Interactional Patterns in ESP Online Teaching Mode at the Fifth Semester of English Education Study Program of Universitas Negeri Medan

Siti Aisah Ginting[1], Nora Ronita Dewi[2]
[1,2]Universitas Negeri Medan, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
	This research aims to identify interactional patterns in the ESP online teaching mode of the fifth semester of the English Department at Universitas Negeri Medan. This research applies descriptive quantitative methodology and focuses on class A of the English Department's fifth semester, which consisted of 36 students and one lecturer who taught online utilizing Google Meet as the platform. This study's data consisted of three audiovisual recordings made by the lecturer. The data were recognized using the IRF pattern of interaction identification table and analyzed using the IRF model. The first discovery revealed that the most frequently used pattern by the lecturer is IRF as a full pattern, followed by IR as a semi-complete pattern and IF as an incomplete pattern. The second finding revealed that elicitation occurs more frequently in classroom interactions. It is possible to infer that this classroom had a high level of interaction since the lecturer provided equal opportunities for students to begin the conversation, resulting in active student participation.

Corresponding Author: Nora Ronita Dewi, English Education Study Program, Universitas Negeri Medan Jalan Willem Iskandar, Pasar V, Medan Estate, Percut Sei. Tuan, Deli Serdang, Sumatera Utara 20221 Tel. (+62 81265949456. E-mail: noradewi@unimed.ac.id

1. Introduction

Interactions in the classroom have been thoroughly studied during the past several decades. Teachers play a fundamental and crucial role in the development of students' knowledge, skills, competencies, and personalities. In addition, positive interactions between teachers and students in the classroom may be essential for providing students with the necessary supports, such as encouragement, inspiration, optimism, and respect, to perform their best. In general, classroom interaction refers to a situation in which two or more individuals speak or react with one another in the classroom. Allwright and Bailey (1991) characterized classroom interaction as "input, practice opportunities, and receptivity" (p.25). Therefore, engagement in the classroom is essential for the teaching and learning process. Teachers must be adaptable and permit student-to-student and student-to-teacher connections.

Also, Walsh (2011) claimed that interaction is crucial to the teaching and learning process, group management, and task and activity organization. This indicates that classroom contact is crucial and a determining factor for teaching and learning effectiveness. Moreover, Rukmana, Yufrizal, and Hasan (2014) demonstrated that students with positive teacher-student interactions acquire more knowledge than those with negative classroom interactions. According to Malamah and Thomas (1987), there are four types of interactions in the classroom: teacher-entire class, teacher-individual student, individual student-teacher, and individual student-individual student. Consequently, the focus of this study was on interactional patterns, particularly teacher-student and student-student interaction. There are several models for interactional patterns, IRF being one of them. Walsh

(2006), cited in Afriyanto, Harahap, and Azwandi (2017), argue that Sinclair and Coulthard's IRF model, developed in 1975, is the most ideal among the others.

However, this type of study is only conducted in the classroom by lecturer and student. Moreover, it is uncommon to discover this research in the context of online education. One research, conducted by Harahap and Emzir (2015), evaluated high school classroom conversation. They determined that no full IRF patterns existed. In the classroom, only IF patterns were seen. In addition, they demonstrated that the teacher's speech was the most prevalent in the classroom dialogue.

Due of the Covid-19 epidemic, all schools and colleges in Indonesia are currently shuttered and have transitioned to online study. Online learning is often a teaching and learning process that occurs through the internet. There are several platforms utilized in online education. They may originate from synchronous platforms, such as Zoom, Google Meet, Skype, etc or asynchronous social media platforms, such as WhatsApp, Moodle, Edmodo, and Google Classroom.

The majority of research on interactional patterns was conducted in traditional classroom settings. In contrast to prior studies, the current research examined the pattern of interactions between lecturer and students in online teaching mode to compare offline and online modes. This research was necessary in order to have a clear understanding of the pattern of interactions between lecturer and students in online instruction.

In this study, the researcher selected 36 students from the English department of class A, fifth semester, who have been taking all of their courses online. However, just one course utilized the synchronous online platform, i.e ESP Class consistently for student instruction. Because they had been using Zoom actively for around four months, they decided to enroll in this course. Additionally, it was due to the ease with which the data could be obtained, as the researcher comes from the same major. Therefore, the researcher investigated the patterns of lecturer-student interactions that happened via Zoom during online instruction.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Classroom Discourse

The key to fostering effective classroom communication is classroom discourse. In addition to focusing on language in terms of words, sentences, and phrases, classroom discourse also relates to the language's context Cazden (2001), and the relationship between linguistics and non-linguistics is described by how language functions and language style are combined in specific situations Paltridge (2006). Pragmatics examines not just the meanings of morphemes, words, phrases, and sentences, but also the context in which utterances are utilized. In addition, we are aware that pragmatics has been addressed by linguists and employed in spoken or written speech Yule (1996). According to Cutting (2002), pragmatic ideas include context, co-text analysis, and dialogue analysis.

2.2 Interactional Patterns

Interactional patterns include instructor initiations, student answers, and teacher feedback. According to Dayag, et al. (2008), initiation is the teacher asking a question or taking an action to commence student engagement in the classroom, whereas reaction is the instructor initiating in response to a participant's initiation move. In addition, they assert that feedback concludes the cycle by bringing an end to the initiation and reaction. Sinclair & Coulthard (1992) classify the initiation move as elicitation, direction, and information, the response move as respond, react, and acknowledge, and the feedback move as accept, assess, and remark.

There are various models of interactional patterns, including IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback) by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975), Foreign Language Interaction (FLINT) by Moskowitz (1971), Flander's Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC) by Flanders (1970), and Brown's Interaction Analysis System (BIAS) by Brown (1975), among others. However, several researches asserted that the IRF pattern is the optimal interaction pattern.

2.3 IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback) by Sinclair and Coulthard

This study focuses on Sinclair and Coulthard's interactional pattern models related to the complete phase from lecturer initiation to student response. Sinclair and Coulthard created classroom discourse analysis in 1975 using the IRF (initiation – response – feedback) Pattern (Coulthard, 1992). This idea addresses the communicative reactions of students, depending of whether the engagement focuses on the instructor or the students (Cockayne, 2010). IRF (Initiation - Response - Feedback) is a pattern of teacher-student interaction described by Sinclair and Coulthard in their theory. Interaction in the classroom must correspond to a pattern since it aids the instructor in soliciting student replies and assessing classroom activity (McCarthy, 1991). The teacher initiates pupils to create excitement and motivate them to be active. After that, students react to the

teacher's questions, and the last teacher provides comments (Coulthard, 1992).

2.4 The Nature of English for Specific Purposes

The emphasis is on "Specific English" that belongs to any particular discipline, occupation, or activity in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) (Javid, 2015). English for Specific Purposes (ESP) has grown in popularity over the last three decades (Ramirez, 2015).

As a learner-centered approach, its primary goal has been to meet the specific needs of target learners in order to meet their professional or vocational demands. According to Hutchinson and Waters (1987), in the English for Specific Purposes (ESP) context, the outcomes of historical occurrences resulted from a number of people around the world who wanted to learn the English language due to its importance in the fields of science, technology, and commerce. The English for Specific Purposes (ESP) teaching movement arose as a result of learners' English language needs for specific purposes related to their professions or job descriptions. According to Howatt (1984), ESP has become a vital and innovative activity within the organization since its inception in the 1960s.

According to Hutchinson and Waters (1987), ESP is a method of language learning that is based on the needs of the learners. It demonstrates that ESP does not involve a specific type of language, teaching material, or methodology," but they suggest that the foundation of ESP involves the learners, the language required, and the learning contexts, all of which are based on the primacy of need in English for Specific Purposes (ESP).

3. Method

The study used a descriptive quantitative methodology. This study included both descriptive and quantitative data. The descriptive quantitative technique is appropriate for this study because it seeks to explain the patterns of interactions between lecturer and students during the synchronous online teaching mode at the English Department of the State University of Medan's fifth-semester students. According to the IRF model pattern of interactions, the researcher analyzed the actions, movements, and exchanges that happened in the interactions between lecturer and student.

One teacher and thirty-six students in class A of the fifth-semester students of the English Department at the State University of Medan who utilized Zoom were the subjects of this study. The primary data consisted of three audiovisual recordings of the online lesson taught by the lecturer in class A of fifth-semester students synchronously through Google Meet on November 15, 23, and 29, 2022. The identification table of IRF interaction pattern served as the primary instrument for this study. In this instance, the researcher modified the table based on Coulthard's (2002) idea as follows:

Table 1. *The Identification Table of IRF Pattern of Interaction from Coulthard's Theory (2002).*

No	Subject	Utterances	IRF Move	Act	Exchange
1.					
2.					
etc.					

The processes of data collection were recording the class by the researcher to obtain the audiovisual records of fifth-semester students in class A via Google Meet for three meetings. Utilizing the Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback) model, the researcher investigated the patterns of interactions between the lecturer and the students in synchronous online teaching mode using Google Meet. Transcribing the data, coding the data, identifying the data, classifying the data, calculating the data, interpreting the data, and drawing a conclusion were all steps in the data analysis process.

4. Results and Discussion

After reviewing the data, the researcher discovered many patterns of interaction. There were patterns of IRF, IR, and IF. Below is a table detailing the frequency of each pattern in class A's synchronous online instruction mode.

Table 2. *Interactional Patterns*

Interactional Patterns	Frequency	Percentage
IRF (Complete Pattern)	77	37,6
IR (Semi Complete Pattern)	71	34,6
IF (Incomplete Pattern)	57	27,8
Total	205	100

According to Table 2, there were three primary interactional patterns observed in Class A's synchronous online teaching style. The pattern with the most occurrences, with a total of 77 instances, is the entire IRF pattern (37.5%). This pattern is a full pattern since it corresponds to the IRF model, which consists of complete steps such as initiation, response, and feedback.

In the previously described synchronous online teaching mode for class A interactional patterns, the researcher identified a number of acts in every move. There are evocation, Instructive, and directive starting moves. The response move includes response, react, and admit. The final step of feedback consists of receive, assess, and remark. The study discovered that initiation moves were made by both the instructor and the students. The act of elicitation happened most frequently among the starting moves. The acts contained in initiating motions are listed below.

Table 3. Acts in Initiation Moves

Acts	Frequency	Percentage
Evocation	174	44,6
Instructive	147	37,7
Directive	69	17,7
Total	390	100

The response moves included a reply, a react, and an acknowledgement. The most common occurrence was a reply. The following table displays the frequency of each act in reaction moves.

Table 4. Acts in Response Moves

Acts	Frequency	Percentage
Response	164	73,5
React	30	13,5
Admit	29	13
Total	223	100

Accept, evaluate, and comment were the three components of feedback movements. In these movements, the accept act happened most frequently. The following table depicts the frequency of feedback move acts.

Table 5. Acts in Feedback Moves

Acts	Frequency	Percentage
Receive	95	68,9
Assess	21	15,2
Remark	22	15,9
Total	138	100

According to the findings of Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) research of interactional patterns using the IRF model, the IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback) pattern was the most prevalent classroom interactional pattern in synchronous online teaching mode in class A through Google Meet. This pattern is comprehensive and excellent since it consists of three steps identical to the Sinclair and Coulthard IRF model (1975). According to the researcher's data, this is the most prevalent pattern, maybe because the lecturer maintained the same method of instruction in online class. It was evident since the instructor still provided pupils with instruction and comments. In addition, students participated actively in classroom engagement by responding to and initiating conversations with the lecturer.

This finding is consistent with that of Afriyanto et al (2017). They discovered that the interaction in the classroom was dominated by the IRF pattern. They speculate that this could be because the instructor sought to make it easier for the students to follow the course by providing more IRF pattern initiation. It presumably suggests that by implementing the IRF pattern in classroom interaction, the teachers may be able to provide the pupils the opportunity to participate.

This study's findings contradict those of Harahap and Emzir (2015). They discovered that the Jakarta high school teacher did not employ the IRF pattern in the classroom. They discovered that the most common pattern was the IF (Initiation-Feedback) pattern, in which the teacher controlled the entire classroom interactions, during their investigation. This meant that the instructor did not allow the student to respond, instead initiating dialogue and making comments. The fact that the teacher dominated the classroom interaction in that class

suggests that it did not function effectively. According to Harmer (1998), in order to improve student performance, there should be a balance between instructor and student engagement. As a result, interaction in the classroom should be encouraged.

In addition, Havwini (2019) discovered that the teacher did not use an organized IRF pattern. In addition, this study indicated that the instructor dominated the beginning in Taiwanese EFL virtual classrooms. However, this study revealed that students started contact with the teacher and other classmates as well. Even in the virtual classroom, the teacher encouraged students to contribute their thoughts, feelings, and personal experiences.

This research discovered that the lecturer utilized the introductory phrase most frequently. In this synchronous online session, students were also able to offer their thoughts and opinions on the issue under discussion. It might be claimed that both student and teacher can initiate a discussion. Multiple interactional patterns also emerged as a result of student initiative, as demonstrated by the findings. This might be due to the fact that this is a discussion-style class in which students present and discuss a topic. In three synchronous online class meetings, there was always a presentation followed by a question and answer session. The students may direct the conversation and ask questions or voice their thoughts freely. The teacher did not always start engagement with the students, but he consistently responded to those who did.

Moreover, the topic of the classroom might influence the nature of classroom interaction. Since the fifth-semester subject of class A was an English discussion, the classroom interactions evolved into an interactive class. Rustandi and Mubarok (2017) discovered that student responses dominated classroom engagement. In the IRF pattern, they discovered that pupils were more responsive to the teacher. This occurred as a result of a group conversation in speaking class. Consequently, the current findings indicate that the content of the class may be affected by the interactions between the lecturer and students.

In contrast, it was discovered that the lecturer maintained influence over the students. On the IF pattern, the lecturer provided feedback even though the initiative came from the students. Typically, students initiate discussions by asking questions or expressing their opinions, and the lecturer then provides comments. It signifies that the instructor desired for the students to continue speaking and engage in classroom engagement. Consequently, it is likely that both the lecturer and the students have equal opportunities to communicate with one another during classroom interaction.

Similar to Nikula's (2007) conclusion that there is no true organized IRF pattern that might lead to teacher domination in the classroom. It might be inferred that under the IRF pattern, instructor and student interaction opportunities are equivalent. The instructor may not always be the dominating participant in classroom interactions. While it is likely that students can interact actively and dominantly with the teacher in the classroom.

Moreover, according to Saikko's (2007) research, students can develop their institutional authority through the IRF pattern. According to this study, students were able to prolong the IRF pattern after the feedback turn and even alter the IRF pattern's structure. Therefore, the engagement is more likely to resemble a conversation than a question-and-answer format. In the current study, the researcher was able to identify this pattern, even if it was not totally representative of the interactional pattern of classroom interaction. Perhaps this is due to the physical layout of the classroom. The interaction in the classroom may rely on the scenario established by the instructor or lecturer in relation to the particular subject being taught.

However, the study also noticed that the period of one IRF pattern to another IRF pattern happened in the classroom interaction was fairly considerable. It could be inferred that the period between occurrences of IRF patterns was extensive, spanning numerous interaction cycles. This may be due to the discovery of other patterns, such as IR and IF patterns. After the occurrence of the IRF pattern, the researcher discovered that subsequent initiations did not occur for some time. It probably occurred because this class was a discussion class, in which students and instructor may engage in lengthy conversations on a topic or question. This conclusion suggests that even though this class followed the IRF pattern based on the theory of Sinclair and Coulthard (1975), it cannot be said that this class was dominated by IRF patterns since the period of occurrence of the IRF pattern in the interaction was fairly lengthy.

The second result of this research was that the act of elicitation occurred most frequently in ESP class A classroom interactions. Either the instructor or the students initiated the act of elicitation. The same as the conclusion reached by Havwini (2019), who discovered that the elicitation act was the most prevalent in teacher and student initiation. Since the new study is identical to the prior one, it can be concluded that elicitation is necessary in the online classroom. It was necessary for the lecturer to obtain information from students, as the teacher is rarely aware of the students' presence. Therefore, the lecturer was frequently required to assess the

students' comprehension of the course, the class environment, the students' presence, and their relationship to the platform being utilized.

Moreover, the students' initiation often consisted of posing a question that was also integral to the process of elicitation. This is likely impacted by the participation of the students in the classroom discussion interaction. The students' participation in the classroom interaction during the discussion class may suggest that the engagement in this classroom was positive. In addition, the researcher discovered that elicitation activities typically took the form of referential questions. It was evident from the questions posed by the lecturer that he lacked knowledge of the subject matter. The majority of the lecturer's inquiries were on the students' perspectives on the issue under discussion. This type of inquiry typically elicits lengthy responses from students. As this was a discussion-based course, the instructor regularly employed referential questions in elicitation actions.

However, the researcher also discovered that just a few students were engaged in the classroom when it came to student initiation, particularly elicitation. Due to the online nature of this course, the researcher was unable to definitively explain the specific reasons for her conclusion based on her data. There were several difficulties that occurred during the course. Due to the online format, the instructor could not ensure that each student participated in the classroom discussion.

5. Conclusion

From the study, it was possible to determine that the lecturer's interactional patterns corresponded to Sinclair and Coulthard's ideal pattern (1975). Furthermore, it was possible to infer that the classroom interaction in this online course was a good interaction since the lecturer followed the ideal pattern of interaction and exhibited the characteristics of a good classroom interaction. Based on the above result, it is proposed that lecturers in the English Education Study Program should evaluate the interactional patterns they deploy in the classroom, since this can have an effect on students' language acquisition. In addition, since this study is limited to synchronous online platforms with limited data, future researchers could conduct similar research with asynchronous or synchronous platforms and a larger sample, as well as conduct interviews with the sample, so as to strengthen the findings of this type of study.

References

Afriyanto, H., Harahap. A., Azwandi, A. (2017). *An analysis of interactional pattern between teacher and student in SMAN 1 Curup Kota*. JOALL: Journal of Applied Linguistic and Literature. 3(1), 25. https://doi.org/10.33369/joall.v3i1.6538.

Allwright, D., & Bailey, M. (1991). *Focus on the language classroom: An introduction to classroom research for language teachers.* Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, G. (1975). *Microteaching.* London, UK: Methuem

Cazden, courtney B. (2001). *Classroom Discourse : The Language Of Teaching And Learning*. 2nd Ed . Oxford, England .Library Of Congress Cataloging In Publication Data.

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

Dayag, D.T., Gustilo, L. E., Flores, E.G., Borlongan, A. M., & Carreon, M. C. (2008). C*lassroom discourse in selected philippine primary schools*. British Council. doi: https://doi.org/10.12669/pjms.36.COVID19-S4.2785.

Flanders, N. (1970). *Analyzing Teacher Behavior*. New York, NY: Addison-Wesley.

Harahap, A. & Emzir, (2015). Teacher-students discourse in English teaching at high school (classroom discourse analysis). *International Journal of Language Education and Culture Review*. 1 (2), 11 – 26.https://doi.org/10.21009/IJLECR.012.012

Havwini, Tian. (2019). Investigating the Interaction Patterns in EFL Virtual Classroom: A Case Study. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, Atlantis Press.* 377 (2). 25.

Howatt A. P. R. (1984). A History of English Language Teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Hutchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1987). English for Specific Purposes: A Learning Centered Approach. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Javid, Choudary. Z. (2013). English for Specific Purposes : Its Definition , Characteristics , Scope and Purpose. European Journal of Scientific Research, 112(1), 138–151.

Malamah & Thomas, A. (1987). *Classroom Interaction.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press

Moskowitz, G. (1971). *Interaction analysis: A new modern language for supervisors.* In: Brown (2001). *Teaching by Principles: an Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy* (2nd edition). New York, NY: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.

Nikula, T. (2007). The IRF pattern and space for interaction comparing CLIL and EFL classroom. In C. Dalton-Puffer and U. Smit (eds.), *Empirical perspective on CLIL classroom discourse.* Frankfurt, DEU: Peter Lang. 179-204.

Paltridge, B. (2006). *An Introduction Discourse Analysis.* The Cambridge Handbook of English Corpus Linguistics. University of London. https://doi.org/10.1007/9781139764377.013

Ramirez, C. G. (2015). English for Specific Purposes: Brief History and Definitions. Revista de Lenguas Modernas, 23, 379-386.

Rukmana, E., Yufrizal, H., & Hasan, H., (2014). Analysis of classroom interaction in the implementation of 2013 curriculum in SMAN. *U-JET.* 3(2). 1-10. http://jurnal.fkip.unila.ac.id/index.php/123/article/view/4103

Rustandi, A. & Mubarok, A. H. (2017). Analysis of IRF (initiation-response-feedback) on classroom interaction in EFL speaking class. *Edulite*: *Journal of English Education, Literature, and Culture.* 2(1), 239-250. http://dx.doi.org/10.30659/e.2.1.239-250

Saikko, V. (2007). *Different student-strategies for interactional power in the IRF pattern in an EFL classroom.* A pro Gradu Thesis. Department of Languages: University of Jyvaskyla.

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

Sinclair, J., and Coulthard, M. (1992). *Advances in spoken discourse Analysis*. London and New York, UK & NY: Routledge.

Walsh, Steve (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse.* UK: University of Nottingham

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. New york, NY: Oxford University Press.

The Authors:

Siti Aisah Ginting (https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5005-0493), a professor at English Language and Literature Department, Faculty of Languages and Arts, Universitas Negeri Medan, Indonesia. Her research interests are Language Teaching, Classroom Discourse Analysis, Systemic Functional Linguistics, Research Methodology. Email: aisah_ginting@yahoo.co.id

Nora Ronita Dewi (https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8774-3779), a lecturer at the English Language and Literature Department, Faculty of Languages and Arts, Universitas Negeri Medan, Indonesia. Her research interests include Language Teaching, ESP, Curriculum Development, Language Testing, Evaluation, Assessment, and Applied Linguistics. Email: noradewi@unimed.ac.id