging, communicative, and responsive learning environment by focusing on certain language functions, promoting reflection, and providing curriculum standardization.

## CONCLUSION

Based on this analysis, it was found that prospective English teachers in teaching practice at junior high schools tend to use direct influence during learning with an average of 68.83% with  $SD=13.61$ , which proves that the use of indirect influence tends to be less, with an average of 31.17% in classroom interactions during learning. Therefore, based on classroom interaction analysis according to Flanders' Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC), this shows a teacher-dominated classroom pattern, with only 1 of the 7 videos showing a student-centred pattern. Furthermore, the category analysis based on Salaberri (1995) shows that the spontaneous situation category had the highest result for the most dominant category in classroom language, namely 48.78%, followed by social interaction at 18.36% and basic instruction at 13.09%, while the non-dominant category dealing with error, which was not detected at all, namely 0%.

Through this teaching practice program, preservice teachers, especially English teachers, need to emphasize indirect influence strategies such as asking questions, praising, and error handling techniques to minimize teacher domination. In this way, student-dominant and teacher-dominant approaches will be aligned and balanced in the learning process going forward. Furthermore, the low EFL practice in pair/group work, which is only 2.09%, indicates a lack of collaborative strategies used by teachers for students in this teaching practice.

The goal of this study is to fill the quantitative gap in the analysis of classroom language and classroom interaction by student teachers of English in Indonesia, by providing a basis for improving the quality of student teachers of English in the education curriculum. Due to the limitations of this study, such as focusing on junior high schools, generalizations to high schools or public/private schools are limited. Therefore, future research can analyze the proportion of students during the learning process and assess the learning outcomes of students from various classroom language patterns.

## REFERENCES

- Adri, D., Sari, E. R., & Wotu, A. H. J. (2024). Penggunaan Microsoft Excel dalam Penyusunan Data dalam Tabel Distribusi Frekuensi. *Education and Learning Journal*, 5(2), 94–111. <http://dx.doi.org/10.33096/eljour.v5i2.1052http://jurnal.fai@umi.ac.id>
- Ariawan, I. P. W., Sanjaya, D. B., & Divayana, D. G. H. (2016). An evaluation of the implementation of practice teaching program for prospective teachers at Ganesha University of Education based on CIPP-forward chaining.

- (IJARAI) *International Journal of Advanced Research in Artificial Intelligence*, 5(2), 1–5. [www.ijarai.thesai.org](http://www.ijarai.thesai.org)
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of Language Learning And Teaching*. Pearson Longman.
- da Luz, F. S. dos R. (2015). *The Relationship between Teachers and Students in the Classroom: Communicative Language Teaching Approach and Cooperative Learning Strategy to Improve Learning*. Bridgewater State University.
- Ghanad, A. (2023). An Overview of Quantitative Research Methods. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*, 06(08), 3794–3803. <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v6-i8-52>
- Hasanah, U., Rosmalinda, S., & Wardi, Moh. (2022). Peningkatan Kompetensi Guru Profesional melalui Program Praktik Mengajar di Perguruan Tinggi Keagamaan Islam Swasta. *Jurnal Intelektual: Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Studi Keislaman*, 12(3), 223–234. <https://doi.org/10.33367/ji.v12i3.2803>
- Kurniatillah, R. E., & Hidayat, D. N. (2022). Teacher-student interaction in English classroom setting. *Journal of Applied Studies in Language*, 6(1), 53–63. <https://ojs2.pnb.ac.id/index.php/JASL/article/view/391>
- Laila, F. N., Adityarini, H., & Maryadi, M. (2023). Challenges and Strategies in Teaching English Speaking Skills to Young Learners: Perspectives of Teachers in Indonesia. *VELES (Voices of English Language Education Society)*, 7(3), 542–556. <https://doi.org/10.29408/veles.v7i3.24030>
- Lestari, B. Y., Yusra, K., & Nuariadi. (2023). Pelatihan penggunaan bahasa kelas ( classroom language ) dalam pembelajaran bahasa inggris. *Darma Diksani: Jurnal Pengabdian Ilmu Pendidikan, Sosial, Dan Humaniora Darma Diksani: Jurnal Pengabdian Ilmu Pendidikan, Sosial, Dan Humaniora*, 3(2), 11–17. <https://journal.unram.ac.id/index.php/darmadiksani/article/view/3347>
- Mustamir. (2024). Indonesian efl learners ' speaking anxiety : insights from a meta-synthetic analysis. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 12(2), 509–518. <https://journal.uniku.ac.id/index.php/ERJEE/article/view/9950>
- Olusegun, S. (2015). Constructivism Learning Theory: A Paradigm for Teaching and Learning. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education Ver. I*, 5(6), 2320–7388. <https://doi.org/10.9790/7388-05616670>
- Rao, P. S. (2019). The Importance Of Speaking Skills In English Classrooms. *Alford Council of International English & Literature Journal (ACIELJ)*, 401(2), 6–18.
- Richards, J. C. (2006). *Communicative Language Teaching Today*. In *Cambridge University Press* (Vol. 1, Number 1).
- Riwayatiningih, R. (2024). Teachers ' Language Use in EFL Classroom Interaction : A Qualitative Study Analysis in Indonesia Settings. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies Volume*, 50(6), 133–141. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2024/v50i61400>
- Salaberri, S. (1995). *Classroom Language - Handbooks for the English Classroom*. Heinemann.

- Sulistiyo, U., Mukminin, A., Abdurrahman, K., & Haryanto, E. (2017). Learning to teach: A case study of student teachers' practicum and policy recommendations. *Qualitative Report*, 22(3), 712–731. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2017.2671>
- Sumarni, B., & Firman, E. (2023). The Use of Classroom Languages in Teaching English. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Pendidikan (JISIP)*, 7(1), 774–778. <https://doi.org/10.58258/jisip.v7i1.4659>
- Swanson, M. A. M. (1971). *Interaction analysis in foreign language teaching a rationale*. University of Texas at Austin.
- Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating Classroom Discourse* (Vol. 1). Routledge. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203015711>
- Walsh, S. (2011). Exploring Classroom Discourse Language in Action. In R. Carter & G. Cook (Eds.), *Language in Action*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203360859>
- Yuyun, Y. (2013). Teaching challenges in indonesia: motivating students and teachers' classroom language. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 3(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.17509/IJAL.V3I1.186>