Classroom Interaction in CLIL: A Case Study at Primary Classroom Context

Sherly Aisyia Anggraeni[1], Ima Isnaini Taufiqur Rohmah[2], Ayu Fitrianingsih[3]

[1,2,3]English Education Department, IKIP PGRI Bojonegoro, Indonesia.

sherlyaisyia@gmail.com[1], isnainiima@ikippgribojonegor.ac.id[2],
ayu_fitrianingsih@ikippgribojonegoro.ac.id[3]

Abstract — Classroom interaction in the Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) approach plays a crucial role in supporting both language acquisition and content understanding. This study aims to identify the types of teacher talk and student talk that occur in CLIL-based primary classroom interactions. This research employed a qualitative method with a case study approach. The participants included two English teachers and forty-five fifth-grade students at SD Integral Luqman Al-Hakim, Bojonegoro. Data were collected through classroom observations, interviews, and document analysis, and were analyzed using Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC). The findings revealed that the dominant types of teacher talk were giving directions, asking questions, repeating students' answers, giving praise, and lecturing. Meanwhile, student talk often took the form of specific responses, choral responses, and occasional student-initiated utterances. These interactions were largely influenced by the teachers' questions and classroom activities such as games, group work, and presentations. These findings suggest that balanced interaction between teachers and students in CLIL classrooms can enhance student engagement as well as improve both language skills and subject matter comprehension.

Keywords — CLIL, classroom interaction, teacher talk, student talk, primary education

Abstrak — Interaksi kelas dalam pendekatan Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) berperan penting dalam mendukung penguasaan bahasa dan pemahaman materi pelajaran. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengidentifikasi jenis-jenis tutur guru dan tutur siswa yang muncul dalam interaksi kelas CLIL di tingkat sekolah dasar. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode kualitatif dengan pendekatan studi kasus. Subjek penelitian adalah dua guru bahasa Inggris dan empat puluh lima siswa kelas lima di SD Integral Luqman Al-Hakim, Bojonegoro. Data dikumpulkan melalui observasi kelas, wawancara, dan analisis dokumen, kemudian dianalisis menggunakan Kategori Analisis Interaksi Flanders (FIAC). Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa jenis tutur guru yang dominan adalah memberi instruksi, mengajukan pertanyaan, mengulang jawaban siswa, memberikan pujian, dan menjelaskan materi. Jenis tutur siswa yang sering muncul adalah jawaban spesifik, jawaban bersama, dan inisiatif berbicara. Interaksi dipengaruhi oleh pertanyaan guru dan aktivitas seperti permainan, kerja kelompok, dan presentasi. Hasil temuan ini mengindikasikan bahwa interaksi yang seimbang antara guru dan siswa dalam kelas CLIL dapat mendorong keterlibatan aktif siswa sekaligus meningkatkan kemampuan bahasa dan pemahaman isi pelajaran.

Kata kunci — CLIL, interaksi kelas, tutur guru, tutur siswa, pendidikan dasar

INTRODUCTION

Classroom interaction plays a central role in the teaching and learning process, especially in the context of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). Interaction in classrooms is not limited to exchanging academic content but also involves social exchanges, both verbal and non-verbal, that foster engagement and language development. Effective classroom interaction, as emphasized by scholars like Harmer (2001), Brown (2000), and Tsui (1995), supports student learning and helps shape the classroom environment through collaboration and communication. In CLIL settings, where subject content is taught through a foreign language, this interaction becomes even more crucial, particularly at the primary level where students face the dual challenge of understanding content and acquiring language. However, research focusing on classroom interaction in primary CLIL classrooms is still limited, making it necessary to explore how interaction unfolds in these contexts to support young learners more effectively.

In a study by Rohmah, Faridi, Saleh, and Fitriati (2019) entitled Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL): Teachers' Point of View, the authors explored teachers' perspectives on CLIL programs, focusing on key aspects such as professional orientation, task orientation, self-efficacy, and collegiality. The study, which involved 30 CLIL teachers from various subject areas, used a qualitative case study methodology, capturing data through classroom observations and interviews. The findings underscored the critical role of teachers' professional orientations and self-efficacy in the effective implementation of CLIL. The study recommended that CLIL teachers receive proper training, develop organized syllabi, and utilize various teaching methods to enhance CLIL practices.

Furthermore, a study by Rohmah (2020) entitled The Feasibility and Effectiveness of Integrating Content Knowledge and English Competences for Assessing English Proficiency in CLIL examined the integration of content knowledge and English competence in assessing English proficiency in CLIL settings. The study, conducted across three primary schools in East Java, Indonesia, used a combined research method with semi-structured interviews, questionnaires, and pre- and post-tests. The results revealed that integrating content knowledge with English

competences is both feasible and effective in assessing English proficiency, with statistically significant improvements in students' English proficiency. The study highlights the importance of balancing content and language in CLIL assessment, which directly impacts the effectiveness of language acquisition in CLIL programs.

In addition, Rohmah, Nurdianingsih, and Zainudin (2020) investigated the need for standardized CLIL assessment practices in Indonesia. Their findings revealed that the assessment practices used were not yet sufficient to effectively evaluate students' English performance. They emphasized the importance of incorporating all four basic language skills in assessment instruments to accurately measure students' abilities within the CLIL framework.

This study aims to investigate two key questions based on the issues outlined in the background. First, it seeks to identify the types of student talk that occur in a CLIL classroom context. Second, it aims to explore the types of teacher talk that appear during classroom interactions. These research problems guide the overall direction of the study and focus on uncovering the communicative dynamics between teachers and students in a CLIL-based primary classroom.

Aligned with the research problems, the objectives of this study are twofold: (1) to identify the various types of teacher talk that emerge during classroom interaction, and (2) to identify the types of student talk that characterize communication in the CLIL classroom. These objectives are intended to provide a clearer picture of how both teacher and student interactions contribute to the learning environment, particularly in a bilingual instructional setting.

The significance of this research lies in its potential to benefit multiple stakeholders. For students, the findings offer insights into how active engagement in classroom interaction supports both content learning and language acquisition. For teachers, the study provides practical strategies to promote meaningful interaction that enhances student participation and learning outcomes in primary CLIL settings. For researchers, it serves as a valuable reference to deepen the understanding of interactional dynamics in bilingual education and encourages further investigation into CLIL practices at the primary level.

To ensure clarity in the study, two key terms are defined. Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) refers to an educational approach where subject matter is taught through a foreign language, promoting both content mastery and language development. This dual-focused pedagogy is complex and varies in implementation, yet it is widely recognized for its benefits in bilingual education. Classroom interaction is understood as the exchange of verbal and non-verbal communication among teachers and students within the classroom. It functions as a core mechanism for learning and reflects the social and pedagogical relationships that shape educational experiences.

METHOD

This study employed a qualitative approach using a descriptive case study design to explore the dynamics of classroom interaction within a Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) context at the primary school level. A case study was deemed appropriate as it enabled the researchers to examine real-life classroom events in depth, particularly focusing on teacher–student and student–student interactions during instruction. As stated by Yin (2003), a case study is effective for investigating contemporary phenomena within their natural context, and this method aligned with the study's goal of understanding classroom discourse practices in an authentic educational environment.

The research was conducted at SD Integral Luqman Al-Hakim in Bojonegoro, East Java, Indonesia, over a period of two months, from February to March 2024. Data collection was carried out through three weekly observation sessions, each lasting approximately 90 minutes, focusing on Science, Mathematics, and Language classes where English was integrated into the learning process. The fifth-grade level was chosen due to its critical role in language development and the richness of interaction it presented within a bilingual educational setting.

Participants were selected through purposive sampling, involving two experienced classroom teachers and 45 fifth-grade students from classes 5A and 5C. Both teachers had over a decade of teaching experience and were directly involved in implementing CLIL strategies. In addition to participants, the data sources included

natural classroom events and documents such as lesson plans, teaching materials, interview transcripts, school schedules, and video recordings, which provided contextual insights into the teaching process.

To obtain comprehensive qualitative data, the researchers utilized semi-structured interviews, non-participant observation, and document analysis. Interviews were conducted with two English teachers and ten students, featuring open-ended questions that allowed for flexible and in-depth responses. Each interview lasted between 25 to 60 minutes and was conducted in Indonesian with the participants' consent. Observations were carried out without researchers interference to maintain the authenticity of classroom interactions. The researchers observed multiple subjects to understand how English was embedded in different content areas. Document analysis complemented these methods by providing factual information and supporting data from official school records and teaching documents.

The collected data were analyzed using the interactive model proposed by Miles and Huberman (1994), which consists of data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing with verification. During data reduction, the researchers coded, categorized, and summarized the data to identify emerging patterns. This was followed by data display, in which information was organized systematically into narrative and visual formats to facilitate interpretation. Finally, conclusions were drawn and continuously verified against the data to ensure their credibility.

To enhance the trustworthiness of the findings, several validation strategies recommended by Creswell (2007) were employed. These included triangulation by comparing data from interviews, observations, and documents, as well as applying multiple theoretical perspectives. Member checking was also conducted by allowing participants to review and confirm the accuracy of the research interpretations. Additionally, rich and thick description was used to provide detailed contextual information and participant perspectives, enabling readers to gain a deep understanding of the research setting and its implications.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

This chapter presents the findings of the classroom observation conducted in a 5th grade CLIL classroom. The findings are divided into two major categories: Teacher Talk and Student Talk, based on the frequency and types of utterances observed during two classroom sessions.

1. Teacher Talk

The observation results revealed various types of teacher talk. The total number of teacher utterances recorded from both observations was 963 utterances. The distribution is presented in the table below:

Table 1. Types of Teacher Talk

No.	Types of Teacher Talk	Total Frequency	Percentage
1.	Accepting student's feeling	4	0.4%
2.	Praising & Encouraging	106	11%
3.	Joking	11	1.1%
4.	Accepting/Using student's ideas	37	4%
5.	Asking Question	233	24.2%
6.	Repeating student's response verbatim	108	11.2%
7.	Lecturing/Giving information	215	22.3%
8.	Giving directions	179	18.6%
9.	Criticizing/Justifying student's behavior/response	59	6.1%
10.	Giving feedback	11	1.1%
	Total	**963**	**100%**

Based on the table 1, the most frequently used type of teacher talk is asking questions with a total of 233 times (24.2%). This shows that teachers actively ask students questions as the main strategy to encourage participation and check for understanding. These questions create a two-way interaction between teachers and students.

In addition, the teacher also used lecturing/giving information 215 times (22.3%). This shows the teacher's role as the main source of information in learning,

especially in the CLIL context where the teacher not only teaches the language but also the content of the lesson.

Another dominant type is giving directions 179 times (18.6%), which shows that teachers give a lot of instructions or directions in the learning process, such as task orders or class arrangements.

Other types of teacher talk such as praising & encouraging (11%), repeating student's response (11.2%), and criticizing/justifying (6.1%) show the teacher's effort in reinforcing, clarifying, and coaching students' behavior. While the least used types are accepting student's feeling (0.4%) and joking and giving feedback (1.1% each), which shows that affective aspects and humor are not very dominant in this classroom interaction.

2. Student Talk

The total number of student utterances recorded during the two observations was 447 utterances, categorized as follows:

Table 2. Types of Student Talk

No.	Types of Student Talk	Total Frequency	Percentage
1.	Student talk, response (specific)	150	33.6%
2.	Student talk, response (choral)	75	16.8%
3.	Student talk, initiation	23	5.1%
4.	Student talk, inquiry	8	1.8%
5.	Expressing lack of understanding verbally	10	2.2%
6.	Student talk in single	63	14.1%
7.	Student talk in pairs	5	1.1%
8.	Student talk in groups	7	1.6%
9.	Silence	50	11.2%
10.	Silence-AV	7	1.6%
11.	Confusion (work-oriented)	21	4.7%
12.	Confusion (non-work-oriented)	2	0.4%
13.	Hand-rising participation	1	0.2%
14.	Laughing	25	5.6%
	Total	**447**	**100%**

Table 2 shows that the most dominant type of student talk is student talk, response (specific) 150 times (33.6%). This shows that students mostly respond directly to questions or directions from the teacher with specific answers, which means they are active but in a context guided by the teacher.

Another type that appears quite often is student talk, response (choral) 75 times (16.8%), where students answer together, usually in the form of repetition or short easy answers.

Student talk in single was also quite high, at 63 times (14.1%), indicating that students sometimes spoke alone (not in groups or pairs), either voluntarily or when called by the teacher.

In contrast, the types of student talk that show student initiative such as student talk, initiation (5.1%) and student talk, inquiry (1.8%) are still low. This indicates that student participation is still dominated by responses to the teacher, and not many have actively initiated communication.

In addition, there is silence (11.2%) which indicates that at some moments students do not respond, which can be interpreted as a pause in thinking, not knowing the answer, or lack of confidence.

Other types such as confusion (4.7%), laughing (5.6%), and expressing lack of understanding (2.2%) indicate a variety of emotional and cognitive responses from students during the learning process. Meanwhile, student talk in groups and in pairs is still very minimal, indicating that collaborative activities between students have not been carried out much during the observation.

Discussion

This section offers the discussion on some issues that emerge from the research findings. It elaborates and interprets the results of this research based on the research questions mentioned in Chapter I and the previous studies. At last, they form the main propositions of this research. Based on the research findings in the previous section, there are two propositions that are formed by the researchers: (1) the teachers perform a variety of teacher talk types as a way to engage students and encourage active participation in the teaching and learning process; (2) the students also demonstrate

various types of student talk as part of their involvement in classroom activities and interaction. The depth explanations are as follows:

1. **The Teachers Perform a Variety of Teacher Talk Types as a Way to Engage Students and Encourage Active Participation in The Teaching and Learning Process.**

   The findings reveal that teachers employed a wide range of teacher talk types to foster active student engagement in the learning process. These included giving directions, asking questions, lecturing, repeating students' responses verbatim, offering praise and encouragement, and occasionally correcting student behavior. These patterns align with prior research, such as Nunan (1991), who observed that teachers often dominate classroom talk without realizing it.

   The roles played by the teachers such as controller, director, facilitator, and resource were evident in the way they guided classroom discourse. Giving directions was particularly frequent and served as a tool to structure learning activities clearly and effectively. Students also confirmed the importance of clear, concise instructions, which helped them follow lessons more easily, echoing recommendations by Rhalmi (2010).

   Teachers also frequently used questions to prompt student responses and stimulate classroom interaction. Questions were derived from both the textbook and real-life topics, and they helped sustain dialogue, assess student understanding, and keep learners involved. This aligns with the idea that effective questioning encourages participation and deeper thinking (Fisher & Frey, 2009; Long et al., 1984).

   Other strategies like repeating student responses were used to reinforce peer learning, provide pronunciation correction, and signal the importance of student contributions. Lecturing, while used frequently, was balanced with interaction and typically aimed at providing background information or clarifying difficult content.

   Positive reinforcement through praise and encouragement was also common, intended to boost student motivation and confidence. This approach aligns with research suggesting that recognition and praise can foster a more supportive learning environment (Goronga, 2013; Setiawati, 2012).

Less frequently used forms of teacher talk included accepting or using students' ideas, joking, and giving feedback. However, when used, these forms contributed to a more relaxed and interactive classroom atmosphere. Accepting students' feelings was the least observed, potentially indicating a need for teachers to be more attuned to students' emotional states during lessons.

Overall, teacher talk played a central role in shaping classroom interaction and student participation. While certain types like directions and questioning dominated, integrating more varied and student-responsive talk types could further enhance learning. As Brown (2001) cautions, teacher talk should not overshadow opportunities for student interaction, highlighting the need for a balanced communicative approach. However, implementing such balanced interaction in CLIL classrooms is not always easy. Isnaini et al. (2019) argue that challenges such as teachers' limited English proficiency, lack of pedagogical training in CLIL, and insufficient learning materials hinder effective content and language delivery in the Indonesian context. These constraints can affect the quality of both teacher and student talk. Moreover, observation plays a vital role in shaping the quality of teacher-student interaction in CLIL classrooms. As shown in a study by Muktamir et al. (2022), teachers utilize techniques such as questioning, probing, and small group interactions as part of observation-based assessment to evaluate and support students' English performance. This formative approach allows teachers to provide timely feedback, adjust instruction, and communicate assessment outcomes effectively, which contributes to more purposeful classroom interaction.

2. **The Students Also Demonstrate Various Types of Student Talk as Part of Their Involvement in Classroom Activities and interaction.**

The research findings indicate that students in both observed classes actively engaged in nearly all types of student talk during classroom learning activities. Some forms of student talk were likely employed as part of their learning strategies. These types primarily fall into two categories: responses and initiations. Teacher inputs such as directions, explanations, and questions appeared to encourage student interaction. Senowarsito (2013:94) emphasizes that students frequently use interpersonal markers

like agreement, disagreement, reaction, and confirmation during learning, indicating active involvement. Similarly, Candela (1999:157) notes that student engagement with academic tasks enhances their role in constructing knowledge and enables them to make meaningful discourse contributions.

In first class, all types of student talk were observed. Types such as specific responses, individual and choral responses, group and pair talk, student-initiated talk, laughter, and silence each exceeded 5%. Less frequently observed were inquiry, verbal confusion related to task difficulty, expressions of misunderstanding, non-task-related confusion, AV silence, and hand-raising each under 5%. In contrast, Class Two students did not use all talk types group talk was absent. Frequently used types (above 4%) included specific and choral responses, individual talk, laughter, initiation, and both types of confusion. Types with less than 4% included inquiry, silence, pair talk, AV silence, verbal misunderstandings, and hand-raising.

These patterns suggest that students were not passive learners. The variety of activities provided by teachers encouraged participation. According to Nunan (1999:241), students' active use of the target language is a fundamental component of language acquisition. While responses were not always delivered individually choral responses were common students reported that answering together felt safer and minimized the fear of making mistakes. Brock-Utne (2006:35) supports this, identifying choral responses as a form of "safe talk."

However, students showed limited initiation due to low confidence. Maurine et al. (2012:144) explain that students may hesitate to initiate due to fear, lack of confidence, or fear of criticism, especially if the teacher does not encourage such behavior. Teachers typically facilitated student responses through nomination, volunteering, choral answering, and teacher-self responses (Setiawati, 2012:43).

Teachers also incorporated a mix of engaging learning tasks such as games, textbook exercises, and pair or group tasks. These activities foster communicative output, as suggested by Harmer (2001:49). Students reported being motivated to complete tasks, particularly because they were often required to present their work. Hadfield (1992:45) highlights pair work as an effective strategy to maximize student talk time. Thus, such classroom activities significantly promote student engagement.

In addition to task-based activities, teachers also used audio-visual materials to support learning. These tools, including videos, captured students' attention, increased motivation, and provided meaningful language input. Teachers acknowledged that silence during AV material use was purposeful, as students focused on understanding the content. Cakir (2006:67) notes that videos help students conceptualize ideas and interpret contextual and non-verbal aspects of the language. This balance between textbook and AV input prevents monotony and enhances the learning experience (Mathew & Alidmat, 2013:88).

Students are expected to develop greater awareness and initiative in their learning. Rubin and Thompson (1983, cited in Nunan, 1991:171) outline characteristics of good language learners, including creativity, willingness to take risks, strategic learning, and using context for comprehension. Activities like games, individual and group tasks help foster these qualities. Therefore, teachers play a crucial role in designing engaging learning experiences that stimulate interaction.

In line with the 2013 Curriculum, which promotes student-centered learning, the availability of diverse tasks in the English textbook such as warm-up activities, individual, pair, and group exercises supports student participation. These activities help increase students' awareness and encourage active involvement in classroom discourse.

CONCLUSIONS

The findings reveal that the teachers employ almost all types of teacher talk to encourage student engagement and active participation in the teaching and learning process. They design a variety of communicative learning activities that lead to the continuous use of teacher talk. The most frequently used types include giving directions, asking questions, lecturing or providing information, praising and encouraging students, and repeating students' responses verbatim. Meanwhile, criticizing or justifying student behavior, accepting or using students' ideas, giving feedback, joking, and acknowledging students' feelings are used less frequently. In delivering the lesson, both teachers regularly incorporate warm-up activities, games,

individual tasks, pair work, and group work, which contributes to the dominance of certain types of teacher talk in the classroom.

The students also demonstrate the use of almost all types of student talk during the learning process in the classroom. They use various types of student talk continuously, although in different proportions, depending on the interactive activities provided by the teachers. It was found that students were often assigned individual, pair, and group tasks throughout the learning process. The more interactive the learning activities given by the teachers, the more students engage verbally in the classroom.

REFERENCES

Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (4th ed.). Longman.

Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (2nd ed.). Longman.

Brock-Utne, B. (2006). *Whose education for all? The recolonization of the African mind*. African Books Collective.

Cakir, I. (2006). The use of video as an audio-visual material in foreign language teaching classroom. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, *5*(4), 67–72.

Candela, A. (1999). Students' power in classroom discourse. *Linguistics and Education*, *10*(2), 139–163. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0898-5898(99)80003-7.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.

Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2009). *Background knowledge: The missing piece of the comprehension puzzle*. Heinemann.

Goronga, P. (2013). Praise and learning: The influence of teacher praise on learners' motivation in Zimbabwean secondary schools. *Greener Journal of Educational Research*, *3*(5), 222–228.

Hadfield, J. (1992). *Classroom dynamics*. Oxford University Press.

Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of English language teaching* (3rd ed.). Longman.

Isnaini, I., Rohmah, T., Saleh, M., Faridi, A., & Fitriati, S. W. (2019). *The challenges in implementing content and language integrated learning*. In Proceedings of the

International Seminar on English Teaching (ISET). IKIP PGRI Bojonegoro. Retrieved from https://repository.ikippgribojonegoro.ac.id/1885/.

Long, M. H., Adams, L., McLean, M., & Castanos, F. (1984). Doing things with words: Verbal interaction in lockstep and small group classroom situations. *TESOL Quarterly*, *18*(4), 531–552. https://doi.org/10.2307/3586584.

Mathew, N. G., & Alidmat, A. O. H. (2013). A study on the usefulness of audio-visual aids in EFL classroom: Implications for effective instruction. *International Journal of Higher Education*, *2*(2), 86–92. https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v2n2p86.

Maurine, K., Margareta, L., & Regina, R. (2012). *Classroom communication and teacher's role in teaching English*. UNNES Press.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.

Muktamir, M., Isnaini, I., & Rohmah, T. (2022). The use of teacher's observation for assessing students' English performance in CLIL. Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran (JPE), 9(1), 52-60. Retrieved from https://ejurnal.ikippgribojonegoro.ac.id/index.php/JPE/article/view/2408.

Nunan, D. (1991). *Language teaching methodology: A textbook for teachers*. Prentice Hall.

Nunan, D. (1999). *Second language teaching & learning*. Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Rhalmi, M. (2010, May 3). *Teacher roles in language learning*. My English Pages. Retrieved from https://www.myenglishpages.com/blog/teacher-roles-in-language-learning/.

Rohmah, T., Taufiqur, I., Faridi, A., & Saleh, M. (2019). *Content and language integrated learning (CLIL): Teachers' point of view. European Union Digital Library*, 594-600. Retrieved from https://repository.ikippgribojonegoro.ac.id/1884/.

Rohmah, I. I. T. (2020). The feasibility and effectiveness of integrating content knowledge and English competences for assessing English proficiency in CLIL. *Eternal (English Teaching Journal)*, 11(2), 175–188. Retrieved from https://journal.upgris.ac.id/index.php/eternal/article/view/3909.

Rohmah, I. I. T., Nurdianingsih, F., & Zainudin, M. (2020). The needs of standardized CLIL assessment in Indonesia. In *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Pendidikan IKIP PGRI Bojonegoro* (pp. 1–7). https://prosiding.ikippgribojonegoro.ac.id/index.php/Prosiding/article/view/1137.

Senowarsito. (2013). Politeness strategies in teacher-student interaction in an EFL classroom context. *TEFLIN Journal*, 24(1), 82–96. https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v24i1/82-96.

Setiawati, L. (2012). Teacher verbal feedback to students' responses: A communicative approach of teaching English as a foreign language. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *1*(2), 42–49. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v1i2.84.

Tsui, A. B. M. (1995). *Introducing classroom interaction*. Penguin English.

Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.