Journal of Authentic Research
https://journal-center.litpam.com/index.php/jar/index

November 2026 Vol. 5 , No. 4
e-ISSN: 2828-3724
pp. 7723-7737

An Analysis of IRF Patterns in Teacher-Student Interaction in an EFL Classroom at SMKN 3 Mataram

[1*] Pradana, [2] Sudirman Wilian, [3] Desi Herayana

[1,2,3] English Education Program, Language and Arts Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, University of Mataram , Indonesia

*Corresponding Author e-mail: pradanasangar@gmail.com

Received: September 2026; Revised: October 2026; Published: November 2026

Abst ract

This study analyzed Initiation–Response–Feedback (IRF) patterns in teacher–student interaction in an EFL classroom at SMKN 3 Mataram. It aimed to identify the IRF patterns that occurred, investigate the factors shaping the teacher's use of these patterns, and examine how the patterns created or limited students' opportunities to participate and produce English. Using a qualitative classroom discourse analysis design, data were collected through four classroom observations and semi-structured interviews with one English teacher and five eleventh-grade Electrical Power Installation Engineering (TITL) students. Data were analyzed following Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña and coded using the IRF framework of Sinclair and Coulthard and Walsh. Of 109 codable teacher–student sequences, 79 were complete three-part IRF exchanges and 30 were incomplete I–R sequences because the Feedback move could not be reliably identified. Initiation was dominated by display questions (103 of 109), and student responses were overwhelmingly minimal (99 of 109). Among the 79 complete sequences, Feedback was divided between evaluative (42) and elaborative (37) types. The teacher's use of these patterns was shaped by student characteristics and classroom conditions, the degree of question preparation, time and class-size constraints, students' English proficiency, and curriculum demands. Most interviewed students preferred questions with a single correct answer and felt more anxious answering in front of the whole class, while the teacher's elaborative feedback was the point at which extended student responses were most likely to develop. These findings suggest that students' opportunities for extended language production depend not only on the type of question asked but also on how feedback is delivered and on students' confidence in the classroom. The study addresses a gap in IRF research, which has mainly examined general secondary schools, elementary classrooms, universities, or online settings and has rarely explained why teachers use particular IRF patterns or how those patterns shape English production in Indonesian vocational high schools.

Keywords : Classroom Discourse Analysis, IRF Pattern, Teacher-Student Interaction, EFL Classroom, Vocational High School.

How to Cite: Pradana, Wilian, S., & Herayana, D. (2026). An Analysis of IRF Patterns in Teacher-Student Interaction in an EFL Classroom at SMKN 3 Mataram. *Journal of Authentic Research , 5*(4), 7723–7737.https://doi.org/10.36312/jar.v5i4.7188

https://doi.org/10.36312/jar.v5i4.7188

Copyright © 2026, Pradana et al.
This is an open-access article under the CC-BY-SA License .

INTRODUCTION

Interaction plays a central role in language learning, especially in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms, where the quality of communication between teachers and students directly shapes how well students can learn and use the target language. Vygotsky (1978) argued that learning is fundamentally a social process that takes place through communication, and Long (1996) emphasized through his Interaction Hypothesis that learners who interact and negotiate meaning are more

likely to develop their language skills. Where students have limited exposure to English outside school, the classroom becomes the primary and often the only place in which they can practice and develop their English (Harmer, 2007). The quality of classroom interaction in EFL settings is therefore not simply a matter of teaching preference but a basic requirement for effective language learning.

However, research has consistently shown that EFL classroom interaction tends to be dominated by the teacher. Walsh (2011) argues that teachers' language choices are never neutral: every decision a teacher makes in managing classroom talk determines how much space students have to participate, negotiate meaning, and develop communicative competence. When teacher talk dominates, students are placed in the role of passive recipients rather than active language users. This pattern has been widely reported in Indonesian EFL classrooms, where teacher talk often takes up most of the classroom communication and reduces the space for meaningful student participation (Abdusyukur, 2022; Nursehag et al., 2024).

The problem becomes even more significant in Indonesian vocational high schools (SMK), where English is not only a school subject but also a practical tool connected to students' future working lives. At SMKN 3 Mataram, for example, students in technical programs need English to read technical manuals, follow instructions, and communicate in workplace settings. Despite this need, EFL interaction in SMK classrooms is still largely controlled by the teacher, and students are rarely given the chance to participate actively in classroom discourse (Putri et al., 2024). Research in the local Mataram context also indicates that managing classroom interaction and encouraging active student participation are among the main challenges faced by English teachers (Insani et al., 2024).

In this study, the IRF pattern is defined as the three-move structural pattern of classroom discourse consisting of teacher initiation, student response, and teacher feedback (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975; Walsh, 2011). Classroom Interactional Competence is defined as the teacher's ability to use classroom interaction strategically so that students' participation and language production can be expanded or constrained in line with lesson goals (Walsh, 2011). Vocational high school is defined as a secondary school that combines general subjects with vocational competence and requires English learning connected to workplace needs (Sujana et al., 2024).

A particularly useful framework for examining this problem is the Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) model developed by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975). The model describes the most common structural pattern of classroom discourse: the teacher opens an exchange, usually with a question; a student responds; and the teacher then gives feedback or an evaluation. Although the IRF pattern has been recognized as a basic organizational feature of classroom talk in many educational contexts (Mehan, 1979; Wells, 1993), its value as a teaching tool is debated. Walsh (2011) argues that IRF can either limit or expand students' language use depending on how the teacher applies it. Applied rigidly, it tends to produce display questions and minimal student output; applied flexibly, with open-ended questions, extended feedback, and scaffolding, it can create real opportunities for language development (Walsh, 2011; Wells, 1993).

Several recent studies have examined IRF and related patterns in Indonesian settings. Kartini et al. (2022) found that elicitation was the dominant initiation move

in a university EFL classroom and that the structure of teacher moves often limited the depth of student responses. Nursehag et al. (2024) reported that teacher talk accounted for 74.4% of classroom communication in a secondary EFL classroom, with heavy reliance on display questions contributing to minimal and formulaic student responses. Hasanah et al. (2024), who applied the Sinclair and Coulthard model to a sixth-grade English class, found that IRF structured communication was effective but that student responses were frequent repetition rather than evidence of comprehension. Wati et al. (2025) showed that offline university classes produced more varied and extended IRF sequences than online ones, and Zulfah et al. (2025) showed that IRF can reinforce power asymmetry between tutors and students while variations in feedback can open the exchange to more balanced interaction.

Although these studies provide important insights, most were conducted in general secondary schools, elementary classrooms, universities, or online settings. None of the reviewed studies investigated how IRF patterns operate in an Indonesian vocational high school, and they tended to describe the occurrence of IRF patterns without examining why the teacher used them or how they created or limited students' opportunities to produce English. The gap addressed in this study is therefore the limited IRF research in Indonesian vocational schools that not only describes structural patterns but also explains why the teacher uses those patterns and how they affect students' opportunities to produce English. The novelty of the study lies in combining a structural analysis of all three IRF moves with the teacher's and students' accounts in a vocational context that has received little attention in the IRF literature. Specifically, this study aims (1) to identify the IRF patterns that occur in an EFL classroom, (2) to investigate the factors that shape the teacher's use of these patterns, and (3) to examine how the observed patterns create or limit students' opportunities to participate and produce English.

METHODS

This study employed a qualitative approach with a classroom discourse analysis design. Qualitative research seeks to understand and interpret social phenomena in their natural settings, focusing on meaning, context, and process rather than numerical measurement (Creswell, 2014). Classroom discourse analysis goes beyond recording what is said in the classroom to analyzing the communicative functions and pedagogical implications of language use (Walsh, 2011). This design suited the study because its primary data were the verbal exchanges between teacher and students, and because it allowed the IRF moves to be identified, described, and interpreted systematically.

Research Setting and Participants

The study was conducted at SMKN 3 Mataram, a state vocational high school in Mataram, West Nusa Tenggara, which offers programs such as Motorcycle Engineering, Mechanical Engineering, Electrical Engineering, Computer and Network Engineering, and Geomatics Engineering, with English taught as a compulsory subject in all programs. The study was conducted during the first semester of the 2025/2026 academic year over approximately three weeks. The participants were one English teacher and one intact class of eleventh-grade students (class XI Teknik Instalasi Tenaga Listrik, TITL) in the academic year 2025/2026, selected through purposive

sampling (Creswell, 2014). The class consisted of approximately 34–35 students of varying English proficiency. The teacher was selected because she was actively teaching English at the school, had at least three years of EFL teaching experience, regularly engaged in verbal interaction with students, and was willing to be observed and interviewed. Five students were selected purposively to include both more active and less active participants, based on the teacher's nomination and classroom observation; the criteria were frequency of voluntary participation and willingness to be interviewed. All five students and the teacher provided informed consent.

Data Collection

Data were collected through classroom observation and semi-structured interviews, which complement each other and support triangulation (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The researcher acted as a non-participant observer in four lessons, each covering one full English lesson over approximately three weeks. An observation checklist guided attention to the types of questions in the Initiation move, the nature of student responses, and the form and function of teacher feedback, and field notes captured contextual information. Each lesson was audio-visually recorded and transcribed.

After the observation, semi-structured interviews were conducted with the teacher and the five students. This format allows pre-determined questions while giving participants freedom to elaborate (Merriam, 2009). The teacher interview covered her awareness of IRF patterns, the factors influencing her interactional choices, and her views on how IRF affects students' language development. The student interviews explored how students felt about being questioned, their comfort in answering in English, the types of questions they preferred, and their perceptions of the teacher's feedback. Interviews were audio-recorded with consent and conducted in English or Indonesian according to participants' preference.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using the interactive model of Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña (2014), consisting of data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing and verification. Recordings and interviews were transcribed in full and condensed by removing repetitions, fillers, and unintelligible segments. Teacher-student exchanges reflecting the three-move IRF structure were segmented and coded using the scheme in Table 1, which draws on Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) and Walsh (2011). Administrative announcements and transitions between activities were excluded. The coded data were displayed as annotated excerpts and frequency tables, and interview data were organized thematically around the factors influencing the teacher's IRF use and the perceived effects of those patterns on students. Findings from the two data sources were cross-referenced, and credibility was supported by observing multiple sessions, member checking, and peer debriefing. Member checking was conducted by sending interview transcripts and summaries of findings to the interviewed teacher and students so that they could confirm whether the researcher's interpretations matched their intended meanings and could correct or clarify any inaccurate points. Peer debriefing was conducted through discussions with supervisors and colleagues familiar with classroom discourse analysis to review the coding process, IRF categories, and data interpretations, so that analytical decisions did not depend on a single researcher.

Table 1. IRF Coding Scheme for Analyzing Teacher-Student Interaction

IRF Move	Category	Indicator
Initiation	Display question	Teacher asks a question with a known answer to check students' knowledge or comprehension.
Initiation	Referential question	Teacher asks for students' opinion, explanation, or personal response to which there is no single correct answer.
Response	Minimal response	Student gives a one-word or short-phrase answer with little or no elaboration.
Response	Extended response	Student gives a longer answer with explanation, reasoning, or elaboration.
Feedback	Evaluative feedback	Teacher responds with a simple judgment such as *correct* , *good* , *wrong* , *yes* , or *no* without extending the interaction.
Feedback	Elaborative feedback	Teacher asks a follow-up question, expands on the student's answer, or prompts further clarification to extend the interaction.

Ethical principles were followed throughout. Informed consent was obtained from the teacher, the students, and, where necessary, their parents or guardians, and formal permission was obtained from the school. Recordings were stored on a password-protected device accessible only to the researcher, and the names of all participants were anonymized using codes or pseudonyms.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

IRF Patterns in the EFL Classroom

The four observations yielded 109 codable teacher–student sequences (24, 29, 29, and 27 on Days 1–4, respectively). Of these, 79 were complete three-part exchanges in which the Initiation, Response, and Feedback moves were all identifiable, and 30 were Initiation–Response pairs only because the Feedback move could not be reliably identified. A sequence was coded as complete when the teacher's verbal reaction to the student's response could be clearly identified in the recording and occurred before the next Initiation began. A sequence was coded as incomplete when the Feedback move could not be reliably identified, for example because the teacher moved directly to the next question, several students answered at once, or the teacher's reaction was non-verbal or unintelligible. Incomplete sequences were retained because their Initiation and Response moves remain analytically meaningful, but they are reported separately.

A sequence was coded as complete when the teacher's verbal reaction to the student's response could be clearly identified in the recording and occurred before the next initiation began. In the observed lessons this mostly happened when students answered individually or on behalf of their group during exercises and games in which answers were scored, so the teacher confirmed, corrected, or expanded each answer before moving on, either with a brief judgment (evaluative) or with a follow-up question or explanation (elaborative). A sequence was coded as incomplete when the Feedback move could not be reliably identified, which occurred in three situations. First, in a rapid question-and-answer series, such as when the teacher showed pictures or asked for vocabulary translations one after another, the teacher moved directly to

the next question without an audible reaction. Second, when several students answered at once, any teacher reaction was not distinguishable from the surrounding classroom talk. Third, some teacher utterances were unintelligible in the recording or were delivered non-verbally, for example through a nod or a gesture, and so could not be transcribed. Incomplete sequences were retained, since their Initiation and Response moves remain analytically meaningful, but they are reported separately (Table 2).

Table 2. Distribution of Codable IRF Sequences Across Observations

Observation	Complete (IRF)	Incomplete (IR only)	Total
Day 1	12	12	24
Day 2	23	6	29
Day 3	24	5	29
Day 4	20	7	27
Total	**79**	**30**	**109**

Table 3 presents one complete and one incomplete sequence from each of the four observations.

Table 3. Examples of Complete and Incomplete IRF Sequences from Each Observation

Day	Type	Initiation (Teacher)	Response (Student)	Feedback (Teacher)
1	Complete	“What does insulation mean?”	“Insulator.”	"Okay."
1	Incomplete	“What does conductor mean? What does conductor mean?”	"Introduction."	[not captured]
2	Complete	"Safety, listen carefully. Listen carefully. I am a tool. I can measure resistance. I am used by electrician. Who am I?"	“Ovometer.”	“Avometer or multimeter? ... That's right, they're the same, a multimeter.”
2	Incomplete	“Okay, group lamp? What does lamp mean?”	"Light."	[not captured]
3	Complete	“Black flexible long electrical cable. What is the correct order?”	“A long flexible electrical cable.”	“Right. So the correct one is a long flexible electrical cable. ...that's the one at the very front, right?”
3	Incomplete	"...does that mean you understand the sequence?"	“Yes.” (several students)	[not captured]
4	Complete	“Lastly, what is the English for butterfly flying high into the clouds?”	“I don’t know.”	“The truth is butterfly flying high up to the clauds.”
4	Incomplete	“Next, why is it called a hollow stone?”	"Because the stone is hollow, ma'am."	[not captured]

Initiation, Response, and Feedback moves

Table 4 summarizes the coded moves. Initiation was dominated by display questions (103 of 109 sequences), while referential questions were rare (6 sequences), and this distribution was consistent across all four observations. Student responses were overwhelmingly minimal (99 of 109 sequences), typically a single word or short phrase, and only 10 responses were extended. Among the 79 complete sequences, Feedback was divided almost evenly between evaluative (42) and elaborative (37) types.

Table 4. Frequency of Initiation, Response, and Feedback Types Across Observations

Day	Display	Referential	Minimum	Extended	Evaluative	Elaborative	Not captured
1	22	2	21	3	5	7	12
2	27	2	24	5	11	12	6
3	28	1	28	1	11	13	5
4	26	1	26	1	15	5	7
Total	**103**	**6**	**99**	**10**	**42**	**37**	**30**

Display questions were most frequent in activities requiring students to recall a specific word, term, or sequence, such as identifying a tool from a riddle (Table 3, Day 2) or ordering adjectives. Referential questions appear mainly when the teacher asks students to reflect on or summarize what they have learned (Excerpt 1). Extended responses occurred mainly after referential or explanation-seeking initiations, where students had to give a reason rather than name an object (Excerpt 2), and were most frequent on Day 2 (5 of 29 sequences) and Day 1 (3 of 24), but almost absent on Day 3 and Day 4 (1 each).

Excerpt 1 (Day 2)

Teacher: "Okay, listen to my question. What did we learn today?"

Student: " Today We work on ... like teamwork, then adjectives."

Excerpt 2 (Day 1)

Teacher: "Please. What is an electrical cable used for?"

Student: " Transmitting Power electricity from One place to " Another place, ma'am ."

Feedback is also varied. Evaluative feedback consists of a brief judgment confirming or rejecting an answer, for example "Very good." Elaborative feedback extends the exchange with explanation, correction, or clarification, as in Excerpt 3, where the teacher did not simply confirm the answer but explained the grammatical reasoning behind it. Day 4 showed the strongest tendency toward evaluative feedback (15 of its 20 complete sequences), whereas Days 2 and 3 showed a nearly equal division between the two types.

Excerpt 3 (Day 2)

Teacher: "Why use 'is'?"

Student: "Because there's only one."

Teacher: "Since there is only one item, in English it's called 'singular.'"

The classroom discourse was organized around a narrow version of the IRF structure: display Initiation, minimal Response, and Feedback that either closed or extended the exchange. This corresponds closely to what Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) describe as the basic exchange structure of classroom discourse. Seen through Walsh's (2011) framework, however, the pairing of display questions with minimal responses indicates an interactional pattern oriented toward accuracy and content coverage rather than extended meaning negotiation, and the present data directly

supports his claim that heavy reliance on display questions and evaluation yields minimal student participation.

The structure was nevertheless not entirely rigid. Referential questions were rare but did occur, and elaborative feedback accounted for a substantial share of the complete sequences (37 of 79). This resembles what Mehan (1979) describes as uptake, where the teacher incorporates the student's contribution into the ongoing discourse instead of simply judging it, and it reflects both the constraining and the enabling sides of IRF noted by Walsh (2011).

These findings are broadly consistent with earlier Indonesian studies. The predominance of display questions and minimal responses parallels the formulaic student responses reported by Nursehag et al. (2024), the repetition-based responses reported by Hasanah et al. (2024), and the limited response depth reported by Kartini et al. (2022). The near-even split between evaluative and elaborative Feedback echoes the duality described by Zulfah et al. (2025), in which feedback variation can open the exchange. The finding also qualifies Wati et al. (2025): although the present classroom was entirely face-to-face, IRF sequences remained predominantly short, suggesting that the offline setting alone does not explain the degree of elaboration, and that other factors specific to the vocational classroom need to be considered. This comparison is indicative rather than conclusive, as the studies differ in level, setting, and method.

Factors Shaping the Teacher's Use of IRF Patterns

The semi-structured interview with the English teacher revealed five interrelated factors that helped explain why her Initiation and Feedback moves took the form described above: student characteristics and classroom conditions, the degree of question preparation, time and class-size constraints, students' English proficiency, and curriculum demand. Viewed through Walsh's (2011) concept of Classroom Interactional Competence, her choices can be understood not as arbitrary habits but as pedagogical decisions made under specific institutional and contextual pressures. Each factor is discussed below in relation to the observational data.

Student characteristics and classroom conditions

The teacher explained that her way of interacting with students was not fixed but adjusted to the character of the class being taught:

"If the way interact with student That depends class . Because of the characteristics student every class different . ... we have to see conditions and characteristics his students moreover formerly ." (Teacher, interview)

She reported that when material was delivered directly through lecturing or a PowerPoint presentation, students tended to lose interest, which led her to use games, challenges, or digital media to keep them engaged:

"If we direct give material or using PowerPoint alone , sometimes student not enough interested . ... For example , if student more interested with game , we Can use games or challenges so that they more Spirit follow learning . You can also use digital media such as Kahoot..." (Teacher, interview)

As an example, she mentioned a recent activity in which adjectives were built around the topic of butterflies and then developed into a descriptive text (“like yesterday We discuss the adjective object from butterfly then made text description ”), which corresponds to the adjective-ordering and descriptive-text activities observed on Days 2 to 4. This helps explain why many of the coded sequences are

short, scored question-and-answer exchanges, such as the ordering of “black flexible long cable electrical” in Table 3: in an activity designed to hold the attention of a class, a quick question with a clear answer is a natural unit of. The teacher's statement that her approach depends on the class (“ depends class ”) reflects precisely the kind of situated, goal-driven adjustment that Walsh (2011) associates with teachers who adapt their interactional behavior to the immediate goals and conditions of the lesson, rather than a fixed teaching style.

Degree of question preparation

The teacher indicated that her Initiation moves combined pre-planned and spontaneous questions rather than following a single approach:

" For question usually prepared previously ... sometimes also spontaneous depends from interaction inside class .” (Teacher, interview)

She added that, regardless of preparation, every question had to be connected to the lesson: “ Anyway must related with material ." Two points follow from this account. First, preparation by itself does not explain the predominance of display questions; rather, the questions seem to have been shaped by the content of each activity, such as recalling the meaning of a technical term, identifying a tool, or arranging words in the correct order, all of which have a known answer questions stay tied to the material may also help account for why referential questions, which invite students' own opinions, were rare and appeared mainly when the teacher asked students to reflect on or summarize the lesson.

Time constraints and class size

The teacher explained that large classes made classroom management difficult, particularly in male-dominated technical classes such as TSM and TITL:

"There are even that class of 38 difficult very For control it , let alone man all ." (Teacher, interview)

She also noted that the limited duration of each lesson restricted how long an interactive activity could be sustained before students became bored, and that lessons in the last period of the school day were especially difficult:

"If it's the last hour more serious , if it's the last hour That yes his students rather difficult arranged , noisy too, and they No Can concentration .” (Teacher, interview)

To manage content coverage under these constraints, she reported lessons through a class WhatsApp group supplement and additional material from YouTube. With classes of up to 38 students and limited lesson time, sustaining extended, open-ended exchanges with individual students become much harder to manage. This is consistent with Cazden's (2001) observation that teacher-student interaction is the mechanism through which classroom participation is organized and managed: under large-class conditions, a teacher's organizational burden favors interactional structures, such as short, closed questions, that can be processed quickly and distributed across many students. The 109 sequences collected in only four lessons, many of them one-line exchanges, fit this reading. The teacher's use of games, challenges, and digital media to maintain engagement can also be read as a strategy for managing participation within these constraints rather than as a departure from sound interactional practice.

Students' English proficiency

This factor was the one most directly connected to the Feedback move. The teacher reported that students' proficiency shaped both the language and the type of question she used:

"If the students who speak English enough , no nothing We wear English . ... But if less students Language English , that's it actually will for they are inferior and lacking believe self , so we combine it so question That wear Indonesian continues they answer wear Indonesian also not What what ." (Teacher, interview)

This account is visible in the transcripts: in Table 3, several Initiation and Feedback moves are delivered in Indonesian or in a mixture of Indonesian and English (for example, "Insulation means what ?"), and students often answered in Indonesian (" Lampu ."). She stated that her main priority was for students to attempt a response in any form rather than remaining silent ("What's important say , want write , want practice "). When a student gave a minimal or hesitant response, she reported following up with a probing question:

"Oh, usually baited ... love question lighter , so that he want to ask why, so widened ." (Teacher, interview)

and, when a student appears reluctant, encouraging the student to respond regardless of accuracy and correcting afterward: "which is important Want to talk Just or write Just or try Just like that Later if we are wrong correct it ." This reported strategy corresponds to what Mehan (1979) describes as uptake, in which the teacher uses the Feedback move to draw out further contributions instead of simply closing the exchange with an evaluation. open-ended questioning less practical. This adds a context-specific dimension to Walsh's (2011) claim that elaborative feedback and uptake keep the interaction open, by showing that in a vocational EFL classroom with uneven proficiency, elaboration was built into her response to the student rather than into the question she first asked.

Curriculum demands

The teachers reported that frequent curriculum changes, and the changes in the accompanying teaching documents, made lesson planning more difficult for teachers in the field:

"This is if the curriculum Now This too fast changes like that ... RPP, teaching modules , scenarios learning , he changeable . Sometimes we in the field That rather difficult adjust it ." (Teacher, interview)

She further explained that her questions needed to align with the learning objectives and material of each lesson rather than being asked as an unrelated warm-up (" The questions must in accordance with objective learning and adapting with material "). She considered the most effective interaction to be questions connected to students' daily lives but still tied to the lesson material, citing the Day 4 activity in which students described their favorite place in Lombok . (2025), who found that English teaching and classroom interactions in Mataram vocational schools are shaped by institutional and resource conditions specific to vocational school settings. It also supports the research gap identified at the outcome: findings from general EFL classrooms cannot be assumed to transfer directly to vocational classrooms such as the one examined here.

Taken together, the five factors indicate that the predominantly display-and-evaluative pattern of interaction was shaped less by a single cause than by the combined pressure of large classes, limited instructional time, a demanding and shifting curriculum, and students' uneven English proficiency, within which closed, game-based questioning functioned as a practical strategy to sustain engagement. None of the five previous studies reviewed documented why the teachers used the pattern they described; the present findings extend this line of research by situating the teacher's choices within the practical realities of teaching English in a vocational classroom, and, in doing so, answer the second research question.

Students' Perspectives and Opportunities to Produce English

The IRF patterns identified above appeared to influence students' language production in several interrelated ways, as shown by both the observational data and the semi-structured interviews with five students (Student 1 to Student 5) of class XI TITL.

Evidence from classroom observation

Of the 109 coded sequences, 99 student responses were minimal and only 10 were extended, and the extended responses occurred mainly after referential or explanation-seeking initiation moves. Since 103 of the 109 Initiation moves were display questions, most exchanges offered students limited structural opportunity to produce language beyond a single word or short phrase. Wells (1993) stressed the value of extended learner turns for practicing the target language, and Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) observed that the scope of a student's response is largely determined by how the initiating question is framed; the present data fits both points. The pattern also corresponds to the teacher's own account of probing for elaboration whenever a response was too short, which suggests that extended student language depends more on the teacher's follow-up within the Feedback stage than on the IRF structure itself.

Student preference for question type

Four of the five students (Students 2, 3, 4, and 5) preferred questions with a single correct answer, mainly because they found it difficult to construct original English sentences to express their own ideas:

"I am more Like question with One correct answer Because I difficulty use vocabulary English for explain my idea alone ." (Student 2, interview)

"I usually more Like type question short It means no answer need I explain long-long ." (Student 3, interview)

"I am more Like question with One answer Correct Because I No must think and make answer new alone ." (Student 5, interview)

Student 4 gave a similar reason, namely that he could answer such questions more directly. Only Student 1 preferred referential, open-ended questions, explaining that they allowed him to share his own thinking (" me Can give opinion I Alone buu "). From the students' own perspective, this distribution offers a plausible for the dominance of display Initiation and minimal Response: for most of the students interviewed, a display question was not only easier to answer but also more comfortable, given their self-reported limited English proficiency. that simply increasing the number of referential Initiation moves may not produce more extended Responses if students lack the linguistic resources, or the confidence, to answer at length.

Confidence and anxiety in responding

All five students reported feeling less comfortable or more anxious when answering in front of the whole class than when answering in a small group, most often citing low confidence in their spoken English:

"When I answer in front all over Friend class , me feel Embarrassed Because I not enough Can my English Not yet fluent ." (Student 1, interview)

"If you answer in front class felt different Because all Friend Look to I , meanwhile moment in group There is other friends also helped I speak ." (Student 2, interview)

" When in front class and try answer question , I nervous and feeling afraid of saying the wrong thing Because ability my English Not yet Enough So Afraid ." (Student 5, interview)

Student 3 similarly described answering at the front as " somewhat awkward " (somewhat awkward) and answering in a group as more comfortable because friends could help. These accounts suggest that the whole-class IRF format itself, independent of question type, may have constrained how much language some students were willing to produce.

Perceptions of teacher feedback

Students' perceptions of the Feedback move were largely positive. Students 1, 2, 3, and 5 reported that feedback helped them correct their answers, understand the material better, and continue speaking:

" Response from the teacher is very helpful Because with That I Can repair answers and study them which one is right ?" (Student 1, interview)

"Very helpful , because I can know Where location wrong answer so I Can fix it later ." (Student 5, interview)

Student 4's experience was more mixed. He reported that feedback helped him understand his mistakes (" Feed back to the teacher according to I help us if it's wrong make us understand again "), but also that:

" Sometimes bait come back the teacher made I stop talk Because Embarrassed If answer I was wrong." (Student 4, interview)

Feedback that was generally experienced as helpful for correction could therefore still discourage further talk for a student who was particularly sensitive to being seen as wrong. This qualifies the claim that elaborative feedback and uptake are automatically more valuable than evaluative feedback (Walsh, 2011): even well-intentioned feedback can discourage further talk if it is experienced as exposing in front of classmates.

Overall perception of interaction and confidence

All five students agreed that interacting with the teacher in English helped develop their language skills to some extent, most commonly their vocabulary and listening or speaking ability:

" Interaction in English can also be increase ability listening and speaking I little by little ." (Student 1, interview)

"When the teacher uses English , this can increase vocabulary English I ." (Student 5, interview)

When asked what made them more confident to speak, three students (Students 2, 3, and 4) pointed to supportive, non-judgmental peers and teachers rather than to their own proficiency:

"I am more believe self if friends support me and no laugh at when " I'm sorry if I say something wrong ." (Student 2, interview)

"I am more believe self when the teacher loves spirit and not direct blame I Because answer I was wrong." (Student 4, interview)

Students 1 and 5, by contrast, linked their confidence directly to their own English, saying they would feel more confident once they could speak more fluently and correctly. Zulfah et al. (2025) found that variations in feedback created openings for more balanced interaction, a claim broadly supported by the teacher's probing strategy. The interview data, however, suggest an additional affective dimension: whether elaborative feedback actually leads to extended language use may depend as much on a student's confidence and fear of embarrassment as on the structural openness of the Feedback move, and the classroom's social climate, not only its IRF structure, shaped students' willingness to engage in extended interaction.

Taken together, the dominant pattern of display Initiation, minimal Response, and largely evaluative or probing Feedback aligned with what most students described as their preferred and most comfortable way of participating, given their limited confidence in spoken English. It offered only limited opportunity for students to produce extended language on their own initiative, students' willingness to keep talking after Feedback depended partly on whether that Feedback felt corrective or embarrassing, and elaborate student talk emerged especially when the teacher deliberately extended the Feedback move through follow-up questioning. This answers the third research question: the IRF pattern influenced students' language production primarily through the Feedback move rather than the Initiation move, and efforts to develop students' spoken English in a setting such as SMKN 3 Mataram would need to address not only the type of question asked but also the way Feedback is delivered and the climate in which students are asked to respond. Because these interview data come from one teacher and five students, these interpretations should be read as context-bound.

CONCLUSION

Students who participated in Madani Super Camp generally gave positive ratings to statements about their perceived speaking development and to the speaking activities included in the questionnaire. In relation to the first research question, students perceive their English speaking skills as developing positively through MSC, as indicated by indicator averages above 4.00. In relation to the second research question, the aspects of speaking perceived as developing most positively were vocabulary (4.67), followed by speaking activities (4.56), comprehension (4.48), grammar (4.41), pronunciation (4.39), and fluency (4.20). In relation to the third research question, vocabulary practice received the highest activity rating (4.68), followed by speaking games (4.63), role-play (4.56), group discussions (4.54), and storytelling (4.41). Taken together, these findings suggest that learners valued opportunities to build and use vocabulary and to participate in engaging communicative activities, while fluency—especially speaking with fewer pauses—may warrant further instructional attention. They do not demonstrate objectively measured improvement or establish a causal effect of MSC. A stronger evaluation should combine perception data with validated instruments, direct speaking assessments, and preferably pre-test/post-test or comparison-group designs.

RECOMENDATIONS

For students, continued participation in speaking activities and regular practice outside the camp may help them develop confidence and use English more frequently. The questionnaire findings indicate that students viewed role-play, group discussions, storytelling, vocabulary practice, and speaking games positively, so students may continue to take part actively in these activities.

For English teachers and Madani Super Camp instructors, the findings suggest that students value a variety of speaking opportunities. Instructors may continue using role-play, group discussions, storytelling, vocabulary practice, and speaking games while providing additional support for fluency, including practice in speaking at length and expressing ideas with fewer pauses.

For the school, maintaining opportunities for meaningful English communication may support students' continued practice. If the school wishes to evaluate students' speaking performance rather than perceptions alone, future program evaluations may combine student-perception questionnaires with direct speaking assessments.

REFERENCES

Aizawa, I., Rose, H., Thompson, G., & Curle, S. (2023). Beyond the threshold: Exploring English language proficiency, linguistic challenges, and academic language skills of Japanese students in an English medium instruction program. *Language Teaching Research* , *27* (4), 837-861. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820965510

Dirgantara, MRR, Astrid, A., & Amrina, RD (2026). 531 FM (SPEAK ENGLISH IN FIVE MINUTES) PROGRAM AT ONE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL IN PALEMBANG: STUDENTS'PERCEPTIONS. *Wiralodra English Journal* , *10* (2), 14-28.

Fan, J., & Yan, X. (2020). Assessing speaking proficiency: A narrative review of speaking assessment research within the argument-based validation framework. *Frontiers in psychology* , *11* , 330.

Fathi, J., Rahimi, M., & Teo, T. (2025). Applying intelligent personal assistants to develop fluency and comprehensibility, and reduce accentedness in EFL learners: an empirical study of Google Assistant. *Language Teaching Research* , 13621688251317786. https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688251317786

Goh, C.C.M., & Burns, A. (2012). *Teaching speaking: A holistic approach* . Cambridge University Press.

Hamzah, MZ, De Vega, N., Ummah, SS, & Pattiasina, PJ (2023). Role-playing method for language development in elementary school. *Journal of Childhood Development* , *3* (2), 36-47.

Ismailov, M., Chiu, T. K., Dearden, J., Yamamoto, Y., & Djalilova, N. (2021). Challenges to internationalization of university programs: A systematic thematic synthesis of qualitative research on learner-centred English medium instruction (EMI) pedagogy. *Sustainability* , *13* (22), 12642. https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/13/22/12642

Lail, H. (2018). The effectiveness of using English films with English subtitles in teaching vocabulary at the eighth year students of SMPN 1 Selong in the academic year of 2018/2019. *Journal of Languages and Language Teaching, 6* (2), 100–107. https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v6i2.1261

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Anderson, M. (2011). *Techniques and principles in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Liu, X. J., Wang, J., & Zou, B. (2025). Evaluating an AI speaking assessment tool: Score accuracy, perceived validity, and oral peer feedback as feedback enhancement. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes , 75 ,* 101505. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2025.101505

Melani, B., Willian, S., Apprianto , K., & Lail, H. (2021). Vocabulary coverage and reading comprehension of university EFL learners. In *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research* (Vol. 546, pp. 65–71). Atlantis Press. https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210427.010

Menggo, S., & Gunas, T. (2022). College Students' Perception of Performance-Based Assessment Use in Boosting Speaking Ability. *International Journal of Language Education , 6* (4), 423-436.

Nation, ISP, & Newton, J. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL listening and speaking* . Routledge.

Nation, P. (2007). The four strands. *Innovations in Language Learning and Teaching, 1* (1), 1–12.

Richards, J. C. (2008). *Teaching listening and speaking: From theory to practice* . Cambridge University Press.

Richards, JC, & Renandya , WA (2002). *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice* . Cambridge University Press.

Riyandani , R., Soepriyanti , H., Agprianto , K., & Waluyo, U. (2024). Motivational factors contributing to students' participation in the English learning programs: A study at MTs. Putri Nurul Haramain Islamic Boarding School Narmada. *Journal Scientific Educational Professions , 9* (4), 2387–2394. https://doi.org/10.29303/jipp.v9i4.2645

Thornbury, S. (2005). *How to teach speaking* . Pearson Education.

Ur, P. (2012). *A course in English language teaching* . Cambridge University Press.

Zakaria, AM, Mohamad, S., & Idris, S. (2022). Students' perceptions of a language camp module. *Malaysian Journal of Language Education, 14* (2), 8–10.