



INITIATION-RESPONSE-FEEDBACK PATTERN USED cBY LECTURER-STUDENTS IN EFL CLASSROOM INTERACTION

Kartini¹, Sitti Syakira², Sitti Aisyah³

*sitti.syakira@unsil.ac.id

Universitas Negeri Makassar¹, Universitas Siliwangi², Universitas Islam Maros³,
Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Applying a descriptive qualitative method with a case study design, this research aimed at finding and describing how initiation-response-feedback take place in classroom interaction. The data collection was done through observation conducted in two classes of third-year students of English Education Department in one of the state universities in Makassar. The observation was conducted three times in each class. Analyzed using discourse analysis, the results show that in terms of initiation, four subclasses were used by the lecturer namely requestives, descriptives, elicitation, and informatives. In terms of students' responding act, students used three subclasses features namely positive responding act, negative responding act, and temporization. As for follow-up, the lecturer used three subclasses features namely endorsement, concession, and acknowledgment. This research also found that acknowledgment was used to repair and accept with repair student's response. Classroom interaction took place by using subclasses of head act. The lecturer uttered initiation based on the function of each subclass. That was similar to how students' responding act took place which was based on lecturer initiation. Furthermore, the lecturer responded students in many ways based on the responding act. Hence, it should be identified that a turn can be constructed of a single move and also of two moves. It can be either a combination of a responding and an initiating move, or a follow-up and an initiating move. However, initiation moves, response moves and follow-up moves cannot be separated each other since it was three-part exchange in classroom interaction.

Keywords: Initiation-Response-Feedback, Lecturer's Initiation and Feedback, Students' Response, EFL Classroom Interaction

INTRODUCTION

Both teacher and student are involved in the process of teaching and learning in the classroom. A procedure exists in which the teacher asks or answers questions, and the pupils, as learners, react to the teacher. According to Hardman (2008), the social constructivist paradigm positions the teacher as a manager in the interaction between the teacher and the entire class, with students being guided as active participants in the co-construction of knowledge. It indicates that in the learning process, the instructor acts as a facilitator and the students act as receivers of the teacher's material. The area for learning and interaction will be enlarged if teachers are able to build on students' contributions in their feedback slot. Interaction is a classroom activity that aims to improve communication

* Corresponding Author

Sitti Syakira

Email: sitti.syakira@unsil.ac.id

between the teacher and the students, according to Walsh (2011), who claims that communication is at the heart of all classroom activities. As a result, communication is at the heart of all interactions. Rather than just producing the phrase or statement, teacher-student conversation has a deeper significance. As a result, effective contact must be handled to assist students in generating deep comprehension. In the classroom, the teacher can interact with pupils by utilizing the target language throughout the encounter. In the learning process, there may be spoken or nonverbal interactions between the teacher and the students. If the teacher or students make statements regarding what they are thinking about, there may be verbal engagement. Body language, such as conveying emotion, gestures, and so on, is considered nonverbal. Classroom engagement has evolved from teacher-student interaction.

The contact between the teacher and the pupils takes place in the classroom. Classroom interaction is a word used to describe what happens in the classroom when language is involved (Hall, 2011). In this regard, classroom interaction is a two-way communication process between the learners. That relationship, in other words, lies at the center of communication. Learning will be more effective if there is collaboration between teachers and students to facilitate communication. Question and response are frequently the most common form of classroom engagement, with teachers asking the majority of the questions. It's because questions give the necessary practice and feedback for growth. A question is a tool that is used in direct communication between two people. In some circumstances, in EFL speaking classes, the learning process and classroom interaction are rare. There are a few issues that arise during the learning process. The students appear to be inactive, and they may be experiencing difficulties due to issues such as native language, age, and intrinsic phonetic aptitude. In contrast to the inexperienced instructor, the experienced teacher has no trouble interacting with kids who have the condition mentioned above. The focus of this study is on the interactions between teachers and students in the classroom. Teachers frequently ask pupils questions in the classroom. The teacher will comment on whether or not the response was correct. Flander (1970) conducted research to assist teachers in developing and controlling their teaching behavior, as well as to study the link between teaching behavior, classroom interaction, and educational outcomes. He developed a ten-category approach for interaction analysis, which is frequently utilized in classrooms today. He divides all classroom discourse into two categories: 'Teacher Talk' and 'Pupil Talk,' which are further separated into 'Initiation' and 'Response.' It provides a broad overview of the interaction pattern. As a result, such a classification is appropriate.

Rustandi and Mubarok (2017) evaluated the reflection of Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) in speaking class and investigated the prevalent sequences among I, R, and F in their study. The outcome revealed that student response has become the dominant IRF sequence. Furthermore, teachers should maintain the efficacy of classroom interaction and provide ample opportunities for students to participate in classroom verbal interaction by incorporating the IRF pattern into the teaching learning process, particularly in the speaking classroom. Sujariati, Rahman, and Mahmud (2016) found the teacher's questioning strategies, the reasons for using, and the effects of the questioning strategies on student learning activities in EFL Classroom. The results of the study revealed that the employment of questioning tactics by teachers in EFL classrooms had a beneficial impact. Most of the students agreed, as can be seen in their comments. In addition, the observation also indicated that both the teacher and the students engaged in effective questioning tactics.

Another study about IRF sequences in EFL classroom was conducted by Butterfield and Bhatta (2015). They used a team to do study into the teacher-student interaction in the classroom. This study looked at how teachers in team-teaching classrooms complete IRF sequences. The Non Native English teacher performed as the one who was in charge of the overall management of the classroom and oriented to her role as the teacher in power in the classroom, as evidenced by her repairing student mistakes, allocating who

spoke, and managing the progressivity of the activities in the lesson, according to an analysis of the data. The Native English teacher concentrated on developing questions and evaluating responses in the traditional IRF sequences. To fill the gap, this present study aimed to see how IRF patterns happened in higher education taught by a lecturer with years of teaching experiences.

In terms of classroom interaction, Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) is most commonly seen during the learning process. Some scholars have given this sequential interaction a different name. Flanders (1970) developed a ten-category method for interaction analysis, which is commonly utilized in the classroom. His categorization of all classroom discourse is classified into 'Teacher Talk' and 'Pupil Talk,' which is further separated into 'Initiation' and 'Response,' provides a broad view of the interaction pattern. As a result, this categorisation is used here. Regrettably, the proposed categories are not consistent. Some are educational behaviors, whereas others are intimately tied to linguistic data (such as asking questions and offering directions) (such as teacher lectures, praises). In addition, there is no objective criterion for classifying the categories. As a result, the data will undoubtedly be subjected to various interpretations. The use of an arbitrary time unit as a basis for categorizing data is meaningless, because it demonstrates a lack of comprehension of the purpose of utterances.

As a result of Flander's omission, Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) did a study and concluded that the majority of L2 classroom interaction research has focused on teacher feedback in connection with examining the Initiation-Response-Feedback cycle (IRF). In a language classroom, the IRF structure is a common sort of teacher-student interaction pattern. According to Seedhouse (2004), depending on the context in which they operate, IRF sequences do distinct interactional and educational activities. The following are the descriptions of IRF sequences.

Initiation, that is only occur when the teacher allows the student to respond to them (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975) describe three categories of initiation:

- a. *elicitation* - requesting a *linguistic* response (ie. interrogative)
Josh what you have written down
- b. *directive* - requesting a *non-linguistic* response (ie. imperative):
Please close the door
- c. *informative* - passing on information (ie. declarative):
It was quite an elaborate stunt.

Response that is dependent on the initiating move provided by the teacher. Therefore, this assign further distinctions of initiation moves with regards to the responses they elicit;

- a. *Assumed Known Information* - the student is expected to supply information that the teacher has in mind, initiated by:
Who was the king of France?
- b. *Personal Information* - the student is expected to provide their *feeling* about a topic, and therefore the information is only known to addressed student, initiated by:
What did other people think...?
- c. *Negotiatory Information* - the student is expected to participate in *exploratory* discussion, where a resolution is reached collaboratively, initiated by:
Do you agree with Nir? Give us a reason

Feedback or follow-up is often commenced with an acceptance. Evaluation – commenting on the quality of the response, often the result of an appeal for assumed known information

- a. *Comment* – developing a response by exemplification, expansion or justification
- b. *Sustaining strategy* – acknowledgment of response as well as encouragement to continue

In this case, initiation, response and follow-up are each known as moves which combine to create exchanges, which in turn often chain together to form larger transactions as stated by Hardman (2008). In this sense, IRF has the potential to be used as a powerful tool in the formation of collaborative learning.

In this study, the researchers adopted the discourse acts taxonomy by Tsui (1994) which is displayed in the following table.

Table 1. An Intuitive Taxonomy of Discourse Acts

Head Acts	Subclasses		
Initiating acts	1. Requestives	a) Request for action b) Request for permission c) Offer d) Invitation e) Proposal	
	2. Directives	Advisives	Advice Warning
		Mandatives	Instruction Threat
		Nominate	
3. Elicitations	Elicit: a) inform b) confirm c) agree d) repeat e) clarify f) commit	1) Display Qs a) factual Qs b) Yes-No Q. c) Reasoning Q. d) Explanation Q. 2) Genuine Qs a) Opinioning Q. b) Information Q. 3) Restating Elicit	
	4. Informatives	a) Report b) Expressive c) Assessments d) Clue	1. Assessing 2. Compliment 3. Criticism 4. Self-denigration 5. Self-commendations
Responding acts	1. Positive-response 2. Negative-response 3. Temporization		
Follow-up acts	1. Endorsement	a) Positive Evaluation b) Negative Evaluation c) Comment	

	2. Concession		
	3. Acknowledgement	Accept	
Second Follow-up move	Turn-passing		

The table above shows an intuitive taxonomy of discourse acts as the last adaptation and refinements by Tsui (1994). Generally the seventeen system and an intuitive taxonomy of discourse acts are almost the same. Both of them explain about the subclasses of head actions. The difference is that the taxonomy explains completely rather than the seventeen system. For example in initiation, it involves requestives which have some subclasses such as requests for action, request for permission, offer, invitation which does not exist clearly in seventeen system because it is explained in general before.

METHODS

To characterize the IRF pattern used by teacher-students, the researchers used a descriptive qualitative design that emphasized discourse analysis. The participants in this study were two classes in the academic year of 2020/2021 of English Education Department in one of the state universities in Makassar. The data were collected three times through classroom observation to describe the reflection of IRF pattern, which included examining the types of IRF pattern used in classroom interaction. For the data analysis, this research applied discourse analysis following the steps (selecting the data, transcribing, interpreting, and reporting) adapted from Mahmud (2017). To select and transcribe the data, the researchers highlighted and categorized them based on the IRF pattern analysis by Tsui (1994) (see table 1). As for the interpreting process, the researchers applied the theory of Wood and Kroger (2000), consisting of six steps: substitution, reframing, multiple functions, content, participants' meaning, and similarities and differences in the meaning.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The results of this study revealed that the IRF pattern utilized by teachers and students differed depending on the goal of classroom engagement. In terms of IRF patterns in the teaching and learning process, requestives, directions, elicitation, and informative were the four subclasses of initiation utilized by the lecturer in classroom interaction. The extracts of the IRF pattern are shown below for a better understanding.

Lecturer's Initiation

Initiations of classroom talk, such as revoicing and strategic reformulation, initiating with a negotiatory question, contrast or clarify, and follow-up that encounters learners to explain, can produce the more beneficial and facilitative learning condition (Vahedi & Mousavi, 2021). In this study, the researchers observed several initiations, which were classified depending. Therefore, the researchers found some subclasses appeared in the classroom interaction that were categorized into some types as follows:

1) Requestives

Requestives refers to an action that the teacher requested the students to do something. This research found some types that the lecturer used in classroom interaction such as request for action, offer, and invitation. In contrast with this research finding which found three kinds of further subclasses in requestives, a research which was conducted by Rashidi and Rafieerad (2010) found that only

request for action appeared in their research. From the observation, Rashidi and Rafieerad found that most of requestives was request for action since they classified initiation and proposal as the form of request for action as well.

(Extract 1) Request for action

L refers to the lecturer while S1 and S2 refer to the students.

L: ... **who wanna be the volunteer?**

S2: *me(raise hand)*

L: Yes. *Others?*

S3 : (*Raise hand*)

The lecturer used to request for action to ask the students to do something. As Tsui (1994) states that request for action acts in which the addressee was given the option of responding positively or negatively - these acts are called requestives. Hence it can be seen that the lecturer in extract 1 that the lecturer asked students to be a presenter, but the lecturer gave the option of responding positively or negatively. However, in the classroom discourse, the action was above all beneficial to the teacher because the lecturer who wanted the action to be carried out; for this reason, the researchers can classify it as a request for action.

(Extract 2) Invitation

L: **you wanna bring some snack?**

it is up to [you]

S: @@

The extract above shows that the lecturer performed an action for students' benefit. The lecturer allowed the students to do something which was useful for them. It can be proved in utterance "*you wanna bring some snack? it is up to [you]*". It means the lecturer performed an action for students' benefit.

2) Directives

According to Tsui (1994), directives are characterized as those initiating acts that prospect a non-verbal action from the addressee and expect him/her only to comply. It can be realized by imperative, advises or warning. The lecturer gave the direction to the students about what should be done by them.

In this research researchers found some subclasses of directives which was used by the lecturer in the learning process; they were advices, mandative and nominate. In contrast with this research finding which found three kinds of further subclass in directives, a research which conducted by Rashidi and Rafieerad (2010) found two further subclasses appeared in their research, they were advices and mandates. From the observation, Rashidi and Rafieerad did not find nominate in whole learning and teaching process. In classroom interaction, the lecturer performed advices which tend to give students some advices or suggestions. It is also used to give warning or caution to the students.

(Extract 3)

L: ... *so you don't have to imagine that you are the best public speaker ever.*

you don't have to be the best, ya?.

you don't have to be the best.

you just to be clear and say something, okay?

Ss: **Yes Sir.**

In the extract above the lecturer said, "you don't have to be the best, ya? you don't have to be the best, you just to be clear and say something". The lecturer suggested the students speak clearly rather than to be the best public speaker. The

lecturer used elicitation at the end of utterances, but it can be classified that the utterance was the form of advice. This finding is supported by Flanders (1970) that giving direction means the lecturer gives direction, commands, advices or orders which student is expected to comply with.

3) Elicitation

It can be seen in the lecturer's request on a linguistic response from students. It deals with interrogatives. In this research the researchers found some subclasses of elicitation which was used by the lecturer in the learning process. They were elicit to inform, elicit to confirm, elicit to agree, elicit to repeat and elicit to clarify. To see the samples of this finding, the researchers display the following extract.

(Extract 4)

L: *what do you think is-- the lesson you learn from this story?*

S: *about do not give up*

Extract above, according to Tsui (1985), is categorized as opposed to display questions, as a type of question that the teacher does not have an answer. The term "genuine" is used as opposed to "pseudo-question" in which the teacher actually already has an answer in mind. It can be a question about the pupils themselves or about their opinion. In this extract, the lecturer asked "*what do you think is-- the lesson you learn from this story?*" This type of question asked for students' opinion and it was linguistically demanding because it required an expression of students' own feeling and opinion and not mere parroting.

From the findings above, the researchers concluded several functions of elicitation, such as seeking a missed information, asking students about their opinion or reasons, repeating the preceding question or simplifying it, inviting the students to confirm what the lecturer assumes to be true, inviting the students to agree, prospecting a repetition and clarification of a preceding utterances. Hence, in elicitation the lecturer who seek clarification has an opportunity to optimize learning potential since she or he did not always accept the first contribution that students offered.

Furthermore, by elicitation the lecturer gave a chance for students to manage their turn-taking without intervention by teachers. The lecturer tends to expand the students' opportunity by allowing students to manage their turn-taking. It will increase the number of students' response since it will lead to complex answers and students' involvement. This is in line with Sujariati, Rahman, Mahmud (2016) who concluded that the goals of using questioning strategies as a teaching device can be reached by implementing the questioning strategies in an appropriate way, and make the interaction and communication between teacher and students are more valuable.

4) Informatives

The last subclass of initiating acts proposed by Tsui (1994) was informatives, including those utterances which provide information, state-affairs, recount the personal experience, report events, convey evaluative judgments, or express beliefs, feelings, and thoughts. The followings are the examples of informatives.

(Extract 5)

L: *in this room, we've some of my students from Pascasarjana.*

They are here <to>---...to observe and I know how stressful is

S: *No Sir, We love you.*

L: *it does not guarantee A or B yah.*

In extract 5, the lecturer said "*in this room, we've some of my students from Pascasarjana. They are here <to>---...to observe and I know how stressful is*". This

utterance was to inform the students that there were students from Postgraduate program. The lecturer used this utterance to report the news to the students.

(Extract 6) Expressive

L: **sorry**. *My question should be, have you ever watched.. Ted Talks in Bahasa Indonesia?*

Ss: *yes sir*

S: *Aderay and Ridwan Kamil,*

In extract 10, the lecturer said “*sorry. My question should be, have you ever watched*”. The lecturer said “*sorry*” to express his feelings. It expressed attitude for being mistaken at the moment. It was easily identifiable since they are often realized by formulaic expressions and their responses prospected were highly predictable.

(Extract 7) Assessing

L: *i am not sure about Korean. **But chinese is very loyal** .*

Ss: *Waah*

In extract 11, the lecturer said “*I am not sure about korean. But chinese is very loyal*”. However, the lecturer was not sure about Korean. It was an example of assessments which gave judgment that Chinese was very loyal. He made a judgment because he was sure about Chinese.

In classroom interaction, the lecturer sometimes used the information to interact with students. Moreover, the researchers sum up several functions of informative. Firstly, to provide information or impart knowledge and to express feelings and attitudes, the lecturer also used informatives to make judgment or evaluation of an event and to express a positive evaluation of the lecturer. This finding is supported by Flanders (1970) who stated that lecturing or informative is to give students facts or opinion about the content or giving her own explanation

Students' Responding Act

In term of students' responding act, the students used all kinds of subclasses. They were a positive responding act, negative responding act, and temporization. Students' responding act depended on initiation act from the lecturer. In a whole classroom, students' interaction used responding act in many ways. Dayag et al. (2008) state that response represents the teacher initiation in response of initiation move by participants act. It means that the students interact to response the lecturer's stimuli. The following extracts display the examples.

1) Positive Responding Act

(Extract 8) Responding to lecturer's initiation positively

L : *ready?*

Ss : **yes sir**

L : *okay. Ya?*

In the extract above, the lecturer used elicitation to initiate the students by saying “*ready?*”. Thus, the students responded the lecturer by saying “**Yes, Sir**”. This responding act included positive responding act to provide a preferred response which fulfilled the illocutionary intent of the initiating act.

L1: *You can see whether people understand you or not if they nod their head. They show that they understand you, they follow you.*

The interview section above supported the extracts data above. It showed that the students responded the lecturer's initiation positively. However, it was only by a short answer or gesture. It can be implied that the students used positive responding act.

2) Negative Responding Act

(Extract 9) Responding to lecturer's initiation negatively

L: *do you think so?*

S: ***I don't know***

L: *ya. Or I think some eh I mean amount of teachers or lecturers, there is saying that % teachers and lecturers pay attention to two types of students.*

In the extract above, the lecturer provided an elicitation "do you think so?". The lecturer asked about the students' opinion. They responded by saying "I don't know". The student's responding act was a negative responding act because the student's response did not fulfill the illocutionary intent of the initiating act.

3) Temporization

(Extract 10) Temporization

L: *is it strange?*

Ss: *no*

S: ***% but sir, many men become a makeup artists sir***

L: *ya, if you make money on it. it's a job, ya?*

Ss: *yes*

In the extract above, the lecturer asked students "is it strange?". Some students said "No", but there was UL, a student who used temporization to respond the lecturer initiation. UL did not answer the lecturer's question whether it was strange or not. She said "% but sir, many men become a makeup artist sir" instead. From the extract above the response was a way to put off both positive and negative responses until some later time before taking a conclusion.

Another type of students' responding act found is that students were being silent during classroom interaction when lecturer asked them. Although Tsui (1994) only classified positive/negative responding act and temporization, there were circumstances that the students did not answer the lecturer questions. Silence came across as another kind of responding act in the form of non-verbal response. Nevertheless, this research did not focus on this form.

To sum up, positive-response was used by the students to respond the lecturer which fulfill the illocutionary intent of the initiating act. Whereas, negative response was used to respond the lecturer who do not fulfill the illocutionary intent of the initiating act. Furthermore, temporization was used by students to postpone to make a decision at the moment.

Lecturer's Follow-up

The follow-up/feedback step in the IRF sequence, according to van Zee and Minstrell (1997), functions as a "reflective toss," in which teachers prod and encourage students to higher-order thinking by purposefully responding to students' prior utterances and encouraging students' deeper knowledge construction, processing, and reflection. In this research, there were three subclasses of lecturer's follow-up found, such as endorsement, concession, and acknowledgment in a whole classroom interaction. In this research, it was found that endorsements had three further subclasses including positive/negative evaluation and comment. A positive evaluation was a positive follow-up to appreciate the students (Selvaraj et al., 2021). It was realized by a closed class of words or phrases. In the classroom interaction, the researchers found some positive

evaluation utterances. More specifically, positive feedback has advantages in increasing students' motivation, confidence, self-efficacy and academic skills. (Arsyan Ani, 2019). The lecturer used it to appreciate the students rather than just saying "yes" or "ok" in which those utterances were one of the examples of acknowledgment: accept. The following extracts are some of the examples.

(Extract 11) Appreciating Student's Response.

- S: *Never give up on failure. It is the life process to success no matter how many times you fall, .. you will stand up and walk again.*
 Ss: *(CLAPPING HANDS)*
 L: ***ya I think it's good advice. Good advice for life, ya.***

In the extract above, the lecturer accepted the students' explanation positively. He appreciated the student by saying "ya, I think it's good advice. Good advice for life, ya.". Thus, this utterance was used to accept the answer and also to value it.

(Extract 12) Accepting and Giving Comment

- L: *oh it's like a research presentation?*
 S: *yes*
 L: ***really?***
.. but Ted Talks are supposed to be ... for the general audience <not>-- not for academic audience.

In the extract above, the lecturer can elicit by pausing to allow students to complete his utterance directly. Thus, he used endorsement to comment and expanded his idea by adding his opinion to the students "... but Ted Talks are supposed to be ... for the general audience <not>-- not for academic audience". Hu et al. (2021) mentions that idea expansion used by the teacher does not simply affirm or correct the students' answer, rather he/she provides further information related to students' answer. Regarding this, Clements et al. (2017) claim that teachers' lengthy and ongoing instructional behaviors during feedback moves can promote students' knowledge and skills of broader range of subject. However,

(Extract 13) Accepting students' negative response

- L: *..Eh anyone looks about food or cooking?*
 S: *actually, we haven't looked the video*
 L: ***okay.***

In extract above the lecturer initiated the students in the form of elicitation "Eh anyone looks about food or cooking?". Thus, to respond the lecturer's question, the student used a negative response act "actually, we haven't looked the video". Furthermore, the lecturer accepted students' negative response by saying "okay". It can be concluded that follow-up in the form of the concession was used to accept the students' negative response.

(Extract 14) Accepting the students' positive response.

- L: *% and music. What is associated with Indonesian music?*
 S: *dangdut.*
 S1: *Angklung*
 L: ***Oke, one. Angklung.***
 S: *gamelang.*
 L: ***Yes.***

This extract showed that the lecturer accepted the students' answer in short response. To accept the student's idea, he repeated the student's answer. Thus, he also said "yes" in another way to accept.

Feedback or follow up, as the last exchange of a turn, aims to give feedback to students' response. In this case, Dayag et al. (2008) believe that follow-up completes the cycle since it provides closure to the initiation and response. This means that the students get immediately acceptance, correction or evaluation for their response. Moreover, endorsement had two functions. They were to respond positively to contributions made by pupils and to expand, develop or provide additional information, as stated by Ajjawi and Boud (2015) that feedback is acknowledged as information transmission. This is, moreover, in line with Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) who stated that a comment could develop a response by exemplification, expansion or justification. Furthermore, Students who have the ability to accept constructive criticism will be better able to understand that feedback emphasizes what they need to do to develop themselves rather than attacking them personally (Selvaraj et al, 2021).

In this interaction, the lecturer controlled the classroom interaction by initiating discussion and then posing questions to the students. After the students responded questions given, the lecturer finished the interaction sequence by giving follow-up on student's response. Follow-up rarely happened because of the lack of students' responses. As a result, the lecturer used verbal and nonverbal response to answer the student response. The follow-up was useful for the lecturer to motivate the students to initiate the interaction. In this regards, Jaeger's (2019) study supports this finding that generally, follow-up questions are the most effective third-turn move, because these questions prompted students to carefully think more about their initial responses. However, this is in contrast with the findings of the study conducted by Rustandi and Mubarak (2017) who stated that students' response was dominantly occurred in classroom lesson which caused by teacher's effort to keep students' participation. Another finding of this research is that initiation from the whole of classroom activities was dominantly occurred. This finding is supported by Butterfield and Bhatta (2015) who commonly performed the IRF sequences by producing questions and evaluating answers in classroom interaction. Moreover, it must be underlined that after responding to the initiation, the lecturer did not always present a follow-up move. It was based on the lecturer's purpose whether he ended the interaction by initiation move or follow-up move.

From the research finding, it can be assumed that there is no exact structure of the IRF pattern that would lead to either teacher or student's dominance. In this case, it depends on the classroom interaction naturally. It means that IRF pattern gives same opportunity for both teacher and students to interact actively as well as dominantly in classroom. This finding is contradiction with the previous study studies, which found that (e.g., Rahmi et al., 2008; Rashidi & Rafieerad, 2010; Putri et al., 2021) even though the IRF pattern was being attempted to be used in the classroom, the teacher still dominated the interactions during the session. However, other studies revealed that the student's response predominated in the classroom activities, consistent with the type of IRF pattern (Rustandi & Mubarak, 2017).

In conclusion, the interaction runs constantly. Both lecturer and students interacted each other. Initiation was not always responded by students. A response also was not always followed-up by the lecturer. Hence, it does not mean that follow-up always occurs in every classroom interaction. Besides, it should be highlighted that a turn can be constructed by both a single and two moves: it can be either a combination of a responding and an initiating move, or a follow-up and an initiating move. Hence, related to IRF pattern in classroom interaction, there was no a constant formulation that Initiation-Response-Follow up always run in order. It runs by the purpose of the use of language. This is in line with Butterfield and Bhatta (2015) who conducted a research about IRF sequences. They stated that merely an assessment is not always adequate to close the

sequence. In this regard, the teacher sometimes needs to produce further talk in order to demonstrate to the students that the sequence is closing.

CONCLUSION

This study aimed to find out how IRF happened in the EFL Classroom. The findings revealed that IRF pattern consists of three moving acts namely initiation, response, follow up. Initiation only occurs when the teacher allows the student to respond to them. It was found that the lecturer used all the subclasses, but not all of the further subclass was used by the lecturer. The subclasses were requestives, directives, elicitation, and informatives. In terms of requestives, this act of initiation was used to ask students to do something, but they were given the option to respond either positively or negatively. The lecturer used some further subclasses of requestives namely request for action, invitation, and proposal. In this way, requestive is commonly used by the lecturer to request for action. Therefore, in the form of request permission and offer, both them did not appear during the classroom interaction. Regarding directives, those initiating acts which prospected a non-verbal action from the students and expect him/her only to comply can be realized by imperative. The lecturer used advises, mandative and nominate during the learning process. There are some functions of directives including giving advice to the students, giving a warning to the students, giving instruction, calling on or giving permission to pupils to give a response, and threatening.

To attain a better outcome in conducting classroom interaction especially in a speaking class, the student must participate more actively in class. So that they may effectively engage and contribute during classroom instruction, they should create their own opportunities and devise their own tactics for language use and practice. Additionally, they should improve their interest in learning English by studying and practicing the language. Furthermore, for the suggestion, the next researcher should investigate not only the IRF pattern in classroom interaction, but also other patterns, such as the scaffolding and private speech patterns. In addition, future researchers are expected to discover interaction patterns not only between teachers and students, but also among students.

REFERENCES

- Ajjawi, Rola & Boud, David (2015): Researching feedback dialogue: An interactional analysis approach. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 1-14.
- Arsyan Ani. (2019). Positive feedback improves students' psychological and physical learning outcomes. *Indonesian Journal of Educational Studies*, 22 (2), 135-143.
- Burton, D. (1981). Analyzing spoken discourse. In *Studies in Discourse Analysis*. Coulthard and Montgomery (eds.). Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Butterfield, J. L., & Bhatta, B. (2015). IRF sequences in team-teaching EFL classrooms. *The Asian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 2(3), 176–185.
- Clements, D. H., Fuson, K. C., & Sarama, J. (2017). The research-based balance in early childhood mathematics: A response to common core criticisms review. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 40(3), 150-162
- Coskun, A. (2010). A classroom research study on oral correction. *Humanizing Language Teaching Magazine*, 12(3), 1-12.

- Dayag, D.T., Gustilo, L. E., Flores, E.G., Borlongan, A. M., & Carreon, M. C. (2008). *Classroom discourse in selected philippine primary schools*. British Council.
- Flander.N. (1970). *Analysing teaching behaviour*. MA: Addison-wesley.
- Hall, G. (2011). *Exploring English language teaching: language in action*. Routledge.
- Hardman, F. (2008). *Teachers' use of feedback in whole-class and group-based talk*. In N. a. H. In Mercer, S. (Ed.), *Exploring Talk in Schools: Inspired by the Work of Douglas Barnes*. SAGE Publications Inc.
- Hu, B. Y., Li, Y., Zhang, X., Roberts, S. K., & Vitiello, G. (2021). The quality of teacher feedback matters: Examining Chinese teachers' use of feedback strategies in preschool math lessons. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 98, 103253.
- Jaeger, E. (2019). Initiation, response, follow-up and beyond: Analyzing dialogue around difficulty in a tutorial setting. *An International Online Journal*, 7, 1-26.
- Mahmud, M. (2017). Communicative styles of English students at the State University of Makassar. *Journal of Language Studies*, 17 (1), 223-238.
- Mousavi, S. N., & Narimani Vahedi, E. (2021). Teachers' scaffolding and preferences of display vs. inferential questions: Initiation-Response-Follow-up (IRF) model. *Preventive Counseling*, 2(1), 13-29.
- Putri, E.B., Vianty, M., & Silvhiany, S. (2021). Analyzing the Initiation- response and feedback patterns and its impact on the interaction between teacher and students in English classroom. *Indonesian Research Journal in Education*, 5(2), 462-478.
- Rahmi, A., Amri, Z., & Narius, D. (2018). An analysis of irf (initiation-response feedback) in interaction between teacher and students in English class at sma negeri 2 Padang Panjang. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 7(3), 415-425.
- Rashidi, N., & Rafieerad, M. (2010). Analyzing patterns of classroom interaction in EFL classrooms in Iran. *The Journal of AsiaTEFL*, 7(3), 93-120.
- Rustandi, A & Mubarak A Husni. (2017). An analysis of IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback) on classroom interaction in EFL speaking class. *EduLite*, 2(1), 239–250.
- Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Selvaraj, A. M., Azman, H., & Wahi, W. (2021). Teachers' feedback practice and students' academic achievement: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 20(1), 308-322.
- Sinclair, J., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards and analysis of discourse: The English Used by teachers and pupils*. Oxford University Press.
- Sujariati, S., Rahman, A. Q., & Mahmud, M. (2016). English teacher's questioning strategies in EFL classroom at SMAN 1 Bontomarannu. *ELT WORLDWIDE*, 3(1), 107–121.
- Tsui, A. (1985). Analyzing input and interaction in second language classrooms. *RELC Journal*, 16(1), 8-32.

Tsui, A. (1994). *English conversation*. Oxford University Press.

van Zee, E., & Minstrell, J. (1997). Using questioning to guide student thinking. *The Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 6(2), 227-269.

Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse language in action*. Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.