



## TEACHER FEEDBACK AND STUDENT RESPONSES IN A GRADE 9 INDONESIAN EFL CLASSROOM: AN IRF-BASED DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Anggun Siska Pratiwi\*

Tadris Bahasa Inggris, Fakultas Ilmu Tarbiyah dan Keguruan, Universitas Islam Negeri  
Sumatera Utara, Medan, 20371, INDONESIA

\*Corresponding author, email: [anggun0304223100@uinsu.ac.id](mailto:anggun0304223100@uinsu.ac.id)

### Abstract

*Classroom interaction and teacher feedback play a crucial role in shaping students' participation in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learning. Classroom discourse is commonly organized through the Initiation–Response–Feedback (IRF) pattern, in which the teacher's feedback move may either terminate or extend interactional opportunities. This study aimed to investigate IRF patterns and examine how teacher feedback was constructed and utilized to manage student participation in a Grade 9 Indonesian EFL classroom. A descriptive qualitative design was employed using a Classroom Discourse Analysis approach. Data were collected through classroom observation, audio recording of an 80-minute lesson, and transcription of teacher–student interaction. The data were analyzed using Sinclair and Coulthard's IRF model combined with an interactive qualitative analysis framework. The findings indicate that classroom interaction was predominantly teacher-initiated, with evaluative feedback occurring most frequently. However, probing and reformulative feedback were found to encourage longer student responses and sustain participation. The study concludes that the pedagogical function of feedback within IRF sequences is crucial in shaping interactional dynamics and promoting student engagement in EFL classrooms. These findings highlight the importance of using feedback strategically not only as an evaluative tool but also as an interactional resource that supports extended classroom discourse and learner participation.*

**Keywords:** Classroom discourse; EFL interaction; IRF model; student participation; teacher feedback.





## Introduction

Classroom interaction plays a central role in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learning because language development is shaped through social interaction between teachers and students. In EFL classrooms, learning occurs not only through instructional materials or teacher explanations but also through verbal exchanges that guide learners to participate, respond, negotiate meaning, and construct knowledge collaboratively. Beyond language education, evidence from higher education contexts suggests that active participation and interaction significantly influence students' learning experiences and engagement (Nasution & Rizka, 2024). Research in second language acquisition has consistently emphasized that interaction provides opportunities for language development by facilitating participation, feedback, and meaning-making processes (Lantolf et al., 2015; Mercer & Dörnyei, 2020; Wang et al., 2022). This perspective is further supported by Long's (1996) Interaction Hypothesis, which argues that meaningful interaction and negotiation of meaning are fundamental mechanisms for second language development.

One of the most widely discussed frameworks for examining classroom interaction is the Initiation–Response–Feedback (IRF) model proposed by Sinclair & Coulthard (1975). This model conceptualizes classroom discourse as a sequence consisting of teacher initiation, student response, and teacher feedback. Within this structure, the feedback move (F-move) is particularly significant because it serves as a bridge between students' responses and subsequent learning opportunities. Teacher feedback may confirm, evaluate, reformulate, clarify, or extend students' contributions, thereby influencing learners' engagement and participation in classroom interaction (Waring, 2008, 2009; Wang et al., 2022). Recent research has further highlighted that feedback is not merely evaluative but also interactional, functioning as a mechanism for sustaining dialogue and promoting student involvement in learning activities (Badem-Korkmaz & Balaman, 2024). Similarly, Hattie & Timperley (2007) emphasize that effective feedback not only evaluates performance but also guides learners toward deeper understanding and continued engagement in learning.

Previous studies have extensively examined classroom discourse through the IRF framework across different educational contexts. International research indicates that IRF patterns remain dominant in EFL classrooms, often reflecting teacher-centered interaction in which teachers maintain substantial control over topic initiation and evaluation (Waring, 2009; Estaji & Shojakhanlou, 2022). More recent studies have explored variations in the feedback move and their influence on student engagement, response length, and interactional quality



(Badash, 2024; Rehman et al., 2025). For example, Peyvandi et al. (2025) demonstrated that different elicitation strategies within IRF sequences significantly affected the quality and complexity of student responses. Similarly, studies in technology-mediated and online learning environments have shown that IRF patterns continue to structure classroom interaction, although participation dynamics may differ from those observed in traditional face-to-face settings (Tjalla et al., 2023; Zulfah et al., 2025). Ellis (2009) likewise highlights that interactional feedback plays a crucial role in facilitating language development by creating opportunities for learners to notice, process, and modify their language use.

In the Indonesian context, several studies have analyzed IRF patterns in EFL classrooms at different educational levels and consistently reported the predominance of teacher initiation and evaluative feedback (Rustandi, 2017; Putri et al., 2021; Gulo et al., 2023; Hasanah et al., 2024). These studies have confirmed the relevance of IRF analysis for understanding classroom discourse; however, they generally focus on identifying interactional patterns rather than examining the pedagogical functions of feedback moves. Consequently, the role of feedback as a resource for managing and extending student participation remains insufficiently explored.

Despite the growing body of research on classroom discourse, several gaps remain. First, many Indonesian studies emphasize the frequency and structure of IRF patterns without closely investigating how the feedback move is constructed and employed to manage or extend student participation. Second, feedback is often treated as a closing move that completes an interactional sequence rather than as a strategic resource capable of sustaining classroom discourse. Contemporary classroom discourse research suggests that feedback can create additional opportunities for learner contributions, negotiation of meaning, and extended interaction when employed effectively (Waring, 2009; Wang et al., 2022; Badem-Korkmaz & Balaman, 2024). Nevertheless, similar investigations at the junior secondary school level in Indonesian EFL contexts remain limited. Moreover, Grade 9 classrooms have received relatively little attention despite curricular expectations that students at this level demonstrate increasingly active verbal participation and communicative competence.

Therefore, there is a need for a focused classroom discourse analysis that not only identifies IRF patterns but also examines how teacher feedback functions pedagogically within Indonesian EFL classroom interaction. Understanding the interactional role of feedback may provide valuable insights into how teachers can foster more active and sustained student participation during classroom communication. The importance of sustaining student engagement is also supported by Harahap et al. (2019), who found that learning environments

encouraging continuous interaction positively contribute to students' achievement and learning processes.

Based on this gap, the present study aims to investigate classroom discourse in a Grade 9 Indonesian EFL classroom using the IRF framework. Specifically, this study addresses the following research questions:

1. What IRF patterns are found in Grade 9 Indonesian EFL classroom interaction?
2. How does the teacher construct and utilize the feedback move (F-move) to manage and extend student participation?

These questions are formulated to move beyond descriptive pattern identification and to explore the interactional role of feedback within IRF sequences. Accordingly, the objectives of this study are to identify dominant IRF patterns in classroom interaction and to analyze the pedagogical functions of teacher feedback in shaping student responses and participation.

This study is expected to offer several contributions. Theoretically, it extends classroom discourse research by providing empirical evidence regarding the function of feedback moves within IRF sequences in an Indonesian EFL context, thereby responding to critiques of traditional interpretations of the IRF model (Mariam, 2024). Pedagogically, the findings may help EFL teachers become more aware of how different feedback strategies influence student participation and interactional flow. Practically, the study may inform classroom practices by encouraging teachers to use feedback not only for evaluation but also as an interactional tool for sustaining classroom discourse and promoting learner engagement. Finally, for researchers and students, this study provides a contextualized example of classroom discourse analysis using the IRF framework at the junior secondary level, which may serve as a reference for future studies in similar educational settings.

## **Literature Review**

### ***Classroom Discourse and Language Learning***

Classroom discourse refers to the patterns of verbal interaction that occur between teachers and students during teaching and learning activities. It reflects how knowledge is constructed, negotiated, and evaluated through language use in instructional settings (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). In EFL classrooms, discourse is not merely a medium for delivering content but a central mechanism through which learners practice language, develop communicative competence, and engage with learning tasks. Research has consistently shown that classroom interaction serves as a primary medium through which learners engage in



communicative practice, negotiate meaning, and receive instructional support (Lantolf et al., 2015; Mercer & Dörnyei, 2020; Wang et al., 2022).

Effective classroom interaction has been shown to support students' comprehension, engagement, motivation, and language development (Badash, 2024; Wang et al., 2022). According to sociocultural perspectives on language learning, interaction serves as a mediating process through which learners co-construct knowledge and gradually develop linguistic competence (Lantolf et al., 2015). Similarly, classroom discourse creates opportunities for learners to receive scaffolding from teachers and peers, facilitating participation in increasingly complex communicative activities (Mercer & Dörnyei, 2020).

Classroom discourse typically involves different interactional patterns, including teacher–student interaction and student–student interaction. Teacher–student interaction often dominates EFL classrooms, particularly through questioning, elicitation, explanation, and feedback moves that guide learners' responses and participation (Rustandi, 2017; Putri et al., 2021). Through these interactional practices, teachers not only manage classroom communication but also create learning opportunities that influence students' engagement and language production (Waring, 2008; Estaji & Shojakhanlou, 2022). Meanwhile, student–student interaction, although less frequent in many EFL settings, provides opportunities for collaborative meaning-making, peer support, and communicative practice (Zaki, 2021).

Recent studies have further demonstrated that the quality of classroom discourse significantly affects learning outcomes. Productive interaction is characterized by opportunities for learners to elaborate responses, negotiate understanding, and participate in extended exchanges rather than merely providing brief answers to teacher questions (Badem-Korkmaz & Balaman, 2024; Waring, 2009). In both face-to-face and technology-mediated EFL classrooms, interaction patterns have been found to influence student participation, learning engagement, and communicative development (Tjalla et al., 2023; Şahin & Karatepe, 2025). Therefore, examining classroom discourse is essential for understanding how language learning is facilitated through interaction in EFL contexts.

### ***IRF Model of Classroom Interaction***

The Initiation–Response–Feedback (IRF) model was first introduced by Sinclair & Coulthard (1975) as a framework for describing the structured nature of classroom interaction. In this model, classroom discourse is organized into recurring sequences consisting of teacher initiation (I), student response (R), and teacher feedback (F). Initiation typically takes the form



of questions, instructions, prompts, or elicitation moves posed by the teacher. Students then respond to these moves, while teachers provide feedback that may evaluate, acknowledge, reformulate, clarify, or extend learners' responses.

The feedback move is considered one of the most pedagogically significant components of the IRF sequence because it connects students' responses to subsequent learning opportunities (Waring, 2008; Wang et al., 2022). Through feedback, teachers can reinforce understanding, address misconceptions, encourage elaboration, and sustain interaction. Research has shown that feedback extending beyond simple evaluation can create additional opportunities for learner participation and facilitate deeper engagement with instructional content (Badem-Korkmaz & Balaman, 2024; Waring, 2009).

In EFL contexts, the IRF model has been widely used to analyze classroom interaction patterns and teacher control of discourse (Rustandi, 2017; Gulo et al., 2023). Numerous studies have reported that teacher initiation remains the dominant discourse move, reflecting the institutional nature of classroom communication in which teachers regulate participation and manage learning activities (Estaji & Shojakhanlou, 2022). However, researchers have also identified variations and adaptations of the model, including the distinction between IRF and IRE (Initiation–Response–Evaluation), where the final move primarily serves evaluative rather than interactional purposes (Waring, 2009).

More recent scholarship has emphasized that classroom interaction should not be viewed solely as a rigid sequence of discourse moves. Instead, IRF exchanges may be expanded through follow-up questions, reformulations, clarification requests, and feedback strategies that encourage extended learner contributions (Badem-Korkmaz & Balaman, 2024; Şahin & Karatepe, 2025). Such extended IRF patterns have been associated with greater student engagement and more meaningful classroom communication.

Despite its widespread application, the IRF model has also been criticized for emphasizing teacher-centered interaction and providing limited attention to learner-initiated discourse. Critics argue that traditional IRF structures may restrict students' opportunities to initiate topics or influence the direction of classroom discussion (Mariam, 2024; Rehman et al., 2025). Nevertheless, the model remains one of the most influential frameworks in classroom discourse research because it offers a systematic approach to examining interactional organization and the pedagogical functions of teacher talk. Consequently, the IRF framework remains highly relevant for investigating how teachers utilize feedback moves to manage and extend student participation in EFL classrooms.

## **Methods**

### ***Research Design***

This study employed a descriptive qualitative research design using a Discourse Analysis (DA) approach to investigate classroom interaction in an EFL context. Specifically, the study adopted the Classroom Discourse Analysis framework to examine the structure and function of verbal interaction between the teacher and students. The analysis was guided by Sinclair & Coulthard's (1975) Initiation–Response–Feedback (IRF) model, which has been widely used to explore interactional patterns in English classrooms (Rustandi, 2017; Gulo et al., 2023; Hasanah et al., 2024). This design focused on naturally occurring classroom discourse and did not involve any manipulation of instructional activities, allowing interaction to be analyzed in its authentic instructional setting. By applying the IRF framework, the researcher was able to identify recurring interactional sequences and examine how teacher feedback functions within classroom exchanges (Alawiyah et al., 2024; Rehman et al., 2025). A qualitative approach was considered appropriate because it enables in-depth analysis of micro-level interactional features and supports a contextualized understanding of how language is used to construct meaning, manage participation, and facilitate learning in EFL classrooms (Miles et al., 2014; Badash, 2024).

### ***Research Site and Participants***

This research was conducted at a state junior high school located in Deli Serdang Regency, North Sumatra, Indonesia. The research site was selected because it represents a typical public EFL classroom context where English is taught as a compulsory subject. While the study focused on a single classroom and one instructional session, the objective was not statistical generalization but an in-depth exploration of naturally occurring interactional patterns within a specific EFL context. The participants were selected using a purposive sampling technique, with selection criteria based on the teacher's professional qualification, teaching experience, and the accessibility of the classroom for systematic observation. Grade 9 was chosen as the focus of the study because students at this level are expected to demonstrate more active verbal participation and engage in more complex classroom interaction compared to lower grades, which is relevant for discourse analysis (Rustandi, 2017; Gulo et al., 2023). Focusing on a single classroom and teacher allowed for in-depth examination of naturally occurring interactional patterns within a specific instructional context, a practice commonly adopted in classroom discourse studies (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975; Alawiyah et al., 2024).

### ***Data Collection***

The primary instrument of this study was the researcher, who acted as a non-participant observer and discourse analyst throughout the data collection process. This role is commonly adopted in classroom discourse studies to allow detailed observation and interpretation of naturally occurring interaction (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975; Rustandi, 2017). To support the observation, an audio recording device in the form of a smartphone was used to capture verbal interaction during the English lesson. Data collection was conducted in three main stages. First, classroom observation was carried out by attending the lesson and monitoring the teaching and learning process without intervening in instructional activities. Second, the entire English lesson, which lasted approximately 80 minutes, was audio-recorded to ensure that all teacher and student utterances were documented. Third, the recorded data were transcribed into written form using a broad transcription technique, focusing on verbal turns rather than detailed phonetic features. The transcription covered the full lesson from the opening to the closing activities, a procedure that aligns with previous IRF-based classroom discourse research emphasizing comprehensive interactional data (Gulo et al., 2023; Alawiyah et al., 2024; Hasanah et al., 2024).

### ***Data Analysis***

The collected data were analyzed using the qualitative interactive analysis model proposed by Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña (2014), combined with Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) IRF rank scale model to examine classroom discourse systematically. The analysis began with data condensation, during which the complete classroom transcript was reviewed and organized to identify interactional sequences occurring throughout the lesson. Non-instructional interruptions and irrelevant background noises were excluded from the analysis to maintain analytical focus.

Subsequently, the utterances were coded and classified according to the IRF framework. Teacher initiations were categorized as elicitation, directive, or informative moves, while student responses were identified as replies or acknowledgements. Teacher feedback moves were classified into categories such as acceptance, evaluation, and interaction-extending comments. Following the coding process, the data were organized and displayed in the form of dialogue extracts and tables to facilitate interpretation of interaction patterns.

The final stage involved drawing conclusions by identifying dominant IRF patterns and interpreting how teacher feedback functioned pedagogically to manage, maintain, or extend

student participation. To support the trustworthiness of the analysis, representative excerpts from the classroom transcript were selected and presented in the findings section as evidence for the identified discourse patterns, following procedures commonly adopted in IRF-based classroom discourse studies (Rustandi, 2017; Gulo et al., 2023; Alawiyah et al., 2024).

## Results and Discussion

### *IRF Patterns in Classroom Interaction*

The analysis of classroom interaction revealed that teacher–student discourse was largely structured through recurring Initiation–Response–Feedback (IRF) sequences. Based on the complete lesson transcript, several representative IRF exchanges were identified across different instructional stages, including lesson opening, explanation, questioning, and task evaluation. Table 1 presents selected extracts illustrating typical IRF patterns observed in the classroom.

**Table 1.** Sample IRF sequences in classroom interaction.

<b>Exchange</b>	<b>Speaker</b>	<b>Move</b>	<b>Example Utterance</b>	<b>Function</b>
1	Teacher	I	“Do you believe this was a human?”	Elicitation
	Student	R	“Percaya.” (believe)	Reply
	Teacher	F	“Okay.”	Accept
2	Teacher	I	“So what happened to him?”	Elicitation
	Student	R	“Dikutuk.” (Cursed)	Reply
	Teacher	F	“Dikutuk jadi batu.” (Cursed into stone)	Evaluate
3	Teacher	I	“Why did Malin do that?”	Elicitation
	Student	R	“Malu.” (Embarrassed)	Reply
	Teacher	F	“Malu mamaknya kenapa?” (Embarrassed, why is his mother?)	Probing Comment
4	Teacher	I	“What ending is better?”	Elicitation
	Student	R	“Yang asli.” (The original)	Reply
	Teacher	F	“Kenapa yang asli?” (Why the original?)	Probing Comment

As shown in Table 1, teacher initiation dominated most interactional exchanges. Elicitation questions were the most frequent initiation type, followed by directive initiations used to manage classroom tasks and activities. Informative initiations appeared primarily during explanation stages. Regarding student responses, replies occurred more frequently than acknowledgements, while non-responses occasionally appeared when questions were addressed to the whole class. Teacher feedback moves were mainly realized through acceptance (e.g., “Okay”), evaluation through repetition or confirmation of answers, and probing comments that encouraged additional responses.

A simple frequency count indicated that approximately 65% of the observed exchanges followed a teacher-initiated IRF pattern, while around 20% represented extended IRF sequences in which the feedback move generated further student responses. The remaining interactions consisted of brief acknowledgements, incomplete responses, or exchanges that did not fully develop into complete IRF cycles.

Overall, the findings indicate that classroom discourse was predominantly teacher-directed, reflecting the institutional nature of classroom communication in which teachers regulate participation and guide learning activities. This pattern is consistent with previous EFL classroom discourse studies reporting the predominance of teacher initiation and teacher control of interaction (Rustandi, 2017; Gulo et al., 2023; Hasanah et al., 2024). However, the occurrence of probing and interaction-extending feedback suggests that the IRF structure was not used solely for evaluation. Instead, the teacher occasionally employed feedback strategically to sustain participation and encourage further contributions. This finding supports Waring's (2009) argument that IRF exchanges can function flexibly and create opportunities for expanded classroom discourse. Similar observations have been reported by Estaji and Shojakhanlou (2022) and Badem-Korkmaz and Balaman (2024), who found that feedback moves may transform otherwise closed interactional sequences into opportunities for deeper learner engagement. This finding is also consistent with Inayatullah et al. (2025), who reported that classroom interaction in bilingual learning contexts remained largely regulated by teachers, although students actively negotiated meaning through various communicative strategies such as code-mixing. Likewise, Batubara and Purnomo (2025) found that interactional opportunities that encourage learners to produce extended responses contribute significantly to speaking development and learner participation.

The findings also suggest that classroom interaction cannot be understood solely as a rigid sequence of discourse moves. Rather, the pedagogical function of each move, particularly feedback, influences whether interaction is terminated or extended. In this respect, the present study supports previous research indicating that the effectiveness of IRF sequences depends largely on how teachers utilize feedback to manage classroom communication and learner participation (Alawiyah et al., 2024; Putri et al., 2021; Nassaji, 2016).

### ***Teacher Feedback (F-Move) and Student Participation***

The analysis indicates that teacher feedback (F-move) played a crucial role in shaping student participation during classroom interaction. Three main types of feedback were

identified: evaluative feedback, reformulative feedback, and probing feedback. Each type functioned differently in influencing the length, continuity, and depth of student responses.

Evaluative feedback was the most frequently observed feedback type. It was commonly realized through brief confirmations or repetitions of students' answers, as illustrated in the following extract:

**Teacher:** "*So what happened to him?*"

**Student:** "*Dikutuk.*" (Cursed)

**Teacher:** "*Dikutuk jadi batu.*" (Cursed into stone)

In this exchange, the teacher repeated and confirmed the student's response, signaling its correctness. While this evaluative feedback validated the answer and maintained instructional flow, it generally resulted in interactional closure because no additional response was required from students. Similar patterns appeared throughout the lesson, suggesting that evaluative feedback primarily functioned as a mechanism for confirming understanding and maintaining lesson progression. This finding is consistent with previous studies showing that evaluative feedback often closes interactional sequences and limits opportunities for extended learner contributions (Waring, 2008; Nassaji, 2016; Wang et al., 2022).

In contrast, probing feedback demonstrated a stronger capacity to extend student participation. Probing feedback was typically realized through follow-up questions designed to elicit clarification, justification, or elaboration, as illustrated below:

**Teacher:** "*Why did Malin do that?*"

**Student:** "*Malu.*" (Embarrassed)

**Teacher:** "*Malu mamaknya kenapa?*" (Embarrassed, why is his mother?)

Rather than evaluating the response, the teacher's feedback prompted the student to elaborate on the initial answer. As a result, the interaction continued beyond the original response, creating additional opportunities for participation. Such feedback encouraged students to provide longer and more cognitively demanding responses. This finding supports Waring's (2009) claim that feedback can function as an interactional resource rather than merely an evaluative device. Similar results have been reported by Badem-Korkmaz and Balaman (2024), who found that response-pursuit practices encourage learner participation, and by Lee (2017), who demonstrated that teacher follow-up strategies can promote greater classroom engagement.

Reformulative feedback appeared less frequently but was observed during explanation and task discussion stages. This feedback type involved rephrasing, expanding, or refining

students' responses to model more appropriate language use. For example, during discussions of alternative story endings, the teacher reformulated students' ideas into more complete expressions. Although reformulative feedback did not always generate immediate follow-up responses, it served important pedagogical functions by providing linguistic scaffolding and supporting comprehension. Such findings align with previous research suggesting that reformulation helps learners notice language forms and develop more accurate language production (Nassaji, 2016; Wang et al., 2022).

The findings further indicate that the impact of feedback depends not only on its linguistic form but also on its instructional purpose. Evaluative feedback was effective for confirming understanding and maintaining lesson efficiency, whereas probing and reformulative feedback contributed more substantially to interactional expansion and learner engagement. This observation is consistent with contemporary classroom discourse research emphasizing that feedback serves both instructional and interactional functions (Waring, 2008; Badem-Korkmaz & Balaman, 2024; Estaji & Shojakhanlou, 2022).

Overall, the results suggest that although evaluative feedback dominated classroom interaction, probing and reformulative feedback played a more significant role in extending student participation. The findings confirm that the feedback move within IRF sequences is not inherently restrictive. Rather, its interactional effect depends on how teachers strategically employ feedback to manage classroom discourse and create opportunities for learner involvement. Similar evidence was reported by Sitanggang and Purnomo (2025), who found that sustained interaction and follow-up communication opportunities increased learners' confidence and willingness to participate in English-speaking activities. Consequently, the study supports the view that classroom discourse is dynamic and that the pedagogical value of IRF sequences lies not in the structure itself but in how teachers utilize feedback to facilitate learning and participation (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975; Waring, 2009; Nassaji, 2016).

## **Conclusion**

This study examined classroom interaction in a Grade 9 Indonesian EFL classroom using the Initiation–Response–Feedback (IRF) framework, with particular attention to interactional patterns and the pedagogical function of teacher feedback. The findings revealed that classroom discourse was predominantly structured through teacher-initiated IRF sequences, indicating a teacher-directed interactional pattern. Teacher elicitation served as the primary initiation strategy, while student participation was generally realized through brief responses to teacher

prompts. More importantly, the study demonstrated that teacher feedback played a significant role in shaping student participation. Evaluative feedback was the most frequently observed feedback type and primarily functioned to confirm responses and maintain lesson progression. In contrast, probing and reformulative feedback created opportunities for extended interaction by encouraging students to elaborate, clarify, and develop their responses. These findings suggest that the pedagogical impact of the IRF structure depends largely on how the feedback move is utilized within classroom interaction.

The study contributes to classroom discourse research by highlighting the interactional potential of teacher feedback in an Indonesian EFL context. The findings support the view that feedback should be considered not only as an evaluative mechanism but also as a strategic resource for promoting learner engagement and sustaining classroom communication. Nevertheless, this study is limited to a single classroom and one instructional session, which restricts the transferability of the findings to other educational contexts. Future research may involve multiple classrooms, longer observation periods, or comparative analyses across different grade levels and instructional settings to obtain a more comprehensive understanding of how feedback practices influence classroom discourse and student participation in EFL learning environments.

## References

- Alawiyah, F., Rozi, F., & Hartono, R. (2024). The realization of the initiation–response–feedback (IRF) model in English classroom at STAIKAP Pekalongan. *International Journal of Research and Review*. <https://doi.org/10.52403/ijrr.20240261>
- Badem-Korkmaz, F., & Balaman, U. (2024). Eliciting student participation in video-mediated EFL classroom interactions: Focus on teacher response-pursuit practices. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 37(7), 1881–1903. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2022.2127772>
- Badash, M. (2024). The effectiveness of teacher–student interaction in the English as a foreign language classroom. *World Journal of English Language*, 15(2), 129–136. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v15n2p129>
- Batubara, P. F., & Purnomo, M. D. (2025). Student’s perspectives on the efficacy of Tandem application in enhancing speaking proficiency. *IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*. <https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v13i1.6408>



- Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *Language Teaching*, 42(1), 3–18. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444808005364>
- Estaji, M., & Shojakhanlou, M. M. (2022). Realization of initiation, response, and feedback in teacher-student interactions in EFL classrooms: Learning realities and opportunities. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 14(30), 91–114. <https://doi.org/10.22034/elt.2022.53522.2510>
- Gulo, S., Harefa, A., & Telaumbanua, K. (2023). Initiation–response–feedback (IRF) analysis in English classroom interaction at the eighth grade of UPTD SMP Negeri 4 Mandrehe in 2022/2023. *Dharmas Education Journal*, 4(2). <https://doi.org/10.56667/dejournal.v4i2.1137>
- Harahap, F., Nasution, N. E. A., & Manurung, B. (2019). The effect of blended learning on student's learning achievement and science process skills in plant tissue culture course. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(1), 521–538. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.12134a>
- Hasanah, U., Sari, N., & Husein, R. (2024). Initiation–response–feedback (IRF) pattern of Sinclair and Coulthard model in English classroom interaction. *Sintaksis: Publikasi Para Ahli Bahasa dan Sastra Inggris*, 2(5). <https://doi.org/10.61132/sintaksis.v2i5.1102>
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81–112. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>
- Inayatullah, A., Daulay, S. H., & Purnomo, M. D. (2025). Students' code-mixing practices in bilingual classroom interaction. *Attadrib: Jurnal Pendidikan Guru Madrasah Ibtidaiyah*, 8(3), 730–739. <https://doi.org/10.54069/attadrib.v8i3.1083>
- Lantolf, J. P., Thorne, S. L., & Poehner, M. E. (2015). Sociocultural theory and second language development. In B. VanPatten & J. Williams (Eds.), *Theories in second language acquisition* (2nd ed., pp. 207–226). Routledge.
- Lee, E. J. (2017). Working with participation and silence in second language classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 51(4), 851–873. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.349>
- Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413–468). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-012589042-7/50015-5>
- Mariam, A. (2024). A discourse analysis of blind spots in Sinclair and Coulthard (1992) model of classroom discourse. *International Journal of English Language and Literature Studies*, 13(3). <https://doi.org/10.55493/5019.v13i3.5195>



- Mercer, S., & Dörnyei, Z. (2020). *Engaging language learners in contemporary classrooms*. Cambridge University Press.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Nassaji, H. (2016). Anniversary article: Interactional feedback in second language teaching and learning. *Language Teaching Research*, 20(4), 535–562. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168816644940>
- Nasution, N. E. A., & Rizka, C. (2024). Investigating university student's acceptance of virtual and remote labs in their learning. *Lentera Pendidikan: Jurnal Ilmu Tarbiyah dan Keguruan*, 27(1), 47–62. <https://doi.org/10.24252/lp.2024v27n1i4>
- Peyvandi, G., Choupanzarvijani, S., & Monfardkhah, G. (2025). Elicitations in whole-classroom events: A comparative study of high vs. low proficient English learners. *International Journal of Modern Languages and Applied Linguistics*, 7(2). <https://doi.org/10.24191/ijmal.v7i2.7487>
- Putri, E., 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). <https://doi.org/10.22437/irje.v5i2.14631>
- Rehman, A., Noor, F., Chaudhary, H., & Yasmeen, I. (2025). Analyzing initiation–response–feedback patterns: An experimental investigation of classroom discourse in Pakistani educational settings. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and TESOL*. <https://doi.org/10.63878/jalt1285>
- Rustandi, A. (2017). An analysis of initiation–response–feedback (IRF) on classroom interaction in EFL speaking class. *EduLite: Journal of English Education, Literature and Culture*, 2(1), 239–250. <https://doi.org/10.30659/e.2.1.239-250>
- Şahin, Ş., & Karatepe, Ç. (2025). Understanding the nature of classroom interaction: A discourse analysis based on the initiation–response–feedback model. *Batı Anadolu Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*. <https://doi.org/10.51460/baebd.1476944>
- Sinclair, J. M., & Coulthard, R. M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. Oxford University Press.
- Sitanggang, C. N., & Purnomo, M. D. (2025). Indonesian EFL students' perspective on Free4Talk: A novice vs. expert user study. *Jurnal Onoma: Pendidikan, Bahasa, dan Sastra*, 11(3), 3783–3796. <https://doi.org/10.30605/onoma.v11i3.6844>



- Tjalla, M., Syamsir, M., Zulfah, Z., Sunubi, A., & Arqam, A. (2023). Exploring classroom interaction patterns in EFL virtual learning. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v11i1.7878>
- Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse: Language in action*. Routledge.
- Wang, B., Yu, S., Zheng, Y., & Teo, T. (2022). Student engagement with teacher oral feedback in EFL university classrooms. *Language Teaching Research*, 29(5). <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688221105772>
- Waring, H. Z. (2008). Using explicit positive assessment in the language classroom: IRF, feedback, and learning opportunities. *The Modern Language Journal*, 92(4), 577–594. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2008.00788.x>
- Waring, H. Z. (2009). Moving out of IRF (Initiation–Response–Feedback): A single case analysis. *Language Learning*, 59(4), 796–824. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2009.00526.x>
- Zaki, M. (2021). Discourse analysis of teacher and students in pre-intermediate English class. *European Journal of Language and Literature Studies*, 7, 27–35. <https://doi.org/10.26417/479ndc49y>
- Zulfah, S., Hisan, L., & Farisi, M. (2025). Unveiling power dynamics in online ESL conversation classes: A critical classroom discourse analysis of the IRF pattern. *Indonesian Journal of EFL and Linguistics*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.21462/ijefl.v10i1.908>