



An Analysis of Initiation, Response and Feedback Used by Teacher and Students at Prospect Learning Centre Medan

Berkah Hasudungan Nasution^{1*} and Ratmanida Ratmanida²

¹² Universitas Negeri Padang

* Corresponding author. Email: berkahhasudungan22@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The context for the study was the researcher's observation of interactions between teachers and students in a classroom at the Prospect Learning Center in Medan, which revealed the employment of an IRF pattern. This study aims to investigate the IRF pattern in the classroom, including how the instructor begins, how the students react, and how the teacher provides feedback. In order to perform this research, descriptive methodologies were combined with an applied linguistics discourse analysis strategy. The contact that takes place between teachers and students at Prospect Learning Centre Medan constitutes the study's data. The findings indicated that in discussion classes, student responses are increasingly dominating the IRF sequence. Additionally, it is encouraged that teachers include the IRF pattern into the teaching and learning process, especially in conversation classrooms, to preserve the efficacy of classroom interaction and provide students plenty of opportunity to engage in verbal engagement in the classroom.

Keywords: *Initiation, Response, Feedback, Interaction*

1. INTRODUCTION

One of our most valuable life skills is speaking. As noted by Thornburry, speaking is a component of daily life that we take for granted[1]. As such, it plays a crucial role in daily interactions with other people. It means that being able to interact with others effectively requires the ability to talk. Thus, it is necessary for students who learn a foreign language to get used to speaking it. Researcher believes that teachers may engage students in conversation in the target language throughout the whole engagement to help pupils become accustomed to speaking it. As stated by Walsh, communication is a vital component of all classroom activities. In the classroom, interaction is a regular occurrence that plays a big part in promoting communication between the instructor and pupils[2].

Speaking and interaction are inextricably linked, without a doubt. Every day, interactions between the teacher and the students take place during class activities. Interaction is at the core of communication ability[3]. It indicates that as students interact with one another, they both absorb and produce language-based knowledge, which they have learned to be their communicative competence. It alludes to how student-teacher contact in the classroom has taken

on a vital role in the teaching and learning process. It may come through the sharing of ideas, emotions, or thoughts as a result of the input and output of language that they learn via interaction.

Classroom interaction has evolved from teacher and student interaction. Classroom interaction, according to Hall, is a word used to describe what occurs when language is utilized in a classroom among students[4]. According to the previous statement, The term "classroom interaction" describes the verbal exchanges that take place between students and teachers over the course of instruction in a classroom. In addition to verbal interactions, teachers often engage in nonverbal communication with their pupils. Nonverbal interaction is the main mode of communication in the classroom[5]. It alludes to classroom body language between the teacher and the pupils. Non-verbal engagement in the classroom serves a variety of purposes, including conveying emotion, expressing personal opinions, and bolstering spoken language.

According to Walsh conversation class focuses on various specific aspects of verbal engagement, including the following: (1) In direct error correction, the teacher engages with the class to interact with the students and fix errors that they made during discourse. This is

significantly less time-consuming because errors are instantly and directly addressed. (2) The teacher responds personally to remarks made during genuine conversations while giving feedback on the subject[2]. It seeks to give oral fluency practice where conversational language is used in a way that is acceptable for their pedagogical goals and language usage.

The use of conversational language when appropriate fosters student engagement and helps to establish a learning environment. (3) By asking for explanation and checking for confirmation, teachers have the chance to maximize learning potential as they don't always accept the students' initial contributions. (4) During long wait times, teachers offer pupils an opportunity to control how they take turns without their help. Giving students the freedom to choose when to take turns will improve the number of responses since it will encourage thoughtful responses and student engagement.

Engagement in the classroom is essential to the teaching and learning process. Classroom interaction, according to Dagarin is a two-way process between the students who are participating in the learning process[6]. Students and teachers have an effect on one another. She continues by quoting Frazier & Brown's claim that "communication is ultimately about interaction, which is the core of communication.[3]" As he continues. As a result, learning happens when teachers and students work together to facilitate dialogue.

The interactants' desire to accomplish certain objectives drives them to communicate. Communication happens in a classroom because the teacher has fresh knowledge to impart to the pupils. Students communicate with their teachers and peers in a manner similar to this in order to gain new material and to voice their ideas. In this sense, interaction between the instructor and students, as well as between the students and the teacher, was used to facilitate communication.

Teacher and student engagement in the classroom are inextricably linked. It has a specific pattern, the IRF pattern being one of them. Initiation-response-feedback, or IRF, is a kind of conversation between a teacher and students. The student reacts, the teacher begins, and the teacher provides feedback [7]. The definition of three patterns may be established by the following explanation.

First is initiation (I), the action in which a teacher starts a conversation, [8] Initiation occurs when a teacher asks a question or takes another action to start a conversation with pupils in a classroom. The instructor makes an attempt to encourage the pupils to put themselves aside during a discussion or engagement. When "the teacher has to do something is to get the students

involved, engaged, and ready," that is the time, according to Harmer [9]. Additionally, because it gives students ongoing stimulus to interact, it is thought to be a crucial component of creating an engaging language classroom.

Second, there are reaction moves (R), which are actions that pupils take after the teacher initiates them. According to Dayag et al, the teacher's response to a participant's initiating move represents the teacher's initiative[8]. It implies that in order to respond to teacher inputs, the pupils do interact.

The final exchange of a turn, feedback/follow-up (F), seeks to provide feedback on the pupils' answer. Feedback completes the cycle since it brings an end to the initiation and reaction, claim [8, p. 5]. It entails that pupils receive their response's correction or evaluation right away.

Several research that looked at the relationship between IRF and classroom interaction found that IRF can foster active contact between teachers and students. These studies [10], [11], [12]. These studies generally shown that the IRF pattern predominated in classroom engagement. However, compared to studies focusing on the application of IRF, Fewer studies have looked at how IRF reflection is analyzed in classroom interactions and how I, R, and F interact most often. As a result, this study is being undertaken to examine how IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback) is reflected in conversation class as well as the prevailing interaction between I, R, and F.

2. METHOD

An English instructor and six students from a basic conversation class in one of the English courses in Medan, Prospect Learning Centre participated in this study. The choice of this course, and in particular the conversation class, is due to the class's active nature and usage of the IRF's interaction sequence during the teaching-learning process.

Data were collected via observing classes. The aim of the observation was to discover the common IRF exchange and to explain the IRF pattern that is shown during teacher-student communication. One distinct time were chosen to administer the observation. The camera video was put up in the ideal position to film the classroom interaction, and the writer sat in the back of the room to take notes on what happened during the teaching and learning process. The data from the observation were then generalized and interpreted to complete the analysis.

The data were then qualitatively examined using stages including transcription, coding, and analysis. One method of data analysis

through observation is transcription. According to Cresswell, transcription is the process of turning audiotape recordings into digital data. The major textual source that the researcher looked at this step was the transcript of the videotaped classroom engagement[13].

Coding is the process of dividing and classifying text to provide descriptions and underlying themes in the data. Additionally, by coding and categorizing utterances, interaction analysis systems may distinguish between verbal and non-verbal interaction. After completing the transcription, the researcher divided each set of utterances into a group based on the Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) pattern. The final step in the analysis of data obtained by observation is analysis. This stage involved the writer analyzing the encoded transcription of the IRF pattern created from the results of the recorded classroom conversation.

3. FINDINGAND DISCUSSION

The study's conclusions showed that the conversation class interactions in the classroom matched the Sinclair and Coulthard IRF pattern [14]. The 34 total encounters are broken down into 11 initiating acts, 15 student reactions, and 8 teacher's feedbacks. These discussions took place during the instructional procedure. Due to their shared pattern, the interactions as a whole cannot be adequately characterized. The following three interactions exhibit IRF exchanges that were selected at random from the 34 encounters. Excerpts 1 shows an instance of teacher-student interaction.

Excerpt 1

Teacher: Well Students, today we are going to talking about "Introduce Yourself" In introduce yourself, who knows what we should Introduce? (Initiation)

Student 1: Me Sir, In Introduce us we should introduce name, hobby, address (Response)

Student2: Age Sir R (Response)

Student 3: Dream sir? R (Response)

Teacher: Okay Good (Feedback)

As can be seen from the three condensed extracts above, the teacher asked the students for their opinions in line 1, one student responded in line 2, and in response to the student's response in line 3, the instructor gave feedback. In this regard, the teacher starts the conversation by posing a question to the students. After the teacher's introductory remarks, the student comments on the performance. Finally, the instructor gave a vocal response to the student's viewpoint in order

to offer feedback.

According to the aforementioned pattern, the instructor will always engage the students in dialogue by posing a question. The majority of the students' passive participation in the conversation class conversation contributed to the initiation. They consistently awaited the professors' wishes. The pupils' subsequent answer follows a pattern. Following the teacher's instigation, the reaction took place. The student replies vocally or occasionally nonverbally. The last pattern is the teacher providing comments on the pupils' responses. Typically, verbal and occasionally non-verbal actions are utilized for feedback.

Each interaction starts with a teacher question, is followed by a student response in which the student shares an opinion on the matter and concludes with the instructor offering both verbal and nonverbal feedback about the student perspective. The frequency of occurrences and the percentage of different types of interactions are shown in Table 1 together with the IRF pattern of classroom interaction in discussion class.

Table 1. IRF Pattern and Frequency Occurrences

Types	F	%
Teacher Initiation	11	32
Students Response	15	44
Teacher Feedback	8	24
TOTAL	34	100

The student's response received the highest score by 44%, as determined from the observation, as shown in the table above. Then, in second place, is teacher initiation, which involves doing a total of 32% of the observation. Teachers' feedback, which comprises a total of 24% of the observations, came in third. In conversation class, the response of the students rather than initiation and feedback, is the predominant form of classroom interaction.

When the class held a discussion, the student response with the highest score fell within this pattern. The teacher encouraged class discussion to foster student initiation, but few students really participated because they were terrified of making errors. Due of the passiveness of the students, teacher initiative comes in second. It's because the teacher's explanation of the content was challenging for the pupils to grasp. Finally, the teacher's primary concern is the start in order to revive the dying conversation.

Teacher comment receives the lowest score, to sum up. Due to the pupils' lack of engagement, teacher feedback is infrequent. The teacher therefore only responded verbally to the student's response. The

teacher might utilize the comments to encourage the pupils to start the conversation.

In terms of the sequence of events during class activities, the instructor initiated, the students responded, and the teacher provided feedback as the last exchange. In this instance, a question was used to start a conversation with the class so that they may participate actively in responses before the teacher confirmed the answers. According to Walsh, IRF (Initiation-Reaction-Feedback) is a pattern of classroom interaction "moves" that stands for I, which represents for teacher initiation, R, which stands for student response, and F, which stands for teacher feedback[2]. In addition, Jaeger claims that the IRF pattern is a typical sequence used in language classes when the teacher and pupils interact[10]. Putri et al, analysis of the same outcome revealed that some teachers generated possibilities for student engagement by using IRF in classroom[15].

This judgment confirms Kumpulainen and Wray's assertion that IRF is the most well-known of the typical classroom interaction patterns, which is consistent with the study's findings[16]. By starting conversations and asking pupils questions, the teacher in this interaction sequence manages classroom interaction. After the students have answered the teachers' questions, the teacher wraps up the interaction sequence by providing comments on the students' answers. Rahmi et al, observed that the Initiation (I) and Response (R) dominated in the classroom interaction[12].

Additionally, the second finding of this study revealed that student answers dominated interactions among I, R, and F in conversation classes. Dayag et al, explain that the teacher initiates the reaction in response to the participants' initial move[8]. It suggests that students connect with one another in order to respond to instructor instruction. The pupils actively participated in this inquiry during the lecture in the classroom. A study done by Rustandi & Mubarak indicated that teacher initiation from the entirety of classroom activities was dominating, which contrasts with the study's results that students' responses were dominant in classroom lessons because of teacher efforts to maintain students' engagement[11].

Walsh noted that interaction is a tool for demonstrating how teachers might create possibilities for learning through the use of language and interactional resources during the teaching and learning process in conversation classrooms[2]. By generating language in which students are involved to generate learning opportunities, teachers support students' engagement through verbal and non-interaction. From their observations, Rustandi & Mubarak concluded that the majority of teaching and

learning activities consisted of the teacher asking the pupils questions[11]. Nothing about the precise construction of the IRF pattern would favor the teacher or the pupils. Naturally, it relies on how students participate in class. It means that the IRF pattern allows teachers and students the same opportunity to interact actively and firmly in the classroom.

According to Walsh, Interaction is a method for showing how instructors may create opportunities for learning via their use of language and interactional resources when it comes to the teaching and learning process in a conversation classroom[2]. By creating language that engages kids to provide learning possibilities, teachers support students' engagement through verbal and non-interaction.

4. CONCLUSIONS

According to data analysis and study findings, interactions during teaching and learning activities frequently followed IRF pattern sequences. It is plausible to infer that teacher initiation, in which the instructor introduces the students by eliciting information from them, selecting who will speak next, and asking questions, is taking place, is an illustration of the style of teacher-student interaction in the discussion class. According to the several IRF pattern types, students' responses predominately occurred during classroom activities. The classroom lesson's content and the teacher's strategy for getting the students involved will determine whether or not the student reaction predominates. The amount of student engagement will increase if the content is relatively simple in the classroom. However, if the teacher provokes the class by initiating the discussion, it may pique their curiosity, increasing the likelihood that they will respond.

Finally, the student should participate more actively in class to have a better outcome from performing classroom interaction in conversation class. In order to effectively engage in and contribute to class discussions, they should develop their own opportunities and tactics for utilizing and practicing the language. In addition, they should learn and use the language to boost their desire for studying English as a second language.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Thornbury, "How To Teach Speaking." Longman, London, p. 163, 2005.
- [2] S. Walsh, *Investigating Classroom Discourse*. London: Routledge, 2006. doi: 10.4324/9780203015711.
- [3] S. Frazier and H. D. Brown, *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*, 2nd ed., vol. 35, no. 2. New Jersey: Longman, 2001. doi: 10.2307/3587655.
- [4] G. Hall, *Exploring English Language Teaching in*

- Action*. Routledge, 2011.
- [5] H. A. Robinson, *The Ethnography Of Empowerment: The Transformative Power Of Classroom interaction*. Washington DC: The Falmer Press, 2005. doi: 10.4324/9780203973691.
 - [6] M. Dagarin, "Classroom Intearction and Communication Strategies in Learning English as A Foreign Language," *ELOPE English Lang. Overseas Perspect. Enq.*, vol. 1, no. 1–2, pp. 127–139, 2004.
 - [7] J. . Sinclair and M. Coulthard, *Towards an Analysis od Discourse: The English Used by Teachers and Pupis*. London: Oxford University Press, 1975.
 - [8] D. . Dayag, L. . Gustilo, E. . Flores, A. . Borlongan, and M. . Carreon, *Classroom Discourse in Selected Philiphine Primary School*. British Council, 2008.
 - [9] J. Harmer, *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. London: Longman, 2001.
 - [10] E. L. Jaeger, "Initiation, response, follow-up and beyond: Analyzing dialogue around difficulty in a tutorial setting," *Dialogic Pedagog.*, vol. 7, pp. A1–A26, 2019, doi: 10.5195/dpj.2019.195.
 - [11] A. Rustandi and A. H. Mubarak, "Analysis of IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback) on Classroom Interaction in EFL Speaking Class," 2017.
 - [12] A. Rahmi, Z. Amri, and D. Narius, "An Analysis of IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback) in Interaction Between Teacher and Students in English Class at SMA Negeri 2 Padang Panjang," *J. English Lang. Teach.*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 415–425, 2018, [Online]. Available: <http://ejournal.unp.ac.id/index.php/jelt>
 - [13] J. W. Creswell, *Educational Research Palnning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualiatative Research*, 4th ed. New Jersey: Pearson, 2008.
 - [14] Malcolm Coulthard, *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis 2ed*. 1985.
 - [15] E. B. Putri, M. Vianty, and S. Silvhiany, "Analyzing the Initiation-Response and Feedback Patterns and Its Impact on the Interaction between Teacher and Students in English Classroom," 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://online-journal.unja.ac.id/index.php/irje/index>
 - [16] K. Kumpulainen and D. Wray, *Classroom Interaction and Social Learning From Theory to Practice*. New York: Routledge, 2002.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

