

## EXPLORING CLASSROOM INTERACTION PATTERNS IN EFL VIRTUAL LEARNING

**Magdahalena Tjalla** (Corresponding author)

Email: [magdahalenatjalla@iainpare.ac.id](mailto:magdahalenatjalla@iainpare.ac.id)

**Marlina Syamsir**

*IAIN Parepare, Indonesia*

Email: [marlina.syamsir98@gmail.com](mailto:marlina.syamsir98@gmail.com)

**Zulfah**

*IAIN Parepare, Indonesia*

Email: [fahrudin.zulfah@yahoo.com](mailto:fahrudin.zulfah@yahoo.com)

**Abdul Haris Sunubi**

*IAIN Parepare, Indonesia*

Email: [abd.harissunubi@iainpare.ac.id](mailto:abd.harissunubi@iainpare.ac.id)

**Arqam**

*IAIN Parepare, Indonesia*

Email: [arqam@iainpare.ac.id](mailto:arqam@iainpare.ac.id)

APA Citation: Tjalla, M., Syamsir, M., Zulfah., Sunubi, A. H., & Arqam. (2023). Exploring classroom interaction patterns in EFL virtual learning. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 11(1), 63-74. <https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v11i1.7878>

Received: 29-10-2022

Accepted: 26-12-2022

Published: 28-02-2023

**Abstract:** This study analyzed classroom interaction patterns in four EFL virtual learning classes at IAIN Parepare: speaking, listening, writing, and reading. The purpose of this study was to give an overview of classroom interaction involving lecturers and students during the learning process. The researchers used a video recorder and field notes to capture the spoken and written interaction during the learning process. Data were transcribed and codified based on the intuitive taxonomy of the discourse act framework of Tsui. Data showed that both in spoken and written interaction, patterns of Initiation-Response (IR), Initiation-Response-Follow up (IRF), and Initiation-Response-Follow Up-Follow Up 2 (IRFF) occurred. In detail, the complete interaction patterns were in listening class, both in spoken and written form. In reading and writing classes, the Initiation-Response (IR) and the Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) occurred. However, in speaking, only Initiation-Response (IR) was produced. In written interaction, except in the listening class, only Initiation-Response (IR) occurred. Data also showed that utterance categories occurred less in written interaction than in spoken. Most of the interactions were done when the lecturer provided information on learning material and instructions on how to do assignments. Thus, there was no feedback given by the lecturer in this interaction. The study also found that the interaction was lecturer-centered, and both the lecturers and the students employed the L1 in the classroom interaction.

**Keywords:** *classroom interaction patterns; EFL virtual learning; spoken interaction; written interaction.*

### INTRODUCTION

Classroom interaction is a crucial element in the EFL learning context. Some researchers have shown that classroom interaction significantly affects the teaching-learning process and learning achievement. For teachers, classroom interaction is beneficial to help them create a supportive atmosphere for interactive teaching-learning activities (Winanta *et al.*, 2020). Class interaction in the EFL context also facilitates students with concrete and natural practice of the target language (Al-Munawwarah, 2021; Some-Guiebre, 2020;

Wizheng, 2019). It is also helpful to engage students in learning by triggering their interest during the teaching and learning process (Entusiastik & Siregar, 2022; Kholisoh & Barati, 2021), a benefit which at the same time can decrease their anxiety (Alahmadi & Alraddadi, 2020). In addition, class interaction provides a path for students' academic success as well as determines the achievement of the learning objective in each meeting (Eisenring & Margana, 2019; Siddig & AlKhouday, 2018). Thus, teacher-

student interaction is a vital tool to involve students in learning and improve their achievement.

Classroom interaction in an EFL setting often does not run smoothly. Learners of English commonly have problems with interactional skills. In addition, teachers are difficult to elicit students' talks during the learning process. A study conducted by Alam & Ashrafuzzaman, (2018) found that many students are not interested to participate in classroom interaction. Some of the reasons are they have low English competence that they mostly yield incomplete sentences, and the factor of shyness and anxiety to talk in front of the class. Some studies by Ate *et al.* (2021) and Fachrunnisa & Nuraeni (2022) also revealed that students tend to be passive in interaction and choose to be silent when teachers ask a question, and they are not interested to ask questions when the teacher gives them a chance to ask. Another factor relies on the domination of the teacher in the interaction in which most of the classroom talks are produced by a teacher resulting in a monstrous classroom interaction atmosphere (Pratiwi, 2018).

There are two main factors contributing to the changes from face-to-face classroom interaction to virtual learning, namely technological development and the case of Pandemic Covid-19. Technology development is the main reason for the integration of technology in language learning. According to Khodabandeh (2020), technology is used extensively in all facets of life, including education. This has caused a shift in the way that people learn from traditional classroom learning contexts to new forms of learning contexts like virtual classes. In addition, virtual classroom platforms combine a variety of technological tools such as computers and smart gadgets connected to the internet, and allow text-, audio-, and video-based communication in actual time (Coulianos *et al.*, 2022; Tyrväinen *et al.*, 2021). In general, virtual learning offers wonderful prospects for expanding access to learning, costs reduction, and—most importantly, improving the standard of instruction and learning (Rachmah, 2020). Dealing with language learning, the positive impact of technology enables the use of internet resources while learning a language, giving students more possibilities to practice their communication abilities. (Alshumaimeri, 2019; Alswilem, 2019; Cong-Lem, 2018). As a result of the pandemic, English language classrooms changed quickly to the innovative and effective use of technology to enhance the teaching and learning process and address anticipated obstacles (Hakim, 2020).

Virtual learning was the best solution to save people from the attack of the Covid-19 virus.

Virtual learning challenges traditional definitions of a situation and the way teachers and students are expected to interact (Willermark, 2020). Yet, some previous studies demonstrate the strength of classroom interaction in virtual learning. Willermark (2020) reported that virtual learning in an EFL context affects positively student interaction. Virtual learning provides easiness for teachers to monitor students' activity, and arrange them in individual and small group activities, providing no chance for students to dominate the classroom activity as in traditional face-to-face learning. This situation improves inter-student interaction. The positive effect of teacher-student interaction in virtual learning also showed in the studies of Masjedi & Tabatabaei (2018) and Vindyasari (2022). They found that online learning provokes students to actively participate in classroom interaction, and avoid the teacher's dominance in the interaction, and produce a variety of classroom interaction pattern. Likewise, a study conducted by Alahmadi & Alraddadi (2020) investigated whether virtual learning during the pandemic era was effective to assist students in their second language interaction and whether virtual learning facilitated students' interaction and language learning. The study on the preparatory year students of the Saudi English Language Center showed that interaction in EFL virtual learning was effective, as students have a positive perception of the virtual class. Students stated that they participated in the learning, shared ideas, and they reported that their language skill was improved.

Apart from the strengths of classroom interaction in virtual learning explained above, some studies show the complexity of teacher-student interaction in virtual learning. Abdusyukur (2022) explored the teacher-student interaction in an online EFL classroom and compared the interaction patterns of teachers and students to find who was dominant in the interaction. This study found that class interaction in virtual learning was teacher-centered. Students tended to be passive in interaction which led teachers to talk more and dominate the interaction. In the same way, Havwini (2019) compared the interaction patterns of teachers and students that focused on the initiation act. The study revealed that teachers dominated the interaction. Teachers did more initiation to elicit information from the students. In addition, students also initiated to get information on things they were not clear about the material.

However, none of the studies described a virtual class that employed both oral and written interactions as the case at English Education Language Program in IAIN Parepare, Indonesia.

This study was meant to investigate how lecturers and students interacted in a virtual learning context using spoken and written modes. Specifically, this study was conducted to provide a detailed linguistic description of interaction patterns in virtual EFL classrooms and the utterance functions as well. By analyzing the interactions that occurred in the virtual EFL classrooms, the research finding was expected to contribute to a deeper understanding of virtual learning and in turn, will help the lecturers to find the best strategy to overcome problems in the virtual learning environment

**METHOD**

This research was conducted using a descriptive-qualitative design. The qualitative approach was relevant to use in this study because it described the patterns of class interaction in a virtual English learning environment. The classroom interaction occurred in EFL virtual class setting in IAIN Parepare. There were four classes selected in this study: speaking, listening, writing, and reading classes, with four lecturers and 114 students.

The researchers used observation, field notes, and open interviews to collect the research data. The researchers acted as non-participant observers by entering the virtual class in the live conference via Zoom or discussion groups in *WhatsApp*. In some meetings, the researchers directly stayed beside the lecturer or one of the students to observe the activities to gain data and a direct understanding of the class interaction. All the situations and conditions related to classroom interaction in the virtual learning process were noted and recorded. The interview was used to ensure data validity by asking the participants whether they agreed or disagreed with the collected data. The transcribed data were then analyzed using a discourse analysis approach with the aid of the Seventeen-Category system of Tsui (1995) to find out the interaction patterns that occurred in virtual learning. This framework provides seventeen categories of speech with sub-categories. This is also beneficial to explain the functions of both lecturers' and students' utterances in classroom interaction. Tsui's system can be summarized in Table 1 below.

Table 1. *The seventeen-category system by Tsui (1995)*

	Move/Exchange	Head/discourse Acts	Sub-classes
Teachers' talk	Initiate	1. Elicit	A. Display Qs a) Factual Q. b) Yes-No Q. c) Reasoning Q. d) Explanation Q. B. Genuine Qs a) Opinion Q b) Information Q. C. Restating Elicit
	Respond	9. Evaluate 10. Accept 11. Comment 12. Clue	a. Encouraging/positive b. Negative
Students' talk	Respond	13. Reply 14. Apologize	a. Restricted b. Expanded
	Initiate	15. Request 16. Elicit 17. Interrupt	

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The result of this study shows that there were three kinds of interaction patterns found in spoken interaction, namely the Initiation - Response (IR) pattern, Initiation - Respond - Follow Up (IRF) pattern, and the Initiation - Respond - Follow up - Follow up 2 (IRFF) pattern. The result also shows that these three patterns were completely produced in listening class. In reading and writing classes, both *IR* and *IRF* patterns were produced, but the *IRFF* pattern was not. Moreover, in speaking class, *IRF* and *IRFF* patterns were not produced. It means that only *the IR* pattern was produced in the speaking class. The lecturers-students interaction patterns were shown in the following table:

Table 2. *Spoken interaction patterns in EFL virtual learning environment*

EFL Class	Virtual Interaction Patterns		
	IR	IRF	IRFF
Listening	√	√	√
Speaking	√	-	-
Reading	√	√	-
Writing	√	√	-

The finding in the table above indicates that the most frequent interaction pattern produced was

Initiation-Response (*IR*) pattern in which the lecturers initiated the interaction by asking questions and the students responded to them. The lecturers did initiation to elicit information to know the students' knowledge on the topic being discussed. The questions could be in the form of yes-no questions or explanation questions. Initiation in the *IR* pattern is also sometimes produced by the students.

Initiation-Response-Follow-up (*IRF*) was also found in the lecturers-student interaction. The initiation was produced by the lecturers and was responded to by the students. The follow-up act was mostly produced by the lecturers as an endorsement or acceptance of the student's responses. The follow-up pattern was produced by the lecturers because students responded to the initiation with the correct answers and followed what was expected by the lecturers as in the following extract:

*Extract 1*

- L : "... Apa yang dia katakan?" (What did he say?)  
 S3 : "I love durian."  
 S5 : "I love it."  
 S1 : "I live it."  
 Ss : "I love it."  
 L : "Ok! Perfect!"  
 (Spoken interaction in listening class)

The dialogue in extract 1 above illustrates the *IRF* pattern produced in the spoken interaction process. The lecturer initiated the conversation by asking a question. The students responded to the question, and when they did it correctly, the lecturer gave feedback by saying "Ok! Perfect!" Therefore, feedback was given by the lecturer in response to the students' correct answers. The use of the *IRF* pattern in teacher-student interaction is an indicator that the interaction was not dominated by teachers or students, instead the two parties have the same opportunity to actively interact within the interaction (Kartini *et al.*, 2020).

As explained earlier, one of the interaction patterns produced in the lecturers-students interaction was Initiation – Respond – Follow up-Follow-up (*IRFF*). The follow-up act from the lecturers such as 'repair' was sometimes followed by a new movement sequence in the form of the second follow-up produced by the students as an acceptance of the repairs suggested or commanded by the lecturers. This interaction pattern is demonstrated in the following extract:

*Extract 2*

- L : "...because I don't like. Bukan lagi like, but I hate durian. What about you? What about you, class? What about you students?"  
 Ss : "I like ma'am. I like durian mam. So, It's very, eee... very delicious, ma'am."  
 S4 : "Very delicious, Mam."  
 L : "Ok! If you like durian so much, you should say "I love durian". Not "I like", but "I love durian"."  
 S4 : Yes Mam! I love durian  
 (Spoken interaction in listening class)

The dialogue in extract 2 above illustrates how the follow-up movement occurred differently. The lecturer initiated the interaction by giving a specific question to students to get information on whether they liked durian did not. Then, the students enthusiastically said that they liked durian so much. However, the response was deemed inaccurate. Therefore, the lecturer gave repair by correcting the students' answers about the right way to express something that people like most. Students then accepted the lecturer's repair and corrected their answers as a follow-up act 2.

Dealing with written interaction in EFL virtual learning environment, there were also three kinds of interaction patterns found here, namely Initiation - Response (*IR*) pattern, Initiation - Respond - Follow up (*IRF*) pattern, and Initiation - Respond - Follow up - Follow up 2 (*IRFF*) pattern. The written interaction patterns produced in EFL Virtual Learning Environment are presented in the following table.

Table 3. *Written interaction patterns in EFL virtual learning environment*

EFL Virtual Class	Interaction Patterns		
	IR	IRF	IRFF
Listening	√	√	√
Speaking	√	-	-
Reading	√	-	-
Writing	√	-	-

The same finding as in the spoken interaction is seen in the table above; the three patterns of lecturers-student interaction completely occurred in listening class. Some conversations between the lecturer and the students represent the complete pattern of interaction in which the lecturer started the interaction with initiation, then it was

responded to by the students, followed by the lecturer's feedback, and ended with the students' feedback. In other classes namely speaking, reading, and writing, the only pattern produced was the IR. This means that there was no feedback given in the written interaction in those three classes. The following extract is the representation of the IRFF pattern in the written interaction:

*Extract 3*

- (8 students collected their assignments.)  
L: "Excellent, but you don't need to write all the conversation. You just need to say they like or not. If he likes, what he said to express his like? Such as "I hate it" or if he does not like it. What he said?  
(5 students collected their assignments.)  
S: "He hasn't like it. Because it was the first time he taste it, Mam."  
L: "You should write he doesn't like it"  
S: "Okay, Mam."  
(written interaction in speaking class)

The conversation above shows the complete pattern of classroom interaction in the virtual learning environment. The lecturer initiated the interaction by giving a compliment to the students who have participated in finishing and submitting their assignments. On the other side, the student's assignment was out of the lecturer's instruction. The lecturer then gave some 'clues' which was also an initiation act. The purpose was to guide the students to the correct answer. In turn, students responded to the 'clue' given by the lecturer. The lecturer gave a follow-up as a 'correction' by saying "You should write he doesn't like it". Then, the students answered by saying "Yes mam". This kind of movement is called 'follow-up 2'.

Both in spoken and written interaction, lecturers initiated the conversations. However, in some situations, the initiations were produced by students. Class interaction with the student's initiation is presented below:

*Extract 4*

- S1 : "Assalamu'alaikum mam!"  
L : "Waalaikumsalam. Move to zoom now!"  
S2 : "Iye bu" (all right, mam).  
S1 : "Baik bu" (okay, mam)  
S2 : "Yes mam."  
(written interaction in speaking class)

Regarding the conversation above, the students initiated the interaction by expressing a greeting. This was done because the class time was already

begun. Students initiated the interaction by greeting as Muslims used to do. The lecturer then gave a response to the greeting. This finding supports some previous studies' results that students sometimes initiate a talk (Mardani, & Gorjizadeh, 2020; Mier & Blanco, 2022; Rasmitadia *et al.*, 2019; Selamat & Melji, 2022).

Based on the findings above, the characteristics of spoken and written interactions of the four classes of EFL learning in IAIN Parepare are described as follows: The three interaction patterns of the IR, IRF, and IRFF occurred both in spoken and written interaction in the listening class. In general, the IR pattern was the most common form of interaction performed both in spoken and written interactions. The IR pattern occurred when the lecturer initiated the interaction by asking the question and the students responded to the initiation. This pattern of interaction has some benefits, such as students actively participate in decision-making, and are involved all day long in classroom activities (Fibri, 2018). The interaction was then restarted with a new initiation. Occasionally, the lecturer gave a follow-up act as an evaluated purpose. This kind of move exchange is then called Initiation – Response – Follow-up (IRF). In certain situations, the lecturer gave a follow-up to guide the students to the correct answer that was categorized as 'repair'. The student's acceptance of the lecturer's repair was categorized as 'accepted'.

Both the spoken and the written interactions produced in this study follow the Initiation – Response – Follow-up – Follow-up (IRFF) pattern. The production of the IRFF pattern in the lecturer-students interaction process can be explained here:

The first turn is an initiation that was taken by the lecturer. The initiation produced by the lecturer is the first turn to open the sequence in the classroom interaction. Initiation is widely used by the lecturers in this study in various functions, such as greeting, conveying information, or stimulating students to display their knowledge about the topic of discussion. However, the researchers also found that the interaction was also initiated by the students. Therefore, it can be said that interactions in virtual classrooms do not always follow a rigid IRF pattern where initiation is produced by the lecturers. Students' initiations also take a large portion of classroom interaction. The purpose of the initiation act carried out by the students is to obtain or share information. This finding is consistent with a study conducted by Li & Lam study (2022).

One of the factors that underlie the initiation carried out by the students is the topic chosen in the learning process. Selamat & Melji (2022) argued that the choice of a topic had an impact on the willingness of the students to respond to participate in the interaction. In addition, if the topic is the one related to the student's experience, they would answer the teacher's questions (Nernere, 2019). This means that students are brave and confident enough to start interacting with the teachers to get or share information.

The second turn of the IRFF pattern is a response (R) which was performed by the students to answer the lecturer's question or to show their understanding of the teachers' command and instruction. Although the responses were mainly produced by the students, the researchers discovered that the response was sometimes produced by the lecturer if the students initiated a question. Hence, the response was not always given by the students. Overall, the IR pattern was always found in every meeting of the four EFL virtual classes both in spoken and written interaction.

In the third turn, it was found that the lecturer provided various types of follow-up (F) in following the students' response during the classroom interaction as seen in Table 4. Providing follow-up on students' responses might increase students' self-confidence, and create close social relations between lecturers and students (Yulia & Zainil, 2021). Afterward, follow-up 2 was the fourth turn in classroom interaction. In this study, the IRFF pattern was only found in the listening class. The lecturer realized the mistakes made by students in giving answers as in the sentence (S: "I like durian, Mam"). To correct the students' answers, the lecturer produced the 'repair' utterance category by saying (L: "... If you like durian so much, you should say "I love durian"/S: Yes, Mam.). Feedback in the form of correction is normally produced by the teacher (Selamat & Melji, (2022). As a form of acceptance of the correction given by the lecturer, the student-produced utterance was categorized as 'accept'. It can be seen how lecturers tried to create interactive classroom conditions, and involved students actively to provide their arguments or opinions.

Interaction with feedback is the ideal form of teacher-student interaction. Feedback might speed up learning and draw students' attention to their language errors (Mohammed, 2019). Also, when using the IRF/IRFF pattern, the teacher could produce lengthy interactive interactions, which provide a variety of feedback such as the

exchanged feedback and arbitrary corrective feedback (Estaji *et al.*, 2022).

In spoken interaction, speaking class only performed the IR pattern, while reading and writing classes produced the IR and IRF patterns. In written mode, the three classes of speaking, reading, and writing, only produced the IR pattern. This means that there is no feedback in the interaction. The researchers found that several categories of the response act given by the students did not require further movements pattern such as the follow-up act. This occurred in certain situations when initiation began with certain utterances, such as 'Elicit: inform' in the form of 'information question', 'Elicit: clarify', request, directive, informative such as report, expressive, and so on. For example, (L: *...jaringan kurang bersahabat yah?* (the network is bad, isn't it? (I)/S: Yes, mam.... (R)/L: So, *bagaimana ini?* (how, is it?). (I)), the follow-up action was not needed by students because the responses given by students were information that does not require evaluation or acceptance as usual. As a result, the lecturer initiates interaction by asking questions to obtain the students' opinions on whether learning continued or skipped. A study conducted by Atmojo & Widhiyanto, (2020)) also found the same, the interaction begins with the teacher informing only followed by the student's answer, then the teacher does not give any follow-up act to the students.

The research found twenty-five utterances categories in spoken interaction, which are demonstrated in the following table:

Table 4. *Taxonomy of discourse act in spoken interaction produced in EFL virtual learning environment*

Head Act	Sub-classes		
Initiating act	Elicitation	Elicit: inform	A. Display Qs
			a) Factual
			b) Yes-No Q
			c) Reasoning Q
B. Genuine Q	Elicit: confirm	Elicit: agree	d) Explanation Q
			a) Opinion Q
			b) Information Q
Elicit: repeat	Elicit: confirm	Elicit: agree	c) Restating elicit
			Elicit: confirm
			Elicit: agree
			Elicit: repeat

	Elicit: clarify	
Requested	Request for action	
	Request for permission	
	Offer	
	Invitation	
Directive	Advisives	1. Advice 2. Warning
	Mandative	3. Instruction
	Nominate	
Informativ e	Report	
	Expressive	
	Assessment s:	
	Compliment	
	Clue	
	Recapitulate	
	Frame	
Respond Act	Positive Respond	
	Negative Respond	
	Negative Respond	
Follow up Act	Endorseme nt	Positive Evaluation
	Concessio n	
	Acknowle dgment	1. Accept  2. Repair 3. Accept with repair

The table above presents the utterances categories that occurred in spoken interaction. There were twenty-five categories of utterances produced in the initiation act. In response act, there were only two categories produced. Henceforth, there were 5 categories in the follow-up act and two categories or utterances produced as follow-up act 2.

However, there are only seven utterances categories found in written interaction as seen in the following table:

Table 5. Taxonomy of discourse act in written interaction produced in EFL virtual learning environment

Head Act	Sub-classes		
Initiati ng Act	Elicitation :	Elicit: Inform	Factual Q Informatio n Q
	Directive Informative	Mandatives: Instruction Report Expressive Assessments: Compliment Clue	

Respon d Act	Positive Respond	
Follow -up Act	Endorsement	Positive/Encour aging Evaluation
	Acknowledge ment	a) Accept b) Repair

The table above indicates the utterances produced in written interaction. There were seven categories produced in the initiation act and one category in the response activities. Henceforth, there were three categories of utterances that occurred in the follow-up act and two categories in follow-up act 2. These data suggest that utterances produced by lecturers and students serve a variety of functions.

The findings above also indicate that fewer interaction patterns, as well as utterances categories, are produced in written interaction than in spoken as well. Written interactions in the current research, as has been previously explained, employed the WhatsApp application. A study has proved that the learners tended to be passive and gave low responses in interactions using the WhatsApp application. Classroom interaction was considered monotonous and therefore affected the students' frustrations (Budianto & Arifani, 2021).

The study also found the use of the student's native language both in spoken and written interaction. Both the lecturers and the students used the native language, namely Indonesian. The use of the native language in classroom interaction is positively viewed by some experts. According to Li (2018), the learners' native language could be used as a means to start a conversation in teacher-student interaction as well as to promote the employment of the L2. In addition, Vazquez & Ordonez (2019) argue that the use of the L1 is beneficial as "it reduces the time students devote to the use of the L2". However, the excessive use of the L1 is contra-productive, as the students have fewer opportunities to experiment with and use their English (Huriyah & Agustiani, 2018).

The finding of this study also showed that lecturer-student interaction in both spoken and written modes was lecturer-centered. In such an interaction, communication is dominantly handled by the teachers and most of the language produced by them (Sarhandi *et al.*, 2018). While learner-centered learning which should be used in classroom interaction has some powerful strengths such as improving students' motivation, self-directed learning, attitude toward the target language, and belief in the language learning and at the same time reducing students' anxiety (Kassem, 2019), all the lecturers dominated the

interaction in the current study. The ideal classroom interaction suggests that teachers should talk 30% of the whole talk, while students should do 70% (Kostadinovska-Stojchevska, 2019). Teacher-centered interaction was also found in a study conducted by Abdusyukur (2020); the teacher-student interaction in an online EFL classroom followed the traditional pattern, in which teachers play a dominant role in conversations, and students were passive. However, the teacher-centered interaction model is not only experienced in virtual learning but also face-to-face learning. Even though teachers believe that learner-centered is the ideal interaction, in the actual realization, they practiced teacher-centered interaction more frequently than the students-centered model (Kaymakamoglu, 2018). A study conducted by Huriyah & Agustiani (2018) also found that teachers dominated classroom interaction by asking students questions. A different finding was seen in a study conducted by Khodabndeh (2021) that compared interaction in online EFL learning to conventional one. The study revealed an interesting fact that online EFL interaction was more dynamic where students were active and dominated the interaction than in the conventional classroom.

## **CONCLUSION**

There were three kinds of interaction patterns produced both in spoken and written forms of the EFL virtual learning environment conducted in IAIN Parepare, namely Initiation – Response (IR) Pattern, Initiation – Response – Follow-up (IRF) pattern, and Initiation – Response – Follow-up – Follow-up2 (IRFF). Among the four classes, only the listening class produced the complete patterns of interaction, both in the spoken and written mode. In the spoken mode, the reading and writing classes showed the same pattern of interaction, the IR and IRF occurred in the classroom interaction, while in the speaking class, only the IR pattern occurred. Generally, the most common pattern of interaction that occurred in all the classes was the IR. The IR pattern mainly occurred when initiation was started by the lecturer, and students responded to it. The IRF pattern then occurred when the students' responses were accepted by the lecturers. While the IRFF pattern was produced when the lecturer repaired the students' responses, and the students acknowledged the repair. Interaction in the three classes of speaking, reading, and writing performed the same interaction pattern in the written mode. Here, only the IR pattern occurred.

This indicates that the lecturers did not provide any follow-up to the student's responses.

Written interaction in this virtual learning employed utterance categories fewer than spoken interactions. Written interaction applied in this virtual environment was limited for some purposes, such as sharing materials and giving instruction on how to do the tasks, and the dominant pattern of interaction used was the IR, where lecturer-initiated interaction and responded to by students. In this context, lecturers rarely gave feedback on students' responses.

Other characteristics found in both spoken and written interaction of lecturers' and students' talks were the use of the L1 and the domination of lecturers' talks. Even though some studies claimed the positive impact of the L1 in EFL learning, the frequent use of the L1 prevents students from experiencing the target language, affecting to low level of students' English proficiency. Likewise, the domination of the teacher in classroom interaction causes students to be passive, and therefore the classroom interaction is monotonous. Also, students are lazy to engage in learning. Therefore, lecturers should limit the use of L1 in the classroom to help students practice their English. The lecturers should also give students more opportunities to be active in classroom interaction by providing students more chances to initiate and respond to the conversations.

Based on the findings of this study, it is suggested to lecturers give more feedback to students, especially feedback on repairing as a way to teach students a good form of language. Moreover, the lecturers should minimize the use of written interaction to give students more chances in practicing all the utterances categories.

This study had a weakness in the unstable connection of students' internet that less number of spoken interactions produced by the students. Since hybrid learning has become a trend in the EFL learning context in Indonesia, it is recommended that future researchers explore more interaction patterns in online EFL classrooms with more stable internet connections.

## **REFERENCES**

- Abdusyukur, M. R., Sudana, D., & Muslim, A. B. (2022). Exploring Indonesian EFL classroom interactions in an online setting. *Journal of English Education and Teaching*, 6(3), 445-457.
- Alam, M. A., & Ashrafuzzaman, M. (2018). Challenges of developing speaking skill through classroom interaction of EFL learners. *Prime University Journal*, 12(1), 45-67.



- Alraddadi, B. M. (2020). The impact of virtual classes on second language interaction in the Saudi EFL context: A case study of Saudi undergraduate students Nesreen Saud Alahmadi. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)*, 11(3), 23-32.
- Alshumaimeri, Y. A., & Alhumud, A. M. (2021). EFL students' perceptions of the effectiveness of virtual classrooms in enhancing communication skills. *English Language Teaching*, 14(11), 80-96.
- Alswilem, D. A. (2019). Saudi English teachers' use of technology in secondary classrooms: Perceptions, barriers, and suggestions for improvement. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 10(6), 168-178.
- Atmojo, F. N. D., Saleh, M., & Widhiyanto, W. (2020). The implementation of Initiational Response Feedback (IRF) in EFL writing class. *English Education Journal*, 10(2), 225-233.
- Ate, M. B., Kolo, C., & Bera, L. K. (2021). EFL classroom behaviours and interactions: A case study of a teacher and her students in a State Junior High School in academic year 2019/2020 in the city of Kupang, East Nusa Tenggara. *Academic Journal of Educational Sciences*, 5(2), 26-38.
- Coulianos, N., Sapalidou, A., Krouska, A., Troussas, C., & Sgouropoulou, C. (2022). Evaluating e-learning process on virtual classroom systems using an ISO-based model. In *Novel & Intelligent Digital Systems: Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference (NiDS 2022)* (pp. 33-45). Springer International Publishing.
- Cong-Lem, N. (2018). Web-based Language Learning (WBLL) for enhancing L2 speaking performance: A review. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 9(4), 143-152.
- Entusiastik., & Siregar, Y. D. (2022). The role of classroom interaction in online learning: Voices from the students. *JEELS (Journal of English Education and Linguistics)*, 9(1), 51-73.
- Eisenring, M. A. A., & Margana, M. (2019). The importance of teacher-students interaction in Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). *Prasasti: Journal of linguistics*, 4(1), 46-54.
- Estaji., Masoomah., & Shojakhanlou, M. M. (2022). Realization of initiation, response, and feedback in teacher-student interactions in EFL classrooms: Learning realities and opportunities. *Two Quarterly Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning University of Tabriz*, 14(30), 91-114.
- Fibri, L. A. I. (2018). Classroom interaction patterns in EFL classroom at Jakarta Intensive Learning Centre (JILC). *IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, 6(2), 25-34.
- Hakim, B. (2020). Technology integrated online classrooms and the challenges faced by the EFL teachers in Saudi Arabia during the COVID-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 9(5), 33-39.
- Havwini, T. (2019, December). Investigating the interaction patterns in EFL virtual classroom: A case study. In *1st International Conference on Applied Economics and Social Science (ICAESS 2019)* (pp. 166-170). Atlantis Press.
- Huriyah, S., & Agustiani, M. (2018). An analysis of English teacher and learner talk in the classroom interaction. *Linguistic, English Education and Art (LEEA) Journal*, 2(1), 60-71.
- Kartini, K., Syakira, S., & Aisyah, S. (2022). Initiation-response-feedback pattern used by lecturer-students in EFL classroom interaction. *TLEMC (Teaching and Learning English in Multicultural Contexts)*, 6(1), 43-56.
- Kassem, H. M. (2019). The impact of student-centered instruction on EFL learners' affect and achievement. *English language teaching*, 12(1), 134-153.
- Kaymakamoglu, S. E. (2018). Teachers' beliefs, perceived practice and actual classroom practice in relation to traditional (teacher-centered) and constructivist (learner-centered) teaching (note 1). *Journal of Education and Learning*, 7(1), 29-37.
- Khodabndeh, F. (2021). Comparing learners' interactions in conventional and virtual classes of distance education university: Examining two approaches of teaching grammar. *Two Quarterly Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning University of Tabriz*, 13(27), 265-294.
- Kholisoh, M. N., & Bharati, D. A. L. (2021). Teachers' questioning strategies and students' perceptions toward critical questions in EFL classroom interaction. *ELT Forum: Journal of English Language Teachingm*, 10(2), 136-145.
- Kostadinovska-Stojchevska, B., & Popovikj, I. (2019). Teacher talking time vs. student talking time: Moving from teacher-centered classroom to learner-centered classroom. *The International Journal of Applied Language Studies and Culture*, 2(2), 25-31.
- Li, H., & Lam, S. M. S. (2022). Is it inevitable for teachers to talk more? analysing classroom interaction using IRF in CFL classroom. *International Journal of Chinese Language Education*, 12, 99-126.
- Li, J. (2018). L1 in the IRF cycle: a case study of Chinese EFL classrooms. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 3, 1-15.
- Mardani, M., & Gorjizadeh, F. (2020). Discourse patterns of teacher/students and students/students in EFL classroom interactions. *Journal of Language and Discourse Practice*, 1(2), 11-23.
- Mohammed, I. A. E. (2019). Investigation the impact of classroom interaction on EFL students'

- proficiency. *Omdurman Islamic University Journal*, 15(1), 20-40.
- Munir, U. M. (2018). Teacher's verbal feedback in the classroom interaction. *Metathesis: Journal of English Language, Literature, and Teaching*, 2(1), 122-146.
- Nernere, M. S. (2019). Teachers' beliefs on teacher-students interaction in young learners' English class. *Indonesian EFL Journal*, 5(2), 113-120.
- Pavón Vázquez, V., & Ramos Ordóñez, M. D. C. (2019). Describing the use of the L1 in CLIL: An analysis of L1 communication strategies in classroom interaction. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 22(1), 35-48.
- Pratiwi, W. R. (2019). Teacher talk and instructional language choice: Two problems encountered in EFL classroom. *ETERNAL (English, Teaching, Learning, and Research Journal)*, 5(1), 195-204.
- Rasmitadila, R., Samsudin, A., & Prasetyo, T. (2019). Teacher-Students' Instructional Interactions Analysis (TSIIA): A Case Study in Inclusive English classrooms in Indonesia. *The International Journal of Interdisciplinary Educational Studies*, 4(1), 24-32.
- Sarhandi, P. S. A., Asghar, J., & Abidi, A. A. (2018). Interaction patterns in WhatsApp conversation in EFL Classroom: Pedagogical implications. *Journal of Academic and Social Research*, 1(1), 1-18.
- Selamat, E. H., & Melji, S. M. (2022). Investigating the interactions between teacher and students in an EFL classroom. *English Language Education Journal (ELEJ)*, 1(1), 23-42.
- Tsui, A. B. (1995). *Introducing Classroom Interaction*. Penguin Books.
- Tyrväinen, H., Uotinen, S., & Valkonen, L. (2021). Instructor presence in a virtual classroom. *Open Education Studies*, 3(1), 132-146.
- Vindiyasari, R., Ivone, F. M., & Wijayati, P. H. (2022). Classroom interaction in an online speaking class. *Jurnal Pendidikan: Teori, Penelitian, dan Pengembangan*, 7(1).
- Weizheng, Z. (2019). Teacher-student interaction in EFL classroom in China: Communication accommodation theory perspective. *English Language Teaching*, 12(12), 99-111.
- Winanta, A., Rochsantiningih, D., & Supriyadi, S. (2020). Exploring EFL Classroom Interaction: An analysis of teacher talk at senior high school level. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, 3(3), 328-343.
- Willermark, S. (2021). Who's there? Characterizing interaction in virtual classrooms. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 59(6), 1036-1055.
- Yulia, M., & Zainil, Y. (2021). An analysis of teachers' oral feedback in EFL classroom interaction at SMP Negeri 10 Batam. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 10(1), 45-52.