A DISCOURSE ANALYSIS APPROACH TO COLLEGE ENGLISH TEACHING: BASED ON INITIATION–RESPONSE–FEEDBACK MODEL

Heng Hu
Zhejiang Shuren University, **China**

ABSTRACT

This study investigates interaction patterns in College English classrooms through Sinclair and Coulthard's Initiation–Response–Feedback (IRF) model. The analysis reveals that over 80% of classroom talk is initiated by teachers, with a strong preference for display questions and brief evaluative feedback. Student participation is limited, with few instances of student-initiated talk or extended responses. This interaction style restricts opportunities for critical thinking, authentic communication, and the development of communicative competence. To address these issues, the study recommends a shift toward referential questions, the use of formative and elaborative feedback, and the integration of student-centered activities such as group discussions and peer interaction. The current study also highlights the importance of teacher training in discourse strategies and institutional support, including smaller class sizes and improved assessment systems. These changes aim to foster a more dialogic and learner-centered classroom environment that supports students' language proficiency, cognitive engagement, and autonomy.

Keywords: Classroom Discourse Analysis; Discourse Analysis; College English Teaching

1. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, College English teaching in China has received more attention because English is becoming more important for international communication and career development (Sun & Wang, 2024). Although current policies support communicative and student-centered teaching methods (Wang, 2024), many university classrooms are still led by teachers. In these classrooms, teachers talk most of the time, and students have few chances to speak or use English actively. This makes it difficult for students to develop communicative competence, which is necessary for using English in real-life situations.

Classroom discourse, which means the way teachers and students use language during lessons, plays an important role in both teaching and learning (Joshua, 2012). Studying how classroom talk is structured can help show the strengths and problems in current teaching practices. Discourse analysis provides useful tools to study how people interact in language classrooms. One widely used tool is the Initiation–Response–Feedback (IRF) model, developed by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975). This model breaks classroom talks into three parts: the teacher starts with a question or prompt (Initiation), the student replies (Response), and the teacher gives feedback (Feedback).

This study uses the IRF model to analyze classroom discourse in College English classes in China. It focuses on how teachers and students interact to find patterns that may reduce student participation and limit their communicative development. The goal is to suggest practical changes that make classrooms more student-centered and interactive. These changes aim to give students more chances to speak and think critically in English, which can improve their language learning.

The study also points out that teacher training in discourse awareness is important for successful teaching reform.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Classroom interaction has long been recognized as a central factor influencing second language acquisition and the development of learners' communicative competence (Brooks, 1992; Leung & Lewkowicz, 2013). Researchers such as Long (1983) and Ellis (2003) have emphasized that effective interaction provides learners with essential input, opportunities for meaningful output, and occasions for negotiating meaning—key components of successful language learning. Over the past few decades, language teaching methodologies have gradually shifted from traditional teacher-centered approaches to communicative approaches that emphasize authentic, functional use of language. According to Richards and Rodgers (2001), communicative language teaching (CLT) focuses on enabling learners to use the target language effectively and appropriately in real-life situations, rather than merely mastering grammatical structures. This paradigm shift has inspired a growing body of research exploring how classroom discourse supports or hinders the goals of communicative pedagogy.

In the Chinese context, particularly in College English education, a series of curriculum reforms initiated since the 1990s have aimed to move away from the grammar-translation method toward more communicative, student-centered instruction (Xing, 2006). These reforms align with national policy directives that promote interactive teaching, learner autonomy, and the development of critical thinking skills. However, empirical studies continue to report that College English classrooms remain largely teacher-dominated, with limited opportunities for student interaction (Chen, 2024; Meng, 2023). This persistent gap between pedagogical ideals and classroom realities has attracted scholarly attention, particularly concerning the structural characteristics of classroom discourse.

Discourse analysis offers a systematic approach to examining how language is used in educational settings. It allows researchers to investigate how interaction is organized, how power is distributed between teachers and students, and how knowledge is constructed and conveyed (Seedhouse, 2004). One widely adopted model in classroom discourse research is the Initiation–Response–Feedback (IRF) model developed by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975). This model characterizes classroom exchanges as consisting of three core moves: 1) the teacher initiates the interaction (e.g., by posing a question or giving instructions), 2) the student responds, and 3) the teacher provides feedback—often in the form of praise, correction, or evaluation. The IRF model has been instrumental in revealing how teacher talk often shapes the interactional dynamics of classrooms, with teachers typically controlling turn-taking and topic management.

A substantial body of international research suggests that while the IRF pattern facilitates classroom management, it also tends to constrain student agency. Mehan (1979) observed that students often provide brief, fact-based answers, reinforcing the teacher's authority and limiting opportunities for extended discourse or student-initiated contributions. Wells (1993) advocated for more dialogic classroom interaction, in which teachers and students co-construct knowledge through reciprocal exchanges. Similarly, Lemke (1990) emphasized the importance of expanding teacher feedback to include prompts that encourage students to elaborate and reflect, thereby fostering more substantive participation.

Within the context of Chinese College English instruction, the application of the IRF model remains relatively underexplored but is gaining attention. For instance, Cortazzi and Jin (1996) found that many teachers relied heavily on display questions, which are questions posed by the teacher for

which the answer is already known (e.g., "What is the past tense of 'go'?"). These questions typically aim to assess factual recall and offer limited scope for student expression. In contrast, referential questions—which seek students' personal views, experiences, or interpretations (e.g., "What do you think about online learning?")—are more likely to promote authentic communication and longer responses. Zhao (2010) reported that teacher feedback in many classrooms was largely evaluative or corrective in nature, lacking follow-up moves that could sustain interaction. Such findings suggest that conventional IRF patterns continue to dominate many Chinese EFL classrooms, potentially undermining the communicative aims of recent teaching reforms. Rao (2002) has called for increased student talk and peer interaction supported by meaningful communicative tasks. However, achieving such reforms requires a precise understanding of how classroom discourse currently functions in practice.

A further challenge lies in the tension between policy and practice. Although recent curriculum guidelines emphasize student-centered and interactive pedagogy, teachers often face considerable constraints, including large class sizes, heavy teaching loads, and heterogeneous student proficiency levels. These factors frequently perpetuate traditional IRF-based teaching practices (Su, 2017). Moreover, Pennington (2008) highlights that many teachers lack sufficient awareness of the impact of classroom discourse on learning outcomes. This highlights the urgent need for targeted professional development to enhance teachers' discourse competence and support the creation of more dialogic and communicative classroom environments.

In summary, the above section indicates that discourse analysis, particularly the IRF model, provides critical insights into the interactional features of College English instruction in China. Despite national efforts to promote interactive and student-centered teaching, classroom discourse remains largely teacher-directed, limiting students' opportunities to develop communicative competence. There is a pressing need for empirical investigations that document current classroom practices and inform evidence-based teaching reforms. Therefore, based on the above, the current study aims to answer the following two questions:

1. What are the dominant patterns of teacher-student interaction in Chinese College English classrooms according to the IRF model?
2. How can teaching reforms based on IRF analysis promote more dialogic and student-centered classroom discourse to improve students' communicative competence?

3. METHOD

3.1 Research Tools and Data Collection

To collect data, audio recordings were used to capture real classroom interactions during College English lessons. A portable digital voice recorder with high sensitivity and noise reduction functions was selected to ensure good sound quality. In addition to audio recording, the researcher also took observation notes during each class. These notes included information that could not be heard on the recordings, such as teacher gestures, student facial expressions, seating arrangements, and levels of student engagement. For example, the researcher noted whether students were looking at the teacher, taking notes, or raising their hands. These observations helped to explain the spoken interaction and provided important context for interpreting classroom communication.

Each class that was recorded lasted about 40 to 45 minutes, which is the standard length of a college English lesson in Chinese universities. Several classes from different teachers and student groups were recorded. This helped to collect data that reflected a range of teaching styles and classroom situations, making it possible to identify both common and varied interaction patterns.

Before data collection began, all participants were informed about the purpose of the study and how the data would be used. Informed consent was obtained from both teachers and students. They were told that participation was voluntary and that they could withdraw at any time. All data were kept confidential, and real names were not used in the transcripts or final report. These steps followed research ethics and ensured the protection of all participants' rights.

3.2 Data Transcription and Coding

All audio recordings were transcribed verbatim by the researcher and a trained assistant following standard transcription procedures. The transcription included not only the spoken words but also important features of spoken interaction such as pauses, overlapping speech, shifts in intonation, and emphasis. A simplified version of the Jefferson transcription system, widely used in discourse studies, was applied to ensure these details were properly captured. This allowed for a more accurate analysis of how participants used language during classroom interaction.

After the transcription was completed, all text data were imported into NVivo 12, a qualitative data analysis software. NVivo helped the researcher manage and organize the large amount of classroom talk, making it easier to identify, compare, and analyze interactional features across lessons. The coding framework followed Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) Initiation–Response–Feedback (IRF) model. Each unit of interaction, called a "move," was categorized as either initiation (usually by the teacher), response (typically from the student), or feedback (commonly from the teacher following a response). These move types were further divided into subcategories. For example, initiation moves included "display questions," where the teacher already knows the answer, and "referential questions," which are open-ended and encourage students to express opinions or experiences. Response moves included both short replies and extended answers, while feedback moves included praise, correction, or encouragement to continue the conversation.

All move types and subcategories were coded into NVivo using a structured system called nodes. This allowed for the systematic counting and comparison of different interaction types across classes. In addition to qualitative coding, simple quantitative data were also collected using Excel, including total speaking time for teachers and students, number of speakers turns, and frequencies of each move type. This mixed-method approach—combining detailed transcription, structured qualitative coding, and basic quantitative analysis—helped reveal how classroom discourse was organized and whether it followed or diverged from the typical IRF structure.

3.3 Sample Background

This study was based on six College English classes from a large public university in a major city in eastern China. These classes were part of the required English program for undergraduate students who were not English majors. The students were in their first or second year and came from different departments such as engineering, business, and education. This variety helped ensure the sample reflected a typical College English teaching environment.

In total, about 180 students took part in the study. Each class had between 28 and 32 students, which is common in many Chinese universities. Most of the students were between 18 and 21 years old. Their English levels were different, but all had either passed the College English Test Band 4 (CET-4) or were preparing for it. This means they had at least an intermediate level of English, making them suitable for analyzing classroom interaction focused on language use and communication.

Three female teachers participated in the study. Their teaching experience ranged from five to over ten years. All of them had at least a master's degree in English, Applied Linguistics, or related

fields. They were familiar with both traditional and communicative teaching methods. The teachers were selected because they were willing to take part in the research and were interested in improving classroom interaction. Before the study started, the researcher explained the research purpose and methods, and the teachers agreed to participate fully.

This sample was chosen to represent a typical situation in urban Chinese universities, where government policies encourage communicative teaching, but traditional methods are still widely used. The mix of students and teachers, as well as the real classroom setting, made this sample suitable for exploring how classroom interaction works under current teaching conditions.

4. FINDINGS

This section reports the main findings from the analysis of six College English classrooms, using the Initiation–Response–Feedback (IRF) model. The results showed several common patterns in how teachers and students interacted. These patterns suggest that there are still problems that limit how much students can participate and use English to communicate. The findings are grouped into three key areas: 1) most classroom talk is started and controlled by teachers, 2) student responses are often short or limited, and 3) teachers usually give basic feedback without encouraging further discussion. Each of these points is explained with real classroom examples and analysis to show what they mean for language learning.

4.1 Teacher-Dominated Initiation Patterns

One of the most salient characteristics of the classroom discourse was the predominance of teacher-initiated interaction. In all six observed classrooms, 82% of the discourse sequences were initiated by the teacher, reflecting a strong teacher-centered pattern of communication. The majority of these initiations consisted of display questions—questions designed to elicit predetermined or factual answers rather than to stimulate open-ended discussion or encourage students' creative and critical thinking. This pattern highlights the limited opportunities provided to students for initiating talk or engaging in authentic language use.

Example 1:

Teacher: "What is the past tense of 'go'?"

Student: "Went."

Teacher: "Correct."

This example clearly shows a typical Initiation–Response–Feedback (IRF) sequence. The teacher asks a factual question (Initiation), the student gives a short answer (Response), and the teacher gives brief feedback (Feedback). Although this exchange is correct and works well for checking knowledge, it does not give the student a chance to speak more or think deeply. The student only replies and is not invited to ask questions or explain their answer.

In many cases, the teacher's questions were display questions, which are questions with known answers. These questions often focused on grammar rules, word meanings, or sentence forms. While such questions help review language knowledge, they may limit students' ability to use English for communication. If teachers rely too much on display questions, students may get used to memorizing answers instead of using language to express their own ideas.

The strong control by the teacher also shows a traditional view of the teacher as the main source of knowledge. This creates an unbalanced classroom environment, where students wait for the teacher

to lead and rarely take an active role. The interaction is mostly one-way (monologic) rather than two-way (dialogic), with little chance for shared discussion between teacher and students.

In general, this pattern of teacher-led talk may not support the goals of communicative and student-centered teaching. If students do not often get to start conversations, ask questions, or share their thoughts, their real-life communication skills in English may not develop well. Using more open-ended or referential questions—where students can share opinions or experiences—can help create more meaningful interaction and support language learning.

Example 2:

Teacher: "Can anyone tell me what a topic sentence is?"

(Pause)

Teacher: "It's the first sentence that tells you what the paragraph is about."

Although the teacher's question seems to invite student participation, no one responds. After a short pause, the teacher gives the answer instead. This type of interaction shows a missed chance for student involvement. Even though the question could lead to discussion, the interaction quickly returns to a teacher-centered pattern when the teacher speaks again to fill the silence. This pattern was seen in several classrooms, where teachers often answered their own questions after waiting only briefly.

This kind of classroom talk suggests that students might not feel confident or comfortable speaking in front of others. In large classes, many students worry about making mistakes or being corrected in public, so they stay silent. When teachers answer their own questions too quickly, students lose the chance to speak or think critically. The teacher may be trying to keep the lesson on track, but this reduces students' independence and learning opportunities.

Also, even though the question appears open-ended, it often acts like a display question—a question with only one correct answer. The teacher expects a specific response and does not accept different ideas or opinions. When students think the teacher will give the answer anyway, they may not see any reason to speak. This reflects a common problem in classrooms where the IRF pattern dominates: students take a passive role and rely on the teacher to lead the talk instead of joining in to build understanding together.

To help students feel more confident in responding, teachers can use small strategies such as allowing more wait time, giving support through simpler follow-up questions, or letting students talk in pairs before sharing with the class. For example, the teacher might say, "Take a minute to think," or "Talk with your partner first." These small changes give students time to prepare and increase their willingness to participate.

This example shows how teacher-centered classroom talk and fast moves from question to answer can reduce student involvement, even when the teacher's question is meant to be interactive. It shows the importance of using teaching methods that involve students more in building meaning and developing their language skills.

4.2 Limited Student Responses and Minimal Peer Interaction

The second important finding from the analysis is that student responses were usually very short and lacked detail. In most classroom interactions, students gave brief answers, often only one or two words. These answers were usually expected or fixed, showing little sign of independent thinking, explanation, or personal opinion. The study of the transcripts showed that about 70% of

student answers were only one to three words long, mostly used to confirm or repeat the correct answer. This shows that students were responding in a routine way instead of using English to communicate in a meaningful way.

Example 3

Teacher: "Is this sentence active or passive?"

Student: "Passive."

Teacher: "Right."

In this example, the teacher asks a simple question with only two possible answers: active or passive. The student answers correctly with just one word. The teacher then confirms the answer and quickly moves on. Although this fits the basic IRF pattern, it does not allow the student to talk more or explain the idea. The student does not give a reason or an example, and the teacher does not ask for more details. This shows that the lesson focuses more on finishing tasks quickly than on letting students express themselves, especially when class time is short.

This type of interaction happened often in the six classrooms. Students rarely had chances to explain their thoughts, ask questions, or talk to each other. In fact, students only started about 12% of all speaking turns, meaning they spoke very little on their own. There was also little talk between students. Most communication was just between the teacher and individual students. This lack of student-to-student talk reduces chances for students to clarify meaning, ask questions, or build on each other's ideas—skills important for learning to use English well.

These results support what Mehan (1979) and Seedhouse (2004) found: when teachers ask mostly closed questions, students give short, simple answers. In these situations, students focus on giving the "right" answer instead of really using the language. The strong teacher control and few open questions make students less willing to take risks or speak freely. So, classroom talk stays controlled and predictable.

To make classroom talk more interactive and meaningful, teachers could try asking more open questions, encouraging pair or group work, and asking students to explain their answers. For example, instead of asking "Is this sentence active or passive?" the teacher could say, "How do you know this sentence is passive? Can you explain?" This type of question asks for more thinking and explanation. Also, encouraging students to ask questions or respond to classmates' answers can help create a more student-centered and interactive classroom.

Example 4:

Teacher: "What do you think of this idea?"

Student A: "It's good."

Teacher: "Okay. Anyone else?"

(Silence)

Teacher: "Let's move on."

In this example, the teacher asks an open-ended question that allows for many possible answers. However, the student only gives a short reply— "It's good"—without any explanation. The teacher then asks if other students want to answer, but no one responds. The teacher quickly ends the

exchange and moves on to the next topic. Although the teacher likely wanted more students to take part, the way the classroom interaction worked did not help support further discussion.

This example shows several key problems. First, students may not feel confident or motivated to express their opinions in English, especially in large classes. Second, they may not be used to answering open-ended questions that require thinking and personal opinion, especially if their past learning focused mainly on getting the "right" answer. Third, the teacher did not ask follow-up questions like "Why do you think so?" or "Can you give an example?", which could have helped the student explain more.

Another issue is that no other students responded after the first student spoke. This silence suggests that students are not used to talking to each other in class discussions. In this kind of classroom, the interaction usually goes only between teacher and students, not among students themselves. Previous studies also show that when student-student interaction is missing, students are less likely to take part actively and have fewer chances to use the language.

To improve this, teachers can use strategies that help students give longer and deeper answers. For example, if a student says "It's good," the teacher can ask questions like "What makes it good?" or "Can you compare it with something else we learned?" This helps students think more and speak more. Also, letting students talk in small groups before asking them to speak in front of the whole class can give them more confidence and make them more willing to share their ideas.

4.3 Restricted and Evaluative Feedback

The third major finding concerns the type of feedback given by teachers, which was mostly evaluative. In most cases, teachers gave either positive comments like "Good," "Yes," or "Right," or corrections such as "No, that's wrong" or "Try again." Only a small number of feedback moves—less than 10%—included elaborative responses. These more supportive types of feedback, which help students think more deeply, explain their answers, or say more, were rarely used.

Example 5:

Teacher: "Can you give me a sentence using 'although'?"

Student: "Although it's raining, I go to school."

Teacher: "Yes, very good."

In this example, the student gives a correct sentence that matches what the teacher expects. The teacher replies with "Yes, very good," showing approval. However, this kind of feedback ends the exchange quickly and does not help the student think more about the sentence or how it could be used in other situations. The teacher does not ask for an explanation or a new example, so the chance for deeper learning is missed.

When feedback is limited to short praise or correction, students may focus only on giving the "right answer" instead of thinking critically or using English in creative ways. This kind of classroom talk keeps the teacher in control and does not support student-centered learning. It also reduces opportunities for students to talk more or develop their own ideas.

Elaborative feedback, which includes explanations, follow-up questions, or suggestions, is more useful for helping students learn. For example, instead of just saying "Very good," the teacher could ask, "Can you make another sentence with a different meaning?" or "Why did you choose this

word?" These questions can help students reflect on their language choices and improve their ability to use English actively.

Example 6:

Teacher: "Why did the character in the story feel sad?"

Student: "Because his dog died."

Teacher: "Correct. Next question…"

This example shows another case of limited feedback in College English classrooms. The teacher asks a reasoning question that invites explanation, but the student's answer is only followed by a short reply: "Correct." The teacher then moves quickly to the next question without asking for more detail or encouraging the student to talk further about the emotional or story-related aspects.

The problem with this kind of feedback is that it turns even open-ended questions into tasks for short, factual answers. It stops the chance for deeper thinking or for using more complex language. For instance, the teacher could have said, "Yes, and how did that affect his actions later?" or "Can you explain how the story shows his sadness?" These kinds of follow-up questions help students think more deeply, express personal views, and use richer language.

This missed opportunity shows a broader problem in the observed classrooms: feedback is often focused on speed and covering content rather than building interaction or deeper learning. While confirming that an answer is correct is useful, good feedback should also help students develop their language skills by encouraging them to reflect and say more. This is especially important in College English teaching, where the goal is not only to test correct answers but also to help students learn to communicate well and think clearly in English.

Example 7 (Elaborative Feedback):

Teacher: "What's your opinion on this issue?"

Student: "I think it's not fair."

Teacher: "Why do you say that? Can you give an example?"

Student: "Because some students… they don't have the same chance. For example, in rural areas…"

Teacher: "That's a good point. Does anyone agree or disagree with her?"

This example shows a more interactive and student-centered type of classroom talk, which is different from the more limited IRF patterns discussed earlier. The teacher asks the student for her opinion, using an open-ended question that encourages personal thinking instead of just a factual answer. After the student replies, the teacher follows up by asking why she thinks so and requests an example. This helps the student give a longer and more detailed answer.

The student responds with a thoughtful explanation about unfair educational chances in rural areas. Her answer shows critical thinking and allows her to use more complex English. The teacher then gives positive feedback and invites other students to agree or disagree. This encourages more peer talk and builds a shared discussion.

This kind of classroom talk shows key features of dialogic teaching. First, the teacher's questions guide students to reflect and explain their ideas, not just say short answers. Second, the teacher's

feedback supports continued discussion, instead of stopping it. Third, involving other students increases participation and gives space for different views.

Such classroom exchanges help students improve both their language use and thinking skills. They also create a more active and engaging learning environment. This example shows how moving beyond the usual IRF pattern can lead to better student interaction and communication in the English classroom.

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study used Sinclair and Coulthard's IRF model to analyze classroom talk in six College English classes in China. The findings showed that most classroom interaction was teacher-led. Teachers initiated about 82% of the talk, and the majority of their questions were display questions—ones with fixed answers. These questions focused on checking knowledge rather than encouraging open discussion, critical thinking, or student creativity. As a result, students often gave short answers and did not start conversations or ask questions. Peer interaction was rare, and students had few chances to express their ideas in extended ways.

Student responses were usually very short, sometimes just one or two words, such as "good" or "passive." Even when teachers asked open-ended questions, students often remained silent. This may be due to large class sizes, fear of making mistakes, or their long experience with traditional IRF teaching. Teacher feedback was mostly evaluative—short phrases like "correct" or "yes"— that ended the conversation quickly. Very few teachers gave elaborative feedback that encouraged students to think more, explain, or build on their ideas. However, in some cases where teachers did give such feedback, students responded with longer and more thoughtful answers. This shows the value of using more supportive feedback to promote student engagement.

These findings highlight a gap between the goals of communicative language teaching and the actual practices in many classrooms. Communicative teaching aims to help students use English for real communication, express opinions, and interact with others. But current classroom patterns—focused on correctness and controlled by teachers—limit students' opportunities to develop these skills.

To improve College English teaching, several changes are suggested. Teachers should use more open-ended questions that ask for opinions or explanations. They should give students more time to think before answering and use feedback to support extended student talk. Pair work, group discussions, and collaborative problem-solving tasks can also help students practice communication in a meaningful way. Creating a classroom environment where students feel safe to speak and share ideas is important.

At a broader level, teacher training should help teachers understand how their talk affects student participation. Training workshops and reflective practice can support teachers in learning how to use referential questions (that seek student opinions) and elaborative feedback (that builds on student ideas). Curriculum designers can also include more student-centered tasks like debates, peer interviews, and group writing that encourage students to use English actively. These tasks support national teaching reforms that focus on practical language use and communication.

However, it is important to recognize the barriers teachers face. Large classes, exam-focused teaching, and heavy workloads can make interactive teaching difficult. Teachers may feel pressure to finish textbooks quickly or prepare students for tests. To help with this, schools and education authorities can reduce class sizes, adjust assessment standards to value communication skills, and

provide more time and support for lesson planning. Teacher communities, peer support groups, and online resources can also encourage gradual change in classroom practice.

Future research should look at how changes in classroom talk affect student learning in different settings. Long-term studies can show how interactive teaching improves language skills over time. Comparative studies across regions or types of schools can provide useful insights into how context influences teaching. It is also useful to study how students and teachers feel about these changes and how their attitudes shape classroom talks.

In conclusion, the IRF model reveals that College English classrooms are still largely teacher-led, with limited student interaction. But the findings also suggest clear paths for improvement. By using more open questions, giving useful feedback, and encouraging peer interaction, teachers can create more active and communicative classrooms. With support from institutions and further research, these changes can help students become more confident and capable English users, ready for academic and real-world communication.

REFERENCE

1) Brooks, F. B. (1992). Communicative competence and the conversation course: A social interaction perspective. Linguistics and education, 4(2), 219-246. https://doi.org/10.1016/0898-5898(92)90015-O

2) Chen, W. (2024). The impact of flipped classroom on English proficiency of first-year Chinese urban and rural pre-service teachers. Frontiers in Psychology, 15, 1347826. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1347826

3) Chien-Yuan, S. (2017). Investigating the Effectiveness of an Interactive IRF-Based English Grammar Learning System. International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (Online), 12(11), 63.https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v12.i11.7036

4) Cortazzi, M; Jin, L. (1996c) Cultures of Learning: Language Classrooms in China in H. Coleman (ed.) Society and the Language Classroom, Cambridge: CUP pp.169-206

5) Ellis, R. (2003). Designing a task-based syllabus. RELC journal, 34(1), 64-81. https://doi.org/10.1177/003368820303400105

6) Lemke, J. (1990). Talking Science: Language, Learning, and Values. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

7) Leung, C., & Lewkowicz, J. (2013). Language communication and communicative competence: A view from contemporary classrooms. Language and Education, 27(5), 398-414.

8) Liang, W. (2024). The Effects of Student-centered Teaching Methods on the Motivation of English Language Learning. Communications in Humanities Research, 32, 78-83. https://doi.org/10.54254/2753-7064/32/20240018

9) Long, M. H. (1983). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input1. Applied linguistics, 4(2), 126-141. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/4.2.126

10) Mehan, H. (1979). Learning Lessons: Social Organization in the Classroom. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

11) Meng, Q. (2023). The transformation and development of teacher's role in the reform of college English teaching. Transactions on Comparative Education, 5(8), 19-24: https://doi.org/10.23977/trance.2023.050804

12) Pennington, M. C. (2008). Examining classroom discourse frames: an approach to raising language teachers' awareness of and planning for language use. In Language in language teacher education (pp. 149-172). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

13) Rao, Z. (2002). Chinese students' perceptions of communicative and non-communicative activities in EFL classroom. System, 30(1), 85-105. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(01)00050-1

14) Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). Approaches and methods in language teaching. Cambridge university press.

15) Seedhouse, P. (2004). The Interactional Architecture of the Language Classroom: A Conversation Analysis Perspective. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

16) Sinclair, J. M., & Coulthard, R. M. (1975). Towards an Analysis of Discourse: The English Used by Teachers and Pupils. London: Oxford University Press.

17) Sun, G., & Wang, Y. (2024). The Role of College English in Promoting Students' Future Career Development. International Journal of Educational Teaching and Research, 1(2). https://doi.org/10.70767/ijetr.v1i2.315

18) Thoms, J. J. (2012). Classroom discourse in foreign language classrooms: A review of the literature. Foreign Language Annals, 45(s1), s8-s27. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2012.01177.x

19) Wells, G. (1993). Reevaluating the IRF Sequence: A Dialogic Perspective. Linguistics and Education, 5(1), 1–37. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0898-5898(05)80001-4

20) Xing, J. Z. (2006). Teaching and learning Chinese as a foreign language: A pedagogical grammar (Vol. 1). Hong Kong University Press.

21) Zhao, H. (2010). Investigating learners' use and understanding of peer and teacher feedback on writing: A comparative study in a Chinese English writing classroom. Assessing writing, 15(1), 3-17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2010.01.002