

## **Classroom Interaction analysis by using IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback)**

1<sup>st</sup> Juniar Frida Andini

1<sup>st</sup> STKIP Al Hikmah Surabaya

Surabaya, Indonesia

juni@gmail.com

*Abstract: Effective teacher-student interaction is fundamental to language learning, particularly in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms. One prominent framework for analyzing classroom discourse is the Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) model, which highlights the structured nature of teacher-led interactions. A summary of a review of foreign language learning for elementary school students regarding recognizing the names of fruits and constructing sentences with the names of these fruits is a good start to learning a foreign language, where students are given a lot of vocabulary as initial capital for them to compose sentences and speak, while the role of the teacher. Here, apart from being a material provider, the teacher also becomes a judge who is able to reflect on what students do and provide feedback that builds students to learn English better.*

### **INTRODUCTION**

Effective teacher-student interaction is fundamental to language learning, particularly in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms. One prominent framework for analyzing classroom discourse is the Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) model, which highlights the structured nature of teacher-led interactions. This study examines a 23-minute English lesson for second-grade elementary students in Indonesia, focusing on vocabulary acquisition and sentence construction through structured interaction. The lesson incorporates religious and social rituals, such as Salam, Basmalah, and Hamdalah, blending cultural elements with pedagogical strategies. Given that English is not the students' primary language, the lesson aims to build

familiarity with basic vocabulary and sentence structures. By analyzing the IRF sequences and repair strategies used, this study explores how teacher feedback can be optimized to foster greater student engagement, self-correction, and critical thinking.

The IRF model, first introduced by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975), is a widely used discourse structure in classroom settings. It consists of three sequential moves: Initiation (I), where the teacher prompts student participation; Response (R), where students provide an answer; and Feedback (F), where the teacher acknowledges, corrects, or extends the response. This model is particularly beneficial in structured language learning environments, as it provides a clear framework for interaction (Walsh, 2011).

Research on IRF sequences has shown that while they facilitate classroom management and learning progression, they may also limit students' opportunities for extended discourse (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). In traditional IRF exchanges, feedback is often given in the form of direct correction, which, although effective for accuracy, may hinder deeper engagement and the development of self-repair skills (Ellis, 2008). Studies suggest that alternative feedback techniques, such as elicitation and clarification requests, encourage students to reflect on their responses and improve their metalinguistic awareness (Nassaji & Swain, 2000).

Repair strategies also play a critical role in language learning. According to Lyster and Ranta (1997), repair can be categorized into self-repair (student-initiated) and other-repair (teacher-initiated). While direct correction provides immediate clarity, self-repair techniques foster

deeper cognitive processing and greater retention of correct language forms (Thornbury, 1999). Encouraging students to justify their answers or rephrase incorrect responses allows them to engage in higher-order thinking and develop autonomy in language use (Tomlinson, 2013). Additionally, guided self-repair strategies, such as elicitation and recasts, have been shown to enhance student learning by encouraging them to actively construct their responses rather than passively receiving corrections (Walsh, 2011).

In the observed lesson, IRF sequences were used not only for instructional purposes but also to establish social and cultural connections. Ritualistic exchanges, such as greetings and religious expressions, followed an IRF pattern that reinforced classroom norms and community engagement. During the lesson activities, the teacher employed varied repair strategies to support student comprehension and language accuracy. Elicitation and guided corrections were used in vocabulary and sentence formation tasks, allowing students to refine their responses while maintaining engagement. When students misinterpreted images, content-related repair strategies helped them build logical connections, ensuring that feedback extended beyond linguistic accuracy to include conceptual understanding.

By incorporating both linguistic and cognitive repair strategies, the teacher was able to create a supportive learning environment that encouraged student participation and self-correction. Research suggests that such interactive feedback approaches can significantly enhance student engagement and language acquisition (Walsh, 2011). By shifting from a purely corrective approach to one that fosters student reflection and participation, teachers can create a more dynamic and effective learning environment.

Overall, applying a nuanced understanding of IRF sequences and repair strategies can significantly enhance student engagement and language acquisition. By incorporating interactive feedback techniques, teachers can empower students to take an active role in their learning, leading to more meaningful and lasting language development.

## **METHODOLOGY.**

This study is qualitative in nature with the teacher interaction as main data. Qualitative approach is used to gain a more complete and in-depth understanding of a phenomenon (Creswell, 2014). The objective of the researcher is to comprehend real-life behavior by gathering data for analysis. A documentation was employed to identify the frequently used interaction used by the teacher. Additionally, semi-structured interviews were conducted to gain deeper insights.

## **FINDING AND DISCUSSION**

The teacher opens with salam and the students answer teacher's salam. The teacher asks to the student about student's news how its going and the students give a responses. The teacher opens the study with basmalah and the students follow the teacher's instruction. The teacher gives instruction to the students that's explain what the students will do. The instruction of the teacher tells to the students to analyze the picture and explain the picture that's given by the teacher with mother language of the students and the students give explain about it.

When the student gives explanation about the pictures, the teacher gives repair about the student's mispronunciation and miss vocabulary

by ask to the students about the vocabulary that they use and the right vocabulary should they say, the function is to recall about the student's knowledge about that word missed. The teacher gives repair to the students perception about the pictures and gives the explanation that make sense and relate to each other pictures and then try to give the students the other picture and explain with the same way like the first picture that given by the teacher. The teacher gives appreciation to the student who can answer the questions.

Afterward, the teacher explains that the material to the students and begs to the students to analyze the sentence that given by the teacher. The teacher gives new verb to the students without full sentences and begs to the students to make sentences by themselves with teacher's instructions. The teacher gives thankful to the students and gives instruction before close the class they try to make one more sentence to makesure that material is clear and understandable. The teacher close the class with hamdalah and kafaratul majelis

From above sequence, The Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) model and repair strategies play a crucial role in structuring interaction within this lesson. The IRF pattern is evident from the beginning, where the teacher initiates with Salam, students respond, and minimal feedback is given, establishing a ritualistic and social connection rather than an instructional exchange. A similar pattern appears when the teacher asks about students' well-being, where responses are acknowledged but without extended feedback that could further encourage spontaneous communication. When the teacher introduces the lesson with Basmalah and explains the learning objectives, the interaction follows a teacher-controlled IRF, where students' compliance with instructions serves as an implicit form of feedback.

During the picture analysis activity, the IRF structure becomes more dynamic. The teacher initiates by instructing students to analyze and describe images in their first language, allowing them to construct meaning before transitioning to English. When students respond, the feedback phase is interactional and corrective, as the teacher engages in repair strategies to refine pronunciation and vocabulary errors. Rather than providing direct corrections, the teacher prompts students to reflect on their word choices, guiding them toward self-repair through elicitation. Additionally, when students misinterpret a picture, the teacher offers content-related repair, helping them build logical connections between images. This ensures that feedback goes beyond linguistic accuracy, fostering conceptual understanding as well.

In the sentence formation activity, the IRF pattern remains structured yet focused on language production. The teacher initiates by providing verbs without full sentences, prompting students to create their own. Students respond with their constructed sentences, and the teacher offers explicit feedback, correcting grammatical errors and refining sentence structures. Here, feedback is more form-focused, ensuring accuracy in verb usage. Before closing, the teacher reinforces the lesson by asking students to produce one final sentence, providing an opportunity for retention and comprehension checks. The lesson concludes with Hamdalah and Kafaratul Majelis, following a minimal IRF structure aimed at cultural and emotional closure rather than instructional purposes.

The teacher's repair strategies throughout the lesson demonstrate a balanced approach between elicitation, guided correction, and explicit

feedback. Self-initiated self-repair is encouraged when students are prompted to recall correct vocabulary. Teacher-initiated student repair is used when guiding students to reconsider their picture interpretations. In grammar-focused segments, the teacher employs explicit correction to ensure accuracy, while implicit recasts help reinforce proper language use without interrupting fluency. These varied repair strategies support both linguistic precision and cognitive development.

Overall, the lesson effectively utilizes the IRF model to maintain structured discourse while integrating repair strategies that support student learning. The teacher's approach fosters engagement, comprehension, and language accuracy, though it remains teacher-led in many aspects. Encouraging more peer-led interaction, student-initiated questions, and self-reflection on errors could further enhance learner autonomy and communicative competence. By making these adjustments, the lesson could shift from structured teacher control to a more interactive and student-driven learning experience.

## **CONCLUSION**

A summary of a review of foreign language learning for elementary school students regarding recognizing the names of fruits and constructing sentences with the names of these fruits is a good start to learning a foreign language, where students are given a lot of vocabulary as initial capital for them to compose sentences and speak, while the role of the teacher Here, apart from being a material provider, the teacher also becomes a judge who is able to reflect on what students do and provide feedback that builds students to learn English better.

**REFERENCE**

- Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford University Press.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 37-66.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034>
- Nassaji, H., & Swain, M. (2000). A Vygotskian perspective on corrective feedback in L2: The effect of random versus negotiated help on the learning of English articles. *Language Awareness*, 9(1), 34-51.
- Sinclair, J., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. Oxford University Press.
- Thornbury, S. (1999). *How to teach grammar*. Pearson Education.
- Tomlinson, B. (2013). *Developing materials for language teaching*. Bloomsbury.
- Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse: Language in action*. Routledge.