



Classroom Discourse Analysis on English Learning Interaction During the Covid-19 Pandemic

Nur Azizah ¹, Dwijani Ratnadewi ², Sofi Yuniarti ^{3*})

sofiyuniarti@um-surabaya.ac.id

¹²³English Education and Teacher Training, Muhammadiyah University of Surabaya,
Indonesia

Received: 2022-10-30 Accepted: 2022-12-25

DOI: 10.24256/ideas.v10i2.3142

Abstract

The spread of Covid-19 has an impact on changing learning patterns from offline learning to online learning or hybrid types. This phenomenon intends to fill the gap that this research analyzes both offline and online learning during pandemic Covid-19. The learning pattern was investigated to obtain information about the characteristics of the learning pattern, advantages, disadvantages, and benefits in classroom interaction. The aims of this study are to find out the types of teacher-student interaction patterns in the classroom (IRF patterns) in offline and online learning, to describe the IRF patterns in each learning interaction, and to identify IRF patterns that frequently appear. The participants in this study were 18 mathematics and science class students from a private high school in Surabaya, Indonesia. The main data were teacher-students interaction in the English class, collected by observing and recording the class offline and online learning and they were analyzed by applying the IRF theory of Sinclair and Coulthard. The results of data analysis showed that there were eleven kinds of exchanges in offline and online learning. In offline learning the initiation-response-feedback (IRF) pattern was balanced between the teacher and the students, while in online learning, the teacher was more dominant in providing explanations and initiations, while students were less active. Therefore, this study implicates on how to implement appropriate communication in teaching learning process.

Keywords: Classroom discourse analysis, offline and online learning, the IRF Pattern

Introduction

Interaction is a relationship between individuals or group who are collaborate by conveying ideas, thoughts, feelings, and producing reciprocal effects. The COVID – 19 pandemic give impacts around the world because this virus quickly spreads from people through sneezing, touching, or surface. The number of infected coronaviruses were 8,339 positive confirmation, the number of recovered patients were 515 and the number of deaths were 15 in one day (Kemenkes RI, 2021). As a consequence, the coronavirus has changes in the teaching learning process and influenced the interaction between teachers and students. The omicron variant appeared in 2022 and the virus increased unexpectedly that is tens of thousands. So, the number of omicron variant increased faster than the delta variant of cases (Syahrial, 2022). Based on UNESCO, by the end of April around 186 countries have implemented online learning (UNESCO, 2020). Therefore, the teaching – learning process was getting the transition period from online to offline learning and the online learning implemented if the omicron cases increased.

Considering transition period from online to online learning, classroom interaction can be done face-to-face or distance learning through applications. Offline learning is a face-to-face meeting or interaction directly in the classroom without technology tools or internet connection. While online learning is a meeting that is carried out by using conference applications such as zoom, google meeting, Microsoft teams, etc, and is supported by the internet network for communication. As consequently, it is interested to analyze due to the transition from offline in the covid-19 era. The distinction of learning ambience is also fascinated to analyze because of student's respond in classroom pattern can be more active or passive.

With regard to analyze the student's respond pattern, several previous studies illustrates that teacher gave a question and the students responded to appear the interaction based on self – evaluation of teacher talk (SETT) or teacher talk strategy and it can also has a positive impact on student learning development (Eisenring & Margana, 2018). The teacher spoke using English and Indonesia so that students could understand the material (Monica Roliani et al., 2019). Teacher talk dominated in the classroom that is supported by IRF pattern and the teacher initiated a lot by asking students (Rahmi et al., 2018). Those researcher was found that classroom is dominated by teacher initiations, the type of teacher talk was lecturing and the teacher rarely gave criticizing or justifying authority. Moreover, the previous researches focus on offline classroom interaction. Therefore, this study fills the gap in analyzing hybrid learning, it analyzes online and offline learning in covid-19 era.

As students respond in English class is needed but there is also significant problem in learning activity. Language variation is influenced by geographical location and political influences because some countries use English as their first language. Thus, English as foreign language is taught in different materials,

syllabuses, and pedagogy (Nunan, 2001). Teaching EFL in Indonesia has challenges and get difficulties in learning activity (Susiyanti, 2019). Furthermore, the learning system is carried out through two phases, namely the transition period and the new habit period. Government regulations require face-to-face learning and entering into new habits (Fitriansyah, 2022). The government issued a policy of self-isolation, social distancing, and physical distancing for the community especially schools to conduct online learning. Online learning is useful for reducing the spread of the COVID-19 virus. In other words, the learning system from conventional to technology which the teacher have to create effective in communication tools (Hamid et al., 2020).

In achieving effective classroom communication, research in classroom discourse is crucial. Classroom discourse is not only focused on language in terms of words, sentences, and phrases but it relates to the context of language (Cazden, 2001) as well as the relationship between linguistics and non – linguistics is described by how language features and language style are combined in certain situations (Paltridge, 2006). Pragmatics is not only study of the meanings that contain morphemes, words, phrases or sentences but also studies the context in which the utterances are used (Slotta, 2018). Besides that, we know pragmatics that researchers have discussed this branch of linguistics and used it in spoken or written discourse (Yule, 1996). According to Cutting (2002) the concepts of pragmatic include context, Co – text, and conversation analysis.

Considering the concepts of pragmatics, conversation analysis is a discourse analysis approach to study language and social interactions in certain utterances. Besides that, the result of utterance can be transcribed in the form of audio and video that occurs naturally and is analyzed based on pragmatic concepts (Hutchby, 2019). Conversation can be carried out by both parties or groups to convey a certain topic. Speakers and listeners have the opportunity to be involved in conveying, responding, refuting an opinion (habibi et al., 2020). Moreover, speech acts are theories of linguistic expressions that follow the rules such as admonishing, affirming, ordering, exclaiming, promising, asking, asking, and warning (Searle, 1979). And also speech acts are determined by the speaker how the speaker uses it in different situations which have three different levels namely Locutionary act, Illocutionary act, and Perlocutionary act (Austin. J.L, 1965).

Conversation can be carried out by both parties or groups to convey a certain topic. speakers and listeners have the opportunity to be involved in conveying, responding, refuting an opinion (Habibi et al., 2020) thus turn-taking contains linguistic or non-linguistic reactions in which the listener gives a signal or interrupt to get his turn. The listener must prepare a response or statement during the speaker's response and the listener determines the appropriate buffer in responding (Corps et al., 2018). Adjacency pairs are the communication by two people where the second utterance is a follow-up to the first utterance expected by the speaker. Adjacency pairs produce expressions such as asking, offering, judging, inviting, requesting (Iswara et al., 2019). Repair is carried out by two or more speakers in which each utterance will not run fluently because the speaker might make mistakes that need correction. This strategy is used to correct someone's speech or rephrase a sentence (Paltridge, 2006). The cooperative principle is a rule that applies conversation where this stage has the goal of exchanging the interactions involved and there were the maxim of quantity, the maxim of quality, the maxim of relation, and the maxim of manner (Liu, 2017).

In classroom discourse, this study focuses on classroom discourse theory by Sinclair and Coulthard due to the complete phase from teacher initiation to feedback from students. Classroom discourse analysis was introduced by Sinclair and Coulthard in 1975 referring to the IRF (initiation – response – feedback) Pattern (Coulthard, 1992). This theory describes students' communicative responses whether the interaction focuses on the teacher or students (Cockayne, 2010). The theory of Sinclair and Coulthard has the pattern, namely IRF (Initiation - Response - Feedback) which is a pattern of interaction between teacher and students. Classroom interaction must pay attention to the pattern because it can help the teacher in eliciting student responses and also evaluate what happens in the classroom (McCarthy, 1991). The teacher gives initiation to students to provide stimulation and make students active. After that students respond to questions from the teacher and the last teacher gives feedback (Coulthard, 1992).

Based on Suter (2001) the form of initiation have three types of questions ; procedural questions, convergent questions to encourage students answer based on their skills, divergent questions where the teacher must encourage students to engage in higher-order thinking. The variety of student's responses can be seen from the analysis interaction and is known as foreign language interaction (FLINT) (Brown, 2001), they are students response specific, student response, open-ended or student-initiated, silence, silence audiovisual confusion, work-oriented and confusion, non-work-oriented. The last stage is feedback which is provided to the student's response and the function as their motivation (Richards & Lockhart, 1995).

The theory of Sinclair and Coulthard concerning this IRF pattern proposes a rank scale model that corresponds to the order of the learning elements. The ranking scale includes lesson, transaction, exchange, move, and acts (Dailey,

2010). In the type of exchanges, there are subcategories that are divided into teaching exchanges and boundary exchanges. Teaching exchange is to give the order or convey a lesson and the teacher also checks student learning outcomes besides that students can give the initiate to the teacher. There are teacher inform, teacher direct, teacher elicit, check, pupil elicit and pupil inform (Buzila, 2018) while boundary exchange is to indicate that teacher will begin an initiation and separate parts of the beginning or end in the transaction. There are re-initiation, listing, reinforce, and repeat (Raine, 2010). This level shows a student response where the element is smaller than the previous level. The five classes of the move are framing, focusing, opening, answering, and feedback (Raine, 2010). Acts is the lowest unit of the Sinclair and Coulthard rating scale. Three main actions occur in the classroom from 22 other actions, namely elicitation, directive, and informative (Nicholson, 2014).

The purpose of conducting this research was to obtain information about the type of IRF patterns in offline and online learning interaction carried out by teacher and students and the IRF that frequently appear in every teaching exchange. The results of this study provide an overview of the effectiveness of online and offline learning, especially in English subjects in Indonesian high schools.

Method

This research was descriptive qualitative research which described an English class interaction. Several characteristics of qualitative research were taken, including natural settings, participant perspectives, researchers as data-gathering instruments, extended first-hand engagement, the centrality of meaning, wholeness and complexity, subjectivity, emergent design, inductive data analysis, and reflexivity (Hatch, 2002).

The research location was conducted in a private high school in Surabaya, Indonesia. The participants were an English teacher and his 18 students in XI math and science class for the 2021/2022 academic year. The research was carried out during the offline-online transition period at the end of the COVID-19 pandemic, namely 18 February - 4 March 2022.

Data were collected from the results of observations and recordings of the

teaching and learning process. The offline learning recording was carried out in the classroom using a video camera that was placed at the rear position of the class. While the online learning process applied the Microsoft Teams and data were recorded by the OBS Studio application. Observations were made using field notes and observation lists. Field notes were in the form of descriptions containing any phenomena occurred in the classroom during the learning process, while the observation sheet was tables containing the IRF sequences.

The components in data analysis were based on Miles and Huberman concept (Sugiyono, 2013). This data showed the exchange between teacher and students by using the IRF pattern as an analytical step which was narrated into written discourse. The data analysis was started with data selection, data transcription, followed by the identification of classroom interaction analysis in terms of the coding and categorization according to the IRF Pattern. And then the symbol transcription was attached to the conversation analysis based on the Hutchby and Wooffitt's work. The data were categorized into sub-topics based on the type of teaching exchanges in the offline and online learning. And finally the application of the IRF pattern and the interpretation of meaning based on classroom discourse analysis

Results

The type of IRF pattern of interaction

Table 1: Off-line and online interaction

Exchanges Type	Offline	Availability	Online	Availability
Teacher Direct	✓	+++	✓	+++
Teacher Inform	✓	++	✓	+++
Teacher Elicit	✓	+++	✓	+++
Pupil Elicit	✓	+	0	0
Pupil Inform	✓	++	✓	+
Checking Students	✓	+++	✓	+++

Notes : 0 (=none); + (=available); ++ (several); +++ (many)

The types of exchange found in offline and online learning were Teacher Direct, Teacher Inform, Teacher Elicit, Pupil Elicit, Pupil Inform and Checking students. The (+) sign indicates its availability, the more (+) signs, the more often this type is encountered in learning, the fewer (+) signs, the less this type of interaction is found in learning. While the sign (0) indicates this type of interaction was not found in learning. The following is the description of each type:

A. Off-line Exchanges Types

The following are the exchange type of interaction in off-line class

Teacher direct exchanges

Teacher direct exchange is seen in the teacher's instructions to the students affected the students' reaction to the teacher's initiation. The teacher's initial speech used a focusing move as a boundary exchange "so" indicated the teacher's direction. This exchange consists of initiation (line 1) and student's response (line 2,4,5). The following is the interactions between teacher and students :

Exchange 1 [F.01.3-7]

- | | | | | | |
|---|----|---|---|--|---|
| 1 | T | : | → <u>So</u> , | | I |
| | | | <u>Before</u> we start the our lesson <u>today</u> , We can si <u>ng</u> ,(5.0) | | |
| | | | is it <u>okay</u> ↑! (d) | | |
| 2 | Ss | : | Okay (.) (ack) | | R |
| 3 | T | : | → <u>Kita</u> nyanyi dulu y:: <u>a</u> ↓! ((open the smartphone)) (d) | | I |
| | | | [we sing first, okay!] | | |
| 4 | S1 | : | [Iya:] = ↑ ((crowded)) (rea) [Yes] | | R |
| 5 | S2 | : | =[°Enggak°] ↓ (rea) [No] | | R |

The pattern of this exchange is (Initiation, Response, Initiation, Response, Response) I R I R R because the teacher accepted students' responses from more than one students from his procedural questions given to provoke student's reaction. This pattern described as the teacher's direct exchange given many times to reinforce the student's response. There is no feedback because this is an ice breaking the teacher gave, so it aims more on raising students' attention.

Teacher inform exchanges

This exchange is shown in the opening move when the teacher tried to check students' understanding to the teaching material. There were two students responded to the teacher's initiation. The teacher accepted student's responses and gave feedback in the form of evaluation. The following is the interactions between the teacher and the students :

Exchange 2 [F.01.198-201]

- | | | | | | |
|---|----|---|---|--|---|
| 1 | T | : | → <u>Be</u> :fore <u>closing</u> the our class ↑ (0.5) what <u>do</u> yo::u | | I |
| | | | <u>learn</u> <u>today</u> about*.↓ (pause) (i) | | |
| 2 | S1 | : | .hh [°Listening°] = (ack) | | R |
| 3 | S2 | : | =[The ↓ <u>Letter</u> *] ((confusion, work-oriented)) (ack) | | R |

4 T : →We learn about letter and listening ↓ (0.5) (.hhh)it can F
 be si::nging ↓ a:nd next time if we have listening lesson
 game plea:se bring cotton bud okay*! ↑ (acc)

The pattern of the exchange is Initiation-Response-Response-Feedback (I R R F) as here the teacher tried to evaluate the learning material before the class was over. The teacher began his first words by rising his tone and there was some emphasis in some words to make the students pay attention to the teacher's initiation. The teacher gave the convergent questions as the Initiation to get two or more student's responses. In line 2, the student answered hesitantly followed by the other student in line 3 who interrupted the response quickly although she was also unsure with her own answer. In the teacher's feedback, he performed low intonation to accept the student's responses and emphasis on satire 'please bring cotton bud' by rising intonation to criticize the students for being considered as less involved in learning.

Teacher elicit exchanges

The teacher gave questions and discussed with students about the definition of letter. The teacher gave elicitation and students answered clearly but students confused at the same time. The following is interactions between teachers and students :

Exchange 3 [F.01.89-104]

1 T : → E::hmm (m) okay lanjut ! ↑ (s) body itu apa ? = (el) I
 [ehm, okay next! What is the body ?]
 2 S1 : =ISI ↑ [contents] (rep) R
 3 T : Hhh Isi di da:lam (.) ? [contents in the?] (el) I
 4 S2 : Dalam surat ↓ (rep) [in the letter] R
 5 T : → Surat (acc) (.) setelah menulis surat ada - tanggal , I
greeting (cl) ..setelah itu isi yang keempat apa ya:? ↓
 (el) [the letter (.) after write the letter there are
 date, greeting after that the contents and then what is
 the fourth ?] ((look the book))
 6 Ss : → [.hhh Closing]= ((confusion, work-oriented)) (rep) R
 7 S1 : →=[Penutup] ((confusion, work-oriented)) (rep) R
 8 T : →Se:belah mana - kita: ↓ menulis closing?↑ (5.0) (el) I
 [where do we write closing?]
 etc
 12 T : →hhh It is the salutation phrase () th::at is closing F
word↓.

Several teacher's initiations were seen to elicit students 'response, the pattern seen is thus I R I R I R R I F. The initiation was given in the beginning and middle conversation as encouragement and prompt to react to the teacher's statement. The teacher gave elicitation many times, while he strengthened and held the student's

response to evaluate it. The teacher always emphasizes and limits the conversation so that students have the opportunity to respond to the teacher. When students feel confused and doubtful the teacher refers to the textbook as a guide.

Pupil elicit exchanges

This exchange is started with a student's question in the conversation when he needs to know the meaning of sentence to the teacher. The student asked directly without any boundary exchanges and the teacher responded by inviting student to think about the verb. The following is the interactions between teachers and students :

Exchange 4 [F.03.78-83]

- | | | | |
|---|----|---|--|
| 1 | S1 | : → <i>Apa Bah:asa inggrisnya, aku melihat film* ?</i> (.)↓ (e1) I
(come to the teacher) [what is the English 'I see the film?'] | |
| 2 | T | : .. <i>hhh Memakai past - berarti subyek plus Verb 2 bu:kan</i> I R
<i>see ↓ (cl) karena itu Verb 1, kalau past itu Verb 2.=</i>
(rep)[use past it means subject plus verb 2 not I see
because it is verb 1 if past it is verb 2] | |
| 3 | S1 | : → <i>apa</i> (.) <i>se:en= ?</i> (rep)[what is seen?] R | |
| 4 | T | : → <i>Bu::kan</i> seen, <i>tapi</i> saw (.) (acc)[not seen but saw] R | |
| 5 | S1 | : E:: <i>hm</i> I <i>sa:w</i> movie ↓ (i) I | |
| 6 | T | : → <i>iya be-nar</i> , I <i>saw</i> movie <i>karena verb 2</i> (e) [yes right, I R
saw movie because of verb 2] | |

The pattern seen in this exchange is I R R R I R with a student started a question. It is an intense discussion between the teacher and student about the tenses. This exchange pattern consist of several Responses, because apparently, the teacher did not want to directly answer the student's questions but tends to guide the student to construct the information he needs himself with the encouragement and assistance. This can be observed from how the teacher responded to students who asked questions. The teacher tried to understand the students' questions patiently. The student interrupted the teacher's answer quickly and impatiently but the

teacher kept his intonation lowered. The teacher guides the students so that finally the student was able to answer his own questions himself.

Pupil inform exchanges

This is the type of exchange where the initiation comes from the student. The following is interactions:

Exchange 5 [F.03.95-100]

- | | | | | |
|---|----|---|---|---|
| 1 | S2 | : | Pak↑, saya sudah*↓ (i) [sir, I've finished] | I |
| 2 | T | : | →Ma-na: ?↑ hh <u>ini</u> <u>masih</u> satu <u>ba:ris</u> (.) (ack) ((look at the text))[where ? this is still one line] | R |
| 3 | S2 | : | Sa::ya (.) bi-ngung(.)↑(i)[I am confused] | I |
| 4 | T | : | →Ka-mu bua:t cerita kejadian <u>masa lalu</u> ↑ hhh yang membuat ka:mu termotivasi untuk <u>masa akan datang</u> ↓(.) (cl) [you made a story in the past that makes you to be motivated in the future] | R |
| 5 | S2 | : | →Ini seperti mencakup simple present dan future ya pak= (rep) [this is like simple present and future yes sir ?] | R |
| 6 | T | : | →=Simple past dulu ↓,kemudian nanti berga:ntung kamu bisa menambahkan simple pre-sent atau fu-ture↓ (.) (ack) Ku::nci utama-nya adalah simple past↑ dan future ↓ (.) (cl) [simple past first, then it depends you can add simple present or future. The main key is simple past and future] | R |

The pattern is I R I R R R where the student started the conversation. This exchange was dominated by responses from both parties, because they were discussing the learning materials. There has been no feedback because the discussion process is ongoing, on the contrary there were efforts to respond to each other for the purpose of understanding the learning material.

Checking student exchanges

The teacher gave elicitation repeatedly so that students achieved a level of understanding from the teacher's explanation. The teacher gave an information and followed the elicitation what if the students understood the subject matter. The following is interactions between student and teacher :

Exchange 6 [F.02.163-171]

- | | | | | |
|---|----|---|---|---|
| 1 | T | : | →Have ini ve-rb one or verb t- <u>two</u> ?(.) (e1) ['have' this is verb one or verb two ?] | I |
| 2 | S1 | : | Ve-rb o:ine (rep) | R |
| 3 | T | : | →Verb one (acc) ,verb <u>two</u> nya a-pa?(.)↑ (e1) [what is the verb two?] | I |
| 4 | S2 | : | <u>Ha:d</u> (rep) | R |

The structure of this conversation piece is I R I R I R in which the teacher provides some information about the material being studied and is followed by student responses. This situational context occurs when the teacher explained the material and asked students to check their understanding repeatedly. Teacher's repeated initiation serves as a tool to ensure students understanding so that the material can be continued. This structure was repeated (but the dialogue is not shown in its entirety here) until the teacher's objectives in this lesson were achieved.

B. Online Exchanges Types

The following are the type of exchange that was found in the online classroom interaction:

Teacher direct exchanges

Teacher direct exchange is seen in the teacher's instructions to the students to have the students' reaction to the teacher's initiation. In this exchange in online learning, it seems that teachers are forced to give extra energy to make their students respond. Here's an excerpt of the conversation:

Exchange 1 [N.01.74-81]

- | | | | | |
|---|----|---|--|---|
| 1 | T | : | →Se-karang (m) (2.0) | I |
| | | | saya minta Fariha:h karena Fariha:h tadi tidak bisa menjawab tapi sekarang <u>membaca</u> ! ↑ (.) (d) [now, I want Farihah because Farihah cannot answer before but now read!] | |
| 2 | S4 | : | [silent] (^) | |
| 3 | T | : | → <u>The</u> grea::t barrier ree-f (.) ((show the text)) (i) | I |
| 4 | S4 | : | [silent] (^) | |
| 5 | T | : | →Ayo dibaca !(1.5) (d) .hh ma-sih tidak ta::hu ? ↑ (i) [let's read! still don't know ?] | I |
| 6 | S4 | : | →Yang mana pak ? ↓ (ack) [which one , sir?] | R |
| 7 | T | : | Yang ini 'lets look at some examples' (.) (d) [this one let's look at some examples.] | I |
| 8 | S4 | : | .hh The great barrier*↑ reef (rea)((read the text)) | R |

There were some causal conjunctions "tapi ('but') and "karena ('because') as a reason to the student to respond him, but she did not. The request to read was

repeated but the teacher received the same reaction (lines 2,3,4) and thus the teacher stated a satire "masih tidak tahu?" (still don't know?) annoyed by the student' ignorance. At the end the teacher refines the command by pointing out which part to read, and the student finally responds). The pattern is I I I R I R the first three Initiation are caused by the repeated teacher's requests to get student's reaction.

Teacher inform exchanges

The exchange pattern was found clearly, namely when the teacher opened the lesson by asking for information if students had prepared student workbooks. The teacher gave the initiation many times but there was no response. The following is the interactions between the teacher and students :

Exchange 2 [N.01.13-20]

- | | | | | |
|---|----|---|---|---|
| 1 | T | : | Do you bring your <u>lks</u> be-sides <u>you</u> ? ↓ (i) | I |
| 2 | Ss | : | [silent] (^) | |
| 3 | T | : | Iya:↑ apa hhh ada lks di samping-nya ? ↓(i) [yes. Is there lks beside you?] | I |
| 4 | Ss | : | [silent] (^) | |
| 5 | T | : | He::llo (0.5)kok di-am saja ! ↑(i) [hello. Why still silent!] | I |
| 6 | Ss | : | [silent] (^) | |
| 7 | T | : | a-apa ada <u>lks</u> Bahasa inggrisnya ? ↑(i)[is there your english book?] | I |
| 8 | Ss | : | [silent] (^) | |

The absence of response in this dialogue piece made the teacher repeat the question so that this exchange pattern is not balanced (I I I I), it even looks like that the teacher dominated the conversation. The teacher waited a few second (line 1,3,5,7) yet the conversation did not run well. (line 1, 2) the teacher lowered his intonation to give direction, while in line 3, 4 the teacher raised his intonation to get the students 'attention. In online learning especially in this exchange the students were more passive.

Teacher elicit exchanges

In this exchange, some information was evoked from the students in reaction to the teacher's questions. The questions were especially related to the English textbook being used in the class.

Before giving the procedural question, the teacher put a marker on the boundary exchange which focused on the topic, as seen in sentence 1

Exchange 3 [N.02.18-29]

- 1 T : →Seka-rang, number two sia::pa yang bisa jawab ? ↑ (n) I
[now, number two, who can answer ?]
- 2 Ss : [silent] (^)
- 3 T : →Why was Anggun tha:nk to her fa:ns (.) berdasarkan I
teks yang dibaca tadi ? (e1) [why was Anggun thank to
her fans based on the text read before?]
- 4 S1 : →.hhh Beca:use they ↓support her*↑ (rep) R
- 5 T : →Siapa - ini yang jawab ? ↑ (i) [who is answering?] I
- 6 S1 : Rahmah pak (ack) [Rahmah, Sir] R
- 7 T : Okay (0.5) bera:rti jawabannya? = ↑(i) [Okay, the I
answer is?]
- 8 S1 : =C (.) (ack) R
- 9 T : Okay, go-od be::cause they↓ support her*↑ .(acc) F
- 10 T : →kalau boleh tau↓, kamu tau jawabannya dari mana(.) kok I
bisa C ka:limatnya itu dimana ? (d) [may I know, how do
you know the answer. How can you find C where is the
sentence?]
- 11 S1 : →I:n the e::nd of Anggun tha:nks us↓ [incorrect R
pronunciation] for coming here and support her* (rea)
- 12 T : →=Okay (acc) tapi us dibaca /ʌs/ bukan /us/[okay but F
'ús' is pronounced as /ʌs/ not /us/]

The interaction structure (I I R I R I R F I R F) describes the dynamics of conversation between the teachers and the students. This pattern illustrates that the teacher does not dominate the conversation, the teacher responded and initiated additional statements so that students actively participate in responding and giving opinions. Although students always respond slowly and lower the intonation, the teacher immediately gave initiation and feedback.

Pupil inform exchanges

This type of exchange sees student initiation in conversations in class, as seen in the following dialogue snippet where students asked questions, prompted ideas

or expressed their will. The following is the interactions between the teacher and students :

Exchange 4 [N.01.149-163]

- | | | | | |
|----|-----|---|---|---|
| 1 | T | : | Hello any-one can a::nswer ↓ (n) ,=Nasiroh !↑ (i) | I |
| 2 | S5 | : | →=Ti-dak bisa pak (ack) [Cannot, Sir] | R |
| 3 | T | : | Hhh Masak kalah sama Dewi: (i). Ayo Dewi !↑ (5.0) (d)
[impossible to beat Dewi. Come on Dewi!] | I |
| 4 | S12 | : | Pa::ragraph se-bab akibat biasanya mengikuti format (.)
paragraph da::sar. ↓ (rep)[the cause effect paragraph
usually follows the basic format paragraph] | R |
| 5 | T | : | Ter:us (.) (i) [then] | R |
| 6 | S12 | : | Ti::dak ta::hu pak hhh.↓ (ack) [don't know, sir.] | I |
| 7 | T | : | →astaghfirullah al adzim kelas sebelas kok tidak tahu.
↑ (i) saya <u>Tanya</u> yang paha:m disini ↑ (2.5) siapa ya: ?
↓ (n) [May allah forgive, the eleventh grade, why (you)
don't know. I ask who understand here. Who?] | F |
| 8 | T | : | Hhh Na::jwa the - hand:some boy: ! (i) | I |
| 9 | S13 | : | Iya pak* (ack) [Yes, Sir] | R |
| 10 | T | : | → <u>Ayo diartikan</u> ↑ (d) [come on translate] | I |
| 11 | S13 | : | Le:mot pak <u>sinyal saya</u> (0.5) dan tidak ada: gambarnya ↓
(i) [my signal is slow, Sir and no picture] | I |

This exchange pattern illustrates the involvement of students in the discussion of the subject matter. They often started a statement and also responded to the teacher. The class looks active, even though the response is in the form of an inability to answer like in line 2 "Tidak bisa pak" ('don't know, sir') or 'Le:mot pak sinyal saya dan tidak ada gambarnya' (my signal is slow, Sir and no picture). The questions were given in a structured manner leading the students' understanding of the subject matter. In this dialogue piece, in line 1 to 6, several adjacency pairs like the acceptance and rejections to the teacher's direction are found. Students have the courage to express themselves so that the class looks fair and balanced in communicating the interests of each party.

Checking students' exchanges

The discourse structure of this excerpt looks somewhat different from the other structures. The teacher seems to dominate the conversation in discussing a text, it is illustrated in the following interactions:

Exchange 5 [N.01.116-124]

- | | | | | |
|---|----|---|--|---|
| 1 | T | : | Fewer baby bi:rds are hatched hhh berarti itu apa ? ↑
((show the text))(e1)[Fewer baby birds are hatched ,
what does it mean?] | I |
| 2 | Ss | : | [silent] (^) | |

- 3 T : Ini menjadi pa:ssive voice (0.5) jadi, subyek-nya tidak I
melakukan sesuatu dan biasanya pakai kata di- seperti
nasi dimakan oleh saya (con) (.) ka::ta subyek itu
selalu berada: di awal kalimat yaitu nasi, tapi yang
melakukan itu na-si apa sa-ya=? ↓ (el) [this becomes a
passive voice. So, the subject do not do something and
usually use the word verb 3 such as rice is eaten by
me. That subject word always in the beginning of
sentence namely rice but Who does that rice or me ?]
- 4 S7 : =Saya↑ (rep) [me] R
- 5 T : Na::h saya itu posisi nya di belakang ↓ atau di depan↑ I
(.) →tadi yang nasi di makan oleh saya ? (el) [me that
position to back or front before that rice is eaten by
me?]
- 6 S7 : →Di:: belaka:ng↓ (rep)[in the back] R
- 7 T : →Di belakang (acc) R

The pattern of this exchange illustrates an imbalance interaction in a classroom discourse. In an effort to check students' understanding of the reading text being discussed, the teacher tried to engage students by provoking questions, giving explanations, yet most of which did not get a response. This pattern is controlled by the teacher, because of the poor response from students, it becomes a dialogue that is less balanced and not evenly distributed between the two parties. The adjacency pairs did not work properly because most of the steps, Initiation, Response and Feedback as well were taken over by the teacher.

Table 1: Off-line and online interaction

Exchanges Type	Offline	Availability	Online	Availability
Teacher Direct	✓	+++	✓	+++
Teacher Inform	✓	++	✓	+++
Teacher Elicit	✓	+++	✓	+++
Pupil Elicit	✓	+	0	0
Pupil Inform	✓	++	✓	+
Checking Students	✓	+++	✓	+++

Notes : 0 (=none); + (=available); ++ (several); +++ (many)

The pattern of exchanges of offline and online learning interaction has certain tendencies. In offline interactions, combination of I R I R I R patterns were more common in classes, while IRF whole patterns and their extensions were rare. The Initiation or I were mostly from the teacher's side when he gave instruction, direction, motivation, calling, giving question or provoking students to respond. While the response or R usually appeared as a result of the teacher's initiation. The teacher's feedback in the form of criticizing, comments and learning evaluations were not frequently found. The students were somewhat engaging more actively to the class compared to the online class. In online learning, I I R I or even I I I I patterns are often found in the learning process. These patterns illustrate that the teacher seemed to dominate the interaction in the classroom, but in fact it was an attempt to make students actively involved in the interaction in the classroom. This is due to the tendency of students to be more passive, the Initiation or I mostly came from the teacher's side when he motivated, called, asked questions or provoked students to respond.

Discussion

The Initiation Response Feedback (I R F) patterns in this English class is functional and distinctive. The exchange patterns found provide a unique picture of offline and online learning. The Initiation move in offline learning worked as it should, while in online learning it was more of an inducement, encouragement and other efforts so that students respond actively to learning. Response moves in offline came from both teachers and students but not in online learning, as students did not respond much, while Feedback moves were only found a little. Students' elicitation is only found in offline and not online learning. However, both elicitation and information expressed by students are only related to assignments not to give opinions or express ideas.

Mixed languages tend to be used in the classroom, namely English and Indonesian, but there was a dominant language in each of these lessons. In offline learning English was used more, while in online learning Indonesian was more likely

to be applied. This phenomenon is formed because in offline learning students were more actively involved in learning, so teachers are more encouraged to use English and build foreign language contexts. Students are encouraged to actively participate in the classroom and student participation is influenced by personal and environmental factors. In the offline class, passive students are students who sit in the back row, they tend to ask questions or discuss more often with their own friends than with the teacher. However they seem more confident to ask questions and they often seek attention in class. Whereas in online learning students are more passive so the teacher encourages them with initiation and elicitation.

Conclusion

There were 11 types of exchange found in the observed English class, they were obtained based on the types of interaction patterns in the classroom (Coulthard) who divided the interaction patterns into 6 types for each teacher and student. Among these types, there were several types that often appeared so that they had specificity, for offline learning there tended to be more balanced interactions between teachers and students, namely the pattern around I R I R I R appeared more often, while for online teacher interaction students were less balanced, because they were dominated by teachers, so that patterns that tend to appear was around I I I R I. The main interaction pattern is initiation (teacher) – response (students) in the form of an exchange of directions to show students' reactions. Student elicitation was only found in offline learning and not online, while student information was found in offline and online learning. Information and student elicitation were found in offline learning, but not in online learning unless the teacher asked. In teaching exchanges, teachers often provided initiation in order that students were actively involved in classroom interactions. While the interactions in online learning, teaching exchanges were dominated by teacher initiation and the use of language was dominated by Indonesian because the teacher provided elicitation to provoke student responses and measure student understanding.

References

- Austin. J.L. (1965). *How To Do Things With Words*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839429693-021>
- Brown. (2001). *Teaching By Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. 2nd Ed (p. 491). Cambridge University Press. <https://octovany.files.wordpress.com/2013/12/ok-teaching-by-principles-h-douglas-brown.pdf>
- Buzila, E. (2018). The Application of Discourse Analysis in First and Second Language Acquisition. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3293291>
- Cazden, courtney B. (2001). *Classroom Discourse : The Language Of Teaching And Learning*. 2nd Ed . Oxford, England .Library Of Congress Cataloging In Publication Data.
- Cockayne, M. (2010). *Applying The Sinclair And Coulthard Model Of Discourse Analysis To A Student- Student - Centered EFL*. 1–45.
- Corps, R. E., Gambi, C., & Pickering, M. J. (2018). Coordinating Utterances During Turn-Taking: The Role of Prediction, Response Preparation, and Articulation. *Discourse Processes*, 55(2), 230–240. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0163853X.2017.1330031>
- Coulthard. (1992). Advances In Spoken Discourse Analysis. In *London and New York*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203200063>
- Cutting, J. (2002). Pragmatics and Discourse. In *The Modern Language Journal* (Vol. 94, Issue 2). Routledge Education Books. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2010.01031.x>
- Dailey. (2010). An Analysis of Classroom Discourse: The Usefulness of Sinclair and Coulthard's Rank Scale in a Language Classroom. *Journal of Discourse Analysis*. Vol 4. *University of Birmingham, July*.
- Eisenring, M. A. A., & Margana. (2018). An Analysis Of Teacher Talk In A Senior High School In Palu , Central Sulawesi Through The Use Of Self-Evaluation Of Teacher Talk (SETT). *Journal Pendidikan Humaniora*, 6(4), 188–200.
- Fitriansyah, F. (2022). Dinamika Pembelajaran Tatap Muka Terbatas Di Kalangan Mahasiswa. *Prima Magistra: Jurnal Ilmiah Kependidikan*, 3(1), 123–130. <https://doi.org/10.37478/jpm.v3i1.1438>
- habibi et al. (2020). Turn Taking in Mata Najwa Talk Show “Ragu-Ragu Perpu” Episode: A Conversational Analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics Research*, 2(1), 80–96. <https://doi.org/10.18326/jopr.v2i1.80-96>
- Hamid, R., SENTRYO, I., & HASAN, S. (2020). Online Learning And Its Problems In The Covid-19 Emergency Period. *Jurnal Prima Edukasia*, 8(1), 86–95. <https://doi.org/10.21831/jpe.v8i1.32165>
- Hatch, J. A. (2002). *Doing Qualitative Research in Education Setting*. State Of University Of New York Press. <https://epdf.pub/zdownload/doing-qualitative-research-in-education->

settings.html?ckey=871b6dcc7eeb5d2757d443da46dfa607

- Hutchby, I. (2019). Conversation Analysis. *Pragmatics of Discourse, September*, 97–124. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315750583-3>
- Iswara, J. W., Rukmini, D., & Widhiyanto, W. (2019). The Adjacency Pair Patterns In Spoken Interaction Of Roundtable Discussion With Susi Pudjiastuti. *English Education Journal*, 9(3), 297–299. <http://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/eej>
- Liu, L. (2017). Application Of Cooperative Principle And Politeness Principle In Class Question-Answer Process. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 7(7), 563. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0707.10>
- McCarthy, M. (1991). Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers. In *Cambridge University Press* (Vol. 8, Issue 1). Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1177/026565909200800108>
- Monica Roliani, C., Asi, N., & Arina Luardini, M. (2019). Discourse Analysis of Teacher’S Spoken Language in English Class of Smpn 16 Palangka Raya. *Maria Arina Luardini Journal Compound*, 7(2), 12–23. <https://e-journal.uprac.id/index.php/JCP/article/download/632/535/1148>
- Nicholson, S. J. (2014). An Impetus for Change: Classroom Analysis Using Sinclair and Coulthard’s Model of Spoken Discourse. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 6(2), 188. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v6i2.5464>
- Nunan, D. (2001). Teaching English To Speakers Of Other Languages. In *Over The Rim*. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt46nrzt.12>
- Paltridge, B. (2006). *An Introduction Discourse Analysis*. The Cambridge Handbook of English Corpus Linguistics. University of London. <https://doi.org/10.1007/9781139764377.013>
- Rahmi, A., Amri, Z., & Narius, D. (2018). An Analysis of IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback) in Interaction Between Teacher and Students in English Class at SMA Negeri 2 Padang Panjang. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 7(3), 414–425. <http://ejournal.unp.ac.id/index.php/jelt/article/view/100824/100306>
- Raine, P. (2010). *An Application of the Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) Method of Discourse Analysis. September*, 110–138.
- RI, K. (2021). *Update Situasi Terkini Perkembangan #COVID19 Di Indonesia*.

- https://twitter.com/KemenkesRI/status/1460570869831405571?ref_src=twsrc%5Egoogle%7Ctwcamp%5Eserp%7Ctwgr%5Etweet
- Richards, Jack C., & Lockhart, C. (1995). Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classrooms. In Jack C. Richards (Ed.), *The Modern Language Journal* (Vol. 79, Issue 1). Cambridge Language Education. <https://doi.org/10.2307/329404>
- Searle, J. R. (1979). *Studies In The Theory Of Speech Acts*. In Cambridge University Press. <http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=dhf27-nv7pkC&oi=fnd&pg=PR6&dq=EXPRESSION+AND+MEANING+Studies+in+the+Theory+of+Speech+Acts&ots=ywgN2W3dyC&sig=1Xq8EaJkLA3eobqEjCxouyzVrk>
- Sugiyono. (2013). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan Tindakan*. Penerbit Alfabeta, Bandung. www.cvalfabeta.com.
- Susiyanti, D. (2019). *Teachers' Difficulties In Teaching English As A Foreign Language At Smk Muhammadiyah 3 Makassar*. https://digilibadmin.unismuh.ac.id/upload/5900-Full_Text.pdf
- Suter, C. (2001). Exploring Teachers' Questions and Feedback. *Assessment, Module One*(January), 0-14.
- Syahrial, M. (2022). *Puncak Kasus Covid-19 Varian Omicron Menurut Prediksi Kemenkes*. Tanggal 12 Februari 2022. Kompas.Com. <https://www.kompas.com/wiken/read/2022/02/12/190000281/puncak-kasus-covid-19-varian-omicron-menurut-prediksi-kemenkes>
- UNESCO. (2020). *Education: From School Closure to Recovery*. Unesco.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. New York. Oxford University Press.