

CLASSROOM INTERACTION PATTERNS ANALYSIS IN ENGLISH CLASSES OF PHARMACY DEPARTMENT

Nimas Ayu Rahardini

Pharmacy Department, Universitas Kediri, Indonesia

Email: nimas_ayu@unik-kediri.ac.id

Abstract

This study aims to investigate the classroom interactions that occur in the English class of the Pharmacy study program at Universitas Kediri using the IRF model and investigates how the implementation of tasks based on TBLT stimulate student engagement. The researcher conducted observations in the English class of the Pharmacy study program at Universitas Kediri. As a passive observer, the researcher collected data by recording video and audio and taking notes during the teaching and learning process. This study is descriptive qualitative research that explores or describes social situations related to student engagement in English classes of non-English major students in depth. The results showed that the use of a sequence of tasks in this class helped to increase student interaction and engagement in the learning process. Implementing types of collaborative tasks has a positive impact on improving classroom interaction. The lecturer also initiated the interaction to help them understand the task process according to the sequence and rules. In addition, the study strongly recommends the role of lecturer as a facilitator in organizing and facilitating the learning process specifically in the process of students completing tasks.

Article History

Submitted: 5 Juli 2024

Accepted: 10 Juli 2024

Published: 11 Juli 2024

Key Words

Classroom Discourse, Initiation, response and feedback (IRF), Teacher Talk, Task-based language teaching (TBLT)

1. Introduction

Achieving maximum results from the learning process in the classroom requires teachers to consider how effective and communicative the learning process is in the classroom. How teachers organize classroom activities and initiate interactions with students are two things that need to be considered. Organizing classroom activities is a process that needs to be done so that students can be involved in the learning process evenly (Walsh, 2006, 2011). Meanwhile, initiating interactions is needed to support engagement and as a way to test whether students can follow the activities and materials being studied well or not. Therefore, it is necessary to study classroom discourse as a field that captures all phenomena that arise in the classroom, especially verbal discourse (Al-Smadi & Ab-Rashid, 2017; Christie, 2002; Markee, 2015).

Classroom discourse analysis is one field which are able to analyze any kinds of behavior, especially language behavior - as structured experience (Christie, 2002). Conducting classroom discourse analysis is also recommended for teachers based on the following four considerations: First, this research can help to enhance the mutual understanding between teachers and students. Second, by conducting this analysis, teachers will be able to understand local differences in classroom talk. Researcher can see if the result indicates beyond stereotypes or other cultural generalizations. Third, classroom discourse analysis can be a tool for the teacher to improve the academic achievement. Last, the process of doing classroom discourse analysis can be useful for teaching practice (Rymes, 2008).

Since classroom interaction is the focus of classroom discourse analysis, the appropriate theory to use is the IRF model. Initiation, Response, Feedback or IRF model is a theory derived from interaction patterns that generally occur in the classroom where initiation is done by the teacher, response arises from students and feedback is done by the teacher (Ayar et al., 2014; Coulthard, 2002; Nugroho et al., 2020; Schmitt & Rodgers, 2020).. This basic pattern leads to several exchanges that can later show a picture of how the interaction in the classroom. In addition, since the interaction in the classroom is related to the activities that will be carried

out in relation to the material to be learned, this study also refers to Task-based language teaching or TBLT as a teaching method to guide the series of activities that take place during the learning process. TBLT itself tries to connect the language practiced in the classroom with real-life situations achieved through the use of tasks. In this case, the context of the teaching process examined in this study is a language class in university (Thanh & Huan, 2012; D. Willis & Willis, 2007; J. Willis, 1996). Thus, TBLT is selected as a guideline because it is a relevant method used in language classes in higher education.

Given that classroom discourse is the main data for conducting research related to interaction analysis, many studies have analyzed classroom interaction using Sinclair and Coulthard's IRF pattern (Bobe, 2018; Lomotey & Gyima-Aboagye, 2021; Nugroho et al., 2020; Shellayukti, 2019). IRF theory has proven to be effectively capable of analyzing various aspects through classroom discourse. Previous studies mainly focused on different focuses. Bobe (2018), mainly looked at interactions based on gender differences in English speaking classes at UMM (Bobe, 2018). Meanwhile, Nugroho et al (2020) focused more on student engagement in English writing lessons in junior high school. The results showed that teachers should maintain classroom interaction by providing more opportunities for students to speak (Nugroho et al., 2020). In particular, Shellayukti (2019), conducted a study focusing on the characteristics of the language used in UNNES pronunciation classes. The researcher tried to investigate the classroom interaction patterns, speech functions, code-mixing, code-switching, and their consequences by combining theories namely the IRF model by Sinclair and Coulthard (1992) for classroom interaction analysis and Eggins and Slade (1997) on speech functions, code-mixing, and code-switching (Shellayukti, 2019). Such interaction can take several forms, and one form is the IRF (initiation-response-feedback) exchange structure developed by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975, 1992). Lomotey & Gyima-Aboagye (2020) investigated the pedagogical effectiveness of the IRF exchange pattern in English classrooms at a particular Primary School in Pokuase, a town in the Greater Accra Region of Ghana. The study found dominance interaction patterns and how patten indicated teacher and student engagement in classroom activities (Lomotey & Gyima-Aboagye, 2021). Based on the explanation above, it can be concluded that research that focuses on analyzing discourse in the classroom by combining how interactions arise from a series of activities based on certain methods has not been conducted much. Therefore, the results of this study are expected to provide new insights in exploring the phenomena of interaction in the classroom along with a sequence of tasks and their dynamics.

This study explores classroom interaction between lecturers and students in an English class in a Pharmacy study program at Universitas Kadiri. The IRF model was used to analyze the class interaction so as to reveal student engagement in the classroom. In addition, the taxonomy of task types in TBLT became a reference in describing the series of activities that occurred in the observed class. As a relatively new combination of theories, this study investigates the patterns of student engagement in task-based language classes. In contrast, previous studies have focused on generalized interactions that are then examined in terms of gender and language. Thus, the results generated can also be used to determine the extent to which TBLT has been successfully implemented in non-English major classes such as this pharmacy program.

Kadiri University was chosen because this university is one of the private universities in Kediri that does not have an English study program. Then, the researcher chose the Pharmacy study program which has a large number of students, which was 79 students. This condition encourages the researcher to evaluate how a certain teaching approach can show changes in the interaction that occurs in the classroom to become a learning process that is easy to follow and understand or not. In general, students in higher education should have at least basic English skills. Therefore, a focused development program in the English learning process is essential.

Examining classroom interactions in the context of implementing an ELT strategy, such as TBLT, is believed to be useful for stakeholders, such as lecturers, in evaluating a particular approach in the classroom. Therefore, this study attempts to investigate the classroom interactions that occur in the English class of the Pharmacy study program, Universitas Kadiri using the IRF model and investigates how the implementation of tasks based on TBLT stimulate student engagement, with the following research questions: How does the implementation of a sequence of tasks stimulate classroom interaction that occurs in the English class of the Pharmacy study program at Universitas Kadiri?

1.1. Theoretical Framework

1.1.1 Classroom Discourse Analysis

In classroom discourse there is a description of various things that happen in the classroom. In general, the picture in question is depicted in the form of verbal discourse in the classroom including the dynamics within it (Al-Smadi & Ab-Rashid, 2017; Christie, 2002; Markee, 2015; Rymes, 2008). The main role of the teacher in the classroom can also be illustrated through classroom discourse. The role of the teacher in the classroom includes organizing the learning activities, ensuring students' involvement in the learning process, and ensuring that students are not only involved but also understand the material provided through the activities provided. In implementing these roles, there are several features that need to be considered. These features include controlling patterns of communication, elicitation techniques, repair strategies and modifying speech to learners (Walsh, 2006, 2011).

In exploring classroom discourse, understanding the basic interaction patterns in the classroom is very necessary. The basic pattern can make it easier for researchers to analyze the discourse presented there and relate it to the context features discussed earlier. The interaction pattern of teacher's initiation - students response - teacher's feedback or commonly called IRF model is a pattern that has often appeared in the learning process in the classroom) (Ayar et al., 2014; Nugroho et al., 2020; Schmitt & Rodgers, 2020; Walsh, 2006, 2011). This IRF model was previously known as The Birmingham School. It is a pattern that is referred to as a tool for grammatical analysis used in classroom discourse settings (Flowerdew, 2013). This basic pattern forms the movements, exchanges, transactions, and combinations that occur between teachers and students (Coulthard, 2002). Then, these things can show how the process of implementing features for teachers in carrying out the role of teachers in the classroom.

1.1.2 Appropriate Language Teaching Approach in Higher Education

In determining a teaching approach that is appropriate to the language teaching context in higher education, teachers must pay attention that in this class they are obliged to provide instruction based on student needs according to a particular context. Thus, in general universities will apply the English for Specific Purposes approach. This approach aims to generate students' needs and learning motivation based on their major (Jafari Pazoki & Alemi, 2020; Yuwono, 2016). Furthermore, several specific approaches need to be determined to support the success of the learning process in producing students who are not only engaged but also able to understand and apply the material being studied in the classroom. Some approaches that are relevant to the ESP classroom context are Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT), Project-Based Learning (PBL). Each of these approaches has its own role according to the teacher's needs in coordinating students in the classroom. In this case, TBLT can be considered as an appropriate approach in the ESP class. TBLT activities are appropriate for learner needs, developing the necessary language skills for a particular academic or occupational setting, and helping learners to practice these language skills in authentic or near-authentic situations (Anthony, 2018).

Task-based language teaching (TBLT) attempts to connect the language practiced in the classroom with real-life situations which is achieved this through the use of tasks (Alimi, 2019; Anthony, 2018; Hismanoglu & Hismanoglu, 2011; Izadpanah, 2010; Mukhrib, 2020; Thanh & Huan, 2012). As defined by Willis (1996), task in TBLT context is the activity where the target language is used by the learner for communicative purpose in order to achieve an outcome (Thanh & Huan, 2012; D. Willis & Willis, 2007; J. Willis, 1996).

2. Method

This research is descriptive qualitative research that aims to elaborate the results of the analysis of interaction patterns and certain teaching approaches to produce changes in the interaction of lecturers and students in the classroom. This research uses classroom discourse as primary data. Thus, the narrative approach is used in this study. This research was conducted in an English class in the Pharmacy study program, faculty of health sciences, Kadiri University. Therefore, this research belongs to a case study as it focuses on one particular university to be a sample that reflects the condition of non-English majors at a higher level in Indonesia. Case study research was chosen in this study. A case study is a thorough investigation of the complexities and peculiarities of a particular initiative, policy, institution, program, or system in a practical context from multiple perspectives. The research data is the result of observing classroom activities in a total of 6 meetings starting from September 21st, 2023 to November 2nd, 2023. Each meeting lasted 110 minutes. The class consists of 80 students.

In this research, researchers recorded video and audio of learning activities in class and then transcribed them. In addition, the researcher also noted several important points discovered during the observation. The videos that have been observed are elaborated based on the structure of the TBLT teaching approach. Meanwhile, the transcript of the conversation that occurred was analyzed based on IRF theory to determine the interaction patterns that occurred in the classroom. Finally, the overall results of the observations are linked to reach a conclusion about how the interactions that occur in the classroom and how the tasks used result in increasing the interaction between lecturer and students or not.

3. Finding and Discussion

3.1. *Task Sequence in The Classroom*

Based on observations that have been made at 6 meetings in the English class of the pharmacy study program, the teacher delivered material from 5 different topics. The first meeting showed the application of a different task sequence because the topic discussed was a learning contract. The teacher gave a brief overview of what would be learned in the whole semester. Then, the lecturer explained about the percentage of accumulated grades that would be obtained from assignments, attendance, activeness and involvement in class. In addition, the lecturer also explained some rules related to absent permits, as well as sanctions that will be obtained if you do or do not submit assignments on time. After all explanations regarding the learning contract have been delivered, the lecturer opens a light discussion related to the material and games as a warming up. This activity was carried out to increase students' enthusiasm in starting lectures in the semester.

In presenting how the learning process and the application of the task in the classroom, the task sequence is described in the following order:

TABLE 4 Task Sequence

PHARMACY DEPARTMENT (Meeting 1)		
TOPIC: Language Function 1		
PRE-TASK	TASK CYCLE	POST TASK
<p>In this session, the lecturer conducted a warming up session. Lecturer invited students to do activities in the form of brainstorming. Students are given an example of a situation related to language function so that they can make a list, what are the expressions that appear and are commonly used in the context of pharmacy. After the students were able to find a list of expressions according to the context, the lecturer gave feedback in the form of appreciation and then gave additions to complete the list they found before continuing the core task in the task cycle.</p>	<p>The main task consisted of two tasks, namely the practice of reading conversations and making conversation in pairs. In the practice of reading conversations, each pair of students is asked to read conversations with correct spelling and intonation so that they resemble everyday conversations. Each group must be given appreciation and feedback as improvement and encouragement to be more confident to perform in front of the class.</p> <p>Furthermore, the second task is in the form of making conversations according to their own imagination and creativity based on expressions or language functions that have been listed before. The results of the tasks they make will be presented. The more new conversational contexts they create by utilizing various expressions that have been listed, will enrich students' insights in implementing these expressions in everyday life.</p>	<p>At this stage, the lecturer directs students to conduct a discussion about a case example in accordance with the context of using the language function being studied. The lecturer applies this task to find out whether students have understood and are able to apply various kinds of language functions in the context of daily conversation.</p>

The table above is a sample that represents the observation results from the point of view of using tasks in the learning process. The table shows how tasks are implemented in the learning process. The description is done by using task sequence from TBLT theory by Willis and Willis (2007). In one meeting, it consists of three stages of pre-test, task cycle, and post-test where each task in each stage refers to the task generator or taxonomy of task types from this theory. The process of lecturing or delivering material that is generally often done in classes to convey the material being discussed did not occur much at this meeting. Because the teaching approach used is TBLT, the lecturer leads students to be involved in each stage of the task so

that they can understand and apply the knowledge given in the context of everyday life specifically in the context of the scientific field, which is pharmacy.

Observations of the six meetings showed that the utilization of tasks in learning activities resulted in a more well-coordinated learning process. In addition, this approach stimulates students to be more critical in understanding a topic of discussion in the classroom. Their participation in each task helps them come to the conclusion of a topic of discussion as well as learn case examples of the material they are studying. In the classroom learning activities, it shows that tasks stimulate students to be more responsible in completing the assigned tasks so that they are not only useful because of course they get grades, but they also experience a learning process that also helps them gain knowledge independently. By stimulating their thinking process using tasks, the knowledge conveyed can be accepted and implemented properly. In addition, some tasks that must be presented can practice students to be more confident in communicating and conveying the results of their thoughts.

3.2. The Interaction in The Classroom

3.2.1 Free Exchanges

From the interaction pattern point of view, the English class in the pharmacy study program that has been observed shows that all types of exchanges in this IRF model appear in the interaction in each meeting. **Teacher direct** and **teacher inform** are the exchanges that produce the least active communication between teachers and students. Students hardly showed any verbal response when the teacher gave information. The responses are only body gestures or facial expressions that show whether or not they understand the information and directions given. On the other hand, the rest of the exchanges dominate the learning process in this class. The exchanges that dominate show more verbal responses so as to create active communication between teachers and students in the classroom. In the **teacher elicit**, the data above shows that there is communication related to the teacher's process in guiding students to study certain topics. These are complete and important exchanges in classroom interaction because these exchanges then elicit verbal responses from students. Through verbal responses from students, lecturers will find it easier to recognize whether students really understand the explanation given or not. When the lecturer does not identify if the students are experiencing problems, the learning process will be disrupted. Another exchange of free exchanges is **student elicit**. It was found from the data that students attempted to confirm certain information related to the explanation or task given. students try to ascertain whether the particular step they are going to do is correct or not. Compared to student responses to teacher elicit, student elicit better describes student involvement in the teaching and learning process. from the results of observations this exchange appears more often in classes that implement projects and creative tasks. Then, the data related to **students inform** exchange shows that students provide a statement in the form of information related to the learning process that is being carried out or that will be carried out at the next meeting. The feedback given is also in the form of a statement that shows confirmation about what should be done next regarding the information the student has provided. Lastly, **check** was found in every meeting. As previously stated, because what the lecturer wanted to ensure whether students could follow the lesson well, feedback from the teacher is not so important in this exchange. However, the researchers found that the teacher continued to provide feedback, especially after students gave responses indicating that they did not understand or still needed time to complete the assignments given. The following table contains examples of free exchanges:

Table 1 The Example of Free Exchanges

CLASSROOM INTERACTION PATTERN FREE EXCHANGES			
Opening	Answering	Follow-up	Exchange s
Hari ini kita membahas tentang menulis application letter yaa. (Today we are talking about writing application letter.)	-	-	Teacher Informs
Seperti western style, when you speak, please stand up. Ayo yang perhatikan temennya presentasi. (Like western style, when you speak, please stand up. Come on, pay attention to your friend's presentation.)	(a student as moderator stands up)	-	Teacher Direct
Belum kamu bahasa inggriskan to? (You haven't translated it into English?)	Belum pak. (Not yet, sir)	Iya ini penjelasannya boleh seperti ini tapi jangan lupa In English lhoo yaa. (Yes, this explanation can be like this but don't forget to speak in English.)	Teacher Elicit
Pak. nanti perbaikannya di kirim? (Sir. will the correction be sent?)	Ya, perbaikan nanti. Di tulis perbaikan kelompok satu. (Yes, corrections later. Write group one's correction.)	-	Student Elicit
Pak, maaf anggota kelompok saya tidak ada yang masuk pak, hanya saya saja. (Sir, I'm sorry none of my group members are in Sir, only me.)	-	Oh, begitu. Tidak apa-apa tetap presentasi hari ini yaa. Berarti anggota mu yang lain tidak dapat nilai. (Oh, I see. It's okay to keep presenting today. That means your other members don't get score.)	Student Inform

Ayo, sudah belum? (Come on, have you done it yet?)	Sebentar lagi pak. (In a moment Sir.	Sebentar lagi itu kapan waktunya. Masak se-jam. (When will this be done? It takes so long.”)	Check
---	---	---	-------

3.2.2 Bound Exchanges

3.2.2.1 Re-Initiation (I) - IRI^bRF

- I** - Teacher : *Kalau disini itu menurut kalian passage ini main point nya apa?*
(What do you think is the main point of this passage?)
- R** - Student : (silent)
- I** - Teacher : *Kira-kira maksudnya untuk apa?*
(What does it mean?)
- R** - Student : (silent)
- I^b** - Teacher : *Main point nya aja gausah artinya semua.*
(Only the main point, you don't have to translate everything.)
- R** - Student : *Menenangkan pasien*
(Calming down the patient.)
- F** - Teacher : *Menenangkan pasien yaa. Jadi poinnya to calm down the patient.*
(The point is to calm down the patient.)

Basically, this bound exchange is a combination of patterns that occur so that there is continuous communication. The data above was found in meeting 2 which shows the re-initiation process carried out by the teacher. The re-initiation is related to the expression that is not enough to make students respond to questions on related topics. At this meeting, the lecturer wanted to recall the material that had been learned in the previous meeting. The example of the interaction above shows that the lecturer tried to recall the material that had been delivered in the previous meeting, as well as helping students engage in interaction. In general, the factors that prevent students from engaging in interaction are because they do not remember the material discussed or it could also be because they are afraid or not confident in answering questions asked by the lecturer. In this class, it can be seen that these exchanges are indeed very much needed not only to remind them to engage in interaction but can also be used to ascertain whether they have understood the rules and order of the tasks given or not.

3.2.2.2 Re-Initiation (II) - IRF(I^b)RF

- I** - Teacher : *Kalau introduction main point nya untuk apa?*
(What is the main point of the introduction?)
- R** - Student : *Perkenalan*
- F** - Teacher : *Perkenalan, iya.*
- I^b** - Teacher : *Betul, tapi main point nya untuk apa?*
(That's right, but what's the main point?)
- R** - Student : *To open communication*
- F** - Teacher : *To open the communication to other people or patient or another officer*

Similar to re-initiaton I, re-initiation II is used to stimulate students' correct answers. Lecturers provide feedback from students' initial responses. At this stage it is important for the

lecturer to provide an appreciative response to boost their confidence. However, afterward the lecturer needs to provide a stimulating question so that students can provide a follow-up response with a more precise answer. Based on the data obtained from observation, re-initiation II was mostly found when the lecturer tried to evaluate students' understanding of the material being studied. In addition, there is also an exchange similar to re-initiation II but has a different function. this exchange is called **Listing**. This exchange takes the form of an interaction where the lecturer tries to dig up more student answers related to the material. This method is very effective in testing student understanding. Besides, this method is also effective in summarizing important points as evaluation material. Although it was not a lot, but the observation results show that, this type of exchange usually appears in the lecturing and evaluating phases.

In this interaction, silence is a form of students' lack of understanding of the material presented. The results of the observation show that there is a continuous silence shown by the students. Students continue to carry out activities and try to understand without any response were given. In this situation, the lecturer will continue the explanation until it is finished. Then, the lecturer will check again whether they understand or not. This process is called **reinforcement**. Finally, in the interaction process there is a repeat exchange which has functions to confirm or emphasize the response given by the student. Although this is usually done by lecturers to students, this exchange can also be used by students to lecturers.

3.3. Classroom interaction and its relation to the teaching approach.

It has previously been discussed how the TBLT teaching approach is implemented. Observations showed that implementing a sequence of tasks in the learning process helped the lecturer a lot in organizing the learning process. By giving tasks, students have the responsibility to do the tasks well and correctly. Rather than providing explanations related to the content of the material being studied, researchers saw that lecturers focused more on explaining the technical implementation of the tasks that students would do. The explanation is more in the form of how the sequence and rules that students must obey while they complete the assigned tasks. Conveying clear rules to students in completing tasks is highly recommended to avoid mistakes in the middle of the learning process (Payukmag, 2014; J. Willis, 1996).

Ensuring that the tasks that students do run smoothly and according to the rules is equal to facilitating students' learning process well. Thus, students can absorb knowledge so that they can understand and apply it directly in the context of everyday life. The tasks assigned are type of collaborative tasks which are tasks that require cooperation in groups or pairs. The results show that collaborative tasks play an important role in stimulating their understanding. There is a discussion process where this group of students can share viewpoints related to the task they are working on. As the goal of TBLT is to implement tasks that make students able to connect with real life situations, this type of task could be considered as the best task that brings students to achieve learning goals (Larsen-Freeman and Anderson 2011; Willis and Willis 2007; Hismanoglu and Hismanoglu 2011; Payukmag 2014; Hasegawa 2018).

On the other hand, based on the interaction pattern, there are not many continuous interactions between lecturers and students in the process of delivering materials. There are more initiations from lecturers than responses from students. However, when entering the task sequence stage, we can see 'student elicit' which is one of the exchanges in the IRF model that shows students initiate the interaction with the lecturer. Many of these exchanges appear in the process of working on tasks by students. As explained earlier, this is a positive result that shows that giving tasks does stimulate students to be more involved in the learning process. If in previous studies one type of task from TBLT also had a positive impact on the interaction between teachers and students, this positive result was also seen in this study (Kunitz et al., 2022). In other words, the role of lecturer in the process of students working on tasks is as a

facilitator. Lecturer provides more responses from student initiation. The response contains directions for students who ask about the task process that is being done. Similar to Ro (2018) and Hasegawa (2018), they also suggested the role of the teacher in managing and facilitating student performance, it is very necessary in "the task-in process" (Hasegawa, 2018; Ro, 2018).

4. Conclusion

This study shows that improving classroom interaction between lecturers and students can be done by implementing one of the teaching approaches that encourages student engagement. This study used TBLT as an approach that uses a series of tasks in the learning process. The results show that there is quite active interaction in the process of students working on tasks. A lot of interaction in the form of student initiation in asking and confirming the progress of the task they are working on shows the engagement of students in the learning process. In addition, the results of this study also underline the very important role of the lecturer as a facilitator in the process of completing the series of tasks. The tasks given are collaborative tasks which can increase the interaction between students as well.

Based on the results of this study, considering conducting deeper investigations in future research can be done by adding the focus of interactions not only between lecturers and students but also among the students. In addition, future research can also use multimodal discourse analysis to explore classroom discourse not only from the point of view of verbal interaction but also using non-verbal points of view such as images, symbols, gestures, actions, music, and sounds. Thus, investigative research on classroom interaction in exploring student engagement in the language learning process will be enriched and help improve student interaction and engagement in the learning process in the language classroom.

References

- Al-Smadi, O. A., & Ab-Rashid, R. (2017). A Theoretical Review of Classroom Discourse. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 6(3), 164–173. <https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarped/v6-i3/3169>
- Alimi, J. (2019). Willis ' s and Skehan ' s versions of task -based learning : A critical examination. *A Critical Examination, January 2001*, 17.
- Anthony, L. (2018). Introducing English for specific purposes. In *Introducing English for Specific Purposes*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351031189>
- Ayar, M. C., Bauchspies, W. K., & Yalvac, B. (2014). Exploring social dynamics in school science context: An ethnographic case study. *SAGE Open*, 4(3), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244014550619>
- Bobo, O. M. F. Q. (2018). *Initiation, Response, and Feedback (Irf) Patterns Used by The Teachers and Learners in Esp Speaking Classes at The University of Muhammadiyah Malang* (Issue July). University of Muhammadiyah Malang.
- Christie, F. (2002). Classroom Discourse Analysis. In *Classroom Discourse Analysis*.
- Coulthard, M. (2002). Advances in spoken discourse analysis. In *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203200063>
- Flowerdew, J. (2013). *Discourse in english language education*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203080870>
- Hasegawa, A. (2018). Understanding Task-in-Process Through the Lens of Laughter: Activity Designs, Instructional Materials, Learner Orientations, and Interpersonal Relationships. *Modern Language Journal*, 102(1), 142–161. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12448>
- Hismanoglu, M., & Hismanoglu, S. (2011). Task-based language teaching: What every EFL teacher should do. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 15(December 2011), 46–52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.03.049>
- Izadpanah, S. (2010). A study on Task-based Language Teaching: From theory to practice. *US-*

- China Foreign Language*, 8(3), 47–56.
- Jafari Pazoki, S., & Alemi, M. (2020). Engineering Students' Motivation to Learn Technical English in ESP Courses: Investigating Iranian Teachers' and Students' Perceptions. *RELC Journal*, 51(2), 212–226. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688218811371>
- Kunitz, S., Berggren, J., Haglind, M., & Löfquist, A. (2022). Getting Students to Talk: A Practice-Based Study on the Design and Implementation of Problem-Solving Tasks in the EFL Classroom. *Languages*, 7(2), 75. <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages7020075>
- Larsen-Freeman, D., & Anderson, M. (2011). *Techniques & Principles in Language Teaching* (Third Edit). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203835654>
- Lomotey, C. F., & Gyima-Aboagye, G. E. (2021). the Irf Exchange As a Pedagogical Tool: a Study of Esl Classrooms in Pokuase Township, Ghana. *European Journal of English Language Teaching*, 6(5), 121–148. <https://doi.org/10.46827/ejel.v6i5.3889>
- Markee, N. (2015). *The Handbook of Classroom Discourse and Interaction*. Wiley Blackwell.
- Mukhrib, A. (2020). Do Saudi Learners of English Recognize the Benefits of Consciousness-raising Tasks and Communicative Tasks? *English Language Teaching*, 13(6), 172. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v13n6p172>
- Nugroho, F., Atmojo, D., & Saleh, M. (2020). The Implementation of Initiation – Response – Feedback (IRF) in EFL Reading Class. *English Education Journal*, 10(2), 225–233.
- Payukmag, W. (2014). *The Perceived Effectiveness of the Implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching and Mediation Procedures for the Teaching of Business Presentations at a Thai University By Wuttiya Payukmag A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for*. University of Warwick.
- Ro, E. (2018). Facilitating an L2 Book Club: A Conversation-Analytic Study of Task Management. *Modern Language Journal*, 102(1), 181–198. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12450>
- Rymes, B. (2008). Classroom discourse analysis: A tool for critical reflection, second edition. *Classroom Discourse Analysis: A Tool For Critical Reflection, Second Edition*, 1–248. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315775630>
- Schmitt, N., & Rodgers, M. P. H. (2020). An Introduction to Applied Linguistics: Third edition. In *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics: Third Edition*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429424465>
- Shellayukti, Y. (2019). *Classroom Interaction Patterns of Pronunciation Class in English Department (A Case at the Fourth Semester of English Department of UNNES) A THESIS In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for Master Degree in Linguistics Yeyisha Shellayukti FACULTY OF. DIPONEGORO UNIVERSITY*.
- Thanh, L. N., & Huan, N. B. (2012). Task-Based Language Learning and Student Motivation in Vocabulary Acquisition. *Language Education in Asia*, 3(1), 106–120. https://doi.org/10.5746/leia/12/v3/i1/a10/thanh_huan
- Walsh, S. (2006). Investigating classroom discourse. *Investigating Classroom Discourse*, 1–188. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203015711>
- Walsh, S. (2011). Exploring Classroom Discourse. In *Exploring Classroom Discourse*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203827826>
- Willis, D., & Willis, J. (2007). *Doing Task Based Teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Willis, J. (1996). *A Framework for Task-based Learning*. Addison Wesley Longman Limited.
- Yuwono, M. R. (2016). Analisis Kesulitan Mahasiswa dalam Menyelesaikan Soal Geometri Berdasarkan Taksonomi Bloom dan Alternatif Pemecahannya. *Beta Jurnal Tadris Matematika*, 9(2), 111. <https://doi.org/10.20414/betajtm.v9i2.7>