

The Realization of the Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) Model in English Classroom at STAIKAP Pekalongan

Feti Alawiyah¹, Fahrur Rozi², Rudi Hartono³

¹Master Program, Students of English Education, ^{2,3}Master Program of English Education,
^{1,2,3}Universitas Negri Semarang City, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: Feti Alawiyah

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.52403/ijrr.20240261>

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to identify the realization of the initiation-response-feedback (IRF) model in English Classroom at STAIKAP Pekalongan. It used a descriptive-qualitative study that implemented classroom interaction analysis by Sinclair and Coulthard in 1975 which stands for teacher initiation, students' response, and feedback by lecturer. The subjects of this study are the first semester from Manajemen Pendidikan Islam Major which consists of 16 students and 1 lecturer. This study used three instruments: observation classroom, video recorder, and lesson transcript to gain the data. Then, the data is analyzed by Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) theory. The study results showed that the lecturer and student implemented the IRF model in the teaching and learning process in English class. In this study there are the IRF pattern that was found to dominate in speaking skills was teacher elicit, in reading skills the IRF pattern that dominated was also teacher elicit, in listening skills the IRF pattern that dominated was Acknowledge act, and last in writing skills the IRF pattern that dominated was student response react. In conclusion, it is advised that the lecturer should uphold the quality of classroom interaction and provide ample opportunities for students to participate in verbal exchanges actively.

Keywords: Classroom Interaction, English Classroom, IRF

INTRODUCTION

In establishing an engaging foreign language class, educators must be mindful of the words used, especially the teacher discourse categories. Numerous researchers have proposed that the disproportionate magnitude of a teacher speaking in the classroom does not offer sufficient chances for student discussion and does not advance dynamic learning and student engagement (Davies, 2011; Walsh, 2002). Just a minimal initiation of the student discourse displays initiation concerning the learning content. It means that the interaction must follow the teacher's plan.

Teachers' domination in classroom interaction can discourage students to participate and speak more in the target language (Kurniawati and Fitriati, 2017). It implies that teachers may not provide sufficient opportunities for students to engage in conversation. A study on teacher talks in classroom interaction conducted by Sukarni and Ulfah (2015) revealed that teachers tend to be more dominant and active in the interaction. Similarly, the study conducted by Sagita (2018) also aims to analyze teacher and student talk in classroom interaction and finds a similar

finding that the teacher generally did most of the talking during the lesson.

Brown (2001) observes that participation in classroom interaction compels learners to use the target language for communication. Additionally, it encourages them to convey meaning that surpasses their existing linguistic proficiency (Mulyati, 2013). Additionally, good classroom interaction can encourage the students to communicate with others in a real situation (Runmei, 2008). These factors underscore the importance of successful classroom interaction in facilitating the language learning process.

Classroom interactions that refer to the three-turn sequences have been known as Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF). This particular pattern commonly starts with initiation or question by a teacher as the first turn. The second turn is the student's answer or response to the teacher's initiation. While, afterward, feedback is given to provide evaluation or a mere response to the students' second turn (Lee, 2017). IRF appears to be the most familiar or spot-on organization of teacher- student talks within classroom interaction. However, the interaction may be different. The teacher may speak to one student while the rest of the student act as listeners. This interaction typically occurs when a teacher expects a student to respond to a specific question or when the interaction is informal. On the other hand, the teacher may speak with a few students (for example, in a group project) to give them instructions or information about what they need to do. Students may begin to speak to the teacher to communicate their thoughts. There are some types of student interaction in addition to these three teacher-student interactions. The student may discuss a group project

with his or her peers or give a presentation in a foreign language in front of the class.

Sinclair and Coulthard in 1975 proposed the IRF pattern. In the classroom, the IRF pattern describes a reciprocal relationship between the teacher and the students. Initiation, response, and follow-up or feedback are the steps in which a teacher asks a question, students respond, and the teacher gives an evaluative follow-up or feedback before asking another question. Because the IRF is a structured pattern, it is useful for analyzing classroom interaction. According to Mc Chartry (2009) it is critical to analyze the pattern in an interaction where talk is relatively tightly structured. As a result, analysing the IRF pattern is extremely beneficial in observing the interaction between the teacher and the students.

Several researchers have studied teacher interaction using Sinclair and Coulthard models (Nicholson, 2014; Ginting, 2017; Rustandi and Mubarok, 2017; Alanazi and Widin, 2018). This study (Nicholson, 2014) aims to provide a brief overview of the Sinclair and Coulthard model, especially at the level of communication, movement, and action. The results show that Sinclair and Coulthard's model is useful for understanding classroom communication as it is an effective tool for looking at the roles of classroom participants, the types of conversations they engage in, and the quality of results derived from the types of questions asked classroom.

Prabowo and Alfiyanti, 2013; Toni and Parse, 2013; Boyd 2015; Maiza, et al, 2015; Vebryanto, 2015; Yuliawati, et al, 2016; Kurniawati and Fitriati 2017, Anisah et al, 2019) conducted study on classroom interaction in term of teacher's questioning in EFL classroom. For instance, Toni and Parse (2013) carried out a qualitative study

focusing on the questions posed by the teacher. The study aimed to find out what technique of questioning teachers use to engage their students in classroom interaction. On the other hand, Boyd (2015) investigated the questioning patterns of a single teacher and their correlation with various types of student discourse and learning in an elementary English Language Learning (ELL) classroom. The findings of the study revealed the teacher's inclination to listen actively and employ questioning techniques to track, as well as selectively reinforce, student ideas, objectives, and lines of reasoning. This approach supported dialogic talk for thinking and learning.

Several researchers have undertaken studies on the use of L1 and L2 in teacher talks (Forman, 2012; Harmanto, 2018). Forman (2012) investigates novel ways of defining the key pedagogical roles of a teacher speaking in such situations in both L1 and L2. It aims to offer broad descriptive categories that teachers and teacher-educators can use to analyze bilingual classroom activities. This study discovered six pedagogical roles, which are as follows: animating, translating, explaining, creating, urging, and dialoguing. Harmanto (2018) also investigated the utilization of L1 and L2 in the classroom. The result findings show that the use of L2 is still dominant for each category in the discourse assessed through the questionnaires.

Based on the issues above, this research focuses on the realization of the initiation-response-feedback (IRF) model in English Classroom at STAIKAP Pekalongan. The research includes participants from the first-semester students of an English classroom at STAIKAP Pekalongan. Hopefully, the students can participate by responding to the lecturer during the teaching-learning process.

METHODS

Descriptive qualitative approach was used as the design of this study since involves human behavior in a natural setting. Descriptive qualitative method describes the population and the evidence of the data systematically, factually, and accurately (Isaac and Michele (1841 p.46). Using a descriptive qualitative approach this present study explained the realization of the initiation-response-feedback (IRF) model in English Classroom at STAIKAP Pekalongan.

The subject of this study was an English lecturer and 15 college students first semester of an English classroom at STAIKAP Pekalongan. This study analyzes the utterances made by both the lecturer and students in the context of classroom interaction. The investigation employs the Sinclair and Coulthard Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) model. The data was collected using an observation classroom, lesson transcript to gain the data, and video recorder for two class meetings in the first semester from Manajemen Pendidikan Islam Major which consisted of 16 students and 1 lecturer which took approximately 120 minutes.

RESULT & DISCUSSION

The Realization of Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) By the Students and Lecturer in Speaking Skill

This research identifies diverse findings regarding implementing the Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) pattern by both students and the lecturer in terms of speaking skills. The analysis reveals that the predominant teaching exchange pattern employed by the lecturer is teacher elicitation. These are the frequency of The Realization of Initiation-Response-Feedback

(IRF) by the students and Lecturer in Speaking Skills.

Table 4.1 The Frequency of Lecturers and students using IRF patterns in speaking skill

Head acts	Classes of acts	Quantity
Initiation	Elicitation	23
	Informative	2
	Check	1
Response	Replay	22
Feedback	Accept	7
	Comment	2

From the table we can see that most initiations from the lecturer are teacher elicits are the most, followed by teacher informative, and one check. It is in line with the work of Ayouni (2019) that found the eliciting exchange used by the teacher was mostly related to obtaining verbal responses from the students. Below is an example showing this teaching exchange pattern.

Figure 4.1 The Example of Teacher Elicit with Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) Moves

T:	Next month?
S:	Next month is November
To:	Okay, good

In the example of Figure 4.1, the teacher opens the conversation by giving a question that prompts the student's response. The researcher originally designed this type of exchange in Figure 4.1 as eliciting because following the initiation move by the teacher; the students produced verbal responses, followed by teacher feedback. The head act of an eliciting exchange is an elicitation act, which according to Sinclair and Coulthard (1992) it is realized by a question and designed to obtain verbal contributions from pupils.

The Realization of Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) By the Students and Lecturer in Reading Skill

The IRF pattern is the least in Reading Skills due to the lack of opportunities for

students to speak. The student only reads English texts and is more dominated by listening to explanations from lecturers.

Table 4.2 The Frequency of Lecturers and students in using IRF patterns in Reading skill

Head acts	Classes of acts	Quantity
Initiation	Elicitation	4
	Directive	2
	Informative	5
Response	Acknowledge	3
	Replay	3
	React	2
Feedback	Accept	2
	Comment	1

The analysis example indicates that the teacher takes the initiative in the interaction with the students. In this situation, the lecturer poses a question to the student concerning how to read the text displayed on the PowerPoint. Here is the pattern of IRF:

T	:	How to read the text? (I)
S	:	nineteen seventy-five (R)
T	:	okay, good (F)

Teacher directives are in the form of orders for students to open material regarding time. Followed by the teacher's information, namely the lecturer explaining how to read the correct time. Elicitation to ask questions to students after explaining how to read time. For the example above the lecturer asks "How to read the text?". According to Sinclair and Coulthard (as cited in Dailey, 2010), an initiation move serves the purpose of eliciting a factual response. This phase typically involves the teacher posing a question to prompt verbal responses from the students.

The Realization of Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) By the Students and Lecturer in Listening Skill

After analyzing the data from the transcribed classroom interaction, the

researcher identified the students' data related to IRF patterns in learning English, especially in Listening skills. From the analyses, the researcher found four teacher exchanges heading to classroom interaction. These are in the table:

Table 4.3 The Frequency of Lecturers and students using IRF patterns in Listening skill

Head acts	Classes of acts	Quantity
Initiation	Elicitation	6
	Directive	2
	Informative	7
	Check	2
Response	Replay	6
	React	1
Feedback	Evaluate	0
	Comment	1
	Accept	1

Based on the table above, the most teacher exchange is teacher information. The students listened to the lecturer's explanations about time. So, there is minimal response from students. Below is an example showing this exchange pattern.

T:	<i>past itu untuk menyatakan lebih. Contoh, jam 07.30. a half past seven. Cara membacanya ada dua cara; yang pertama membaca jamnya saja diikuti menitnya. Jam 03.30. its three thirty. Contoh yang kedua jam 06.45. it is six forty-five. Ini adalah cara yang paling mudah. Kemudian cara yang kedua, cara pengucapannya (I)</i>
----	--

In listening skills, more teachers inform because students are more dominant in listening to lecturers' explanations. As stated by Rosa and Diora (2020) Comprehension is needed in listening, it is a process that wants to measure how the meaning will be understood. This is following Sinclair and Coulthard (1992) Speech act categories of informative are realized through statements, distinguishing them from other uses of statements by their primary function of providing information.

The Realization of Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) By The Students and Lecturer in Writing Skill

This research finds various findings in term of Realization of Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) by the students and lecturer in writing skill. The analysis shows that the teaching exchange pattern which the teacher implements most is teacher direct. These are the frequency The Realization of Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) by the students and Lecturer in Writing Skill.

Table 4.4 The Frequency of Lecturers and students in using IRF patterns in Writing skill

Head acts	Classes of acts	Quantity
Initiation	Elicitation	1
	Directive	7
	Informative	1
Response	Acknowledge	1
	Replay	1
	React	6
Feedback	Accept	2
	Comment	1

The researcher found student information exchange and got a response from the teacher. The student volunteered to write the results of the exercise on the blackboard. The lecturer responded well. This is very good because there is the student's initiative to come forward to write the answer on the blackboard. Apart from that, based on the note field in class, after the student comes forward to write the answer to the front, other students automatically follow suit without being ordered by the lecturer. This motivates other students to come forward without being asked by lecturers or other friends. Below is an example showing this exchange pattern.

S:	May I sir? NV (raising her hand) (I)
T:	Sure. Nice answer (R)

As in the example above, the lecturer orders students to do exercises. Hence, the student's response constitutes the action component, predominantly manifesting as a non-verbal response, although exceptions may occur. Figure above shows that the way teacher directs her students to do the job. The students give response to the directive act by the lecturer. When the lecturer asked students to open the book, they reply by reacting to open their book. This current study aligns with the findings of prior research conducted by Ginting (2017), wherein the teacher primarily employed a direct approach in her communication. The teacher initiated the discourse, and students responded non-verbally. It is supported by Dewi (2018), through the direction given by their teacher, the students are expected to understand what they supposed to do during teaching and learning process. Then researcher found student initiation in this section, the student volunteered to work on the blackboard. It happened because they were not active in class, most of the students mostly passive in class discussions. They always wait for what the teachers want to do. This study corresponds with the research conducted by Zulaikha and Mulyono (2018), indicating that in situations where students-maintained silence, teachers perceived the necessity to engage in active discourse to break the silence and uphold a dynamic classroom environment. Supported by Liu & Zhu (2012), Pujiastuti (2013), Setiawati, (2012), Zare-Behtash & Azarnia (2015) and Zhang (2012), it indicated that the teacher dominates classroom interaction. It can be assumed that the lecturer is still primarily needed in the classroom to control the student's learning and the student needs more engaging activity.

CONCLUSION

Based on results and discussions, the study found that the IRF pattern in speaking skill applied by the students and lecturer in English Classroom. The model that implemented by the teacher consists of three teaching exchange patterns, namely teacher

elicit, teacher inform, and check. There is one student exchange pattern, namely elicit act. IRF in Speaking skills, the initiation pattern that appears most is teacher elicitation, the response used by students is replay, and feedback is given by the lecturer are replay and comment of these sessions.

In the second research question, this present study analyzes the IRF pattern in reading skill applied by the students and lecturer in English Classroom. It found that only the teacher was implemented the IRF model suggested by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975). The model that implemented by the teacher consists of three teaching exchange patterns, namely teacher elicit, teacher inform, and teacher direct. IRF pattern in Reading skills, the initiation pattern that appears most is teacher informative, the response used by students is replay, Acknowledge, and react. The only a little feedback is given in this session. Feedback is given in the form of Except for correct answers and Comment for student responses that are additional informations in responding to initiations from previous lecturer.

In the third research question, this present study analyzes the IRF pattern in listening skill applied by the students and lecturer in English Classroom. The study revealed that the implementation of the IRF model by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) was only found in the actions of the lecturer. The lecturer's utilization of the IRF model encompassed four teaching exchange patterns: teacher elicitation, teacher information, teacher direction, and check. In the context of listening skills, the predominant initiation pattern observed was teacher informative.

In the last research question, this current study examines the application of the IRF pattern in writing skills within the English classroom by both students and the lecturer. The findings indicate that both the teacher and students employed the IRF model proposed by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975). The teacher's implementation of the model encompasses four teaching exchange patterns: teacher elicitation, teacher

information, teacher directive, and check. Regarding the IRF pattern in writing skills, the most prevalent initiation patterns observed were teacher elicitation. Students predominantly adopted the student information exchange. Student responses were characterized by non-verbal linguistic (NV) reactions, with minimal feedback provided during the session. The feedback given took the form of an "Accept" act in response to correct answers displayed on the whiteboard by students. The researcher proposed a future investigation involving the examination of classroom interaction, specifically focusing on initiation-response-feedback (IRF) patterns. Furthermore, it recommended addressing the limitation of the current study, which only explores four skill interaction processes in English classrooms. The suggestion for future research involves a study that delves into the interaction process and its effects on students within the English Department.

Declaration by Authors

Acknowledgment: None

Source of Funding: None

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

1. Anisah, N., Fitriati, S. W., & Rukmini, D. (2019). Teachers' questioning Strategies to Scaffold Students' Learning in Reading. *English Education Journal*, 9(1), 128-143.
2. Ary, Donald; Jacobs, Lucy Cheser; Sorensen, Chris; & Razavieh, Asghar. 2010. *Introduction to Research in Education (8th ed.)*. Belmont: Thomson Wadsworth.
3. Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching in Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. (2nd Ed). Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.
4. Davies, M. J. (2011). Increasing students' L2 usage : An analysis of teacher talk time and student talk time. University of Birmingham. Available at <https://www.birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/collegeartslaw/cels/essays/language/teaching/Daviesessay1TTTessaybank.pdf>
5. Duranti, A. and Goodwin, C. (eds). (1992). *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*. Cambridge University Press.
6. Febriyanti, G. A. A. A., Dewi, N. K. S. L., Ratna, I. G. A. A. I., & Dewi, C. (2018). Using self-assessment to assess rural young learners' writing skills in English foreign language classroom. *Journal of Applied Studies in Language*, 2(2), 109-115.
7. Forman, R. (2012). Six functions of bilingual EFL teacher talk: Animating, translating, explaining, creating, prompting and dialoguing. *RELC journal*, 43(2), 239-253.
8. Ginting, S. A. (2017). The importance of opening moves in classroom interaction. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 8(6), 7-11.
9. Harmanto, M. D. (2018). Teacher Talk: The Use of L1 vs. L2 in the Classroom. *Academic Journal Perspective: Education, Language, and Literature*, 6(2),96-109.
10. Kurniawati, R. A., and Fitriati, S., W. (2017) Realization of teacher's questions to uncover students' cognitive domain of English subject matter in classroom interaction. *English Education Journal*, 7(3), 194 – 200.
11. Liu, M., & Zhu, L. (2012). An investigation and analysis of teacher talk in college English class. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 2(5), 117-121.
12. Maiza, M., Rukmini, D., & Sofwan, A. (2015). Teachers Basic Questionings Used by English Teachers in Teaching English. *English Education Journal*, 5(1).
13. Mulyati, A. F. (2013). A study of teacher talk and student talk in verbal classroom interaction to develop speaking skill for young learners. *Journal of English and Education*, 1(1), 1-10.
14. Nicholson, S. J. (2014). An impetus for change: Classroom analysis using Sinclair and Coulthard's model of spoken discourse. *International journal of linguistics*, 6(2), 188.
15. Prabowo, A. B., & Alfiyanti, A. (2013). An Analysis of Teachers' questioning Strategies during Interaction in The Classroom: A Case of the Eight Grade Smp PGRI 01 Semarang. *ETERNAL (English Teaching Journal)*, 4(1).
16. Pujiastuti, R.T. (2013). Classroom interaction: an analysis of teacher talk and

- student talk in English for young learners (EYL). *Journal of English and Education*, 1(1), 163 – 172.
17. Sagita, I. (2018). Teacher talk and learner talk in the classroom interaction (an interaction analysis to an English language class at SMP N 2 Sindang). *WEJ*, 2(1). 15 – 23.
18. Setiawati, L. (2012). A descriptive study on the teacher talk at EYL classroom. *CONAPLIN Journal*, 1(2), 33 – 38.
19. Sinclair, J., and Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an Analysis of Discourse: the English Used by Teachers and Pupils*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
20. Sukarni, S., and Ulfah, S. (2015). An analysis of teacher and student talk in the classroom interaction of the eighth grade of SMP Negeri 18 Purworejo. *Journal Vision*. 4(2), 261 – 277
21. Toni, A., & Parse, F. (2013). The Status of Teacher's Questions and Students' Responses: The Case of an EFL Class. *Journal of Language Teaching & Research*, 4(3).
22. Zare-Behtash, E., & Azarnia, T. (2015). A case study of teacher talk time and student talk time in an Iranian language school. *International Journal of English Language, Literature and Translation Studies*, 2(2011), 274 – 285.
23. Zhang, P. (2012). Interactive Patterns and Teacher Talk Features in an EFL Reading Class in a Chinese University--A Case Study with Communicative Teaching. *Theory & Practice in Language Studies*, 2(5).
24. Zulaiha, S., and Mulyono, H. (2018). Preservice EFL teachers' talk during a teaching practicum at a lower secondary school: A report on video-stimulated reflection (VSR). *Argentinian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 6(1), 44 – 60.

How to cite this article: Feti Alawiyah, Fahrur Rozi, Rudi Hartono. The realization of the initiation-response-feedback (IRF) model in English classroom at STAIKAP Pekalongan. *International Journal of Research and Review*. 2024; 11(2): 604-611.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.52403/ijrr.20240261>
