# Classroom Discourse Structures: A Comparative Study of Formal and Non-Formal Education at Different Student Levels

**Laelatul Abidah¹ , Hamzah²**

¹ Universitas Negeri Padang, Padang, Indonesia; laelatulabidah99@gmail.com
² Universitas Negeri Padang, Padang, Indonesia; Hamzah@fbs.unp.ac.id

| ARTICLE INFO | ABSTRACT |
|---|---|
| | Classroom discourse varies based on the interactions between teachers and students, influencing the structure and effectiveness of teaching and learning. A well-structured classroom discourse fosters an organized teaching pattern and facilitates learning. This study analyzed the structure of classroom discourse in English classes across formal (Junior and Senior High Schools) and non-formal (English courses) education settings. A qualitative research design was employed, involving participants from second-grade classes in Junior and Senior High Schools and basic and advanced levels in English courses. Data were collected from transcripts of 20 lessons, covering interactions from opening to closing, and analyzed using the Sinclair and Coulthard model, which organizes discourse hierarchically into ranks: lesson, transaction, exchange, move, and act. The findings showed that non-formal education (basic and advanced English courses) exhibited a higher frequency of all five discourse ranks compared to formal education settings (Junior and Senior High Schools). Non-formal settings also demonstrated more complete discourse stages—opening, body, and closing—indicating a more structured interaction pattern. These results suggest that non-formal education may provide a more conducive environment for student participation and interaction, potentially benefiting language acquisition. The study underscores the effectiveness of non-formal education settings in fostering structured classroom discourse. Further research should explore specific teaching strategies in non-formal settings to enhance interaction and learning outcomes in formal education contexts.<br> |

**Corresponding Author:**
Laelatul Abidah
Universitas Negeri Padang, Padang, Indonesia; Laelatulabidah99@gmail.com

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Classroom discourse analysis is a branch of linguistics that focuses on how teachers interact verbally with students in the classroom, such as through conversations and interactions between teachers and students in the classroom. Rymes (2008) defines classroom discourse as the study of language being used in a classroom context. It indicates that classroom discourse analysis is a kind of discourse analysis that happens in the classroom. In other words, classroom discourse is a language used in the classroom by teachers and students during the learning process (Ardian & Indah, 2022). It means the language produced by teachers and students from the beginning until the end of learning process.

Discourse analysis can be useful in the classroom, particularly in language teaching. When discourse analysis is applied in the classroom, it helps us comprehend the relationship that develops between students and teachers as well as how that relationship affects the learning process that takes place there (Woodward-Kron & Remedios, 2007, cited in Alsoraihi, 2019). This is because studying language use in the classroom, particularly close examination of talk, might show general patterns of language use by teachers and students. By knowing the patterns of language use which is discourse, in the classroom, academic achievement may improve (Rymes, 2008).

Furthermore, interaction is emphasized as a crucial element of language acquisition in the concepts of communicative language teaching (CLT). Meaningful language learning requires active student participation, which CLT promotes (Tatar, 2005 in Mustapha et al., 2010).This is supported by classroom discourse analysis, which finds methods to lessen teacher-centered methods and promote more communicative, interactive settings that engage students Zaki's study (2021).

The structure of classroom discourse also influences learning. (Gonzalez, 2008) defines classroom discourse as patterned interactions between teachers and students, in which the teacher's role frequently dictates the shape of exchanges. Domalewska (2015) also observes that teachers' control over discourse is a distinguishing element of classroom interactions. This controlled communication not only helps learning, but it also coincides with the goals of CLT by encouraging intentional and meaningful exchanges in class.

Students can only learn a language by participating in exchanges and relationships that form during interactions. Based on the explanation above, it appears that establishing an interaction between instructor and students will influence the structure of the interaction in the classroom. Knowing the discourse structure enables the teacher and student to understand each other's communication aims and objectives (Handayani et al., 2019). Furthermore, understanding the structure of discourse in a classroom increases the function of language used by teachers and students during classroom interaction, allowing the learning objective to be easily fulfilled.

Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) proposed a hierarchical model of classroom discourse structure, identifying five levels: act, movement, exchange, transaction, and interaction. This approach provides a systematic framework for evaluating patterns of interaction in classrooms, providing insights into how communication occurs during teaching and learning. The concept is consistent with communicative language teaching (CLT), which sees interaction as an essential component of language learning. CLT moves the focus away from teacher-dominated instruction and toward interactive, communicative approaches that encourage student participation. Using Sinclair and Coulthard's methodology, researchers can assess how successfully classroom interactions comply to CLT principles. For example, the patterns of initiation, response, and feedback in classroom discourse might reflect whether communication promotes active student participation or is mostly teacher-centered.

Studies have been conducted on classroom discipline analysis using Sinclair and Coulthard's theory. Abeti (2022); Baharudin Maghfur (2021); and Raharja (2020) examined patterns of teacher-student interaction in the English classroom. This study relied on Sinclair and Coulthard's Initiation Response Feedback (IRF) theory. The findings of these studies revealed that the instructor was the dominant figure in classroom interactions. Usman & Mujahidah (2021) examined Classroom Discourse Analysis using the S&C rank scale, concentrating on the types of act structures produced by students and teachers in the classroom. She discovered that different sorts of Act structures are used, with elicitation being the most common. According to Mardiah et al. (2020)), discourse analysis utilizing S&C revealed three lowest rank scales: Act, Move, and Exchange, with Teaching Exchange dominating. Those previous studies mostly conducted at school and the analysis is less than five ranks, did not examine the discourse structure as a whole.

Besides school as a formal education, there are also informal and non-formal education institutions in Indonesia. According to the Indonesian Act No. 20, passed in 2013, there are three categories of education in Indonesia: formal, non-formal, and informal (Rahayu, 2020). Thus, it can be said that non-formal education is also used in Indonesia in addition to formal education for the teaching and learning

of English. According to Dib (1988) formal education alone cannot meet the needs of the students. So, it should collaborate with non-formal and informal education. It may inferred that non-formal education is just as important as formal education in Indonesia when it comes to teaching and studying English.

Formal education refers to a structured educational approach that is governed by rules and regulations, with rigorous curricular objectives, methods, and content requirements. Formal and non-formal education differ greatly in numerous aspects. Though curriculum and methods are variable, learning in these environments is planned and purposeful rather than accidental (Shala & Grajcevci, 2016). Melnic & Botez, (2014) also defines formal education as a systematic, organized educational model that is structured and managed in accordance with a specific set of laws and standards, and it presents a somewhat rigid curriculum in terms of aims, content, and methods. Non-formal education include student activities outside the school, such as home reading and paperwork, with flexible curricula and methodologies.The formal education prioritize the professor/school system while non-formal education prioritizes the student, developing objectives, programs, and approaches based on their unique needs and qualities. One of the example of formal education is school that arranged by government and non-formal education is english course.

Based on the description above, it is important to do classroom discourse analysis. In the language teaching setting, the study of classroom discourse can allow language teachers to run the language and teaching process well (Putri, 2018). So this study analyzed the classroom discourse produced by teacher and students in the classroom. Some previous studies above also analyzed about classroom discourse by Sinclair and Coulthard, they did not reveal the whole discourse analysis, so the information result was partial. To better understand the structure and genre of classroom discourse, this study will use a hierarchical model to examine the unit patterns at each level. The objective of this study is to compare classroom discourse structures produced by teacher and students at school and english course from opening to closing at the level of interaction, exchange, transaction, exchange, move, and act.

## 2. METHODS

This study used a qualitative design with a focus on discourse analysis, and audio recordings were used to capture natural classroom interactions. Mobile phones were chosen for audio recording because of their convenience, portability, and ability to provide a non-intrusive environment that encourages natural interactions between students and teachers. Mobile phones were particularly useful since they may be easily placed in the classroom, reducing disturbance to the learning process. To ensure the quality and trustworthiness of the recordings, various precautions were taken: the mobile phone was strategically placed—usually at the front of the class or near the teacher—to capture good audio. Prior to the real sessions, the researcher made trial recordings to fine-tune the positioning and settings for best sound quality. Furthermore, each recording was examined immediately following the session to ensure that the audio was clear and interference-free.

The selection of specific classes and levels for analysis was based on defined criteria rather than random sampling. The study focused on both formal and informal educational settings, including 1 meeting of each English lessons at SMP N 1 Padang (Grade 8) and SMA N 10 Padang (Grade 11), as well as one meeting at basic and advanced levels at an English Training Center. So, the total class of this study is four classes. The rationale for selecting second-grade classrooms in both junior and senior high schools was to ensure that students' competency levels matched those in the English course. This enabled a realistic comparison of discourse structures in similar educational levels.

Data collection involves gaining permission from school principals and course directors, and then scheduling meetings with the designated teachers to do the recordings. The researcher attended one class session in each venue and documented the lessons from beginning to end. The recordings ranged in length, ranging from one hour to an hour and a half, depending on the lesson arrangement.

After recording the audio, the researcher physically transcribed it into text to ensure accurate portrayal of classroom dialog. The transcripts were then classified using Sinclair and Coulthard's five-

rank categorization framework: lesson, transaction, exchange, move, and act based on its structure from each ranks in a table. To guarantee the classification was reliable, the researcher examined relevant literature and Sinclair and Coulthard's model definitions throughout the coding procedure. Following the final categorization, the frequency of each discourse element was manually calculated. Percentages were determined by dividing the number of occurrences of each category by the total number of categories and multiplying by 100. To ensure accuracy, the calculation was completed with a calculator. The findings of these calculations were analyzed in relation to the research topics, with the goal of discovering differences in classroom interaction between formal and non-formal educational situations. The study's goal was to give insights into the dynamics of teacher-student interactions across different learning environments by evaluating the frequency and distribution of discourse elements.

Furthermore, because our primary goal in this study is to fully comprehend the classroom discourse, a qualitative method is more appropriate, and statistical analysis was not used. Since the information we gathered is narrative and descriptive, numerical analysis was not necessary. By placing more emphasis on context and meaning than on numbers, our objective is to find themes and patterns in the discourse. To gain deeper insights, we decided to do a qualitative analysis of the data, even if we provide it as percentages to illustrate the distribution of discourse parts. We can still provide insightful results and a deeper comprehension of interactions in formal and informal learning environments without the need for statistical analysis.

## 3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The results obtained from the research have to be supported by sufficient data. The research results and the discovery must be the answers, or the research hypothesis stated previously in the introduction part.

### 3.1. *Structure of Classroom Discourse of Acts rank*

Sinclair and Coulthard's theory identifies this act as the lowest rank in classroom discourse. Within this framework, there are twenty-two types of acts, each serving a unique name and function. However, these acts are not always fully realized during classroom interactions; their occurrence depends on the dynamics of the specific classroom context. Table 1 illustrates the frequency of these acts across varying student levels in two schools and an English course.

The data in Table 1 highlights variations in the types of acts produced in school and English course settings across different levels. The distribution of these acts is uneven, with certain types being more prominent than others. At the high school (SMA) and junior high school (SMP) levels, the reply act is the most dominant. This predominance suggests that students in formal classroom settings primarily respond reactively rather than initiating interactions, indicating a more passive role in the discourse. Following this, elicitation acts appear as the next most frequent, reflecting the teacher's role in prompting student responses.

In contrast, the English course setting—both at the basic and advanced levels—shows a greater emphasis on elicitation acts as the most frequently used type. This aligns with the principles of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), which prioritize active student participation and interaction in language learning. The higher frequency of elicitation acts in these settings indicates a deliberate effort to foster engagement and dialogue, encouraging learners to take a more active role in their language acquisition process.

**Table 1**. The Structure of Acts Produced in Formal and Non-Formal Education Different Student's Level

| No | Acts | Formal | | Total | Non-Formal | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | SMA | SMP | | Basic | Advance | |
| 1 | Accept | 29 | 20 | 49 | 45 | 45 | 90 |
| 2 | Acknowledge | 7 | 2 | 9 | 10 | 19 | 29 |
| 3 | Aside | 4 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 6 |
| 4 | Bid | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| 5 | Check | 2 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 8 |
| 6 | Cue | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | Clue | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 8 | Comment | 3 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 6 |
| 9 | Conclusion | 4 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 5 |
| 10 | Directive | 21 | 11 | 32 | 6 | 15 | 21 |
| 11 | Elicitation | 70 | 58 | 128 | 159 | 115 | 274 |
| 12 | Evaluation | 8 | 13 | 21 | 17 | 10 | 27 |
| 13 | Informative | 31 | 6 | 37 | 19 | 46 | 65 |
| 14 | Loop | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 15 | Marker | 41 | 10 | 51 | 37 | 19 | 56 |
| 16 | Metastatement | 15 | 4 | 19 | 16 | 8 | 24 |
| 17 | Nomination | 11 | 2 | 13 | 9 | 4 | 13 |
| 18 | Prompt | 1 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 0 | 10 |
| 19 | React | 5 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 7 |
| 20 | Reply | 79 | 57 | 136 | 143 | 103 | 246 |
| 21 | Silent stress | 2 | 6 | 8 | 7 | 1 | 8 |
| 22 | Starter | 19 | 1 | 20 | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| **Number of Act Types** | | 18 | 17 | 35 | 20 | 20 | 40 |
| | **TOTAL** | 352 | 198 | 550 | 499 | 410 | 909 |

Compared to SMP and SMA, the basic and advanced levels in non-formal education exhibited a higher number of act types and a greater total number of acts. At the SMA level, 18 types of acts were recorded, while the SMP level accounted for only 17 types. In contrast, both the basic and advanced levels in non-formal education achieved 20 types of acts. This pattern highlights the greater flexibility and diversity in interaction that non-formal education offers, enabling a broader range of communication and engagement opportunities.

The increased variety of act types in non-formal settings suggests a more dynamic and participatory learning environment, where students are encouraged to contribute in multiple ways. This flexibility fosters greater interaction, allowing learners to actively engage with the material and with one another. Such an approach not only enhances student participation but also supports deeper comprehension, as the varied interaction styles cater to different learning needs and preferences. This phenomenon underscores the potential of non-formal education to create an enriched, interactive learning experience that emphasizes active involvement and collaborative learning.

### 3.2. Structure of Classroom Discourse of Move rank

The move is composed of acts and occupy certain positions in the trade system. This account describes the organization of the move based on class. There are five types of move: framing, focusing, opening, answering and follow-up. The frequesncy of each type may different depends on the interaction in the classroom. The frequency the types of moves in different students' level at two schools and English course was presented in the table below:

**Table 2**. The Structure of Move Produced in Formal and Non-Formal Education Different Student's Level

| No | Types of move | formal | | Non-formal | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | SMP | SMA | Basic | Advance |
| 1 | Framing | 10 | 42 | 37 | 20 |
| 2 | Focusing | 6 | 18 | 19 | 8 |
| 3 | Opening | 70 | 114 | 183 | 151 |
| 4 | Answering | 60 | 103 | 161 | 144 |
| 5 | Follow-up | 30 | 32 | 49 | 51 |
| | **TOTAL** | 176 | 309 | 449 | 374 |

Based on Table 2, SMA exhibits a higher frequency of framing moves compared to other levels. Teachers at the SMA level more frequently utilized framing moves to establish boundaries and structure their lessons, followed by the basic level in non-formal education. In contrast, for focusing, opening, answering, and follow-up moves, the basic and advanced levels—particularly the basic level—demonstrated higher frequencies than SMP and SMA.

This indicates that the frequency and diversity of move ranks produced by teachers and students in non-formal education settings surpass those in formal education. The broader variety and greater number of move ranks in non-formal education suggest a more interactive and engaging learning environment. Such an environment likely provides students with increased opportunities to actively participate, which can significantly enhance their understanding of the material. The interactive nature of non-formal education fosters collaboration and dialogue, creating a dynamic learning atmosphere that supports deeper comprehension and learner involvement.

### 3.3. The Structure of Classroom Discourse of Exchange Rank

There are three types of exchange produced at school and english course in different student's level. Each exchange has different frequency depends on the interaction between teacher and students in the classroom. The frequency of exchange rank in formal and non-formal education in different student's level is drawn below:

**Table 3**. The Structure of Exchange Produced in Formal and Non-Formal Education Different Student's Level

| No | Types of Exchange | Formal | | Non-formal | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | SMP | SMA | Basic | Adv |
| 1 | I (Initiation) | 9 | 17 | 20 | 3 |
| 2 | IR (Initiation-Response) | 30 | 62 | 109 | 69 |
| 3 | IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback) | 28 | 32 | 46 | 35 |
| | **TOTAL** | 67 | 110 | 183 | 108 |

Table 3 shows that the types of exchange produced varied on the basis of different student's level in formal and non-formal education. The contribution of each type exchange were clearly unequal portion. The number of I in basic level is the highest, followed by SMA and the last advance and SMP. For only initiation, this basic could be teachers giving questions to the students, giving direction or giving an information and explanation to the student without any response from student. This case, teachers often started the initiation by giving information or explanation and giving direction during learning process. Second, the frequency of IR in basic was higher followed by advanced level. this reveals that students in basic and advance level was more responsive in the classroom than students in SMP and SMA. They often replied what the teacher's initiation in the classroom . It reveals that the interaction at basic and advanced is reciprocal but interaction in formal class is more one-way, with the teacher as the leader of learning process. Furthermore, for IRF, the most frequency appeared in the

advance followed by the basic level. This is a complete exchange because IRF involves both teachers and students, this exchange is viewed as a complete unit of classroom engagement. Teachers not only initiate conversations and receive responses from students, but they also guarantee that those responses are followed up with feedback so that learning may continue to progress.

From the total types of exchange, the highest number produced exchange was by basic and advanced level which is in non-formal class. The high frequency of exchanges in non-formal education implies a more dynamic and interactive learning environment in which students feel more comfortable interacting and contributing to conversations. The more exchanges produced in the classroom, the more complex interactions between teacher and students produced in the classroom.

### 3.4. *The Structure of Classroom Discourse of Transaction Rank*

Transaction units in classroom discourse are divided into different types of exchanges. There are three types of exchanges: preliminary, medium, and terminal. Preliminary exchanges mark the start of an activity or the composition of subsequent exchanges. The quantity of actions determines how many medial exchanges occur. Medial exchanges refer to transactions that occur during ongoing operations. Finally, terminal exchanges serve as signposts that indicate the end of an activity.

In general, the two levels of formal and non-formal education created a lower number of preliminary and terminal exchanges. The terminal exchanges were even smaller. Teachers rarely provided summaries before moving on to the next activity. The table below provides detailed information:

**Table 4**. The Structure of Transaction Produced in Formal and Non-Formal Education in Different Student's Level

| No | Types of Transaction | Formal | | Non-formal | |
|----|----------------------|--------|-----|-------|-----|
| | | SMP | SMA | Basic | Adv |
| 1 | Preliminary | 4 | 7 | 9 | 14 |
| 2 | Medial | 67 | 112 | 160 | 135 |
| 3 | Terminal | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 |
| | **TOTAL** | 71 | 119 | 171 | 161 |

At the basic and advanced levels of the English course, teachers frequently signaled the start of activities, reflecting the frequent use of preliminary exchanges in non-formal education compared to formal settings. The highest number of medial exchanges was observed at the basic level, followed by the advanced level, indicating that these exchanges were also predominantly produced in non-formal education. Additionally, terminal exchanges were unique to non-formal education, appearing at both the basic and advanced levels, with similar frequencies across these levels.

The disparity between the number of preliminary and terminal exchanges suggests that the learning process at various levels may lack a well-structured framework. A well-structured presentation relies on clear signposts, such as preliminary and terminal exchanges, which serve as crucial markers at the transaction level. Preliminary exchanges signify the teacher's transition to a new activity, while terminal exchanges signal the conclusion of the discussion. In a student-centered classroom, these exchanges mark the beginning and completion of activities, providing clarity and direction in the learning process.

Compared to formal education at the SMP and SMA levels, non-formal education at the basic and advanced levels demonstrated the highest volume of classroom discourse transactions. This is evidenced by the substantial number of preliminary, medial, and terminal exchanges in these settings. This pattern indicates that non-formal education fosters more participatory and flexible communication dynamics. The emphasis in non-formal education, particularly in English courses, appears to prioritize active student participation and engagement over passive listening to teacher-led instruction. This focus on interactive learning allows students to play an active role in their education, enhancing their ability to learn effectively and engage meaningfully with the content.

### 3.5. *The Structure of Classroom Discourse of Lesson*

In general, classroom discourse is made up of several interactions that occur during the teaching-learning process. They are the opening, body, and closing stages. Ideally, the opening stage consists of greeting, motivating, reviewing, and bridging. For body stage, it consists of presenting, practice, and producing. While for closing stage, it consists of concluding, evaluating, giving homework and previewing. Each of these stages contains certain units of interaction, which are identified through exchanges. Data study indicates that both formal and non-formal education lacks certain components for effective engagement in English classrooms. The details are presented in the following table:

**Table 5**. The Structure of Lessons Produced in Formal and Non-Formal Education at Different Student's Levels

| STAGES | | Formal | | | | | | | | Non-formal | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | SMP | | | | SMA | | | | Basic | | | | Adv | | | |
| | | P | M | | T | P | M | | T | P | M | | T | P | M | | T |
| | | | Act | Ex | | | Act | Ex | | | Act | Ex | | | Act | ex | |
| opening | Greeting | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 26 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 |
| | Motivating | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Reviewing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 27 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Bridging | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 63 | 29 | 0 | 2 | 47 | 5 | 0 |
| Body | Presenting | 6 | 80 | 27 | 0 | 5 | 146 | 42 | 0 | 8 | 206 | 29 | 0 | 4 | 113 | 29 | 1 |
| | practicing | 2 | 102 | 37 | 0 | 1 | 32 | 10 | 0 | 5 | 174 | 61 | 1 | 3 | 131 | 35 | 2 |
| | producing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95 | 39 | 0 | 1 | 21 | 44 | 0 | 4 | 139 | 51 | 1 |
| Closing | concluding | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 1 | 0 |
| | evaluating | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 82 | 27 | 0 |
| | Giving homework | 1 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 0 |
| | previewing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Based on Table 5, the opening stage, which includes activities such as greeting, motivating, reviewing, and bridging, was produced differently across various levels of the learning process. Greetings consistently occurred at every level, but preliminary exchanges were observed only at the SMA level, and terminal exchanges were absent across all levels. Motivating activities were notably absent in all lessons.

Reviewing activities were present at all levels except SMP, where they did not occur. Bridging, however, was the most frequently performed interaction during the opening stage at the basic and advanced levels. This is evidenced by the higher number of activities recorded in these levels, as shown in the table. Notably, there were no bridging activities produced by SMP or SMA during the opening stage, highlighting a significant difference in interaction patterns between formal and non-formal education settings.

During the opening stage, teachers generally underperformed in delivering effective induction activities. This was evident from the absence of motivation-related activities at the beginning of lessons. Motivating students is essential for capturing their attention and demonstrating the relevance of the lesson to their immediate needs. Additionally, reviewing activities, which serve to activate students' prior knowledge, were largely neglected by most teachers, as reflected in the minimal number of reviewing activities observed in formal education settings such as SMP and SMA. On the other hand, the bridging stage, which involves outlining the purpose and structure of the lesson, was executed effectively only by teachers in formal education.

The second stage, the body, comprises the core instructional activities: presenting, practicing, and producing. This stage is pivotal as it constitutes the main focus of the lesson. The findings indicate that teachers and students across all levels performed well in the presenting and practicing phases. These

two stages accounted for the highest number of activities recorded. The producing stage, which is equally critical, provides an opportunity for students to actively apply their learning. However, in English classes at the SMP level, no activities were observed during this stage, while other levels demonstrated active engagement.

When comparing formal and non-formal education, English courses exhibited a significantly higher quantity of activities across all three components of the body stage—presenting, practicing, and producing. These findings highlight the greater emphasis placed on interactive and applied learning in non-formal education, particularly in the English course setting, where students actively engage with and apply the content more frequently than in formal educational contexts.

The final stage of the lesson encompasses activities such as concluding, evaluating, assigning homework, and previewing. Despite the limited number of exchanges in this stage, both high schools and English courses demonstrated an ability to manage the learning process effectively, as evidenced by the findings. Notably, only the advanced level included product or result evaluations at the end of the session, while other levels did not engage in evaluation activities. This suggests a reliance on students' performance or presentations during class as a substitute for formal evaluation. While such activities can provide immediate feedback, the evaluation stage at the end of a session is essential for assessing the overall effectiveness of the teaching and learning process during the allotted period.

In non-formal English courses, homework assignments are typically rare, as the focus is on verbal interaction and direct communication. Exceptions are seen in more structured courses, where homework may be assigned to reinforce learning. In schools, however, assigning homework is a common practice, aimed at encouraging consistent engagement and improving daily grades. The findings revealed that only at the basic level were teachers observed not assigning homework to students.

Previewing, the final step of the lesson, involves teachers introducing the topic for the next meeting and occasionally assigning preparatory tasks such as reading or conducting an online survey. Previewing activities were rarely utilized, as indicated by the minimal number of such activities recorded. Only the SMA and basic levels included previewing activities, highlighting a missed opportunity to effectively scaffold learning for subsequent lessons. This underutilization of previewing activities suggests room for improvement in preparing students for future learning objectives.

The study's findings show that the organization of classroom discourse varies significantly across educational levels, specifically in formal education (SMP and SMA) and non-formal education (basic and advanced levels in English courses). In non-formal settings, particularly at the basic and advanced levels, there was a significantly higher frequency of acts compared to the SMP and SMA levels. This suggests that as students' proficiency increases, particularly in non-formal settings, there is an increased frequency of interactional acts. This can be attributed to a combination of factors, including the higher motivation often observed in students attending English courses voluntarily, as opposed to the compulsory nature of language learning in formal education (Rahayu, 2020). These findings are consistent with Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) principles, which emphasize the importance of interaction in language learning (Melnic & Botez, 2014). CLT promotes a more dynamic and student-centered classroom environment, which is reflected in the higher number of acts observed in non-formal education settings.

In terms of move structure, basic and advanced levels in non-formal education exhibited a higher frequency of moves than their formal counterparts in SMP and SMA. While the types of moves were consistent across all educational levels, non-formal settings featured a more frequent occurrence, suggesting that teachers in non-formal contexts encourage a greater degree of interaction and student participation. This finding further supports the role of CLT in fostering more engaging classroom discourse, where student responses are valued and solicited more frequently.

Regarding exchanges, all educational levels employed the I, IR, and IRF structures, but non-formal education settings, especially at the basic and advanced levels, showed a more complete exchange structure (IRF). This higher frequency of complete exchanges may be attributed to the conversational

style of instruction in non-formal education, where teachers often encourage more frequent and extended student responses, in line with sociocultural theory (Vygotsky, 1978). This theory emphasizes the role of social interaction in language development, where more dynamic teacher-student exchanges facilitate deeper learning and understanding.

Transaction structures revealed that terminal exchanges were the least common across all contexts, with medium exchanges being more frequent, indicating that classroom discourse tends to focus on ongoing, interactive communication rather than ending exchanges. Interestingly, the highest frequency of exchanges occurred in non-formal education settings, highlighting the more interactive and participatory nature of these classrooms. This aligns with findings from previous studies (Zaki, 2021) that suggest that non-formal education tends to foster more active student involvement.

The lesson format varied across educational levels, with SMP-level classrooms characterized by simple greetings and bridging at the beginning, whereas higher levels in both formal and non-formal education involved more structured and complex interactions. This difference underscores the evolving nature of classroom discourse as students advance in their education. The observed patterns in non-formal education suggest that these environments promote more flexible and engaging teaching methods, which may facilitate better language learning outcomes.

Implications of these findings are significant for educators in formal education contexts. The lower frequency of moves and exchanges in formal settings, particularly in SMP and SMA, indicates that there is substantial room for improvement in increasing student interaction. Incorporating more dynamic and student-centered exercises, as seen in non-formal English courses, could foster higher levels of student participation and engagement, consistent with Communicative Language Teaching principles. This approach could help reduce the more rigid, teacher-centered dynamics often observed in formal education. Furthermore, understanding which discourse structures are underutilized provides valuable insight into areas where teaching practices could be adapted to enhance classroom interaction.

However, the study's limitations include a narrow focus on a small number of educational environments, specifically a limited range of educational levels and types of institutions. Future research could broaden the scope of this analysis to include a more diverse set of educational contexts and disciplines. Additionally, examining how different teaching approaches—such as task-based language teaching or flipped classrooms—affect discourse structures could provide further insights into how classroom interactions influence language acquisition. Investigating the role of student characteristics, such as motivation and language proficiency, in shaping classroom discourse could also provide valuable insights into the dynamics of teacher-student interactions.

Longitudinal studies tracking changes in classroom discourse over time would be particularly useful in understanding how discourse patterns evolve as students progress through various educational levels. Such studies could also explore how the impact of different pedagogical approaches and teaching styles changes over the course of a student's education.

## 4. CONCLUSION

On the basis of the information described and explained in the findings, the conclusion can be drawn that the structure of classroom discourse at various student levels in non-formal education is more engaging and contains more discourse features than formal education. This research implies that non-formal education settings may be more effective at encouraging student participation and interaction, which could be advantageous for language acquisition. Educators and policymakers should take these findings into account when developing curricula and instructional practices, as encouraging interactive discourse may improve learning results in formal education environments.

This study has several limitations. First, the sample size was relatively small, with only four classroom sessions analyzed. This may limit the generalizability of the findings to broader contexts. Second, the study focused solely on classroom discourse in formal and non-formal education in a specific region, which may not represent discourse patterns in other regions or educational settings.

Future research could expand the sample size and include diverse educational contexts to provide a more comprehensive understanding of classroom discourse. Additionally, further studies could explore the impact of cultural and institutional factors on classroom discourse or incorporate multimodal analysis to examine non-verbal communication.

## REFERENCES

Abeti, M. T. (2022). Classroom Discourse Analysis. *International Journal of Advanced Research and Publication*, *5*(3), 86–90. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315775630

Alsoraihi, M. H. (2019). Bridging the Gap Between Discourse Analysis and Language Classroom Practice. *English Language Teaching*, *12*(8), 79. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v12n8p79

Ardian, F., & Indah, R. N. (2022). Classroom Discourse Analysis of Teacher's Code-Switching. *Humanitatis: Journal of Language and Literature*, *9*(1), 1–12.

Baharudin Maghfur. (2021). Classroom Discourse Analysis of Teacher-Students Interaction. *Journal of English Language and Pedagogy*, *4*(1), 40–47. https://doi.org/10.36597/jelp.v4i1.9272

Dib, C. Z. (1988). Formal, Non-formal and Informal Education: Concepts/Applicability. *Птицы*, *1*(2), 12–17.

Domalewska, D. (2015). Classroom Discourse Analysis in EFL Elementary Lessons. *International Journal of Languages, Literature and Linguistics*, *1*(1), 6–9. https://doi.org/10.7763/ijlll.2015.v1.2

Gonzalez, J. M. (2008). Encyclopedia of Bilingual Education. In J. M. Gonzalez (Ed.), *Sage* (Vol. 1 and 2). United States: R.

Handayani, D., Suwandi, S., & Setiawan, B. (2019). Penggunaan Bahasa Indonesia Dalam Interaksi Kelas Mata Pelajaran Bahasa Indonesia (Studi Kasus Di Sma Negeri 2 Sragen). *Basastra: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Dan Pengajarannya*, *7*(1), 113. https://doi.org/10.20961/basastra.v7i1.35495

Kasmiati. (2021). Classroom Discourse Analysis on Language Interaction at The First Level Class of STAR English Course Parepare. *Inspiring: English Education Journal*, *4*(2), 71–78. https://doi.org/10.35905/inspiring.v4i2.1953

Mardiah, I., Jamalullail, M. H., & Hidayatic, R. (2020). Discourse Analysis of Classroom Interaction in EFL Context. *Linguistics and English Languages Teaching Studies*, *1*(2), 17–34.

Melnic, A.-S., & Botez, N. (2014). Formal, Non-Formal and Informal Interdependence in Education. *Economy Transdisciplinarity Cognition*, *17*(1), 113–118. Retrieved from www.ugb.ro/etc

Mustapha, S. M., Rahman, N. S. N. A., & Yunus, M. M. (2010). Factors influencing classroom participation: A case study of Malaysian undergraduate students. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *9*, 1079–1084. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.12.289

Putri, D. M. (2018). EFL Classroom Discourse; From the Perspective of Discourse Analysis and Conversation Analysis. *Tell-Us Journal*, *4*(1), 33–46. https://doi.org/10.22202/tus.2018.v4i1.2387

Raharja, B. J. (2020). Discourse analysis on teacher-students interaction pattern of English teaching learning process in vocational high school. *Journal of English Language and Pedagogy*, *3*(1), 36–40. https://doi.org/10.36597/jelp.v3i1.2900

Rahayu, D. I. (2020). The Acquisition and Learning of EFL inA Non-formal English Education in Indonesia. *Journal of English Education*, *5*(2), 86–94.

Rymes, B. (2008). Classroom discourse analysis : a tool for critical reflection. *Discourse and Social Processes*, 1–368.

Shah Zaki, M. (2021). European Journal of Language and Literature Studies Discourse Analysis of Teacher and Students in Pre-Intermediate English Class. *European Journal of Language and Literature Studies*, *7*(1), 28–36.

Shala, A., & Grajcevci, A. (2016). Formal and Non-Formal Education in the New Era. *Action Researcher in Education*, (7), 119–130. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/328812348

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. London: Harvard University Press.