

The Social Dimension of Teacher Student Interaction in English Teaching

Zahara Safrina Aini Lubis^{1*}), Ahmad Laut hasibuan²⁾

^{1,2}Universitas Muslim Nusantara Al Washliyah, Medan, Indonesia

Email: zaharasafrina02@gmail.com¹, ahmadlauthsb@gmail.com²

Correspondence Authors: zaharasafrina02@gmail.com

Article history: Received November 24, 2025; revised December 22, 2025; accepted January 17, 2026

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License



ABSTRACT

This qualitative research investigates the social dimensions, power relations, and underlying ideologies in teacher-student interaction within the English classroom at the MTS PP Al-Qomariyah. Despite the curriculum shift toward a student-centered approach, there is potential for unintentional power imbalances and ideological influences that limit student exploration. This study aims to identify social dimensions (social norms, status, roles, and power) and understand the influence of underlying learning ideologies. The research employed a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) methodology, utilizing Norman Fairclough's three-dimensional framework. The participants were English teachers and Grade IX students at the school. Data were collected through classroom observations and analysis of interaction transcripts, with an analysis focused on connecting discourse to ideology and social practice. The findings revealed that classroom interaction is primarily shaped by an Asymmetrical Hierarchy rooted in the Pesantren (Islamic boarding school) context. This hierarchy is constantly reinforced by Hegemonic Values such as Adab (etiquette) and Kepatuhan (obedience), which manifest linguistically through formal addresses. Furthermore, the underlying ideology is dual, instrumental (English as a technical tool) and normative (requiring content to be filtered by religious/cultural values). In conclusion, the traditional institutional context strongly affects modern pedagogical roles. This study recommends implementing practical strategies to democratize classroom discourse and foster a more empowering, inclusive learning environment.

Keywords: Teacher-Student Interaction, Social Dimension, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

I. INTRODUCTION

The social dimension refers to the aspects of human life that involve interactions, relationships, and structures within society. This encompasses how individuals and groups function within a community, including cultural norms, social roles, institutions, and power dynamics. In broader terms, the social dimension is concerned with how people relate to one another, form identities, and participate in collective life.

Furthermore, according to Bourdieu, a prominent sociologist, the social dimension is deeply tied to the concept of social capital, which refers to the resources individuals gain through their relationships and networks (Shmatko & Markova, 2025). Similarly, Emile Durkheim emphasized the importance of social cohesion and collective consciousness in maintaining societal stability (Khara & Soren, 2025). These perspectives highlight the interdependence of individuals in a social system. Also, inline with these statement, according to Turner (2003) social dimension refers to the social and cultural factors that influence how individuals interact with each other. This dimension includes social norms, cultural values, social roles, social status, and power (K, 2025).

The social dimension manifested within the interaction of teacher-student and student-student. Thus, the social dimension is inseparable from social interaction, because social interaction itself is a process in which individuals interact and influence each other. Social interaction is the action or behavior of an individual directly aimed at another individual. Social interaction can occur in various forms, such as verbal and nonverbal communication, cooperation, conflict, and competition. Social interaction is also influenced by social dimensions, because individuals interact based on the norms and values that apply to society. For example, the norm of politeness requires individuals to speak politely and respect others in social interactions (Batat, 2025).

Social interaction are inseparable from social dynamics. Social interaction dynamics refer to the changes and developments that occur in social interaction over time. These dynamics are influenced by various factors, including social dimensions, characteristics of the individuals involved in the interaction, and the context of

the interaction. For example, changes in social norms can affect how individuals interact. Additionally, individual characteristics such as personality and experience can affect the dynamics of social interaction. Despite these inseparable relations, this research mostly examined the social dimension within English classrooms.

The social dimension also includes issues such as social inclusion and equity. In the context of education, especially in the classroom, this refers to interpersonal interactions, relationships, and group dynamics that influence the learning environment. It encompasses how students and teachers interact, collaborate, and build a sense of community, which can significantly impact their academic performance, engagement, and emotional well-being. The social dimension of teacher-student interaction play an important role in creating an effective learning environment. Positive and supportive interaction between teachers and students can increase student motivation and learning outcomes (Khvedelidze et al., 2025). Based on this statement, the interaction between teachers and students is a fundamental foundation in the learning process, especially in the context of English language teaching. Effective and positive interaction can create a conducive learning environment, motivate students, and encourage deeper understanding. According to UNESCO (2017), inclusive education ensures that all students feel welcomed and supported in the classroom regardless of their background or abilities. This involves fostering a culture of respect, empathy, and collaboration between students and teachers. Based on this statement, learning is highly dependent on how this interaction is established and the social dimensions within it (Arshad, 2025).

In conclusion, the social dimensions of teacher-student interaction in English learning encompass various aspects, such as how teachers build positive relationships with students, how students interact and collaborate with each other, how power and authority are distributed in the classroom, and how social and cultural norms influence these interactions. These aspects can affect student motivation, self-confidence, and participation in the learning process. If the interactions are positive and inclusive, students will feel comfortable actively participating, taking challenge, and developing their critical thinking skills. Conversely, if the interactions are less supportive, students may feel excluded and unmotivated, and find it difficult to achieve learning objectives.

This situation presents a significant challenge for educators worldwide, particularly in Indonesia. Teachers are increasingly expected to create learning environments characterized by positive, equitable, interactive, and comfortable relationships, where students feel secure enough to articulate and explore their ideas freely throughout the learning process.

However, in practice, there is potential for unintentional power imbalances and ideological influences within teacher-student interactions, especially during English language instruction. Unfortunately, this hinders the very nature of effective teacher-student approaches, particularly under the current "Merdeka Curriculum," which positions the teacher as a facilitator. In some instances, with teachers maintaining a degree of "power" in classroom management, they regrettably—and sometimes unconsciously—tend to guide discussions towards topics they are more proficient in or deem more important, thereby inadvertently restricting students' ideas.

Furthermore, in managing classroom interactions, teachers naturally control who speaks, how long it takes, and how often it takes. If not carefully managed, this can lead to more active students dominating discussions, inadvertently marginalizing the students who are shy by not providing them with sufficient opportunities to participate. Consequently, these students may feel that their learning activities lack meaning because of a perceived lack of involvement, ultimately diminishing their enthusiasm for active participation.

This study is important for several reasons. First, research on teacher-student interaction in the context of English learning is still relatively limited, especially at the MTS level. Second, a deeper understanding of these social dimensions of interaction can provide valuable insights for teachers in designing and implementing more effective and inclusive learning. Third, this research can contribute to teacher professional development, particularly by facilitating positive and productive interactions in the classroom.

Moreover, in K13 and Kurikulum Merdeka, teachers play a different role compared to the previous KTSP. Teachers are no longer the primary source of information, but rather act as facilitators and guides for students in the process of discovering their own knowledge. This is another reason for the importance of conducting this study. The reasons are to help uncover how power and ideology are manifested in teacher-student interactions during the learning process. In English learning, teachers may unconsciously still maintain control over the learning process by facilitating discussions, providing feedback, or directing students.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) was a research methodology used in this study to study the social dimension in the classroom. CDA offers a comprehensive framework for an in-depth analysis of teacher-student interaction. CDA helps identify how power, ideology, and certain values are manifested in the language used

by teachers and students, and how this affects the dynamics of interaction in the classroom (Fairclough, 2003). By analyzing this discourse, this study aims to uncover the hidden social dimensions in teacher-student interaction and provide practical recommendations to improve the quality of English language teaching, especially at the schools in which this research will be conducted. This research aims to learn the teacher-student social dimension that manifests within interactions in the English teaching and learning classroom. There are various studies on CDA and its social dimension. Some studies include research that have explored the social dimensions of online learning and the ways in which learners interact and communicate with other learners and their tutors using electronic communication networks (Botes et al., 2025). The context for this exploration is a module provided by a networked, geographically dispersed, higher education institution. This study argues that the social context of online learning is qualitatively different from face-to-face learning, and that this has significant implications for online learning design.

Another study by Botes et al. (2025) examined how learner autonomy and self-regulated learning might be related by comparing and contrasting the two constructs. After identifying the traits that learner autonomy and self-regulated learning have in common, Murray argues that to understand how they differ, we must look beyond a discrete point comparison of their features. Murray then expands the scope of the analysis to include their social dimensions, which resulted what Murray concluded: "despite a movement towards social concerns, self-regulated learning research remains primarily concerned with learners' cognitive processes. On the other hand, I see research into learner autonomy as being situated at the interface of the self and social worlds. (Botes et al., 2025)"

Meanwhile, a study conducted by Baranova et al. (2025) argued that the conceptual understanding of participants in the deliberative discourse style condition was higher than that in the disputative condition. Furthermore, even though previous studies have reported that belief in human interaction benefits learning in consensual interactions, the opposite was found to be true in a setting of disagreement and critique: belief in interaction with a computer agent resulted in higher conceptual learning gains, compared to belief in interaction with a human peer. The implications for theory and instructional design are also discussed (Baranova et al., 2025).

Furthermore, Ivani (2024) analyzed student and teacher communication in discovery learning using transcript-based lesson analysis (TBLA). The results of the analysis showed that in the preliminary activity, communication was dominated by the teacher. The dialogue that appears is merely minimalistic. In core activities, student communication began to dominate, particularly during the collaboration and communication stages. The use of interactive simulation media during the collaboration stage improved communication between students. The creativity stage was mostly dominated by the teacher, until the closing activity, and less by student communication. The lag time between teacher questions and student answers is the key to student responses. When a pause is given too quickly, there is no communication from students at almost all stages (Irvan Irvani & Agus, 2024).

Moreover, several studies have employed Norman Fairclough's three-dimensional Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) model to examine power dynamics and ideological representations in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms. Santoso (2018) integrated Fairclough's framework to analyze news discourse in Indonesian EFL reading tasks, design activities that reveal hidden ideologies, and foster students' critical thinking. Similarly, Rachmawati (2022) applied CDA alongside French and Raven's power base theory to transcripts of teacher-student interactions, uncovering how teachers' coercive dominance through commands impedes learner outcomes and recommends reduced directivity for equitable discourse.

Chandra (2024) extended this approach to content analysis of grade 7 English textbooks, identifying sociocultural biases such as gender stereotypes via Fairclough's text, discursive practice, and social practice dimensions, with implications for curriculum revision. Collectively, these studies demonstrate CDA's versatility of CDA in EFL contexts—from external media (Santoso), live interactions (Rachmawati), and static materials (Chandra)—highlighting consistent findings on how linguistic power perpetuates inequality, while advocating democratic teaching designs to empower learners. The differences lie in their foci and applications: Santoso emphasizes practical task integration for awareness; Rachmawati diagnoses interpersonal power imbalances; and Chandra targets representational flaws in resources, yet all converge on Fairclough's model as a tool for transformative pedagogy in EFL.

While there has been extensive research on analyses using the CDA method and research related to social dimensions, studies that discuss the analysis of social dimensions in English learning, especially in the Islamic/Madrasah tsanawiyah context, are still limited. Some of the previously discussed studies also tend not to discuss the application of CDA as a tool to analyze the social dimensions depicted in the learning model. Therefore, this research focuses on examining the social dimensions depicted through the dynamics of

interaction that occur during the teaching and learning process, which is analyzed using the CDA approach based on the theories of Norman Fairclough (1995), which analyzes and explores how discourse shapes and regulates individuals, and how power works through knowledge and discourse.

This research is expected to make a significant contribution to the development of more effective and student-centered (based on K13 and Kurikulum Merdeka) English teaching strategies. In addition, this research is expected to provide insights for teachers about the importance of social dimensions in teacher-student interaction and how to create a positive and inclusive learning environment for all students.

II. METHODS

A. Research Design

Essentially, the research setting is the physical, social, or virtual context within which data collection and research activities occur. It's the "where" and "when" of your research, encompassing all the elements that could potentially influence your study's outcomes. Understanding and carefully considering the research setting is crucial for ensuring the validity, reliability, and generalizability of the findings. In addition, Marshall and Rossman (2014) highlight the significance of the research setting in qualitative research, arguing that it is not merely a backdrop, but an integral part of the phenomenon being studied. They stress the need for researchers to be reflexive about their own role in shaping the setting and be aware of how the setting influences the data they collect (Marshall, C. and Rossman, 2014).

This research was conducted at the MTS PP Al-Qomariyah, a junior high school level. This location was chosen because it provides a representative context for exploring teacher-student interaction within the Discovery Learning strategy in an Indonesian MTS PP setting. The researcher had access to this school and its participants, which facilitated data collection.

B. Research Method

Creswell and Plano Clark (2017) define research methods as the specific procedures for data collection, analysis, and interpretation that researchers use in a study. They emphasize that the choice of method should be aligned with the research question and overall research design (Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, 2017). In addition, Bryman (2012) described research methods as a technique for collecting data. It can involve specific instruments, such as questionnaires or interview schedules, or a more general approach, such as participant observation (Bryman, 2004).

This research was a qualitative study using CDA as an approach. Fairclough (1989) defined CDA as a discourse analysis that aims to explore how discourse constructs, legitimates, and challenges social inequalities. He emphasizes the role of language in shaping our understanding of the world and social identities. Furthermore, van Dijk (2001) emphasizes the socio-cognitive aspect of CDA, contending that discourse is a social and cognitive phenomenon in addition to a linguistic one. Van Dijk places strong emphasis on how ideological convictions, social knowledge, and mental models influence how discourse is produced and understood. Wodak and Meyer (2009) then characterized CDA as a problem-oriented, transdisciplinary research approach that aims to analyze social problems and contribute to their solution. CDA is an interdisciplinary method for studying speech that views language as a social practice and is called critical discourse analysis, (CDA). It investigates how language is used to create, uphold, and perpetuate power dynamics, ideologies, and social injustices rather than merely documenting linguistic traits.

Furthermore, this approach was specified in Fairclough's (1992, 1989, 2003) approach. Norman Fairclough's approach to Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is characterized by its focus on the relationship between language, power, and ideology in contemporary society. His framework is particularly useful for analyzing how discourse contributes to the construction and maintenance of social inequalities. Fairclough emphasizes the importance of analyzing discourse at multiple levels, from the micro-level of linguistic features to the macro-level of social and political contexts (Fairclough, 2003).

C. Data Collection Technique

According to Sugiyono (2017), techniques of collecting data are essential methods used in research to gather information from various sources (Sugiyono, 2017). These techniques can include surveys, interviews, observations, and documentation, each serving different purposes depending on the research objectives. The techniques used in this study are as follows:

Systematic description of events, behaviors, and artifacts in the social setting chosen for the study." She emphasized the importance of detailed and accurate record-keeping. This observation allows researchers to study behavior in its natural context, providing rich and nuanced data that may not be accessible through other

methods. Based on these statements, the observation process was conducted in the classroom in this study. The observation was recorded after the teacher entered and prepared the classroom to begin learning.

Efficiency and cost-effectiveness of document analysis as a data collection method. He noted that documents are often readily available and can provide valuable insights into the context of a research study. Document analysis is a systematic procedure for reviewing or evaluating printed and electronic document. Similar to other analytical methods in qualitative research, document analysis involves the interpretation of materials to increase the understanding of a phenomenon. In the context of this research, documentation was carried out using the recording method, which involves video recording of teacher-student interactions in the classroom. A qualitative research interview was conducted on a construction site for knowledge. Inter-view, where knowledge is constructed in the inter-action between the interviewer and interviewee." Thus, an interview is a data collection method in which a researcher asks the participants question to gather information about their experiences, perspectives, and beliefs. Interviews can be conducted face-to-face, via telephone, or online. Furthermore, Galletta (2013) describes semi-structured interviews as a "flexible approach" that allows researchers to gather rich, detailed data while maintaining a degree of consistency across interviews. Whiting (2008) emphasized that semi-structured interviews are particularly useful for exploring participants' perspectives on complex or sensitive topics. The flexibility of the approach allows the interviewer to build rapport and encourages participants to share their experiences in their own words.

In this research, the researcher used semi-structured interview, as semi-structured interview is a type of interview that uses an interview guide or topic list to ensure that certain topics are covered, but also allows the interviewer to deviate from the guide and explore new areas based on the participants responses. This is a flexible approach that combines structured and unstructured elements.

D. Data Analysis Technique

In this study, the data were processed and analyzed using Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña (2014). Their approach was characterized by three key stages: data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing/verification. Data condensation involves reducing and simplifying data through processes such as coding, taking memos, and selecting themes, allowing the researcher to focus on the most relevant information. Furthermore, the researcher will also use the CDA approach to analyze relevant data.

Data display focuses on organizing condensed data into visual formats such as matrices, charts, networks, and diagrams, making patterns and relationships more readily apparent.

Finally, conclusion drawing/verification involves interpreting the displayed data to develop meaningful insights, and testing these interpretations through further data analysis and triangulation to ensure their validity and reliability. This cyclical and iterative process provides a structured framework for transforming voluminous qualitative data into credible and well-supported data.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Research Result

Before delving into the specific findings gathered through field observations, it is essential to first establish the institutional and cultural context of the school environment under investigation. This foundational step is critical because the classroom is not a neutral space; rather, it is a complex social arena where pedagogical practices are deeply intertwined with, and often dictated by, the surrounding institutional values. Understanding this environment allows for proper interpretation of the interactional patterns, discourse choices, and social dimensions observed within the English class. MTS PP Al-Qomariyah functions as a formal junior secondary school operating under the umbrella of Pesantren (Islamic Boarding School). This dual context—the integration of a formal school system and a traditional religious dormitory environment—is crucial in shaping the social dimensions and interaction dynamics within the classroom. The school is not merely a venue for the transfer of academic knowledge, but also an arena for socialization, where the norms of the pesantren serve as the primary framework for behavior and roles.

Institutionally, the pesantren environment inherently prioritizes hedonic values such as Adab (etiquette/manners) and Kepatuhan (obedience) as absolute core values. These values define the traditional relationship between teachers and students (Kyai/Ustadz-Santri), which is strictly characterized by an Asymmetrical Hierarchy.

In this context, the Teacher/Ustadzah (addressed as 'Ma'am' by the students) assumes a dual role: she acts not only as an academic instructor providing the formal curriculum, but also as a moral and spiritual role model who possesses high authority.

The Normative Realization of these values is manifestly demonstrated in daily classroom practice. The spiritual dimension is integrated through Religious Rituals, where the class consistently opens and closes with greetings (Assalammualaikum) and prayer (first prayer), signifying that faith is inseparable from learning. Furthermore, the students' Formal Address to the teacher as 'Ma'am' is an actualization of the norm of the teacher's high social status, constantly reinforcing the formal hierarchy in every communication.

As a result of this binding cultural context, the role of subject teachers, such as English teachers becomes more complex. They were required to manage the academic curriculum with Islamic/MTS values in a balanced manner. Therefore, social dimensions—including norms, status, roles, and cultural values—do not merely exist in the background, but are inherently reproduced in every interaction that takes place in the classroom. A profound understanding of this cultural and institutional context is key to analyzing and interpreting the specific findings that emerge from field observations.

This section focuses on the setup of the observed English class, which was a Grade IX session that concentrated on the material of the Greeting Card. The arrangement of the class and roles of the participants are essential for understanding the resulting interactional dynamics. The observed interactions revealed a teacher profile that was largely dominant in controlling the process.

1) Teacher Profile:

The Teacher play the role of primary authority in information and process control. The Teacher initiates topics (we are going to learn new materials), controls turn-taking, provides formal definitions, and checks comprehension. However, the Teacher also attempted to be a motivator ("Ayo, yang semangat dong") and a facilitator during the activity phase.

2) Student Profile:

The students showed high obedience (indicated by consistent and quick responses), but also good cognitive ability in guessing and recalling concepts (greeting cards, receivers, bodies, and senders). They actively participated when prompted or directed.

3) Teaching Method: The method employed is a blend of:

- Teacher-Centered/Transactional: The Teacher presents the material, asks for definitions, and checks understanding (Dominant IRF Pattern).
- Student-centered (Collaborative): The Teacher assigns group tasks and allows students to lead the presentations ("Silahkan discuss with your friends"), aligning with the goal of fostering a student-centered approach. This echoes the application of Vygotsky's theory (Sociocultural Learning), in which learning occurs through social interaction.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), particularly the model developed by Norman Fairclough, offers a distinct framework that views discourse as a social practice rather than merely a unit of language, thereby enabling an in-depth examination of the relationship between language, power, and society. Fundamentally, this model comprises three interconnected and progressive analysis dimensions. The first dimension is text, which is a linguistic descriptive analysis focusing on the actual features within the data, such as vocabulary, grammar, and cohesion in the transcripts. Consequently, this section presents the researcher's field findings, which begin by providing a data table from vocabulary (lexis) analysis, consisting of the use of modality and lexical choices. The next section will cover grammar analysis, which includes the use of imperative and interrogative sentences, as well as the use of pronouns. The third part will then analyze the interactional structure. Thus, this section microscopically analyzes how social dimensions (power, roles, and norms) are realized in word choice and sentence structure.

In this section, the data were viewed from the perspective of modality, followed by data on lexical choices. Which will be displayed using tables, followed by a conclusion for each section after the table. The following table displays the use of modality

Table 1. Use of Modality

Speaker	Quote	Modality Type	Manifestation of Power
Teacher	<i>it very to us for to take pray firts</i>	Deontic (Obligation)	Modality Institutional Norms and Control. The Teacher establishes the religious ritual as a non-negotiable obligation, reflecting MTS values.
Teacher	<i>walaupun kelompok you must be active okay</i>	Deontic (Obligation)	Modality Disciplinary Power. The Teacher explicitly mandates activity as a condition for participation, rather than just a hope.
Teacher	<i>I hope in this lesson all of you can make greeting cards</i>	Epistemic Modality (Hope/Possibility)	Facilitative Function. The Teacher shifts the discourse from command to desired learning outcome, indicating a shift to a facilitator role.

The analysis of the table reveals how teachers strategically utilize different types of modalities to exert control, enforce norms, and facilitate learning in the classroom. Modality, the linguistic device used to express necessity, obligation, or possibility, has become a subtle yet powerful tool in shaping the social and academic environment.

These two instances of Deontic Modality showcase the teacher's role in enforcing rules and maintaining discipline. The first quote, "it very to us for to take pray first, establishes the religious ritual as a non-negotiable obligation rooted in institutional norms (likely Madrasah Tsanawiyah, or MTS, values). Here, the teacher manifests power by aligning personal authority with a broader, institutional, and sacred requirement. The

second Deontic instance, "walaupun kelompok you must be active okay", demonstrates Disciplinary Power. By using the strong obligatory term 'must,' the teacher elevates 'being active' from a suggestion to an essential condition for participation, directly managing student behavior and engagement levels.

In contrast, the use of Epistemic Modality introduces a softer dimension to the teacher's power. The quote "I hope in this lesson all of you can make greeting cards" employs the term 'hope,' signaling a shift to a Facilitative Function. Epistemic modality relates to knowledge, belief, or possibility rather than duty. Using this modality, the teacher temporarily suspends direct commands and focuses the discourse on the desired learning outcome and possibility (can make). This choice positions the teacher less as an authoritarian figure and more as a guide, providing a goal for students to achieve, rather than an immediate task to obey.

In conclusion, the teacher's language shifts fluidly between modal types in order to achieve multiple objectives. The teacher wields a Deontic Modality to exercise absolute control over institutional obedience and behavioral discipline. Conversely, they employ epistemic modalities to facilitate learning and encourage student autonomy to reach academic goals. This variation underscores a sophisticated approach to classroom management, in which power is manifested through rigid obligations and motivational encouragement.

The analysis provided in the table highlights how specific lexical categories employed in the classroom serve not merely as communicative tools but also as powerful mechanisms for establishing social hierarchy, reinforcing institutional values, and maintaining procedural control. The teacher's and students' choices of words fundamentally shape the social reality of the learning environment.

The use of Formal Address, exemplified by expressions like "Good Morning Ma'am," directly manifests Status and Role. This choice of language creates an asymmetrical hierarchy inherent in classroom settings. Using a formal title ('Ma'am'), students verbally acknowledge and defer the teacher's superior status and authority. This recurrent use of formal addresses is crucial for maintaining the expected relational distance and respect required in structured educational environments.

Furthermore, the integration of Islamic Terminology (such as "Assalammualaikum" and "Alhamdulillah") reveals the pervasive influence of Cultural Values. In an institutional context like an MTS (Madrasah Tsanawiyah), these terms are not mere additions but are vital components that unify the academic classroom space with the broader religious madrasah (Islamic boarding school) culture. The language used internalizes and promotes these specific religious and cultural values, making classroom discourse an extension of the school's religious mission.

Finally, the teacher utilized Control Terminology (for example, "Is there anyone absent today?" or "Is this clear?") for procedural controls. These phrases secure the teacher's social role as a monitor and manager of the lesson. By addressing attendance, the teacher adhered to the necessary administrative procedure, and by checking for clarity, they secured the pedagogical path. This lexical category ensures that the class adheres to the established structure and confirms the teacher's position as the primary authority responsible for organization and comprehension.

In addition to lexical usage, it is important to analyze the language structure used. According to Geoffrey Leech (1982), in Takadisihang (2022), Grammar is the structural rule governing the composition of clauses, phrases, and words in any given natural language. Grammar is the study of how language works to communicate. This section presents the use of interrogative and imperative sentences, followed by pronouns.

The table above analyzes how a teacher strategically uses different sentence types—interrogative, direct imperative, and motivational imperatives—to establish and exert authority in classroom discourse. This manifestation of power goes beyond simple instruction, extending into control over information, interaction structure, and even students' emotional states.

The Interrogative Sentence Type, particularly when used for control (e.g., "Is there anyone absent today?") primarily serves as a mechanism for Initiation and Information Control. By continually asking questions, the teacher maintains control over the flow of dialogue, positioning themselves as initiators of all interaction. This pattern reinforces the classic IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback) structure, where the teacher's status as the source of questions is recognized, thereby cementing their dominant role in the interaction flow.

Second the two forms of Imperative Sentence Type reveal the different facets of power execution. The Direct Imperative (e.g., assigning a student to lead a prayer) focuses on allocating roles and tasks. Although the command might be slightly mitigated by polite terms like "please," its fundamental function is to assign responsibilities, illustrating the teacher's power to dictate structure and mandate actions within the learning environment.

Finally, the Motivational Imperative (e.g., "Ayo, yang semangat dong. Ready!") is an Affective Command aimed at controlling student emotions and learning attitudes. This type of utterance is not focused on academic content, but on inducing obedience and an emotional response (enthusiasm). This highlights the subtle, yet

powerful, reach of the teacher's authority, which extends into regulating the psychological and behavioral disposition of the students towards the learning process.

In conclusion, the analysis clearly demonstrates that the teacher employed a sophisticated linguistic toolkit. Each sentence type acts as a discourse mechanism to ensure compliance, manage the environment, and consistently uphold the teacher's status as the ultimate authority in the classroom.

The analysis of pronoun usage in the classroom reveals that the teacher strategically employs "we/kita," "I/saya," and "you/kalian" to define relationships, assert different aspects of authority, and manage the social distance with the students. Each pronoun serves a distinct Discourse Function that manifests a specific Social Role.

The use of the Inclusive Pronoun "We/Kita" (e.g., "before we start our lesson today, now we are going to learn new material") functions to create Inclusive Solidarity. By grouping themselves with students, the teacher linguistically suggests that both parties are engaged in the same learning journey. This choice temporarily serves to reduce hierarchical distance during transitional phases, fostering a sense of shared purpose and collaboration essential for moving the lesson forward smoothly.

Conversely, the use of the First-Person Singular Pronoun "I/Saya" (e.g., "I will show you some picture, I hope in this lesson..., Saya akan mengamatin kalian") serves to manifest Individual Authority. The teacher uses "I" precisely when performing high-power actions, such as : making decisions, setting expectations, and conducting assessments. This linguistic choice directly asserts the teacher's individual role as the decision-maker and assessor, explicitly marking them as the primary holders of power and responsibility for the lesson's direction and evaluation.

Finally, the Second-Person Plural Pronoun "You/Kalian" (e.g., "So all you in a good condition, Silahkan discuss with your friends") functions to establish the students as the Target of Command/Assessment. The teacher uses "you" when communicating the results of an evaluation (e.g., confirming their condition) or, more frequently, when issuing instructions for tasks. This linguistic targeting clearly positions students as recipients of instructions, marking them as the group subject to the teacher's commands, monitoring, and required engagement.

In conclusion, teacher' pronoun usage is highly functional and dynamic. They utilize "We" to build rapport and common ground, "I" to affirm personal authority and assessment power, and "You" to address the class as the target for tasks. This strategic pronoun shifting allows the teacher to navigate between a facilitative, collaborative role and an authoritative, disciplinary role, as required by the interaction context.

C. Interactional Structure (Textual)

The next section present the data viewed from the Interactional Structure (textual) dimension. This section features the data results from the analysis of adjacency pairs as well as the analysis of the Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) pattern.

1) Analysis of Adjacency Pairs

Before proceeding to the data presentation, it is beneficial to understand the adjacency pairs. Conversation is crucial in every act of communication, an interaction occurs between the speaker and the listener (addressee), which can take the form of an exchange of information. A conversation must involve at least two people: speaker and listener. On the surface, a conversation sounds simple; we can start with the word 'Hello' and end it with the word Goodbye. However, in reality, this is not the case because the use of language in conversations is highly complex. There are several important aspects that both the speaker and listener must pay attention to when conversing, including turn-taking, adjacency pairs, opening conversation, and closing conversation.

The conversation showed a general pattern. This pattern is the "ordinary" conversation. The pattern of this "ordinary" conversation with the formula "A-B-A-B." This means that, in any conversation, when one party is speaking, the other party listens and waits for their turn to respond to the speech and interpret the speaker's intent. This formula represents the turns of participants during a conversation. This turning sequence is called turn taking. Turn-taking rules in conversation can be influenced by specific settings, such as a conversation in a courtroom or classroom. These speaking turns are also regulated by the norms or conventions applicable to each setting. For instance, in a courtroom conversation, a person cannot simply take a turn to speak before being invited by a presiding judge. Similarly, in a classroom, a student must raise their hand before taking a turn to speak (Zulfah et al., 2025).

Moreover, in addition to the different styles, many speakers have their own ways of conversing. Many automatic patterns in conversation help speakers engage in social interaction. Adjacency pairs include such types of utterance exchanges as greetings/summons – answer, question – answer, complaint – denial, offer – accept, request – acceptance, compliment – thanking, challenge-rejection, and instruct-receipt.

The provided data highlight that the Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) pattern serves as the foundational structure of classroom interaction, with a high dominance of its asymmetrical form. This pattern is crucial not only for transmitting content but also, more significantly, to manifest and reinforce the power imbalance between the teacher and the students.

The sequence begins with the Initiation (I) phase, where the Teacher, through a question like "What is Greeting Card?" primarily seeks to test students' knowledge. This initial move immediately established the teacher's role as the material controller. The power is manifested through the right to determine the topic and acceptable parameters of the discussion, forcing the students to operate within the cognitive and procedural framework set by the instructor.

The Response (R) phase, delivered by student (L), provides a direct answer ("Kartu memberi selamat"). In this phase, the student fulfills their required academic role—that of the recipient of instruction, whose duty is to display knowledge upon prompting. The student's contribution is structurally subordinate, as it exists only as a direct reaction to the teacher's initiation. Crucially, the student's role is simply to provide information and, not to evaluate or control the subsequent turn.

The power dynamics were fully closed and reinforced in the feedback (F) phase. The Teacher's utterance ("iya betul L, ada lagi?") serves a dual function of Evaluation and Rediagnosis. The teacher first validates the student's response ("iya betul L), thereby acting as the ultimate evaluator of truth and correctness. Immediately following the evaluation, the teacher reinitiated the sequence ("ada lagi?"), indicating that the initial response was either insufficient or incomplete. This rediagnosis ensures that the teacher retains absolute control over the conversation trajectory, validating their authority to evaluate, correct, and demand further, more comprehensive input. The asymmetrical nature of IRF is thus confirmed, as the teacher retains the dominant speaking slot for two of the three turns (I and F), ultimately dictating the pace and criteria for successful participation.

Heavy reliance on the asymmetrical IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback) pattern has significant pedagogical implications, primarily affecting student autonomy, critical thinking, and participation dynamics in the classroom. This pattern limits the depth of student thinking, because the teacher holds control over both initiation and evaluative feedback. This often encourages teachers to ask display questions (questions to which the answer is already known), such as "What is Greeting Card?" example, rather than authentic referential questions.

This focus on known information requires students to merely recall fact, rather than engaging in higher-order thinking, such as synthesizing, analyzing, or speculating. Consequently, students tend to reduce risk-taking. They learned that their primary role was to provide the "correct" answer validated by the teacher. This can stifle curiosity and limit the willingness to offer unconventional or exploratory responses, thereby inhibiting genuine intellectual discovery.

Beyond cognitive impact, the structural dominance of the teacher within the IRF sequence creates a tightly controlled conversational environment. The teacher acts as the conversational gatekeeper, since the teacher retains the right to initiate the next turn (such as re-initiation, "any more?"), students rarely have the opportunity to self-select, initiate their own topics, or challenge feedback. This structure keeps the conversation monologic (teacher-centered) rather than dialogic (student-centered), as every student utterance is immediately followed by teacher evaluation (F).

In summary, a constant evaluation cycle reinforces the hierarchical power structure within the classroom. Students are perpetually positioned as knowledge recipients who require validation, which can undermine the development of autonomy and self-regulation in learning. While the Asymmetrical IRF pattern is highly effective for classroom management and ensuring factual recall, its dominance risks creating a passive learning environment where student voices are structurally constrained, and the development of critical thinking skills is marginalized in favor of obedience to the teacher's cognitive agenda.

3) Variation (Turn-taking Negotiation):

The only significant variation from IRF was during group presentations and the cheer/chant. During the presentation phase, students (S, I, U, and M) take long initiations, and the teacher shifts to the role of the moderator. This was the moment of a successful partial role shift. This highlights a crucial moment of deviation from the rigidly controlled communication structures typically found in classrooms. While the asymmetrical (initiation-response-feedback) pattern establishes the teacher as the dominant figure, the text identifies group presentations and cheer/chant activities as the primary source of significant variation.

A fundamental role shift occurred during the presentation phase. The students (S, I, U, M) transitioned from being passive respondents to taking "long initiations." This means that students seize control of the conversational floor, delivering extended turns of talk, managing the topic, and directing the flow of

information without the immediate and constant prompts characteristic of the IRF. They temporarily act as the primary initiators, reversing the typical power dynamic in which the teacher controls the "I" slot.

As a direct consequence of this shift, teachers are compelled to change their roles from primary initiators and evaluators to moderators. The teacher refrains from interrupting students' sustained initiations with immediate feedback (the 'F' slot) or corrective questions. Instead, the teacher facilitates the environment and manages the proceedings, allowing students to exercise greater autonomy. This successful, albeit partial, role shift is highly significant because it demonstrates that the communication structure is not entirely immutable; given the appropriate context, students are capable of leading discourse, and the teacher is willing to temporarily relinquish linguistic control, promoting a brief period of student-centered interaction.

In short, the teacher-controlled IRF Pattern was temporarily broken during group presentations, allowing students to assume the role of discourse leadership, and compelling the teacher to become a passive moderator, which is a sign of momentary student autonomy.

B. Discussions

Following the linguistic findings in the previous section, these findings are then moved to the second dimension, Discourse Practice, which examines the process of text production, distribution, and consumption, including how the text is connected to other texts (intertextuality). In the final section, these two dimensions are connected to the broadest, third dimension, Sociocultural Practice, which explains how text and discourse practice reflect, shape, or maintain larger social structures, institutions, power relations, and ideologies. Therefore, in this section, the discussion is divided into several key parts: the analysis of dimension 2 (discourse practice) and dimension 3 (sociocultural practice), which will then be discussed again to compare the results of these findings with those of previous research. This comparison will then be used as the basis for fulfilling the research objective: 'To provide practical recommendations based on the research findings to improve the quality of teacher-student interaction in English language learning with the student-centered model at MTS PP Al-Qomariyah'.

A. Analysis Dimension 2: Discourse Practice (Intertextual Interpretation)

Discursive practice refers to the analysis of text production and consumption. Similarly, Fairclough (1995) stated that discourse practice is related to discourse conventions. Convention means that there is an unwritten rule in which society has the same point of view. The Fairclough idea implies that one of those activities in CDA is seeking discourse conventions or genres produced by the speaker or writer. In discursive or discourse practice, the analysis focuses on attempts to seek text production and assumptions. This analysis is directed toward the analysis of society as the consumer of the presented text. The analysis involved seeking conventions for the creation of certain texts in society.

Furthermore, according to Fairclough (2003), this dimension has two facets: institutional processes (e.g. editorial procedures), and discourse processes (changes the text goes through in production and consumption). For Fairclough, "discourse practice straddles the division between society and culture on the one hand, and discourse, language, and text on the other". Institutional processes, in terms of media discourse. However, discourse processes, can be best explained by discussing a core concept in his approach: intertextuality. Intertextuality and intertextual analysis. In this analytical framework, while there is linguistic analysis at the text level, there is also linguistic analysis at the discourse practice level that Fairclough calls "intertextual analysis." Fairclough (2003) also states that intertextual analysis focuses on the borderline between text and discourse practices in the analytical framework. Intertextual analysis looks at text from the perspective of discourse practice, looking at the traces of discourse practice in the text (Fairclough, 2003).

The interaction occurring in this classroom simultaneously draws on three main discourses. The Discourse of Traditional Education underpins the interaction by positioning the Teacher Authority as the source of knowledge. This is evident from the teacher's definition of the structure of the material (e.g., definition of Greeting Card, its social function, and structure) and maintaining tight control over turn-taking, ensuring that the discourse remains centrally controlled by the teacher.

On the other hand, the interaction also draws upon the Sociocultural Discourse, based on Vygotsky's ideas, where knowledge is socially constructed and scaffolding is necessary. The Teacher activates this discourse using scaffolding (such as pictures and code-switching). Most clearly, the teacher divided students into groups, emphasizing the importance of good cooperation and activity. This promotes the creation of joint knowledge. Concurrently, the madrasah/religious discourse is the basis that education must be imbued with Islamic manners and values. Strong evidence of this discourse includes the opening with Assalammualaikum and the closing with Hamdalah, as well as the students' use of religious holiday examples (such as Idul Fitri) for material purpose, demonstrating the internalization of these values.

The dominant interaction patterns and turn-taking create clear Power Asymmetry. The pervasive IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback) pattern not only shows the teacher initiating and responding, but also actively evaluating and directing the next response (through feedback). This asymmetry of control is reinforced by the teachers explicit announcement that they will observe (e.g., Saya akan mengamatin kalian siapa yang disiplin... siapa yang aktif - "I will observe who among you is disciplined... who is active"). This observation represents the use of Foucaultian disciplinary power, expressed softly, where the teacher monitors and disciplines the students' bodies and behaviors, shaping the interaction into an assessable practice. The rigid structure of the interaction due to IRF dominance and the focus on compliance (such as the response Jelas Ma'am - "Clear Ma'am") de facto hinders critical space, despite research perhaps aiming to find moments of negotiation.

The interaction within this English language classroom serves as a battleground for at least three contrasting discourses: Traditional Education, which prioritizes the teachers authority as the sole source of knowledge; sociocultural, which attempts to activate collaborative learning and scaffolding (ZPD); and madrasah/religious, which integrates Islamic ethics and values into the learning content.

Despite attempts to utilize the Vygotskyan methods (group work and cooperation), the overall power structure in the classroom remains asymmetrical. This asymmetry was maintained through two primary mechanisms. Dominance of the IRF Pattern: The rigid Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) pattern restricts students to the role of compliance, where they are expected to provide responses that align with the teachers expectations. This effectively hinders negotiation and suppresses critical space.

The Use of Disciplinary Power: The explicit threat of observation from the teacher (e.g., who is disciplined... who is active) is a manifestation of Foucaultian Disciplinary Power. This practice transforms the interaction into an assessable practice, where the teacher non-physically controls student behavior to ensure compliance. Overall, traditional discourse and Disciplinary Power proved to be the dominant forces. The collaborative efforts encouraged by sociocultural discourse are ultimately utilized as a means to achieve ends predetermined by the teachers authority, rather than for open and critical knowledge exploration.

Classroom interaction actively constructs a specific social reality through formal lexical and grammatical choices. The use of formal address (e.g., "Ma'am") and the Teacher's strategic use of pronouns establish roles: the Teacher utilizes "I/Saya" to assert control and authority and "We/Kita" to invoke solidarity and joint activity. This results in the construction of the teacher as the definitive authority figure, assessor, and primary source of scaffolding. Conversely, students were constructed as obedient, responsive, and cooperative. Students' immediate compliance with non-academic instruction, such as following the cheer ("Ready!! Ready!! Ready!!"), demonstrates their interpretation of the teachers role as a leader, whose direction must be followed not only academically but also in setting the overall class mood and energy.

Although social reality is dominated by obedience, subtle negotiations of social dimensions still occur. Students avoid engaging in overt resistance (such as asking critical questions) but instead practice a form of passive negotiation by initiating correct answers (e.g., identifying a "Greeting Card" or "Birthday Card"). They do not challenge the existing power structure but rather utilize the structure itself to demonstrate their academic competence. A successful role shift was observed during the student presentation (Part 3), where students temporarily controlled the discourse to explain their work. The Teacher deliberately allows this shift, re-negotiating their role from a strict controller to a facilitator or audience member. This suggests that the teachers authority is flexible and strategic, adapting temporarily to accommodate the needs of Vygotskian, student-centered learning.

This dynamic produces a system where Hegemony and Dissonance co exist. Social norms, especially those rooted in the madrasah context, such as obedience, adab (Islamic manners), and formality, are hegemonic. The prevailing discourse practices, characterized by rigid IRF patterns and formal addresses, reproduce and normalize the existing hierarchy, ultimately making students reluctant to question the power structure. However, this creates a dissonance between the dominant madrasah/traditional ideology (teacher as controller, addressed as "Ma'am") and the theoretical goal of a Student-Centered Model. While the Teacher employs methods aligned with Vygotsky (scaffolding and group work), the overarching dominance of IRF and the scarcity of transactive or critical dialogue suggests that structural compliance is prioritized over genuine critical and communicative language exploration.

The classroom interaction successfully constructs a social reality defined by Teacher Authority (asserted through formal address and control pronouns like "I/Saya") and Student Obedience (evidenced by immediate compliance). This reality is reinforced by the hegemony of traditional/religious norms (formality, adab), which normalize the existing hierarchy.

While the structure fosters Model Dissonance—employing Vygotskyan methods but maintaining strict control—negotiation is limited. Students engage in passive negotiation by demonstrating competence rather

than engaging in critical resistance. The Teacher's authority is flexible and strategic, allowing temporary role shifts (e.g., during presentations) to facilitate collaborative learning. Ultimately, however, dominant discourse prioritizes structural compliance with the development of genuine critical and communicative dialogue.

According to Fairclough (1995) analyzing the sociocultural context of a communicative event requires consideration of its economic (media economics), political (media power and ideology), and cultural (values) aspects. However, he advised researchers to focus only on the levels deemed necessary to understand the specific event under analysis.

1) Ideology Underpinning Learning Practices

Observed classroom interaction is structurally grounded in two mutually reinforcing ideologies that dictate the flow of power and discourse. First, madrasah ideology establishes the fundamental social dimensions of Adab (respectful manners) and Obedience. Both the Teacher and students realize this social disposition because of their shared experiences within the madrasah habitus. The Teacher's use of religious markers (such as Alhamdulillah) and the students' consistent use of the formal address ("Ma'am") are not merely classroom rules, but reflect a deep-seated social disposition to respect spiritual and educational authority. Consequently, the power discourse within the classroom, manifested through the teachers control of turn-taking and the initiation of prayers, serves as a mechanism to reproduce and maintain the social structure and adab established by the educational institution (MTS).

Second Traditional Education Ideology positions the Teacher as the Absolute More Knowledgeable Other (MKO). Despite efforts to incorporate Vygotskian principles, practical implementation tends to emphasize the teacher as the primary MKO and the provider of scaffolding, while students remain passive recipients of assistance. This suggests that vygotsky's application is still constrained by a traditional framework in which the teacher must rigidly control the direction and flow of assistance, thereby preventing a truly reciprocal or student-initiated form of knowledge construction.

Classroom discourse is fundamentally governed by two intertwined ideologies: madrasah Ideology and the Traditional Education Ideology. The madrasah ideology provides a social foundation, establishing Adab (manners) and Obedience as paramount due to the shared institutional habitus. This ideology is visibly reproduced through formal language (addressing the teacher as "Ma'am") and religious markers (Alhamdulillah). Critically, the Teacher utilizes control over turn-taking and other activities as a power discourse mechanism to reinforce and maintain this hierarchical social structure.

Concurrently, Traditional Education Ideology dictates pedagogical flow, positioning the Teacher as the Absolute More Knowledgeable Other (MKO). Although Vygotskian principles are superficially adopted, their application is limited; the teacher unilaterally controls the scaffolding process. This results in a constrained implementation of Vygotsky, where students are merely passive recipients, ultimately trapping classroom interaction within a rigid, teacher-controlled framework that inhibits truly reciprocal or student-initiated knowledge construction.

The analysis reveals that classroom interaction is fundamentally defined by a powerful and persistent Asymmetry of Control, despite the teachers attempt to integrate student-centered methods. This power dynamic is structurally grounded in two mutually reinforcing ideologies: the madrasah Ideology, which establishes a hegemonic social structure prioritizing Adab and Obedience (reproduced through formal address like "Ma'am"), and the Traditional Education Ideology, which casts the Teacher as the Absolute More Knowledgeable Other (MKO). The dominance of the rigid IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback) pattern is the primary mechanism that sustains this traditional hierarchy. This limits students to the role of compliance and actively suppresses the creation of a critical space, making the search for genuine negotiation difficult. While the Teacher strategically uses Sociocultural Discourse (scaffolding, group work) and occasionally allows temporary role shifts (e.g., during presentations), these attempts at collaboration are ultimately contained by Disciplinary Power (explicit observation and control). In essence, the classroom exhibits profound Model Dissonance: pedagogical methods may aim for student collaboration, but structural reality prioritizes compliance and the reproduction of the established hierarchy. The implementation of Vygotskian principles remains constrained within a rigid framework, ensuring that the teacher maintains control over the flow of assistance and the direction of knowledge construction, rather than fostering open, reciprocal communication. Furthermore, the underlying ideology governing English language learning in this context appears to be both instrumental and normative. The Instrumental view regards English primarily as a technical tool whose structures (such as Receiver, Body, and Sender) and functions (social function) must be mastered in order to achieve specific academic goals. Concurrently, the approach is fundamentally normative, requiring all learning content to be filtered by religious values. Although the Teacher permits relevant examples such as Idul Fitri and Wedding Cards, there is an observable absence of exploration into topics that might be considered

"sensitive" or fall outside the acceptable cultural and moral norms of the MTS (Islamic Junior High School) environment. This dual ideology ensures that English is acquired functionally while remaining strictly within the institution's ethical framework.

The dominance of obedience ideology (rooted in the madrasah context), realized through a control discourse marked by rigid IRF patterns and a lack of critical dialogue, severely inhibits the stated goals of the student-centered model and genuine communicative language acquisition. This framework creates a Communicative Barrier: If students are primarily trained to practice responding solely to the teachers initiation, they risk failing to develop the crucial skills necessary for authentic language use, such as the ability to negotiate meaning, argue viewpoints, or independently initiate topics (transactive dialogue). Furthermore, this rigid structure reproduces the power. While the interaction may appear procedural, the underlying ideology of obedience has successfully reproduced the asymmetrical teacher-student power structure. This makes the learning process appear neutral when, in fact, it is heavily value-laden, reinforcing existing authority and embedding hierarchical expectations into students' dispositional habitus.

The classroom operates under two main rules: Obedience (from religious school culture) and Teacher Control (traditional teaching). What is the Class Like? The teacher is Boss: The teacher holds all the power and knowledge (the "Absolute MKO"). Students must be polite ("Ma'am") and follow rules (like Adab).

Furthermore, there are strict conversation rules: the main way they talk is the rigid IRF pattern (teacher starts then student answers, and then teacher judges). This pattern stops students from asking critical questions or starting their own discussions.

Moreover, it was found that English is a tool with limits: English is taught only as a skill to pass exams (instrumental), and it must only be used with safe, religious-friendly topics like Idul Fitri (normative).

Furthermore, the main conflict is that the teacher tries to use modern group work (Vygotsky's scaffolding) and allows students to talk during the presentations. However, the old rules of Obedience and the IRF pattern are too strong. This creates a dissonance (mismatch) with the goal, which is to teach students to communicate freely and critically. The reality is that there is a constant need for compliance, and the fear of being judged by the teacher's control stops students from becoming independent, critical thinkers. In short, the traditional culture and power structure win, making students obedient subjects rather than free communicators.

The realization of these social dimensions—namely, the roles of authority and obedience—is driven by the deeply ingrained dispositional habitus and necessity of social structure reproduction within the educational institution. The Teacher consciously realizes their status and power to ensure class order, discipline, and the transmission of adab (respectful manners), which aligns directly with MTS's ideological mandate. Conversely, students adopt the obedient and responsive role because they have internalized the norms of adab and the madrasah hierarchy, where both social and academic success are often intrinsically tied to compliance. Their awareness that the teacher is observing them ("Saya akan mengamatin kalian") leads them to consciously adjust their discourse behavior to meet disciplinary expectations. In conclusion, the interaction observed in MTS PP Al-Qomariyah demonstrates a discourse practice that successfully integrates cultural and religious values. However, it structurally remains dominated by a Teacher-centered Power Discourse, which poses a significant challenge to the full, critical, and communicative implementation of any student-centered learning model.

The findings of this research confirm a significant Model Dissonance within classroom discourse practice at MTS PP Al-Qomariyah. This dissonance arises from the contradiction between the pedagogical goal (implementing student-centered and Vygotskyan models) and the structural reality dominated by two hegemonic ideologies: Madrasah Ideology (obedience and adab or respectful manners) and Traditional Education Ideology (The Teacher as the Absolute More Knowledgeable Other—MKO).

This hegemony is linguistically manifested through the dominance of the asymmetric IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback) pattern. This structure fundamentally limits the students' roles to those of obedient and responsive subjects. This, in turn, creates a severe communication barrier.

- If students are trained only to respond to the teacher's initiation, they fail to develop the critical skills necessary for authentic communication, such as negotiating meaning, initiating independent topics, or engaging in transactive dialogue.
- This structure effectively defeats the full potential of a communicative language learning model, where critical exploration and student autonomy should be prioritized.

To strengthen and critique these findings, a comparison with previous research on autonomy, discourse, and social contexts is essential.

Santika (2025) argues that research on Learner Autonomy operates at the "interface of self and social worlds," while Self-Regulated Learning (SRL) tends to focus on cognitive processes (Santika et al., 2025).

Critique/MTS Context: The findings of MTS show that student autonomy (via temporary role shift during presentations) is still structurally controlled by the hegemonic social world (Madrasah/Obedience Ideology). Although students possess the cognitive potential for discussion (evidenced by passive negotiation when giving correct answers), the social/ideological context inhibits the full realization of autonomy. The autonomy that emerges in the MTS setting is conditioned and granted by the teacher, rather than fought for or created by the students themselves.

Firmansyah (2018) divides the social dimension of Fairclough's CDA social practice into three stages: situational, institutional, and social (Firmansyah, 2018).

Reinforcement: This finding strongly supports the importance of institutional level in the CDA. The ideologies of Madrasah and Traditional Education are institutional structures that directly reproduce power asymmetry through classroom discourse. The use of formal salutations ("Ma'am") and the teacher's control over religious rituals (doa) are manifestations of the institutional level that colonizes the situational discourse space.

Krason et al., (2025) found that participants' conceptual understanding was higher in the deliberative discourse condition compared to the disputative condition (Krason et al., 2025).

Solution/Implications: The MTS context demonstrates neither deliberative (transactive dialogue) nor disputative (explicit critique) discourse, but rather compliance discourse. This suggests that the MTS environment, which prioritizes obedience over critical exploration, does not optimally support conceptual understanding. Recommendations should be directed at creating a safe deliberative space, independent of the Madrasah Ideology, by changing the function of the feedback (F) slot from evaluation to re-initiation of dialogue (rediagnosis).

Ivani (2024) found that teacher communication dominance occurs primarily during preliminary and closing activities, and that the lag time between teacher questions and student answers is key to student responses.

Relevance: This finding reinforces evidence that teacher control (via the IRF pattern) dominates. However, this study adds that teacher control continues into the core phase through the dominance of initiation (I) and feedback (F) slots within the IRF.

Implication: While a fast lag time (as found by Ivani, 2024) indicates a lack of cognitive space, in the MTS context, IRF dominance, even without a rapid pause, is sufficient to inhibit dialogue, as students know their role is merely to provide the known-answer (display question).

Based on the analysis of the model dissonance and communicative barriers found, the following recommendations aim to shift the balance of power in classroom discourse towards a student-centered model at MTS PP Al-Qomariyah.

1) Shifting the Function of the Feedback (F) Slot in IRF

The core barrier is that the teacher uses the F Slot for an absolute evaluation and rediagnosis. This must be changed to a transactive Dialogue function.

Recommendation: The teacher should replace the evaluative statements ("Yes, L, correct. Anything else?") with authentic reference questions (asking back) directed at the other students.

Example: Student A's answer. Instead of: "Correct. Anyone else?" Teacher: "Is what A said relevant to what Group B discussed? Why?"

Goal: To encourage students to evaluate and negotiate with each other, rather than merely waiting for validation from the teacher (MKO).

As students rarely initiate topics (Initiation or I) independently, a structural mechanism must be implemented to create this space.

Recommendation: Implementing a rotating "Student Moderator System" for each meeting. The Student Moderator's task was to open the lesson (replacing the teacher's Assalamualaikum and doa), ask classmates about previous material, and close the discussion.

Goal: To explicitly transfer the I Slot and procedural control to students, replicating the success of the role shift during presentations.

The teacher explicitly employs Foucaultian Disciplinary Power by announcing they will observe behavior ("Saya akan mengamati kalian siapa yang disiplin..."—"I will observe who among you is disciplined...").

Recommendation: The teacher must eliminate the threat of explicit observation during class discussion. The assessment of discipline (adab) and participation (academic) must be separated. Discipline should be recorded covertly/non-verbally, while all discourses should be allowed to unfold without fear of non-academic punishment.

Goal: To reduce the reluctance to negotiate that stems from hegemonic compliance pressure.

Instrumental-Normative Language Ideology, often encountered within formal educational contexts, tends to limit authentic language exploration because it focuses rigidly on using language for practical purposes

(instrumental) and adhering strictly to certain standard rules (normative). This limitation can hinder students from understanding the dynamics of real-world language use and reduce their awareness that language choice is a social and ideological act, not merely a grammatical one. To overcome this, teachers can utilize the normative context (such as the Madrasah Tsanawiyah/MTS) not as a constraint, but as an object of critical analysis. For instance, the teacher can utilize online or social media discourse to compare Real-World English Norms (which may not always be religiously nuanced or rigid) with MTS Classroom Norms. The goal was to use this normative constraint as a springboard to cultivate students' critical awareness of language ideology. By comparing and analyzing these differences, students learn that language is an ideological and social battleground, empowering them to make conscious and informed language choices.

The structural reality of the classroom, where obedience and authority are prioritized over spontaneous dialogue, creates a series of detrimental impacts on advanced language acquisition and critical thinking, despite the potential offered by modern pedagogical tools. The overwhelming reliance on the Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) pattern in classroom discourse fundamentally limits students' ability to authentically use language, thereby creating a significant communicative barrier. In this highly structured environment, the student is strictly confined to the "Response" slot. They are trained to predict and provide a single expected answer rather than formulate complex thoughts, raise critical questions, or initiate new topics. This structure actively discourages or entirely prevents transactive dialogue—critical follow-up arguments, challenges, or collaborative problem-solving exchanges necessary for real-world interaction. Consequently, while students may achieve the Instrumental Goal of mastering discrete grammar rules and vocabulary, they ultimately remain deficient in Communicative Competence, the essential ability to use language effectively, adaptively, and meaningfully across various social contexts and negotiations.

The core issue stems from Model Dissonance—the fundamental clash between the stated pedagogical goal of student-centered learning and the actual practice of teacher-centered control. This control is reinforced by the MKO Constraint, where the teacher positions themselves as the Absolute More Knowledgeable Other (MKO). This ensures that even scaffolding is delivered to the student rather than with them, with assistance flowing in only one direction and preventing students from owning their own learning process. This structural dynamic is further compounded by the Price of Obedience, which reflects the hegemony of the adab (respect/propriety). Social success and acceptance in the institutional environment hinge on displaying respect and compliance, thus, when faced with choosing between passive obedience (silent acceptance) and critical questioning (challenging authority), students rationally opt for the former to meet disciplinary expectations. This profoundly impacts negotiation, fostering Passive Negotiation—a mode of participation in which students demonstrate competence through expected answers rather than posing critical questions—as the safest mode, allowing them to leverage academic performance to avoid friction without using language to challenge the status quo or delve into complex, potentially disruptive ideas.

Crucially, the rigid discourse structure, particularly the sustained reliance on IRF, serves a function beyond mere linguistic instruction, it acts as a mechanism for the reproduction of power and ideological structures. Strict adherence to these practices, coupled with highly formal addresses (often dictated by cultural norms), actively works to normalize the hierarchical relationship between the teacher and students. This repetitive, asymmetrical interaction trains students to internalize the notion that authority is absolute and that communication flows predominantly in one direction. Moreover, this relationship is reinforced by Disciplinary Power, which is a concept articulated by Foucault. The Teacher's use of direct warnings, such as "Saya akan mengamati kalian (I will observe you), extends control into behavioral governance. This threat of continuous observation ensures that students become docile subjects compelled towards constant self-monitoring to successfully meet the behavioral and academic standards set by the omnipresent disciplinary authority.

In conclusion, while the discourse of power successfully integrates the desired cultural and behavioral values, it does so at the expense of genuine linguistic development. By structurally undermining the potential for critical thought, spontaneous interaction, and challenge, the classroom environment implicitly suggests that its primary function is the maintenance of social order and institutional hierarch, rather than the full, unconstrained pursuit of communicative language proficiency. The net result is a student body that may be culturally compliant and obedient, but whose capacity for autonomous, critical, and effective communication—essential for complex social negotiations in the real world—is significantly curtailed.

In educational institutions that highly value hierarchical respect and propriety, such as the madrasah environment, a fundamental pedagogical challenge exists: cultivating authentic communicative competence and critical thinking without compromising the deeply ingrained value of respect (adab) and established norms of authority. Often, the imperative to adhere to adab results in passive communicative patterns (such as compliance-response) that prevent students from asking in-depth questions (transactive dialogue) or

challenging ideas. To resolve this paradox—that is, to promote effective, real-world language skills while maintaining the structural integrity of the institution—teachers must strategically shift away from overly authoritarian, teacher-centered practices toward empowering approaches. Considering these contextual constraints, there are a series of practical pedagogical suggestions designed to promote genuine critical engagement and communication without diminishing the established norms of authority and respect.

Table 2. Practical Pedagogical Suggestions

Challenge	Recommendation	Strategy Details
Communicative Barrier (Over-reliance on IRF)	Shift from IRF to I-R-E (Initiation-Response-Expansion)	The Teacher should follow the Student's Response not with evaluation, but with a request for expansion or clarification. Example: Instead of "Good. Next." (Feedback/Evaluation), the Teacher says, "That's a great answer. Can you tell the group <i>why</i> that is the best structure?" (Expansion).
Lack of Student Initiation	Use Structured Debate or Role-Playing with Assigned Roles	Introduce controlled activities where Initiation is mandated by the task, not by challenging the Teacher. Example: Assign two student groups different positions (e.g., "Digital Greeting Cards are better" vs. "Physical Cards are better"). The <i>adab</i> is preserved because the "challenge" is part of the task, not a personal challenge to the Teacher.
Absolute MKO (One-Way Scaffolding)	Employ Peer-Scaffolding and Expert Teams	During group work, the Teacher should step back and formally assign Student Experts (or the "MKO") within each group. The Teacher's role shifts to "MKO of the MKO"—guiding the peer leaders. This decentralizes knowledge transfer and promotes transactive dialogue among students.
Hegemony of Obedience (Fear of Speaking Out)	Introduce Indirect Critique or Anonymous Feedback	Create a "Safe Space" for critical thought where the source of critique is unknown. Example: Use anonymous sticky notes or digital forms for students to submit critical questions about the lesson, which the Teacher then addresses formally without revealing the initiator. This promotes critical thinking while maintaining respect for the hierarchy.
Instrumental vs. Normative Discourse	Integrate Critical-Cultural Comparison Tasks	To challenge the instrumental view, introduce tasks that require comparison. Example: Compare the social function of a "Thank You Card" in the local <i>madrasah</i> context versus a Western office setting. This shows students that language is not just a tool, but a carrier of different, but equally valid, cultural norms.

By implementing these strategies, the teacher can strategically promote the necessary communicative skills (negotiation, initiation, and argumentation) in a way that respects the established madrasah social structure, transforming the classroom from a site of structural compliance to a site of controlled, critical communication.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

This study aimed to investigate the social dimension of teacher-student interaction in English teaching at MTS PP Al-Qomariyah, specifically focusing on how ideological mandates and power dynamics shape classroom discourse. The findings conclusively demonstrate that classroom interaction is defined by a deep and persistent Asymmetry of Power, which is structurally reinforced by two mutually supporting ideological frameworks, ultimately leading to significant Model Dissonance in pedagogical practice. The core conclusions of this research are as follows. The observed discourse practice is characterized by the overwhelming dominance of the Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) pattern. This structure is the primary mechanism through which authority is asserted and maintained, strictly confining students to the respons slot. The Teacher strategically utilizes pronouns ("I/Saya") and commands to assert control, while students are consistently constructed as obedient, responsive subjects. Furthermore, the Teacher's explicit use of Disciplinary Power ("Saya akan mengamati kalian") ensures that students adjust their discourse behavior to meet these expectations, making compliance the highest-valued communicative act. Classroom dynamics are fundamentally grounded in the Hegemony of Pesantren Ideology, which prioritizes *Adab* (respectful manners) and *Obedience*. This social disposition, ingrained through institutional habitus, dictates the

mandatory use of formal address ("Ma'am") and teacher control over non-academic activities (such as initiating prayer). Concurrently, the Traditional Education Ideology positions the Teacher as the Absolute More Knowledgeable Other (MKO). Despite attempts to implement Vygotskian principles (scaffolding and group work), this MKO status ensures that assistance is strictly one-way and controlled, thus preventing truly reciprocal or student-initiated knowledge construction. The confluence of rigid IRF and obedient ideology results in significant pedagogical constraints. This creates Model Dissonance between the communicative goals of the curriculum and the structural reality of the classroom hierarchy. Students employ Passive Negotiation (demonstrating academic competence). Rather than engaging in critical resistance or meaningful transactive dialogue. This leads to a Communicative Barrier, where students may acquire instrumental linguistic knowledge but fail to develop the crucial skills of argumentation, topic initiation, and flexible negotiation required for authentic communicative language use. In summary, the discourse practice at the MTS PP Al-Qomariyah successfully integrated the institution's cultural and religious values. However, it is structurally dominated by a Teacher-centered Power Discourse, which ultimately prioritizes structural compliance and the reproduction of the social hierarchy over the full, critical, and communicative potential of the student-centered learning model.

Funding Statement

"No external funding was received for this study."

Ethical Compliance

All procedures performed in this study involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki Declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards.

Data Access Statement

No datasets were generated or analyzed during the current study

Conflict of Interest Declaration

The authors declare that they have no affiliations with or involvement in any organization or entity with any financial interest in the subject matter or materials discussed in this manuscript.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author thanks all the people in most cases and the sponsor and financial support acknowledgments.

REFERENCES

- [1] Arshad, A. (2025). Teachers' Classroom Management Skills Influence the Academic Performance of Secondary School Science Students in Lahore. *ACADEMIA International Journal for Social Sciences*, 4(4), 2891–2908. <https://doi.org/10.63056/ACAD.004.04.1145>
- [2] Baranova, V., Ivanchenkova, L., Mostova, A., Lagodiienko, N., & Holubkin, S. (2025). Conditions and determinants of digital transformation of financial services market participants. *FINANCIAL AND CREDIT SYSTEMS: PROSPECTS FOR DEVELOPMENT*, 3(18), 45–62. <https://doi.org/10.26565/2786-4995-2025-3-04>
- [3] Batat, W. (2025). "Binge delivery" behaviors among digital natives: a phigital exploration of status, empowerment, and vulnerability. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 28(5), 941–964. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QMR-08-2024-0153>
- [4] Botes, E., Resnik, P., Moskowitz, S., Dewaele, J.-M., Mercer, S., & Greiff, S. (2025). A Tangled Web: Learner Autonomy as a Predictor of Learner Emotions, Willingness to Communicate and Academic Achievement in Online Language Learning. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly*, 48, 10–29. <https://doi.org/10.32038/ltrq.2025.48.02>
- [5] Bryman, A. (2004). *Social research methods* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- [6] Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2017). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- [7] Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London and New York: Routledge.

[8] Firmansyah, M. B. (2018). *Analisis Wacana Kritis: Dimensi Sosial dalam Novel Negeri Para Bedebah Karya Tere Liye*. <https://doi.org/10.31227/osf.io/9tmav>

[9] Irvan Irvani, A., & Agus, D. (2024). Analysis of Student Communication in the Discovery Learning Model Using Transcript-based Lesson Analysis. *KnE Social Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v9i13.15974>

[10] K, C. (2025). BEYOND TRAITS: UNDERSTANDING HOW DEMOGRAPIIC, SOCIAL, AND CULTURAL VARIABLES INFLUENCE LEADERSHIOP. *International Journal on Science and Technology*, 16(4). <https://doi.org/10.71097/IJSAT.v16.i4.8809>

[11] Khara, N. K., & Soren, T. (2025). Émile Durkheim and Talcott Parsons: sociological ideas. *RESEARCH HUB International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 12(5), 137–144. <https://doi.org/10.53573/rhimrj.2025.v12n5.017>

[12] Khvedelidze, E., Gvarishvili, E., & Chikovani, E. (2025). MOTIVATING STUDENTS OF MODERN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS TO STUDY. *Innovative Economics and Management*, 12(2), 153–164. <https://doi.org/10.46361/2449-2604.12.2.2025.153-164>

[13] Krason, A., Varley, R., & Vigliocco, G. (2025). Understanding discourse in face-to-face settings: The impact of multimodal cues and listening conditions. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 51(5), 837–854. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xlm0001399>

[14] Marshall, C. and Rossman, G. B. (2014). *Designing Qualitative Research*. New York: Sage Publications.

[15] Santika, R., Arifin, S., Zulaiha, S., & Gashimov, E. (2025). The Implementation of Self-Regulated Learning Strategies in Promoting Autonomy Learner Among University Students. *Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia*, 6(3), 1650–1660. <https://doi.org/10.59141/japendi.v6i3.7381>

[16] Shmatko, N., & Markova, Y. (2025). “Social Space” of Pierre Bourdieu: History of Concept Construction. *Sociological Journal*, 31(1), 110–123. <https://doi.org/10.19181/socjour.2025.31.1.6>

[17] Sugiyono, D. (2017). *Metode Penelitian, Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan Tindakan*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

[18] Zulfah, S., Hisan, L. C., & Al Farisi, M. R. (2025). Unveiling Power Dynamics in Online ESL Conversation Classes: A Critical Classroom Discourse Analysis of the IRF Pattern. *Indonesian Journal of EFL and Linguistics*, 213–232. <https://doi.org/10.21462/ijefl.v10i1.908>