ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JALT

JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL

Vol.8. No.3.2025

ANALYZING INITIATION-RESPONSE-FEEDBACK PATTERNS: AN EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATION OF CLASSROOM DISCOURSE IN PAKISTANI EDUCATIONAL SETTINGS

Anosh Rehman[1], Farwa Noor[2], Hamza Nawaz Chaudhary[3], Iqra Yasmeen[4]
[1]MPhil. English Linguistics and Literature, University of Sargodha
Email: anoshrehman09@gmail.com
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0001-0412-0160
[2]Lecturer, National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad
Email: farwanoor5@gmail.com
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0008-9144-0330
[3]University of Sargodha
Email: hamnaw66@gmail.com
[4]MPhil. English Linguistics and Literature, University of Sargodha
Email: iqrayasmeen9009@gmail.com
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0002-6872-7874

DOI: https://doi.org/10.63878/jalt1285

Abstract

The current paper analyses conversations between teachers and students in the classroom in the context of the IRF model of discourse analysis, as developed by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975). The information was taken as an output of an online lesson recording on Academic Writing in English, which gives the researcher an opportunity to examine how the teacher can begin, govern, and end the interaction, as well as how students can respond in this context. As the analysis shows, the communication pattern that dominates the classroom, the IRF pattern of initiation, response, and feedback, has a propensity to encourage a highly teacher-centred discourse. This structure makes sure that the lesson content is addressed and it is sequential; however, the student is hardly involved in the lesson process and is not able to develop communicative competence. The results validate the prevailing criticisms of the IRF model, as it is useful in describing the interactional structures, at the same time demonstrating how it is limited in fostering learner autonomy. The paper concludes by highlighting the necessity of more learner-based methods in ESL/EFL settings, in which students are invited to be more active participants in a conversation, thus encouraging a more intense and effective language use and skill development.

Keywords: *discourse analysis, Sinclair & Coulthard, classroom interaction, ESL, EFL, communication, intercourse, IRF, Pakistan.*

1. Introduction:

Discourse analysis is a study technique for examining spoken or written communication concerning its sociocultural settings (Fairclough, 1992). It seeks to comprehend how speech is applied in practical contexts. When conducting discourse analysis, you may concentrate on the functions and results of various linguistic forms. Using the model developed by Sinclair and Coulthard, this study examines teacher-student interactions in the classroom. The purpose of this study is to describe how the instructor starts conversations, how the students react, and how the teacher continues the conversations. The encounter was found to be teacher-centered by the researcher. It implied that the teacher ruled the majority of the interactions. Additionally, he

aa
ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JALT

discovered that while the contact is enough for the pupils to get through the exam, it is insufficient for them to learn the skills. Research in the social constructionist tradition particularly stresses the study method of scrutiny of groups of people interacting in natural settings, which has dominated American conversation analysis. It looks at different communicative events like narrative, ways of greeting customs, and verbal combat in various sociocultural environments (Gumperz and Hymes 1972). Discourse analysis is the umbrella term for what is commonly referred to as communication theory in the American tradition. In conversational analysis, the focus is not on creating modeling techniques but rather on closely observing participant behaviors and trends that appear across a variety of real data.

Classroom discourse is a crucial understanding since it is how power, knowledge, and participation are distributed between teachers and learners. In conventional classroom engagement, the teacher usually jumps in by introducing questions, assessing responses, and directing the conversation, thereby restricting the student from having a genuine communication experience (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975; Nunan, 1999). Studies indicate that, although this arrangement can sustain order and ensure that students obtain exam-based results, they often fail to develop critical thinkers and communicative skills (Chaudron, 1988; Wells, 1999). This is more urgent in ESL and EFL settings, as when learners need to develop confidence and proficiency in the language of instruction, they need meaningful interaction (Ohta, 2001). Consequently, it is essential to analyze teacher-student interaction through discourse analysis to obtain the necessary information about the effectiveness of classroom talk and the degree to which it facilitates or prohibits active learning (Fairclough, 1992; Rex, 2010).

2. Rationale of the Study:

Classroom discourse is a crucial component of the teaching and learning process, particularly in ESL/EFL classrooms where both language and content are taught. The study of teacher-student discourse provides a valuable perspective on how learning opportunities are either created, constrained, or defined by communication structures. The systematic organization of classroom interactions offered by Sinclair and Coulthard with the help of the IRF model is important because it provides a clear pattern of understanding the interaction patterns. The research results imply that the IRF model can help understand how discourse in the classroom is arranged; however, it also highlights how much teacher-dominated communication is a common phenomenon that could limit learner autonomy and participation. These limits are outlined, and their incorporation into the wider discussion of the creation of more interactive and participatory learning environments can take place. The research will target to inform teachers, curriculum developers, and policy makers on the importance of encouraging learner-centered discourse practices that may lead to critical thinking and active engagement, which will ultimately lead to building communicative competence. It does so in a way that makes us consider how essential it is that teachers should go beyond their normal instructional practices to create a classroom in which students will be actively engaged in the learning process.

3. Research Objectives:

The research addresses the following objectives:

1. To study patterns of teacher-student interaction in classroom dialogue through the IRF model of Sinclair and Coulthard.
2. To determine the roles that teachers and students play when initiating, responding, and giving feedback in classroom communication.

aa
ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JALT

3. To assess how much discourse structure encourages significant learning or strengthens the power of the teacher.
4. To suggest the strategies of the transition between the teacher-centered and the learner-centered classroom discourse.

4. Research Questions:

The research aims to answer the following questions:

1. How do teachers start, run, and end classroom conversations as per the IRF model of Sinclair and Coulthard?
2. How far is the classroom interaction teacher-centered or student-centered within the observed English language class?
3. What affects the opportunities and skills development of students, the structure of teacher-student discourse?

4. Significance of the Study:

In discourse analysis, spoken contact is not the only thing that is described and examined. In contrast to all of the daily vocal interactions, people read dozens of textual and printable words every day, including newspaper headlines, emails, tales, menus, directions, announcements, caricatures, posters, flyers shoved through the doorway, and much more. Discourse analysts are incredibly interested in the arrangement of written engagement because consumers typically anticipate interactions to be cohesive, comprehensible interactions that occur when the words or phrases are related to each other in a manner that correlates to traditional patterns, just as it is done in speech.

5. Literature Review:

Discourse can be defined as a vocal or textual interaction between individuals that consists of more than one sentence. It is essential to note that conversation goes beyond language. Linguistic studies might concentrate on the distinct interpretations of words, but the concept of "language" can encompass all phonetic and symbolic elements, including items like road signs. Discourse extends past this and examines the broader meanings that language in context conveys. The social, cultural, political, and historical context of the discourse is referred to as "context" in this instance, and it is crucial to consider this to comprehend the fundamental concepts presented through language (Abeti, 2022). Following the Oxford English Dictionary, discourse analysis is “Linguistics, a technique of evaluating the organization of texts or speeches larger than a single phrase, taking into consideration simultaneously its syntactic content and its sociolinguistic context; research accomplished using this method".

According to the approach, instruction is teacher-centered and led. Because students wait for guidance from the teachers, this type of instruction cannot foster learning. They are unable to act and apply their lessons on their own. The discourse in language schools that fits perfectly into the S&C three-stage model has also received some criticism. Chaudron (1988), Long & Sato (1983), Ohta (2001), and Wells (1999) are cited by Muller and De Boer (2012) to support their claim that such discourse frequently involves instructor presentation questions, in which the instructor is aware of the proper response but is only interested in determining if the student can provide it. This is ineffective because it deprives pupils of the chance to engage in substantial discussion. Discourse analysis comes from the sociological field, according to Snape and Spencer (2003), and is concerned with "Examining the performances, language styles, and rhetorical techniques utilized in specific narratives to examine how knowledge is formed within various

ISSN E: 2709-8273
aa ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JALT

discourses." Discourse analysis, or the historical approach, is particularly relevant when hearing people's firsthand accounts of events, according to Jankowicz (2005, p. 229).

5.1.Classroom discourse:

The speech of a classroom teacher to achieve objectives is referred to as their discourse (Sinclair and Brazil, 1982). Due to the disparity of power between instructors and students, classroom rhetoric is distinctive in its environment. Instructors frequently run the class, hold rule discussions, and start conversations. In a quintessential discourse, a topic is posed, one or more students respond, and then the teacher assesses the answer (Nunan, 1999). Facets of instinctual discussion, such as turn-taking, intonation, and exchanges, are modified in a traditional classroom (McCarthy, 1992). In the school environment, turn-taking is preplanned and chiefly managed by the teacher (Brazil, 1995). Instructors, in their dominant involvement, furthermore, strive to employ more stylistic components with notable syllables quite often to illustrate crucial data.

5.2.Speech Acts and Moves:

The notion of "illocutionary act" (Austin, 1962) was introduced to communicate the impact of such statements on the audience in a specific situation, as opposed to the fundamental figurative or "locutionary" interpretation, and was used by the theory of speech acts to allocate functional meaning in interaction to utterances (divisible into the various classes, such as declaratives, directives, expressives, and so on – while there was substantial heterogeneity in classifications among authors). The need for a new level of description to demonstrate the connection between each speech and its dialectical purpose, termed discourse, was thus proposed to Sinclair and Coulthard. They present an IRF model, which is a hierarchical paradigm that is mostly utilized in schools for conversation analysis. The paradigm is an adaptation of Halliday's (1961) rank model for discourse analysis. Halliday developed his framework to demonstrate the grammatical interdependence of all languages, with the pyramidal aspect emphasizing the interaction between morphemes in a sentence. Sinclair and Coulthard modified the hierarchy and rank components of Halliday’s model to fit the conversation that takes place in a classroom, notably between the teacher and the students. Five ranks made up the original model: lesson, transaction, exchange, move, and act. The lesson was dropped from the 1992 revision, leaving 4 ranks in its place (Halliday, 1992). Nevertheless, it is challenging to determine whether the discussion was beneficial in boosting comprehension. The teacher directs it. It seems mechanistic as well. That implies that within a classroom, there are only instruction (Hailom B., 2016).

The reviewed literature puts emphasis on the strengths and weaknesses of the current methods of classroom discourse analysis. On the one hand, the IRF model by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) offers a formal way to determine the structures of classroom interaction and has been extensively used in ESL / EFL studies. Conversely, other researchers like Chaudron (1988), Wells (1999), and Ohta (2001) claim that this model poses the danger of strengthening the teacher's dominance and providing students with little opportunity to engage in real communication and language practice. Also, although the framework of systemic functional grammar and speech act theory by Halliday makes the language use in social context more comprehensible (Halliday, 1961; Austin, 1962), little consideration has been given to the intersection of these models with the realities of the ESL/EFL classroom in the modern, online, or exam-driven environment. This is an area that requires the conduct of studies to understand the influence of classroom discourse on learner participation, engagement, and the development of skills upon analysis using a model developed by Sinclair and Coulthard. To fill this niche, the current research paper explores teacher-

ISSN E: 2709-8273
aa ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JALT

student discourse within an ESL classroom to determine the degree to which current discourse systems either promote or suppress effective learning.

6. Research Methodology:

Conversations between teachers and students serve as a basis for classroom dialogue. Various models for classroom discourse can aid the conversation between teachers and pupils. Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) model is another one of those. This paradigm, which is built on hierarchical overlapping discourse units, was created to represent teacher-student conversation. It is presupposed that discourse in the classroom "appears to follow a relatively consistent and predictable pattern, containing 3 components: a teacher Initiation, a pupil Response, and a teacher Feedback, typically known as IRF, or IRE: Initiation, Response, and Feedback/Evaluation." Some authors and practitioners prefer IRE to emphasize the fact that instructors' feedback is frequently an assessment of a student's ability to contribute. Teachers continually evaluate the accuracy of a statement and provide feedback to students. The approach is based on the observation that every interaction between a teacher and student has the form of three steps: a query, a response, and a follow-up. The model presupposes that all teacher-student interactions are of this three-part format, where a question or a prompt will be followed by a student response and then the teacher's feedback. In this research, the analytical framework utilized is the one developed by Sinclair and Coulthard, which becomes the analytical tool to employ in the research to analyze classroom discourse and assess the impact of such discourse structures on participation and learning outcomes.

7. Ethical Considerations

Ethical guidelines were highly followed in the course of this study. The recording and transcription of classes were conducted for academic purposes, and participants' privacy and confidentiality were considered. To preserve anonymity, the students and the instructor were not named; rather, pseudonyms or general referrals (e.g., Student A) were provided in the transcription. Informed consent was considered, and care was taken to ensure that the data was treated responsibly, not harming or giving false information about the participants.

8. Analytical Framework:

The following methodology is utilized in the research paper for the discussion and analysis of the Academic writing class lecture.

The Ranking System

The lesson has the greatest rank and is composed of "an unordered succession of transactions" (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975, p. 25). Evaluation of this rank is pointless because there is no restriction on the sequence of transactions inside a lesson. Such an investigation could not lead to the structural conclusion that "ordering differs from teacher to teacher. According to Sinclair and Coulthard, they did not do enough research on the rank of transactions to make it a significant portion of their study. The greatest level that is still suitable for examination is exchanged. Moves are composed of actions, while moves are composed of exchanges.

Moves and Exchanges

Boundary exchanges and instructional exchanges are the two categories of exchange that Sinclair and Coulthard distinguish in classroom speech. While teaching encounters are where queries are posed and responded to, as well as commentary on responses, boundary exchanges, which are started by the teacher, mark the move from one segment of the class to the next. Tables 1 and 2 indicate potential architectures for different exchange kinds, drawn from Sinclair and Coulthard (1975, p. 26). Letters in parentheses in the left margin stand in for the labeling symbols

aa
ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JALT

for the structural elements. Symbols in parentheses are not necessary parts of the structure in the middle column, while symbols without parentheses are to be found.

Table 1: Rank III: Exchange (boundary)

Elements of structure	Structures	Classes of move
Frame (Fr) Focus (Fo)	(Fr) (Fo)	Fr: Framing (III.1) Fo: Focusing (III.2)

Table 2: Rank III: IRF Exchange (teaching)

Elements of structure	Structures	Classes of move
Initiation (I) Response (R) Feedback (F)	I (R) (F)	I: opening (III.3) R: answering (III.4) F: follow-up (III.5)

There are five primary groups of moves in the S&C model, as shown in the Tables above: framing and focusing moves that realize boundary exchanges; opening, replying, and follow-up moves that achieve instructional exchanges. These have the designations I, R, and F as structural components, and the S&C model is frequently described as having an IRF, three-part structure. Focusing moves are "meta statements about the discourse," whereas framing moves "suggest boundaries in the instruction." Coulthard and Sinclair (1975, p. 22). Eleven more subcategories, including six "free" and five "bound," might be added to the category of teaching exchanges (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975, p. 49). Exchanges that are bound are connected to earlier exchanges that were free, to which they relate.

Table 3: Sub-categories of free exchange

Sub-class of exchange	Structures	Function of exchange
Teacher informs (Inform)	I (R)	to convey information to the pupils
Teacher direct (Direct)	I R (F)	to elicit a non-verbal response from the pupils
Teacher elicits (Elicit)	I R F	to elicit a verbal response from a pupil
Check (Check)	I R (F)	to discover how well students are getting on and identify any problems
Pupil elicit (P-Elicit)	I R	to elicit a verbal response
		from the teacher
Pupil inform (P-Inform)	I F	to convey information to the teacher

aa
ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JALT

Table 4: Sub-categories of bound exchanges

Sub-class of exchange	Structures	Function of exchange
Re-initiation (i) (Re-initiation)	I R Ib R F	to induce a response to a previously unanswered question
Re-initiation (ii) (Re-initiation)	I R F (Ib) R F	to induce a correct response to a previously incorrectly answered elicitation
Listing (Listing)	I R F (Ib) R F	to withhold evaluation until two or more responses are received to an elicitation
Reinforce (Reinforce)	I R Ib R	to induce a (correct) response to a previously issued directive
Repeat (Repeat)	I R Ib R F	to induce a repetition of a response

Acts and Moves

Acts, the "bottom level of discourse" (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975, p. 27) and "equivalent to morphemes in language" (ibid., p. 23), are the building blocks of moves since they cannot be broken down into smaller components. Table 5 below summarizes Sinclair and Coulthard's pages 35 to 44, as cited in Raine (2010, pp. 9–10).

Table 5: Types of acts, notation, and function

Act	Notation	Function	Reference #
marker	m	to mark boundaries in the discourse	IV.1
silent stress	^	to emphasize a marker	IV.11
starter	s	to prime pupils for a correct response to an initiation	IV.2
elicitation	el	to request a linguistic response	IV.3.1
check	ch	to ascertain whether any problems are preventing the successful progress of the lesson	IV.3.2
directive	d	to request a non-linguistic response	IV.3.3
informative	i	to provide information	IV.3.4

ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JALT

prompt	p	to prompt a response to a previous directive or elicitation	IV.4.1
clue	cl	to provide additional information	IV.4.2
bid	b	to signal a desire to contribute to the discourse	IV.5.2
cue	cu	to evoke an appropriate bid	IV.51
nomination	n	to call on or permit a pupil to contribute to the discourse	IV.5.3
acknowledgment	ack	to show that initiation has been understood	IV.6
reply	rep	to provide a linguistic response appropriate	IV.7.1
react	rea	to provide a non-linguistic response	IV.7.2
comment	com	to provide additional information relating	IV.8
accept	acc	to indicate that a reply was appropriate	IV.9
evaluate	e	to positively or negatively evaluate a previous reply	IV.10
meta-statement	ms	to help students follow the future	IV.12.1
		structure of a lesson	
conclusion	con	to help students understand the past content of a lesson	IV.12.2
loop	l	to elicit the repetition of a student's reply	IV.13

ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JALT

aside	z	includes any elements of discourse intended not to elicit a reply or reaction, such as the teacher thinking aloud or talking to himself	IV.14

The tables below are reproduced from Sinclair and Coulthard (1975, pp. 26-7) and show the structures of the five main types of moves and the classes of acts which they comprise.

Table 6: Rank IV: Move (opening)

Elements of structure	Structures	Classes of act
signal (s) pre-head (pre-h) head (h) post-head (post-h) select (sel)	(s) (pre-h) h (post-h) (sel) (sel) (pre-h) h	s: marker (IV.1) pre-h: starter (IV.2) h: system operating at h; choice of elicitation, directive, informative, check (IV.3) post-h: system operating at post-h; choice from prompt and clue (IV.4) sel: ((cue) bid) nomination (IV.5)

Table 7: Rank IV: Move (answering)

Elements of structure	Structures	Classes of act
pre-head (pre-h) head (h) post-head (post-h)	(pre-h) h (post-h)	pre-h: acknowledge (IV.6) h: system operating at h; choice of reply, react, acknowledge (IV.7) post-h: comment (IV.8)

Table 8: Rank IV: Move (follow-up)

Elements of structure	Structures	Classes of act
pre-head (pre-h) head (h) post-head (post-h)	(pre-h) (h) (post-h)	pre-h: accept (IV.9) h: evaluate (IV.10) post-h: comment (IV.8)

ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JALT

Elements of structure	Structures	Classes of act
head (h) qualifier (q)	hq	h: marker (IV.1) q: silent stress (IV.11)

Table 9: Rank IV: Move (framing)

Elements of structure	Structures	Classes of act
signal (s) pre-head (pre-h) head (h) post-head (post-h)	(s) (pre-h) h (post-h)	s: marker (IV.1) pre-h: starter (IV.2) h: system operating at h; choice from meta-statement or conclusion (IV.12) post-h: comment (IV.8)

Table 10: Rank IV: Move (focusing)

Hence, this framework has been utilized for research analysis.

9. Data Collection:

The data was obtained from an English language online class lecture held on the topic of *Academic Writing Introduction*. The interactions between the teacher and the students were then transcribed by the researchers, and the transcription was used for analysis using the above-discussed model.

10. Data Analysis:

The discussion of the classroom talks in the IRF model of Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) had been recorded and analyzed. Transcripts of the teacher-student communication were coded into initiation, response, and feedback moves, which made it possible to identify patterns of participation. The following tables show how various kinds of exchanges played out in the lesson and how they demonstrate the teacher-centeredness of classroom conversation.

Elements of structure	Structures	Classes of move
Initiate (V-I) Respond (V-R) Feedback (V-F)	V-I (V-R) ((V-R) (V-F))n (V-F) V-I (V-R)	V-I: Opening V-R: Answering V-F: Follow-up

Table 11: V-task exchange

Table 13: V-task exchange

The structural parts of a typical classroom task exchange based on the model by Sinclair and Coulthard are described in Table 11. Each conversation involves three significant actions: Initiation (V-I), Response (V-R), and Feedback (V-F). Following the sequence, the teacher will provide a question or a prompt, and the student will answer, and the teacher will give feedback or assessment. The specified trend is representative of the IRF framework that serves as the basis of the majority of teacher-student interactions and promotes the contemplation of a facilitative role played by a teacher in regulating classroom discourse. These distinctions are indicated in the table and the packaging of student contributions in the teacher-practitioner interactions, which have the propensity to limit the length of the learner discourses.

aa
ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JALT

Directing Transactions:

Table 12 Directing Transactions

Exchange Type	Opening (V-I)	Act	Answering (V-R)	Act	Follow-Up (V-F)	Act
Boundary Exchange	So, ^ FRAME	m q				
	I hope you are all doing well. Yesterday we studied academic writing, and today we are going to have a quiz on it. FOCUS	ms com				
Direct	The first question that I am going to ask is How will you define academic writing?	s	It is formal and logical.	rep	yeah	acc
Check	Is he telling the truth, Mr. B?	ch >n<	Yeah	rep	good	m
Elicit	Tell me what you have understood about academic writing, Ms. A.	el	It is logical, ma'am, and reasonable. It is not fictional.	rep	Yeah, you are right, but why not fictional?	e com
Listing			That means it is formal and does not have emotive	rep	Ok good.	acc

aa
ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JALT

			language, ma'am.			
Boundary	Well, I think y'all know this	m acc	Yes. Ma'am.	rep	Hmm	acc

Directing transactions analysis shows the way the teacher controls the movement of classroom discussion by using various kinds of exchanges, including boundary, direct, check, and elicit moves. Boundary exchanges, e.g., introduce changes between lesson phases (Yesterday we learned academic writing and today we are going to have a quiz on it), and direct and check moves direct student response and check correctness. The elicited moves accept the input of the students verbally, but the teacher maintains evaluative control in the follow-up phase. This shows that classroom discourse is very well structured, with students mostly answering teacher questions and not engaging in dialogue.

Eliciting transactions:

Table 13: Eliciting transactions

Exchange type	Opening	Act	Answering	Act	Follow up	Act
T-Inform	Academic writing is focused, organized, brief, and backed up by proof. Its goal is to make the reader's comprehension easier.	i	Yes ma'am. Is it lengthy too?	reps	Although it has a serious tone and style, it is not difficult to understand and doesn't need the use of lengthy	acc. z
P Elicit	Ma'am, how would we know that it is formal?	el	Eh-there will be no use of emotions in the language	l rep	Alright, ma'am	m
T Elicit	Anybody? What is emotive language now	n com	I'm sick, I feel bad, and I don't like it.	rep	mm... ok	l m
Re-initiative	Or? ^	q	I hate you?	rep	yes	ack
T elicit	What are the four types of academic writing?	el	Persuasive, descriptive?	rep	Hurry up	p
T elicit	What are they?	d >n<	Critical and analytical, ma'am	rep	Very good	m

aa
ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JALT

Boundary	Now ^ FRAME	m q				
Elicit	You have to tell me what are the five features of academic writing?	cu el				
Direct	You can't tell me because you haven't learned these	d	Sorry ma'am	rep	hmm	m
Elicit	Have a guess!	p	Raises hand	b	Yes, plz.	m
			Ma'am, it is precision, objectivity, and formality	rep	Very good	ack
Direct	Alright. So, tomorrow I will listen to it again	m d	Okay, ma'am	rep	Learn it nicely!	com

These eliciting transactions also serve to underline how the teacher exerted dominance in classroom talk. In this case, it is possible to see various types of exchange (Teacher Inform (T-Inform), Pupil Elicit (P-Elicit), Teacher Elicit (T-Elicit), and Re-initiation). The T-Inform moves are where the teacher gives the student information directly about academic writing, T-Elicit, and P-Elicit are where the teacher tries to get the student to talk. Nonetheless, the review reveals that despite student participation, their answers tend to be brief, and feedback is immediate, which restricts the possibility of a long conversation. The cases of re-initiation reveal the authoritative role of the teacher through pushing students to the correct answer. It is also shown in the table that the evaluative comments are used, as well, to close down a conversation, instead of making someone elaborate.

11. Interpretations of the Findings:

Quantitative coding of the transcript reveals that the initiating discourse moves were, in the majority of cases, initiated by the teacher. Among some 20 initiations recorded, all were by teachers, and moves by students were nonexistent. Responses (n=18) were mostly brief phrases or sentences, and feedback (n=15) was mostly composed of evaluative statements. Boundary exchanges were made 4 times, and the student-teacher interaction was mostly on elicitation exchanges (n = 7) and checks (n = 3). Re-initiation sequences were used twice, and the teacher asked the same question or paraphrased it until the correct response was given.

Analytical Implications

In the analysis, it is revealed that classroom discourse was well-teacher-centered, with students being reactive. Their responses were short, usually limited to one or two words or the briefest of sentences, and teacher responses were mostly appraisals. Boundary exchanges were also common in marking the end of one lesson stage to another, and did not include any possibility of student contribution, indicating that the teacher could not only control what the students were learning, but also when and in what order the lesson would proceed. Elicit and check moves, though meant to elicit the verbal feedback, frequently provided little input, which was immediately

aa ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JALT

succeeded by the feedback. This strengthened the power of the teacher and reduced the agency of the students. Likewise, patterns of re-initiation showed that questioning was mostly used as a recall test where the teacher repeated or paraphrased and got the correct response. Although students tried to continue their responses, such as discussing the characteristics of academic writing, teacher feedback was still evaluative instead of exploratory, which limited the possibility of thinking critically and contemplating more deeply.

All of this, in general, demonstrates how IRF cycles presuppose the organization of classroom communication, which confirms previous claims that the model is systematic but inclined to promote the authority of teachers (Chaudron, 1988; Wells, 1999; Ohta, 2001). Although the Sinclair and Coulthard framework is an effective mapping tool in terms of structural mechanics of classroom talk, it also reveals the drawback of teacher-centered discourse in ESL/EFL settings. The limited variety of opportunities to talk to the learners extensively clearly highlights the necessity of a more dialogic and learner-oriented strategy, where the students are expected to initiate, elaborate, and be critical in their interaction, thus promoting communicative proficiency and effective learning.

The study of classroom discourse demonstrated that the teachers were at the core of initiating, controlling, and bringing an interaction to an end. The IRF pattern prevailed in the pattern of communication as the teachers always asked the questions, the students gave concise answers, and the teachers ended by giving evaluative remarks. This shows that the classroom conversation was strictly regulated by the instructor, thereby restricting the students in terms of initiating the conversation and elaborating on their answers. Such findings are consistent with the objective of the study to identify and compare and contrast the initiation, maintenance, and closure of classroom conversations amongst teachers, and claim the dominance of teacher talk and dependence of students on teacher cues. Also indicated by the findings is that the observed lesson was teacher-dominated with regard to classroom interaction. The students were reduced to direct questions or elicited questions that, in most cases, were one word or shorter phrases, where the teacher could control the pace and content of the dialogue. They, too, were requested to answer, but they were engaged in the customary style; not the faintest sign of an individual contribution, or of a protracted discussion, was noticeable. This observation, along with the purpose to identify roles of teachers and students as issues in classroom communication, supports matters brought up by the literature, that matters of teacher-centered discourse would hinder learner sovereignty.

The structure of the discussion was both beneficial and detrimental to the learning and development of students. On the one hand, the IRF pattern ensured that everything was structured and foreseeable, and the teacher could follow the lesson and assess the understanding. On the one hand, the answers of the students were noticeably brief, and the students were unable to ask questions at the end, which prevented delving into the material further. The students were not forced to expound their answers and elaborate on the meaning, which is vital in building communication competence and critical thinking. This symptomatically demonstrates that the implementation of strict discourse structure is infeasible in the context of the ESL/EFL classroom, where students need more exposure to authentic language use and real linguistic interaction.

Lastly, the research results also indicate the advantages and disadvantages of using the Sinclair and Coulthard model to examine classroom discourse. The model offered a clear map in recognizing and grouping moves, exchanges, and acts, and thus it became possible to trace the framework of classroom communication systematically. Nevertheless, the discussion has also shown that the model is also inclined towards focusing on structural form, rather than pedagogical

ISSN E: 2709-8273
aa ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JALT

function, thereby revealing rather than remedying the problem of teacher dominance in classroom talk. This creates the necessity of supplementing such models with strategies that consider the quality of interaction and its consequences to learning. In this way, the classroom discussion can be changed so that its orientation is less teacher-centered and more learner-centered, where the students are prompted to engage more actively in classroom discussion and to expand their input and gain confidence in their language skills.

12. Conclusion:

Though Sinclair and Coulthard have given an excellent model for classroom discourse analysis, it was still a teacher-centered approach. Since the class was instructor-centered and the process of learning and teaching attempted to adhere to Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) IRF model, the discourse witnessed in the classroom was compared to that of that work. In addition, the classroom discussion also ingrained the transaction exchange model in that students tried to answer the teacher, giving the impression that the teacher is all-knowing and that pupils expect from the teacher. In general, the Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) approach was used to study classroom conversation. This discourse analysis led to the conclusion that teaching methods where the teacher speaks more and the students wait for everything the teacher says are ineffective for helping students learn English as a foreign language. In order to develop a learner-centered approach, the Instructors should be well-prepped for each session in accordance. Instructors ought to provide their students with enough time to practice the languages. Students must actively engage in English teaching in the classroom. To improve their oral communication abilities, students are expected to be involved during lectures. The management of the educational institutions must establish a pleasant learning atmosphere for students to recognize their proficiency in English, and teachers should use a learner-centered approach.

In addition to its direct conclusions, this paper contributes to the significance of reconsidering the structure of the classroom discourse in ESL/EFL teaching. Although the Sinclair and Coulthard model can be quite useful to understand the dynamics of teacher-student interactions, it must be supplemented with pedagogical approaches that would facilitate a higher level of student agency and authentic communication. Future studies can elaborate on this discussion with respect to considering a greater volume of data, or different classroom contexts, or teacher-focused and student-focused discourse patterns. Subsequent research may expand on this discussion in terms of addressing a larger amount of data, or other classroom settings, or teacher-directed and student-directed patterns of discourse. These studies would not only sharpen our understanding of the matter of communication in the classroom, but they would also provide valuable tips to teachers who must balance between structure and interaction. Very soon, it is hoped to develop classrooms where discourse is more than an apparatus to put the material in front of the learners, but a stage where learners can produce the knowledge, build confidence, and develop the communicative skills that will equip them to use English in real life.

13. Limitations of the Study

Despite some interesting information on classroom dialogue presented in this study, there are some limitations to it. First, the research was conducted during a single English online language lesson, which also restricts the generalization of the findings. Different classrooms, teaching topics, or styles could provide dissimilar patterns of interaction. Two, the study relied on the application of only the IRF model of Sinclair and Coulthard (1975), which, even as systematic, is too concerned with structural properties of the discourse and lacks the qualitative aspect of engagement or meaning making of the learner. Lastly, the study restricted itself to the transcribed

information and thus, non-verbal components of interaction, including gestures, tone, and facial expressions, among others, were not included, though they contribute to communication. The limitations might be resolved in the future by examining a larger dataset, contrasting across different classroom settings, and using other types of analytical frameworks to represent both structural and functional features of discourse.

14. Future Recommendations

Considering the result, it is advised that educational practitioners should engage in more learner-centered activities that enable students to contribute more towards the initiation and maintenance of the classroom conversation. The instructors are expected to make their learners answer long, elaborate sentences, build and argue their ideas, instead of using short questions and judgmental statements most of the time. The further diversification of participation can be provided by group and peer time, as well as reducing the preeminence of a teacher in conversation, and communicative tasks that would create the effect of a real-life situation would help students to become confident and fluent. Institutional-level professional development programs are supposed to be designed so that they equip the teachers with discourse strategies that would enable them to entice the learners into a sense of autonomy and active participation. It also matters that the learners get a conducive classroom atmosphere where they feel comfortable opening up and speaking without fear of errors or being condemned. These steps taken together will transform classroom speech into a teacher-led process into a more active and interactive process that will positively influence language acquisition and communicative proficiency.

References:

Abeti, M. T. (2022). Classroom discourse analysis. International Journal of Advanced Research and Publication, 5(3), 86-90.

Banteyirga, H. (2016). Lecture note. Addis Ababa University. Unpublished lecture.

Brown, Helen. (2010-2011). Exchange Structure in the Modern Classroom: 'Jamie's Dream School.' (n.d.). University of Nottingham. https://www.nottingham.ac.uk/english/documents/innervate/1011/1011brownexchangestructure.pdf

Chaudron, C. (1988). Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning. Cambridge University Press.

Coulthard, M. & Brazil, D. (1992). Exchange Structure. In J. Sinclair & M. Coulthard, Advances in spoken discourse analysis. London: Routledge

Fairclough, N. (1992). Discourse and Social Change. Cambridge: Polity Press. Francis, G. & Hunston, S. (1992). Analyzing everyday conversation. In J. Sinclair & M. Coulthard Eds.）, Advances in spoken discourse analysis. London: Routledge.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1961). Categories of the theory of grammar. Word, 17(3), 241–292. https://doi.org/10.1080/00437956.1961.11659756

Halliday, M. A. (1992). Language as system and language as instance: The corpus as a theoretical construct. Directions in corpus linguistics, 61-77.

Hodges, B. D., Kuper, A., & Reeves, S. (2008). Qualitative Research: Discourse Analysis. *BMJ: British Medical Journal*, *337*(7669), 570–572. http://www.jstor.org/stable/20510756

Jansen, D. (2022, June 27). What is discourse analysis? Simple definition + examples. Grad Coach. https://gradcoach.com/discourse-analysis-101/

Long, M. H., & Sato, C. J. (1983). Classroom foreigner talk discourse: Forms and functions of teachers' questions. In H. W. Seliger & M. H. Long (Eds.), Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition (pp. 268–285). Newbury House.

McCarthy, M. (1992). Discourse analysis for language teachers. Child language teaching and therapy, 8(1), 96-100.

Muller, T. Muller, T. & de Boer, M.(2012). Classroom discourse analysis of student use of language scaffolding during tasks. In T. Muller, S. Herder, J. Adamson, & P.S. Brown (Eds.), Innovating EFL Teaching in Asia (pp. 145–161), Palgrave Macmillan.

Nunan, D. (1999). *Second Language Teaching & Learning*. Heinle & Heinle Publishers, 7625 Empire Dr., Florence, KY 41042-2978.

Ohta, A. S. (2001). Second language acquisition processes in the classroom: Learning Japanese. Routledge.

Paterson, David. (2008). Analyzing classroom discourse using the Sinclair/Coulthard model (n.d.) https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/230511931.pdf

Raine, P. (2010). An application of the Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) method of discourse analysis. Studentská práce). Birmingham: University of Birmingham. Dostupné z http://www. Birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/college-artslaw/cels/essays/csdp/rainesinc-coul. Pdf.

Rex, L. A., & Schiller, L. (2010). Using discourse analysis to improve classroom interaction. Routledge.

Sinclair, J. M., & Coulthard, R. M. (1975). Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils. Oxford University Press.

Wells, G. (1999). *Dialogic inquiry: Toward a sociocultural practice and theory of education.* Cambridge University Press.