



EXPLORING STUDENT VOICES : A DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF EFL CLASSROOM INTERACTION

Putri Triana Shinta Rahma*¹, Irmayani²
¹putrishnt1608@gmail.com, ²irmayani@unisda.ac.id

*¹Universitas Islam Darul Ulum Lamongan, Lamongan, Jawa Timur, Indonesia

²Universitas Islam Darul Ulum Lamongan, Lamongan, Jawa Timur, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

In Indonesia, this study investigates how student voice is both constructed and restrained in EFL classrooms, using discourse analysis of classroom interactions in two senior high schools. The data was collected from four observed lessons, and analysed for patterns in turn-taking, speech function, and code-switching. The findings indicate, classroom talk is primarily dominated by teachers using the IRF pattern that constrains student voice. However there was improvement in student engagement and verbal output when teachers used dialogic strategies such as open-ended questions and scaffolding. Code-switching also emerged as an effective way to increase participation. These findings highlight the need to shift from teacher-centred, monolingual, and display pedagogy to more student-centred, multilingual and discourse aware approaches to teaching that promote teacher-learner participation and voice in EFL classrooms.

Keywords: Classroom Discourse, Code Switching, Discourse Analysis, EFL Classroom, Interaction Patterns

A. INTRODUCTION

It is in this context that learners engage not only with the target language, but also with the social convention and power relations embodied in all forms of communication. Student talk - qualitative and quantitative verbal contributions- significantly influences students' language development and identity. Overall, in many EFL classrooms within non-Western contexts (like Indonesia), student talk is constrained both qualitatively and quantitatively. Therefore, we need to account for the institutional and pedagogical ideologies that discourage learner expression, and for those that actively foster learner expression and ownership. In this study we define student voice more holistically than simply 'speaking in class' to encompass students' ability to: Express ideas, Negotiate meaning, Demonstrate agency, and Co-construct knowledge (Raharja and Ghozali 2020).

A classroom ecosystem that values and supports student voice affords students opportunities to express their thinking, ask questions, and genuinely work towards engaging one another. In teacher-dominated classrooms that transfer authoritative knowledge, students do not have those



opportunities, and the learning is little more than a mechanical reproduction devised by the teacher. There is an authoritative and transmission language model that characterizes the pedagogical practices of many of Indonesia's secondary EFL classrooms. The teacher acts as the knowledge provider by assembling a group of knowledge providers and drawing upon the Initiation–Response–Feedback (IRF) model, which helps to scaffold the interaction; however, these event-structures typically end up being shallow, short responses based on expressiveness in terms of correctness not critically thinking, or arguing, or debating (Cahyalaili Dalia and Rizaldy Putra 2024) (Lestari and Rohmani 2024a). In other contemporary scholarship, a significant movement towards a dialogic pedagogy draws the attention of educators by highlighting talk as a means to think with and learn from.

In the context of EFL in Indonesia, practices are seen like: Open-ended questions, Student-led formal or informal discussions, Opportunities for elaboration and critiquing. Classrooms like this make room for student talk as authentic communicative processes and student agency (Cassandra, Hamied, Bukhori Muslim, et al. 2024; Sakkir and Al Amir 2024). Barriers to implementing dialogic pedagogy, Despite policies existing to promote these practices into the classroom and curriculum such as the 2013 Curriculum and Merdeka Curriculum, classroom practices (e.g. curriculum and classroom culture) remain teacher and exam-focused. Barriers that contribute to the lack of use of student talk and dialogic pedagogy include: Large class sizes, Exam-oriented educational practices, Few examples of practice - lack of teacher professional development in interactional practices of students, Cultural histories which establish teacher as an authority on the knowledge of teaching and learning also become a dominant credible voice diminished, Language anxiety can be dominant and affect how students participate, Student stance of being passive, reactive and/or at times withdraws when prompted or expected to contribute to discussions, Limited vocabulary impacts being able to extend knowledge of language into extended contributions. This gap between policy and practice is concerning, and needs to be considered critically. Indonesian research (Tadris et al., n.d.; Safitri et al. 2023) describes students as having the potential to contribute in discussions in meaningful ways but they are rarely given the opportunity to. Rather, classroom interactions socialise students into being passive and to be reactive or passive because of: Language anxiety, fear of making mistakes, and limited vocabulary.



This all suggests that it is necessary to consider not only how much students are talking, but how they are using language, or what the purpose of their speech is. Code-Switching and Translanguaging, Code-switching is the switching back and forth between L1 and L2, and it is one of the features of multilingual classrooms. Traditionally, it is typically conceptualized as a deficit, but in newer work - especially research associated with translanguaging frameworks - it is being conceptualized as a communicative resource that is strategic and legitimate. We all recognize that students code-switch to: clarify meaning, when they do not know how to express certainty, and/or when they want to maintain an interpersonal connection. To perceive these strategies as part of classroom talk, brings us closer to a more equitable and realistic understanding of language (Renandya and Chang 2022; Zhang et al. 2024; Sakkir and Al Amir 2024)

This study employs a discourse analysis perspective utilizing actual classroom data to explore:

1. What patterns and characteristics are found in student talk?
2. What are the discourse strategies that students are utilizing?
3. How do instructional practices shape classroom talk and consequently student engagement?

Classroom Discourse and Student Talks

Student talk also has implications for the development of meaning in students. Language and social learning are interrelated. When we acquire new knowledge, it is tied in time and meaning to how we used language to communicate it to others. Even though each student will develop their own meaning of what they have heard or read, both the language development and sociality of students is to be considered when they are developing their own meaning based upon their experience with and use of language. The collaborative and social uses of language add rich layers of meaning to any communication between communicators, especially when their use of language is based in meaningful experiences. A subsequent study by (Masruroh Isnawati 2023) examined how certain aspects of teacher talk could foster increasing students to engage with their students. The authors argue that when teachers use open-ended questions, descriptive feedback and paraphrased student responses, students respond meaningfully. These supportive strategies ease the rigid sequence of



classroom discourse, such as IRF (Initiation–Response–Feedback), and allow room for students to build their speaking abilities. In her earlier work, (Irmayani and Rachmajanti 2017), discussed how supportive interaction between students and teachers can support critical thinking and self-reflection. The study demonstrated that when teachers asked probing questions of their students or allowed for room to manoeuvre a lengthy response; students were more self-assured in responding and were often more forthcoming to engage when presented with opportunities to respond in lessons.

A basic model in this area is the Initiation–Response–Feedback (IRF) model. In the IRF model of communication, the typical classroom exchange may be defined as having three parts: a teacher initiates the interaction with a question or a prompt, a student responds to the question or prompt, and the teacher gives feedback (Uswatun Hasanah, Neni Afrida Sari, and Rahmad Husein 2024) This type of pattern of interaction has been seen in Indonesian EFL classroom exchanges and persists in the instructional context (Lestari and Rohmani 2024b; Cahyalaili Dalia and Rizaldy Putra 2024) Current research in Indonesia does not indicate an alternative pattern of use: in study of teacher talk by (Irmayani and Rachmajanti 2017), for example, we see that almost all lexical input is being provided through teacher-controlled IRF interaction turn-types, thus allowing for its dominant use as an instructional turn taking sequence. They also echo that, for example with open-ended questions and descriptive feedback, the IRF turns will maintain the student contributions as either short, pre-structured or preparatory response aspects only, so limiting space for further development of students' conceptual development and processes of critical inquiry, a similar concern raised by (Raden et al., n.d.). Unless the teacher flow of interaction purposively moves toward more supporting moves.

These interactional limitations are particularly evident in teacher-centered educational contexts. Research in Indonesian secondary schools shows teacher talk has a predominance in classroom interaction, usually with limited space for students to communicate apart from elicited unelaborated pre-formulated responses (Raharja and Ghozali 2020) Teacher talk is much more than a singular aspect of teacher agency; teachers control the direction of talk and who speaks, which aspects of participants' contributions count, and for how long. This shows how teacher talk enforces asymmetrical power relations as it positions students as passive targets of negotiated meaning-making rather than active instigators of it. Similar observations were made by (Irmayani and Rachmajanti 2017), who noted that EFL classrooms in Indonesia



are often characterized by high lexical density teacher talk, which limits the students' opportunities to initiate classroom discourse surrounding a topic investigated by both students and teachers (Masruroh Isnawati 2023) also include in their study numerous observed lessons in which teacher questions remained primarily close-ended and the interaction was tightly constrained as the teacher remained an authoritative regulatory figure, disallowing students to exercise their agency and appropriate initiative in meaning-making.

Cultural norms valuing respect, hierarchy, and conformity can be powerful enactors of the cultural message behind classroom talk. In cultures with such norms, students are often not empowered to challenge teachers' authority, which puts students at risk when they articulate ideational thought publicly. This contributes to patterns of classroom discourse preferring correctness and discipline rather than communicative interaction. Research from Indonesia indicates these classroom norms of respect and hierarchy typically foster orderly classrooms, but limit opportunities for students to enact their potential communicative competence. Research also indicates that when students are genuinely to engage in intra- and inter-personal talk, the nature of that talk assisted language development, as students engage in a process of negotiation of meaning and make peer-to-peer connections, as well as a greater amount of discourse within a single turn it appears (Cassandra, Hamied, Bukhori Muslim, et al. 2024; Sakkir and Al Amir 2024). Furthermore, (Irmayani and Rachmajanti 2017) research findings demonstrate when teachers' questioned students in supportive ways and allowed time for elaboration, students were willing to commit to retelling, and were willing to be noticeably active within the learning process. Dialogic exchanges were taken up between teachers and students, which fostered fluency, critical thought and developing learner confidence towards purposeful pedagogy, within Indonesian EFL classrooms.

In light of such concerns, an expanding field of local scholarship has begun to endorse dialogic pedagogy a form of teaching that aspires to communication that is reciprocal, uncertain in outcomes, and student participatory. In dialogic classrooms in Indonesia, learners have displayed enhanced confidence and fluency particularly when learners are encouraged to ask questions, articulate their rationales, and expand on responses provided by peers (Valentika and Yulia 2020; Sita Herdanti and Saefullah 2021a). As a result of pursuing dialogic pedagogy, the teacher acts more like a facilitator of the interactional process, than as the authority in the classroom. According to Irmayani and Masruroh, when teachers used both deliberate random



questioning and summary descriptions of student work so that students had opportunity to elaborate themselves in their responses, their students were much more verbally engaged and exhibited more initiative.

Making interactional space for other types of talk with students, such as collaborative peer work, group conversations, and dialogue that is scaffolded, improves students communicative competence and critical thinking. In (Irmayani and Rachmajanti 2017) study, after immersing students in extended conversations that were scaffolded through techniques such as probing and restating, students gained confidence and had a better understanding of the content . The shift to these conversations encourages not only student autonomy, but meets the learner-centered expectations in the recent Indonesian curriculum that promotes student learning as part of the Merdeka Belajar.

Learner Agency and Dialogic Pedagogy

In an Indonesian EFL context, the focus of research studies has focused on the limitations of teacher-centred discourse focusing on learner agency the ability for students to make decisions and build their learning. Agency will not develop immediately nor is it guaranteed, it is built through interactions in the classroom, teacher support and consistency with institutional norms, and values (Sakkir and Al Amir 2024; Irmayani and Rachmajanti 2017). Dialogic pedagogy has potential to support the development of learner agency, because of the focus on open-ended question development, collaborative reasoning including engaging in dialogue that includes consideration of reasoning and rationale of the student response, and building opportunities for extended student talk (Cassandra, Hamied, Muslim, et al. 2024; Masrurroh Isnawati 2023). Where teacher do talk about pedagogical practices, as practitioners they may use fixed tick box pre-scripted question IRF pattern, with dialogic pedagogies view of interaction as supporting cognitive and linguistic growth; and confirmatory opportunities for students to explore, change, or build on their ideas. From a dialogic reading of the classroom interactions, teachers can more securely scaffold learning, build learning across multiple lessons by accepting students' ideas/responses giving the student a greater tolerance to accept failure as they take risks in talking and contributing (Valentika and Yulia 2020; Irmayani and Rachmajanti 2017). Dialogic pedagogy is not without its challenges including disrupting beliefs of teacher-centred



classroom practices, no space to change practice, little room to make space when considering carefully constructed curriculum directives shaped by intended outcomes directed by high stakes assessments, Above all, this type of pedagogy is sustained with a sociocultural perspective on curriculum and society, and an aspirational pathway of student ownership for all knowledge and practices. Finally, if the relationships of practice in language development are developed and sustained, then once dialogic pedagogy is fully immersed into the curriculum, the environment will become more equitable, participative, and empowering for students.

Discourse Analysis in Educational Research

In educational research particularly for investigating classroom interaction, discourse analysis (DA) is a fundamental methodological and theoretical instrument. DA sees language as social action, emphasizing on how it shapes roles, power, and identities, unlike conventional language study which treats language as a tool for social change. DA shows in EFL contexts how turn-taking, question types, and topic control (Raharja & Ghozali, 2021) either encourage or restrict student engagement. Often revealing disparities that influence learning, it reveals underlying rules that control who speaks and how, thereby addressing DA additionally underlines as appropriate means of meaning-making student techniques including code-switching or repetition (Putrawan, 2022). Indonesian classroom studies illustrate that strategies such as reformulation, dialogic teacher talk scaffolding, and elicitations can be of high impact in terms of engagement among students (Sita Herdanti and Saefullah 2021 a). This aligns with the DA's (Discourse Analysis) perspective of viewing classrooms as lively, non-neutral environments in which information, identity, and relationships are incessantly negotiated along the lines of sociocultural knowledge (Maulana, Gunawan, and Zifana, 2022)

Code-Switching and Multilingual Practices in EFL Classrooms

Code-switching among languages is a daily norm within Indonesia's multilingual EFL classroom. While previously seen as a sign of weakness, recent studies accept code-switching as a strategic and effective communicative resource (Putrawan, n.d.; Maulana, Gunawan, and Zifana, n.d.-a). Learners use it to facilitate meaning, signal uncertainty, or seek help, while teachers use it to aid content and reduce cognitive load, especially for low-proficiency learners.



Based on translanguaging theory, this perspective values the use of any language resource to facilitate understanding and participation (Emilia and Hamied 2022; Sakkir and Al Amir 2024). Enforced "English-only" policies can silence students, but embracing multilingual strategies is inclusive, self-esteem affirming, and authenticating of learners' identities and heritage (Sekar Titania and Ashadi 2024). Discourse analysis uncovers code-switching as a sign of linguistic competence a meaning-negotiating strategic resource. Its acknowledged instructional value assists teachers in creating more responsive, inclusive, and effective EFL learning environments

Sociocultural Perspectives on Classroom Interaction

Sociocultural theory provides a broad lens through which one could see how classroom speech supports not only language development but also identity creation. This theoretical approach stresses that, looking at language structures or turn-taking patterns, learning is a fundamentally social process governed by interaction and guided involvement (Emilia and Hamied 2022; Sakkir and Al Amir 2024). In Indonesian EFL classes, instructional strategies such as scaffolding, peer working, and dialogic talk have been shown to be effective in facilitating students' linguistic ability, confidence, and agency (Sita Herdanti and Saefullah, 2021). Scaffolding, for instance, involves temporary support from teachers or more able peers that enables learners to perform tasks that are otherwise beyond their present independent capacity. This assistance may come in the form of prompting, modeling, questioning, or co-construction of responses during interaction. Importantly, sociocultural theory also sees classroom talk as shaped by broader cultural values, norms, and power relations. Student silence, for example, from this view would not be automatically ascribed to disengagement but may, instead, be a cultural means of displaying respect or deference in the local educational setting. Translated into EFL instruction, the sociocultural framework dares teachers to become inclusive, contextually responsive practitioners who nurture collaboration, risk, and collective meaning-making making the classroom a dynamic space for both language learning and identity negotiation. (Mardiah, Hadian Jamalullail, & Hidayati, 2022)

B. METHOD

Research Design



This study anchored in discourse analysis utilising a qualitative research approach looks at student voices in EFL classroom speaking. One can obtain a comprehensive, contextualised knowledge of language use in daily life by means of qualitative research, so omitting the complex whole of social and educational processes underlying classroom communication (Tadris et al., n.d.). Discourse analysis in this case is not just an analytical instrument of conversational structure in the study, but also a critical instrument to examine power relations, negotiation of identity, and social functions of language in the classroom. Based on recent studies in Indonesian EFL studies, DA is utilized to explore how student discourse is structured, how classroom norms are established, and how meaning is co-constructed within classroom discourse (Alek and -, n.d.; Safitri et al. 2023). Based on an interpretivist paradigm, which stresses the element that meaning is co-created among the participants and the researcher inside their particular socio-cultural setting, the present study Consequently, the present studies on natural classroom interaction avoid artificial or synthetic data collecting to give the spontaneity, complexity, and natural continuity of language use in actual educational environments (Yolanda, Setyaningsih, and Drajadi 2024).

Data Collection

Two East Java, Indonesia public senior high schools provided data expressly to show typical EFL classroom dynamics with different student backgrounds and different teaching approaches. Administrative clearance and institutional permission were sought before data collecting thereby guaranteeing complete compliance to school policies (Afriadi 2021a; Mardiah, Hadian Jamalullail, and Hidayati, n.d.). Four EFL classes total, each lasting roughly ninety minutes, were audio-recorded with non-intrusive digital recorders positioned to record high-quality sound and reduce disturbance of natural classroom interaction. The researcher took extensive field notes capturing contextual aspects such student sitting, classroom architecture, nonverbal cues, and degrees of involvement all of which could influence speech patterns, so complementing audio data (Putrawan, n.d.).

The audio data was transcribed using conventions altered from conversational analysis models as used in Indonesian classroom discourse research (Mardiah, Hadian Jamalullail, and Hidayati, n.d.). The transcription procedure kept the delicate texture required for micro-analytic interpretation by means of interactional components including pauses, overlaps, code-switches,



repetitions, and tone fluctuations. Reviewing transcripts enabled a multilingual assistant competent in the local language, student lingua, and school-based communicative norms maintain correctness and cultural sensitivity. One watched closely moral practices. Regarding the objectives, voluntary behaviour, and confidentiality policies of the study, every participant gave age-appropriate, clear, unambiguous, justifications. Teachers and school principals signed written agreements; all transcripts and reporting under pseud aliases so order to preserve participant identification (Yolanda, Setyaningsih, and Drajadi 2024). To respect privacy and follow ethical guidelines appropriate for Indonesian qualitative research methods, any obvious data were deleted.

Data Analysis

In keeping with accepted qualitative methods applied in Indonesian ELT research, the data analysis followed a multi-layered strategy combining thematic coding with micro-level discourse analytic techniques (Ucan, Kılıç Özmen & Serbest, 2023) (Mardiah, Hadian Jamalullail & Hidayati, 2022). Starting with repeated careful readings of the classroom transcripts, thematic coding started with notable themes relating to student participation, instructor questioning strategies, turn-taking patterns, and code-switching behaviour. Iteratively, coding was done under analytical labels including reactive answers, teacher scaffolding, student-initiated speech, and multilingual practices. By means of qualitative data software tools, coded data was systematically organised and retrieved (Afriadi; 2021).

Turn-taking sequences, overlaps, repair procedures, and the usage of pauses were investigated at the micro level using conversation analysis techniques, therefore allowing a comprehensive knowledge of how classroom engagement was locally managed and co-generated (Putrawan, 2022). Simultaneously, components of critical discourse analysis (CDA) were investigated in language use and participant roles to show how power relations, positioning, and institutional standards were mirrored (Alek, Maulana, Gunawan & Zifana, 2022). Teacher scaffolding techniques including prompting, recasting, and offering relevant feedback and their impact on the complexity, length, and content of student utterances received particular special attention. Examined both functionally that is, for clarity, emphasis and interactionally that is, to control classroom alignment or communicate group affiliation instances of code-switching between English and Bahasa Indonesia (Sakkir & Amir, 2024).



The data were triangulated across several classrooms, participant interactions, and observational notes to improve the legitimacy and trustworthiness of the conclusions. Member checking sharing preliminary results with the participating teachers to validate interpretations and get contextual insights was also used, and peer debriefing sessions with other discourse researchers were held to hone interpretations (Yolanda, Setyaningsih & Drajadi, 2024)

Research Instrument

This approach incorporated digital technology to improve accuracy, consistency, and analytic transparency in the transcription and coding process. Transcription programs like ELAN or Express Scribe incorporated audio recordings from classroom interactions into synchronised playback and multi-tier annotation capability. These platforms facilitated the accurate documentation of pauses, overlaps, intonation, and code-switching, crucial for discourse-based microanalysis (Mardiah, Hadian Jamalullail & Hidayati, 2022). The researcher made systematic labelling, classification, and comparison of discourse aspects between courses and participant groups using NVivo, a qualitative data analysis tool designed for coding that allowed for such processes. Supported theme mapping and pattern identification; the visualisation and query tools of the programme helped to track interactional factors including scaffolding, questioning techniques, and student agency markers (Afriadi, 2021; Safitri et al, 2023). Thanks in major part to these tools, which also enabled researchers document each coding option and retain an auditable trail, large volumes of textual data were treated with analytical rigour. They also permitted (Yolanda, Setyaningsih, and Drajadi 2024) Iterative analysis whereby categories may be improved in response to changing patterns during data immersion and triangulation.

Researcher Reflexivity and Positionality

The researcher deliberately kept a stance all during the investigation and noted that data interpretation could be influenced by background, opinions, linguistic abilities, past assumptions, and so on. During school visits and analysis, reflexive notes were diligently preserved to faithfully reflect field observations, coding decisions, and emotional responses. This introspection helped to lower any interpretive bias (Yolanda, Setyaningsih, and Drajadi 2024) and increase openness. Although the study gained from a fresh interpretive perspective, given the researcher's relative stranger to the classroom context, it also found challenges in



capturing culturally rooted discourse practices. Regular interaction with local teacher-collaborators and triangulation with pertinent Indonesian educational discourse literature helped to overcome these constraints by means of collaborative validation (Ucan, Kılıç Özmen, & Serbest, 2023). The researcher aimed to remain ethically sensitive to participant voices across the study since she understood that meaning-making in qualitative research is co-constructed (Safitri et al, 2023)

Limitations and Delimitations

Certain methodological flaws were employed in this paper. It only employed a narrow sample of just two East Java senior high schools. This would limit generalizability across results to broader EFL environments in Indonesia with more than one institutional culture or student population, although it would allow for more intensified observation of classroom discourse (Renandya & Chang, 2022). Besides, it was only audio recordings that the study concentrated on, thereby confining observation of non-verbal communication channels like gesture, gaze, and spatiality whose importance in class conversation is hard to capture without the use of video methods. Therefore, the study accorded verbal and interactional elements first priority and underscored the fact that meaning-making within learning spaces is multimodal. Subsequent studies can apply video-based multimodal analysis to record further layers of interaction and increase the sample to various levels of education, regional differences, and multiple proficiency learner groups. These enlargements would give a broader account of EFL speech patterns in many Indonesian classroom contexts (Putrawan, 2022; Maulana, Gunawan & Zifana, 2022).

C. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Dominance of Teacher Talk

They were also the primary assessors of students' answers, controlling the rhythm and shape of talk. The quantitative analysis of the transcripts revealed that the teachers produced approximately 75%–85% of the total utterances, and the students only had 15%–25% of the verbal space, which consisted of short, reactive responses (Hasanah et al., 2024; Dalia & Putra, 2024). Students expressed responses in the form of single words or short phrases of "Yes,



Miss," "No," "I don't know," or repetitions of the teacher's utterances before they responded. While such responses were beneficial for classroom management, they were a part of traditional Initiation–Response–Feedback (IRF) cycles, which offered little space for student-initiated elaboration or expression. Such a teacher-fronted interactional routine reduced the space for students to engage in practicing meaning-making, questioning, or taking part in negotiated interaction all of which are key aspects involved in developing communicative competence (Raharja and Ghozali 2020).

Excerpt from Transcript A:

T: "Why is a procedure text used?"

S1: "To explain how to do something."

T: "Good. Next."

In cases like these the evaluative feedback of the teacher ("Good. Next.") acts as a closure for the interaction instead of providing an opening, reproduced short response expectations, and restricted students' free spaces for elaborated or extended talk.

Limited Student-Initiated Interaction

Student-initiated discussion was exceptional and tended to occur outside of official instructional times, such as at transitions, spontaneous breaks, or task-switching phases. During the four observed lessons, 5–8% of classroom talk was student-initiated, and these were procedural talk in the main, such as clarification requests regarding instructions or questioning about timetabling (e.g., "What page, Miss?"). Student content or cognitively demanding queries were effectively non-existent, a sign of disengagement in dialogic or inquiry discourse (Valentika and Yulia 2020). The trend indicates that students were not socialized to be co-constructors of knowledge but rather behaved as passive respondents and sustained a culture of conformity over curiosity. Research from Indonesian EFL context shows evidence that students stifled ownership of interaction if they were given scripted text, always for success-driven practices, and controlled by the teacher (Cassandra, Hamied, Muslim, et al. 2024; Sakkir and Al Amir 2024).

Excerpt from Transcript B:

S2: "Miss, do we have homework?"



T: "I'll tell you later. Now focus."

Whereas this student initiated interaction, the teacher's reply instantly closed off control and ended other potential interaction. This kind of moment illustrates how even if students want to interact, institutional context and prevailing discourse norms will tend to squelch spontaneity and student agency.

Scaffolding and Open-Ended Questions Encourage Talk

Interestingly, in teaching sessions where teachers employed scaffolding strategies, student responses were greatly longer, more comprehensive, and at times jointly generated. Scaffolding moves observed were paraphrasing of complex questions, provision of contextual cues, provision of lengthy wait-time, and asking peer-to-peer responses prior to teacher response. By use of such acts, students become more self-assured about their efforts and assist to readily alter interactional power (Sekar Titania and Ashadi 2024). Open-ended inquiries like "What do you think about this subject?" or "Can you explain your answer?" yielded more sophisticated responses typically with reference to history, logic, or anecdote. Such approaches clearly deviated from traditional IRF sequences and showed movement toward dialogic discourse, in which the students were being viewed as co-producers of meaning-making (Valentika and Yulia 2020; Cassandra, Hamied, Bukhori Muslim, et al. 2024).

Transcript C's fragment:

T: "Why must individuals?"obey orders?!"?"

S3: "Because if not, possibly the outcome is not great. such as... hmm... maybe they cannot create the good."

T: "Effective point. Could you give one?"

S3: "Like in a recipe. Skipping steps will make the food awful."

This exchange illustrates how follow-up by teacher scaffolding and appreciation can extend the exchange beyond immediate answer. The teacher's statement ("Good point. Can you give an example?") is an invitation for discursive expansion, hence allowing students a chance to exercise critical thinking and fluency under low-anxiety conditions (Sita Herdanti and Saefullah 2021b). Although these kinds of dialogic exchanges were not the dominant pattern



in all classes observed, their presence shows the power of transformation for dialogic approaches in enabling student voice and more authentic engagement so long as teachers consciously shift their discourse norms (Sakkir and Al Amir 2024; Yolanda, Setyaningsih, and Drajati 2024).

Code-Switching as a Strategy for Expression

Regarding language use, the students were reported to have code-switched from Bahasa Indonesia to English irrespective of the level observable and particularly amidst lexical void, selective response expression, and time constraints. This research regard code-switching as a communicative resources which can be the flexible tools for meaningmaking and interactional coherence (Putrawan, n.d.; Maulana, Gunawan, and Zifana, n.d.-a) rather as speakers' linguistic deficiency. Many times in classroom settings, students started their utterances in English then changed to Indonesian when unsure about structure or terminology. Usually, teachers approved of these changes without calling back. Sometimes they answered in English while gently leading students back into the target language, hence creating a low-anxiety, participatory setting (Sakkir and Al Amir 2024).

Section from Transcript D:

T: "can you please describe the steps of the process?"

S4: "We combine them first, then ... we prepare the materials we need."

T: "Yes, good. We mix up initially after starting by preparing the tools and materials. Carry on?"

It illustrates how code-switching facilitates student participation and involvement even where there are limited linguistic resources in the target language. Learners who employed their full language resources managed to communicate, to maintain fluency, and to take confidence. These methods fit modern ideas on translanguaging in EFL classrooms, which acknowledge the pedagogical validity of including several languages as means of meaning-making resources (Emilia and Hamied 2022; Sekar Titania and Ashadi 2024) The teacher models the equivalent in English and strategically handles multilingual comments reinforcing the student's concept, therefore promoting a dialogic and supporting classroom conversation. Particularly important



in multilingual Indonesian classrooms, it also shows a change from strict monolingual rules toward more inclusive, learner-centered interactive methods.

Discussion

This study identifies a key tension in Indonesian EFL classrooms: the ubiquity of teacher-dominated IRF patterns versus the promise of dialogic, student-led practices. While IRF formats offer control and organization, they restrict student agency and shut down possibilities for authentic interaction. Conversely, consistent with socially-situated learning, teachers using dialogic tactics including open-ended inquiries, scaffolding, and longer wait-time student participation became more sophisticated and confident. Emerging as a valid translanguaging technique, code-switching helps students stay involved and clarify meaning. These results imply that improvements in teacher attitude, institutional standards, and curriculum are prerequisites for meaningful debate transformation. Encouragement of student voice sees students as active language users with ability to shape interaction and co-construct knowledge.

IRF Patterns vs. Dialogic Teaching

The endurance of Initiation–Response–Feedback (IRF) systems within the found EFL lecture rooms displays entrenched pedagogical traditions, wherein the instructor keeps number one manipulate over the flow, content, and motive of lecture room interaction. Typically, the instructor initiates with a show or closed question, the scholar gives a quick respond regularly only a phrase or word and the instructor concludes with an evaluative comment. While it helps in the management of the lecture hall, this category tends to be a tool for control rather than a platform for the creation of more meaningful knowledge or communication (Uswatun Hasanah, Neni Afrida Sari, and Rahmad Husein 2024; Cahyalaili Dalia and Rizaldy Putra 2024). This strict triadic relationship has a tendency to suppress learner autonomy and spontaneity and hence supports a teacher-dominated pattern where college students role-define as passive receivers. Opportunities for college kids to invite questions, provoke ideas, or amplify peer responses are minimal. As nearby research have shown, such asymmetries can preclude essential thinking, self belief building, and the improvement of communicative competence,



which can be crucial effects in language learning (Raharja and Ghozali 2020; Uswatun Hasanah, Neni Afrida Sari, and Rahmad Husein 2024).

In contrast, in classrooms where dialogic teaching was observed, there was a noticeable improvement in the complexity and quality of student talk. Teachers who employed open-ended questions such as “What do you think about...?”, “Can you explain your answer?”, or “Why do you agree or disagree?” triggered interaction that moved beyond IRF conventions. Students produced longer sentences, engaged in personal introspection, and sometimes even launched follow-up discussions. Their responses revealed not just increased fluency but also critical involvement in defending ideas or challenging assumptions (Cassandra, Hamied, Bukhori Muslim, et al. 2024; Yolanda, Setyaningsih, and Drajati 2024). Moreover, while instructors avoided immediate correction and used scaffolding measures restatement questions, requests for clarification, and eliciting peer response, learners evinced greater willingness to take linguistic and cognitive risks. In these moments, students transitioned from passive responders to collaborative meaning-makers, which was a momentous interactional role and agency reversal (Sita Herdanti and Saefullah 2021b; Sakkir and Al Amir 2024).

These findings highlight that options for teacher talk have direct effects on classroom discourse. The contrast between IRF dominant and dialogic approaches reveals that speech is not neutral it actively constructs who speaks, how ideas unfold, and what kind of learning occurs. Although IRF can present predictability and control, it appears to quell students' contribution. Dialogic pedagogy, however, stimulates greater thought, language growth, and a more collaborative classroom atmosphere (Valentika and Yulia 2020). In the situation of EFL settings especially where learners may be already linguistically at risk, this distinction is crucial. Stepping away from IRF towards dialogic interaction is not a methodological option, but a pedagogic necessity in order to empower learners as competent and confident English users in their own world.

Code-Switching and Multilingual Competence

One of the most clear and recurrent aspects found in the classroom interactions was the widespread use of code-switching especially among students bouncing between English and



Bahasa Indonesia during responses. Far from a sign of language deficiency, this study views code-switching as a deliberate and adaptive discourse strategy reflecting multilingual competence. Students solved linguistic problems, defined meaning, affirmed knowledge, or maintained peer rapport by means of codes-switching. These exercises show active verbal bargaining and cognitive agency instead of depending simply on L1 (Putrawan, n.d.; Maulana, Gunawan, and Zifana, n.d.-a). This point of view backs translanguaging theory, which challenges conceptions of rigorous language separation and instead values students's common language repertoire. From this vantage point, students readily deploy more than one linguistic system in a flexible manner to produce meaning and express thought. Indonesian EFL classroom research has established that translanguaging can enable learners to evoke background knowledge, express complex ideas, and critically engage with classroom content even with low levels of English competence (Sakkir and Al Amir 2024; Emilia and Hamied 2022).

In multilingual countries like Indonesia, these kinds of behaviors are very important. Students may struggle with English fluency even yet have strong cognitive ability. Under rigorous "English-only" policies, translanguaging serves as a cognitive bridge enabling students to engage in academic discourse otherwise unavailable (Sekar Titania and Ashadi 2024). Reducing performance anxiety helps to complement these strategies so enhancing learner confidence as well as language development. The presence of the teacher greatly shapes the language environment of the classroom. Emphasizing meaning instead of form, teachers that react compassionately or supportingly to code-switching will validate their students and raise their chances of giving longer, more thorough answers. On the other hand, pupils sometimes withdraw or turn to silence when code-switching is ignored or punished, therefore reducing opportunities for interaction. These findings highlight the fact that teacher views are discursively powerful. Even implicit speech defines the acceptable forms of language. A strict reliance on monolingual English could be stifling still developing students' voice. Alternatively, an open and multilingual posture not only supports student identity but also helps to enable fair participation and classroom membership (Emilia and Hamied 2022). Viewing code-switching as a resource rather than a lack enables one to rethink teaching conventions. EFL classrooms need to value linguistic variability, locating students' full repertoires as central



resources in the learning process. Such a shift not only enhances language learning but also advocates for educational justice, learner autonomy, and genuine voice

Implications for Teacher Training and Classroom Practices

The results of the study indicate that improving student voice calls for deliberate changes in instructor behavior and perspective. Teachers have to go beyond just imparting knowledge to enable students to express, ask questions, and think through ideas. Training courses for EFL teachers should thus comprise: Techniques for managing open-ended conversations, Practical strategies for encouraging student-initiated participation, Understanding of the reality of multilingual classrooms and the advantages of translanguaging. Teachers also need help in establishing interactional awareness that is, in identifying times when student involvement might be strengthened and in knowing how to respond positively. Classroom conversation addresses not only language but also who gets to talk, how, and why a profoundly social and ethical concern.

Reimagining Classroom Power Structures

Student voice speaks to directly to the power relationships in the classroom. Standard classroom discussion is constituted; it is hierarchical with the teacher controlling turn-taking, topic, and assessment. While it may guarantee coverage of curriculum content or help to manage a classroom with much of a student body, it can silence students' voices, especially those of the less confident or weaker students. The study reveals how inclusive and dialogic discourse patterns could split power in a way that helps students assume a more active participation in the construction of classroom knowledge. Not a loss of power for the teacher, this is a rethinking of her roles as facilitator, co-learner, and interlocutor. When students are positioned as legitimate contributors, they are more likely to take intellectual risks and to engage intensely with language and content.

Such changes, nevertheless, require more than just teacher effort. Institutional support in the form of curriculum flexibility, assessment reform, and professional development is needed to



create an environment within which dialogic teaching and pupil voice can be genuinely appreciated.

CONCLUSION

Within the framework of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) lessons in Indonesian senior high schools, this study has investigated how student voice is established, limited, and occasionally empowered. Using a discourse analytic approach to naturally occurring classroom conversation, the study exposed low presence of student-initiated interaction, monologic instruction, and common interactional patterns especially the frequency of teacher-led Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) structures. Often at the price of student agency, inventiveness, and dialogic involvement, these tendencies reflect a more general pedagogical stance stressing teacher authority, language precision, and control (Uswatun Hasanah, Neni Afrida Sari, and Rahmad Husein 2024).

Not with standing these restrictions, the findings revealed certain moments of dialogic potential, particularly in classrooms where teachers used scaffolding, asked open-ended questions, offered extended wait-times, or encouraged peer engagement. Students moved from passive knowledge receivers to active meaning-makers in these episodes: generating prolonged utterances, starting conversations, asking questions, and so conveying personal reasoning (Cassandra, Hamied, Muslim, et al. 2024; Yolanda, Setyaningsih, and Drajadi 2024). These dialogic approaches reinterpreted classroom discourse as a cooperative social environment in which language acquisition also entails the negotiating of relationships, power, and learner identity.

The research revealed some very surprising results, including students using code-switching intentionally. Code-switching was found to be an adaptive and intentional strategy used to ensure verbal flow, regulate cognitive demands, and access sophisticated meanings rather than indicating linguistic weakness. These processes of translanguaging disrupt monolingual language ideologies and enable Indonesian EFL students (Putrawan, n.d.; Emilia and Hamied 2022; Sakkir and Al Amir 2024) to inhabit multilingual reality. The study supports a flexible



and inclusive language approach in schools thereby allowing pupils to access their complete language repertoire.

This study finally highlights a very important realization: the structure and manner of classroom communication significantly influence the opportunities for student learning, involvement, and empowerment. If we want to learn communicative competence in the real world, classroom talk must change from stereotypical, judgmental habits to responsive, dialogic, and participatory talk. Teachers must become more sensitive in their understanding of communication and make instruction more focused on student voice. Institution and curriculum planners must also consider how assessment instruments and education standards could work to amplify or silence students.

Ultimately, encouraging student voice in EFL classes is about changing the interactional conditions of learning, not only about raising speak time. It calls on students as competent interlocutors deserving of respect, space, and attention. Only by means of such pedagogical changes will language instruction in Indonesia become empowering, fair, and really sensitive to the linguistic and cultural reality of its students.

REFERENCES

- Afriadi, Rendi. 2021a. "EXPLORING TRANSLANGUAGING PRACTICE IN EFL CLASSROOM TALK" 4.
- . 2021b. "EXPLORING TRANSLANGUAGING PRACTICE IN EFL CLASSROOM TALK" 4.
- Alek, -Dr, and MPd -. n.d. "DISCOURSE ANALYSIS FOR LANGUAGE EDUCATION."
- Cahyalaili Dalia, Arisa, and Fahry Rizaldy Putra. 2024. "THE INITIATION, RESPONSE, AND FEEDBACK (IRF) IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING: A LITERATURE REVIEW." *SPECTRAL | Jurnal Ilmiah Spectral* 10 (1).
- Cassandra, Nina Wanda, Abdul Hamied, Ahmad Bukhori Muslim, and Saleha Gandana. 2024. "Facilitating Dialogues in an Online Classroom: Insights from an EFL Classroom." *Indonesian Research Journal in Education |IRJE|* 8 (1): 284. <https://doi.org/10.22437/irje.v8i1.34157>.
- Cassandra, Nina Wanda, Fuad Abdul Hamied, Ahmad Bukhori Muslim, and Isti Gandana. 2024. "Enacting Dialogic Pedagogy in an EFL Online Classroom: A Self-Study." *Studying Teacher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17425964.2024.2433788>.



- Emilia, Emi, and Fuad Abdul Hamied. 2022. "TRANSLANGUAGING PRACTICES IN A TERTIARY EFL CONTEXT IN INDONESIA." *Teflin Journal* 33 (1): 47–74. <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v33i1/47-74>.
- Irmayani, Irmayani, and Sri Rachmajanti. 2017. "Lexical Features of Teacher Talk in English Classrooms in Senior High Schools." *Dinamika Ilmu*, June, 59–70. <https://doi.org/10.21093/di.v17i1.639>.
- Lestari, Rizkye, and Rohmani Rohmani. 2024a. "Analysis of the Effectiveness of Wordwall Media Use on Science Learning Outcomes in Elementary Schools." *IJORER : International Journal of Recent Educational Research* 5 (4): 891–905. <https://doi.org/10.46245/ijorer.v5i4.634>.
- . 2024b. "Analysis of the Effectiveness of Wordwall Media Use on Science Learning Outcomes in Elementary Schools." *IJORER : International Journal of Recent Educational Research* 5 (4): 891–905. <https://doi.org/10.46245/ijorer.v5i4.634>.
- Mardiah, Issyatul, Muhammad Hadian Jamalullail, and Rospin Hidayati. n.d. "Discourse Analysis of Classroom Interaction in EFL Context."
- Masruroh Isnawati, Uzlifatul. 2023. "Supportive Teacher Talk Features to Promote Students' Responses In EFL Classroom." *Education and Human Development Journal Tahun* 8 (1). <https://doi.org/10.33086/ehdj.v8i1>.
- Maulana, Angga, Wawan Gunawan, and Mahardhika Zifana. n.d.-a. "Power through Translanguaging in Writing Class Discourse: An Indonesian Case Study." *Acuity: Journal of English Language Pedagogy, Literature, and Culture* 10 (2): 2025. <https://doi.org/10.35974/acuity.v9i2.3848>.
- . n.d.-b. "Power through Translanguaging in Writing Class Discourse: An Indonesian Case Study." *Acuity: Journal of English Language Pedagogy, Literature, and Culture* 10 (2): 2025. <https://doi.org/10.35974/acuity.v9i2.3848>.
- Putrawan, Gede Eka. n.d. "Gede Eka Putrawan Translanguaging Practices in EFL Classrooms: Evidence From Indonesia TRANSLANGUAGING PRACTICES IN EFL CLASSROOMS: EVIDENCE FROM INDONESIA."
- Raden, Oleh :, Panji Hartono, Slamet Setiawan, and Maria Mintowati. n.d. "A STUDY OF TEACHER TALK IN A CLASSROOM INTERACTION AT A SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL."
- Raharja, Bayu Jati, and Imam Ghozali. 2020. "Discourse Analysis on Teacher-Students Interaction Pattern of English Teaching Learning Process." *Journal of Applied Linguistics, Translation, and Literature*. Vol. 1.
- Renandya, Willy A., and Anna C.S. Chang. 2022. "Translanguaging: Does It Work in EFL Contexts?" *TESL-EJ* 26 (3). <https://doi.org/10.55593/ej.26103a25>.



- Safitri, Vivi, Alek Alek, Didin Nuruddin Hidayat, and Nida Husna. 2023. "Teacher and Students' Oral Interaction in EFL Classroom: A Structural Discourse Analysis." *EDUKATIF: JURNAL ILMU PENDIDIKAN* 5 (6): 2582–90. <https://doi.org/10.31004/edukatif.v5i6.5487>.
- Sakkir, Geminastiti, and Fitrah Al Amir. 2024. "Students' Voice Towards the Translanguaging Practices in EFL Classroom Corresponding Email." *Journal of English Education and Teaching*. Vol. 8.
- Sekar Titania, Yulandha, and Ashadi Ashadi. 2024. "Translanguaging as Pedagogical Practice: Insight from Indonesian EFL Classroom." *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS* 07 (06). <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v7-i06-78>.
- Sita Herdanti, Annisa, and Hilmansyah Saefullah. 2021a. "Exploring Students-Teacher Interaction in Dialogic Reading of Descriptive Texts." Vol. 5.
- . 2021b. "Exploring Students-Teacher Interaction in Dialogic Reading of Descriptive Texts." Vol. 5.
- Tadris, Prodi, Bahasa Inggris, Fakultas Tarbiyah, and Iain Bone. n.d. "A DISCOURSE ANALYSIS ON STUDENT TALKS IN EFL CLASSROOM INTERACTION Wahyu."
- Ucan, S, Z Kılıç Özmen, and M Serbest. 2023. "Understanding the Cognitive and Socio-Emotional Dimensions of Dialogic Teaching and Learning Approach." *International Journal of Curriculum and Instructional Studies* 13 (1): 158–75. <https://doi.org/10.31704/ijocis.2023.007>.
- Uswatun Hasanah, Neni Afrida Sari, and Rahmad Husein. 2024. "Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) Pattern of Sinclair and Coulthard Model In English Classroom Interaction." *Sintaksis: Publikasi Para Ahli Bahasa Dan Sastra Inggris* 2 (5): 340–48. <https://doi.org/10.61132/sintaksis.v2i5.1102>.
- Valentika, Riski, and Yuyun Yulia. 2020. "An Analysis of Teachers' Classroom Interaction by Using Self-Evaluation of Teacher Talk." *Journal of English Language and Pedagogy* 3 (1): 41–51. <https://doi.org/10.36597/jelp.v3i1.2903>.
- Yolanda, Ika Yasyinta Nindy, Endang Setyaningsih, and Nur Arifah Drajadi. 2024. "Translanguaging in Academic Writing Classroom: A Case Study of EFL Pre-Service Teachers's Perception." *JEELS (Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies)* 11 (1): 277–91. <https://doi.org/10.30762/jeels.v11i1.2670>.
- Zhang, Wenjuan, Menglin Xu, Yujuan Feng, Zhixiong Mao, and Zengyin Yan. 2024. "The Effect of Procrastination on Physical Exercise among College Students—The Chain Effect of Exercise Commitment and Action Control." *International Journal of Mental Health Promotion* 26 (8): 611–22. <https://doi.org/10.32604/ijmh.2024.052730>.