



Mapping Teacher Talk in an EFL Classroom: Empirical Evidence from an Indonesian Pre-service Teacher

Metty Agustine Primary¹, Emi Emilia², and Didi Sukyadi³

^{1,2,3} Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung 40154, West Java, Indonesia
mettyap@upi.edu

Abstract. This paper mainly reports on the features of a pre-service teacher's talk, which may impact the learners' interaction in an EFL classroom. This study employed the data gathered from a lesson transcript of teaching practice recording from an Indonesian pre-service teacher involved in a teaching practicum program at one of the teacher education faculties in Tasikmalaya, West Java, Indonesia, for three months. The data was thematically analysed through the SETT (Self Evaluation of Teacher Talk) framework. The results indicate that the pre-service teacher utilised all forms of teacher discourse to pedagogical objectives: 1) managerial, 2) material, 3) skills and systems, and 4) classroom context, aligned with the interactional characteristics. In conclusion, the pre-service teacher's reliance on teacher talk in English instruction predominates classroom talk, as she priorities lesson delivery over fostering student learning. A pre-service teacher is advised to utilise the English language in her instruction to enhance its role in promoting an effective language classroom. Besides that, this study is expected to provide critical insights for improving the language learning classroom, which pre-service teachers should be prepared for by promoting their communicative competence and skills.

Keywords: Pre-service teacher, SETT, Teacher talk.

1 Introduction

The growth of classroom research focusing on teacher talk as a part of classroom interaction has been predominant in recent years. Some research indicated that classroom dialogue is perceived as an essential aspect [1-3] and certain implications of having a robust collection of talk in class [4,5]. Classroom talk is an effective way to improve classroom interaction if the teacher can utilize it in the appropriate use and function. Teacher Talk (hereafter TT) is a form of talk that facilitates the interchange of ideas between the teacher and students during instruction. There are many studies concerning teacher talk in language classrooms. For instance, the study concentrates on instructing group discussion in secondary English classes [6] and the third-grade bilingual teacher used teacher-talk to support her students' learning by addressing their sociocultural, linguistic, cognitive, and academic needs [7]. The characterization of teacher talks in a bilingual educational setting, especially within a children's language classroom, can support the improvement of children's participation in classroom discussions by

introducing them to the discourse used in educational activities and academic subjects [8]. There is little research concerning pre-service teachers' talk in EFL classrooms, which is essential to expose because they are language teacher candidates who should be aware of the existence of TT in the classroom. The aforementioned issue has the potential to motivate learners when they are provided with a role model who can demonstrate the application of language, particularly English as a foreign language.

Teacher talk constitutes a pivotal component in the realm of pedagogy, especially in the context of teaching a second or foreign language. Two principal characteristics of teacher talk in second language classrooms are evident; firstly, it serves as a mechanism for communication within classroom discourse that encompasses the subject matters specifically lexis, syntactic structures, and phonological elements, and secondly, it offers learners opportunities to connect with the second language in a way that fosters meaningful communication, thereby either enhancing or obstructing those interactions. As a result, the effectiveness of teacher talk could carry greater significance for language acquisition in second or foreign language educational contexts than in other academic disciplines. The present investigation employed Self Evaluation of Teacher Talk (SETT) framework from Walsh [9]. The framework asserts that teacher talk (TT) is dependent on the pedagogical goals associated with the various phases of instruction. Within the SETT framework, it delineates four distinct modes or phases of classroom interaction. Each of these modes is aligned with a specific pedagogical objective and encompasses particular interactional characteristics [10]. The four highlighted types are management, materials, skills and systems, and classroom context. Utilizing these sorts, the current study seeks to clarify the research question: what features of foreign language pre-service teachers' talk occur in an EFL classroom?

Considering the limited research on teacher talk in relation to classroom interaction in EFL settings, this study seeks to examine the characteristics of teacher talk, providing insights into how pre-service teachers can better understand its significance. It may sometimes be dangerous when the teacher does not know the function of TT in the language classroom. However, it may be beneficial if the teacher recognizes the use of talk to urge students to utilize the target language they have learned. The significance of this study also highlights and concludes with several implications and recommendations to prepare and improve the practice of English teaching in the EFL context such as recognizing the four types of TT (management, materials, skills and system, and classroom context modes) that can be used by teachers to improve their interaction with students using English. It is a probable solution to overcome the problems discussed related to the use of TT, which usually dominates the language learning process for Indonesian students.

2 Literature Review

2.1 Sociocultural Theory of Learning

The theoretical framework that is employed to examine the study question is Vygotsky's sociocultural theory of learning (1978). Sociocultural theory is an emerging psy-

chological framework that examines society's critical contributions to individual development. This idea focuses on the interplay between developing people and the cultures in which they inhabit. Sociocultural theory also contends that human learning is fundamentally a social activity. This theory originated from the research of psychologist Lev Vygotsky, resulting in the framework of Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) for learner development. It denotes the difference between a learner's current developmental level, shown through independent problem-solving, and their potential developmental level, evaluated through problem-solving with adult guidance or collaboration with more knowledgeable peers [11].

The term ZPD (Zone of Proximal Development) refers to the gap between what a student can achieve independently and what they can achieve with support from someone more skilled. Scaffolding, a key concept within ZPD, is closely related to teacher talk, which involves the verbal guidance typically offered to a student by a more knowledgeable individual, such as a teacher [12]. For instance, a teacher might modify a request from "Would you mind cleaning the whiteboard, please?" to "Can you clean the whiteboard?" To facilitate effective learning, language teachers must determine the optimal timing for implementing scaffolding. Sociocultural theory emphasizes that learning is centered on interaction and negotiation rather than simply acquiring knowledge [13]. Long acknowledged the importance of interactions and meaning negotiations in fostering language development [14]. Swain proposed that the output, or language production, of second language learners contributes to the development of language accuracy [15]. Recent studies in second language acquisition have broadened the conventional model of intake, interaction, and output by incorporating social activities [16], drawing inspiration from Vygotsky's work [17] and related studies in activity theory [18]. This research focuses particularly on how skilled speakers provide scaffolding to support learners' language development [19].

Long's Interaction Hypothesis (1996) is closely connected to teacher talk, as it supports the sociocultural theory of learning. It highlights the significance of not only the level, complexity, and amount of language input, like teacher talk, but also the importance of negotiation among learners and between learners and teachers in promoting effective learning [12]. Negotiating meaning may lead to interactional adjustments by the competent interlocutor, such as the instructor in language classes, who supports learners' language acquisition [20]. Building on Long's work, Swain's Output Hypothesis [21] emphasizes the role of teacher talk not only in delivering comprehensible input but also in facilitating opportunities for comprehensible output, allowing interaction to play a key role in language acquisition. For instance, when a teacher observes that certain students do not understand a peer's input, they can encourage the student to adjust their language to make their output clearer. This process allows learners to test and refine their language hypotheses, further enhancing their awareness and understanding of the second or foreign language. It is well established that ESL or EFL classrooms are social environments where language acquisition occurs. In the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), a knowledgeable expert or competent interlocutor should use teacher talk strategically to scaffold learners, facilitate interaction, and encourage negotiation, pushing students to actively participate. Classroom interactions foster language acquisition as a collaborative

process, constructed collectively and deeply connected to learners' consistent and repeated engagement in meaningful activities [22]. As a result, sociocultural theory provides a suitable framework for examining teacher talk.

2.2 Teacher Talk and Classroom Interaction

Teacher talk (TT) is one of the factors influencing learners' language proficiency when studying EFL. Ellis suggested that teacher talk is seen as a key factor in influencing learners' performance in second language acquisition [23]. Teachers communicate with language learners in the classroom differently than with other types of learners, modifying both the form and function of their language to facilitate effective communication [24]. These modifications are collectively referred to as teacher talk. In addition, teacher talk is a part of classroom interaction that emphasises the use of every single utterance by the teacher during classroom practice, with different functions and purposes.

Teacher talk plays a crucial role in language teaching [25]. Pedagogical theory suggests that the language teachers use in the classroom significantly influences the success of a lesson. Research has shown that teacher talk constitutes approximately 70% of classroom language [25,26]. Through teacher talk, teachers deliver knowledge and skills, organize teaching activities, and support students in practicing the language. In English classrooms, the teacher's use of English serves not only as the content to be learned but also as the tool for achieving teaching and learning objectives. Both classroom management and the attainment of instructional goals rely heavily on effective teacher talk.

The growth of classroom research focusing on teacher talk as a part of classroom interaction has been predominant in recent years. A close study investigates the development of questioning-based discourse as an analytical framework for representing classroom talk and questioning [27]. Another study reveals that an in-service training project has been conducted to examine trainees' awareness through the analysis of teaching sequences' transcription and the degree of communicativeness in their classroom interactions [28]. Several absences and the presence of communicative classroom talk features for this study described classroom interactions. It is necessary to examine the conceptions of interactive pedagogy toward classroom interaction, the classroom interaction in literacy and numeric lessons, and critical reflection upon this process [29]. Furthermore, this study focuses on how the teacher question starts an opening classroom interaction to promote pupil responses.

Teacher talk plays a vital role in the success of learners in acquiring a second or foreign language. As Nunan emphasized, teacher talk is essential not only for organizing and managing the classroom but also for facilitating language acquisition processes [30]. It is fundamental to classroom structure and administration, as the language used by teachers determines their ability to effectively implement lesson plans. From an acquisition perspective, teacher talk serves as the primary source of comprehensible input in the target language for learners. The amount and quality of teacher talk are key factors influencing the effectiveness of classroom teaching [31]. This study explores the role of teacher talk in the context of young language learners

[32], identifying various characteristics of teacher language use that align with two themes: constructive and obstructive teacher talk. Constructive teacher talk involves strategies like correcting errors directly, giving content-focused feedback, prompting students, allowing extended wait times, and addressing mistakes. In contrast, obstructive teacher talk involves behaviors like completing students' turns, excessive use of teacher echo, and frequent reliance on initiation-response-feedback turn-taking patterns [32].

Teacher talk can be divided into two main types of language: the first focuses on managing classroom activities, while the second is used to deliver instructional content to students [33]. Classroom interactions can be further categorized into two aspects: functional features and formal features, with functional features being the primary focus. Functional features refer to the language used by the teacher for organizing and managing the classroom. This encompasses the quantity and quality of teacher talk, the types of questions posed, the interactional adjustments implemented, and the feedback given by the teacher [34]. This concept is relevant to the theories concerned with teacher talks in English classrooms, such as Krashen's input theory and Swain's output theory. Krashen's input hypothesis posits that a learner can acquire language through one mechanism: either by comprehending messages or by receiving intelligible information. Swain's output hypothesis posits that mere exposure to comprehensive information is inadequate for language development. Two traits exist. The initial aspect is the formal dimension, wherein teachers must articulate at a moderate pace to facilitate comprehension of terminology. The second aspect is termed the functional facet; it encompasses the teacher's inquiries, the methodology employed in posing questions, the feedback provided by the teacher, and the effective strategies utilized for the rapid review of prior information. Teacher talk is essential in language acquisition as it assesses students' capacity to perceive and understand language.

To sum up, teacher talk will be very beneficial for helping learners achieve their learning objectives through various teacher talks in the classroom. This term will also encourage classroom interaction to build rapport between students and teachers or students to students. Besides that, it also motivates learners to create classroom talk, which refers to the concept of classroom language use. The learners will know the turn-taking and move-in talks. Thus, teacher talk will be critical in classroom talk and interaction in English language learning.

3 Research Method

This study adopts a case-study approach, conducting an in-depth analysis of the characteristics of pre-service teacher talk in using English in an EFL classroom and its effects on learners' interactions. A case study involves a detailed investigation of a specific, bounded system (such as an activity, event, process, or individual) through comprehensive data collection [35]. The study aligns with Stakes' assertion that "case study researchers may concentrate on a program, event, activity, or individual rather

than focusing on a group as a whole" [35]. Due to this framework, this study will explore teacher talk patterns that can influence classroom interaction, especially learner interaction.

3.1 **Setting and Participant**

This study was conducted on a female pre-service English teacher who participated in a school-based internship for three months in one of the high schools in Indonesia. She joined this program as a requirement for finishing her accomplishment of bachelor’s degree in teacher education. During her teaching practicum, she has experienced using English as a medium language to teach and knows various teaching strategies concerning the EFL classroom context. The program was aimed at training the participant to implement her pedagogical content knowledge. She had a mentor teacher and a supervisor to guide her in developing her ability to conduct EFL classroom practice. This program helped her develop her knowledge of not only her English ability but also her experiences regarding EFL teaching.

3.2 **Data Collection and Analysis**

The lesson of teaching practice was recorded to gather the data, and it was transcribed to analyze. The dataset comprised a transcription of a forty-minute video-recorded lesson extract. The lesson transcript was subsequently evaluated utilizing the SETT (Self Evaluation of Teacher Talk) methodology from Walsh [9] to examine situations when the pre-service teacher's talk facilitated or hindered interactions. This paper examines the factors that inhibited interaction. The researcher rigorously analysed the data multiple times to determine responses to the research questions outlined in this article. The following table displays the modes of SETT proposed by Walsh [9] consisting of four modes that are a base for analyzing the primary data of the transcript.

Table 1. SETT modes [9]

Mode	Pedagogic Goals	Interactional features
Managerial	• To convey evidence • To manage the bodily learning atmosphere • To direct learners to resources or materials • To initiate or wrap up an action • To transition between different learning modes	• A single, prolonged teacher turn involving clarifications and/or commands • The inclusion of intermediate signs • The use of validation checks • A lack of learner participation

Mode	Pedagogic Goals	Interactional features
Materials	• To facilitate language repetition based on a specific substantial • To prompt rejoinders related to the substantial • To verify and showcase replies • To provide clarification when needed • To assess contributions	• Prevalence of the IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback) outline • Frequent use of presentation requests • Feedback absorbed on language form • Implementation of corrective strategies • Utilization of support techniques
Skills and systems	• To help learners create accurate language forms • To assist learners in manipulating the target language • To offer corrective feedback • To give learners practice in specific sub-skills • To present correct responses	• Implementation of straight correction • Application of scaffolding techniques • Prolonged teacher turns • Frequent use of exhibition questions • Repetition of student responses by the teacher (teacher echo) • Requests for clarification • Feedback centered on language form
Classroom context	• To help learners communicate their ideas clearly • To create a meaningful context • To encourage the development of oral fluency	• Longer learner contributions • Brief teacher turns • Limited correction or repair • Feedback focused on content • Use of referential questions • Application of scaffolding strategies • Requests for clarification

4 Findings and Discussion

In addressing the research question regarding the characteristics of pre-service teacher talk, the transcript data showed that the participant was able to implement all pedagogical goals associated with the four modes—managerial, materials, skills and systems, and classroom context—while incorporating interactional features. The following data are displayed as extracts from the transcript lesson analysis based on the modes presented in Table 1. The findings are discussed and elaborated with the theory proposed in this study. Four codes are used in the extracts dealing with T (teacher). Even though the participant is a pre-service teacher, in this context, she is a teacher for her students in a teaching practicum context), S (student), Ss (students), and SG (student

group). The extracts were displayed in dialogue to clarify the interactional activities between the teacher and students.

4.1 Managerial Mode

The first extract displayed in this managerial mode shows that the pre-service teacher began her teaching practice by explaining the concept of personal letters in writing classroom context. She tried to introduce the new material and ask students about the personal letter. The following extract describes how the pre-service teacher shows her talk in a managerial mode to involve the learners' interaction by asking the learners.

Extract 1

T : Ooow love letter? Love letter

Ss : (laughing)

T : Okay, there are so many letters that you know. But today, we are going to learn about personal letters. (Teacher wrote on the board "personal letter") personal letter, what is that? Personal letter?

Okay, here I would like to give you the definition (teacher wrote the definition on the board). Alright, the first, personal letter is the letter that you write for someone to see you such as for example Gita writes the letter for Giri.

Ss : (laughing)

Based on extract 1, in this mode, it is pretty standard when the teacher dominates the talk while explaining and checking the students' understanding, especially when the teacher wants to introduce the topic or material [9]. Communication was typically done in one way, and it seems students do not get involved because this is an everyday activity at the beginning of the process of teaching and learning. However, teacher talk could enhance learner interaction in English language classrooms if varied questioning techniques and feedback methods are employed well [36], [37].

4.2 Materials Mode

The second extract shows the material mode, where the material and content of language learning were presented using resources. The pre-service teacher put a personal letter into an oversized chart as visual media and put it on the board. In the personal letter, she showed the students the structure of the text relating to the sender, opening, content, closing, and salutation and the purpose of making a letter. Since the Indonesian curriculum used a genre-based approach in teaching language [38], in this context, the pre-service teacher perceives that the materials should be aligned with the approach. She also used several strategies to make all students interact with the teacher by questioning as a part of the teacher-talk concept.

Extract 2

T : They send letters to each other because they are friends. Okay? Gita sends the letter to Giri about her activity. Telling about her holiday or anything else. ***This is called a personal letter. Now before going to this letter (pointing to the visual aid which was***

pasted on the board) I am going to give you the new vocabulary. (she wrote some vocabularies) Okay, the first one is ... do you know what holiday is?

Ss : *liburan* (expressing using a native language, Bahasa Indonesia)

T : This is really easy. Holiday means *Liburan* or this is similar like, you know vacation (writing the word on the board). It is the time, the free time when you can go somewhere to some places, the beautiful places.

Ss : ouuuu

T : You can go anymore, anymore you want. Okay, the second is (writing the word on the board) okay, say together... carnival

Ss : carnival

T : What is carnival?

Ss : Festival (responding together)

T : This is such a big event or celebration held outside. Okay this is such kind, you know, public event in Dadaha or Tarumanegera?

Ss : TOF (Tasik Festival October)

Extract 3

T : yaa, this is really easy, it is day. This is the day. This is something like when you write a letter. Today, two weeks ago, yesterday, when you wrote the letter. Next, Dear Nathan. *It's something like you greet someone. Okay, and this is called a salutation.* Say together. Salutation.

Extract 2 revealed that the pre-service teacher tried to use classroom talk to initiate students' interaction in learning language. The organization of the talk was defined by the materials given and controlled by the pre-service teacher [9]. In material mode, the interactional feature supports the pedagogical goals to elicit responses about the material. This is a personal correspondence regarding a holiday with a friend. In this approach, the roles of teacher and student are reflected by the material: the teacher prompts responses, and learners reply to [10]. For example, when the teacher asked, "*Do you know what holiday is?*", the learners responded by answering the word in their native language "*liburan*", meaning holiday. After that, the teacher gave the feedback and explained the definition in English: "*This is really easy. Holiday means Liburan or this is like, you know vacation. It is the time, the free time when you can go somewhere to some places, the beautiful places*". This statement aligns with [9], which identified the sequence as a "classic IRF" (teacher Initiation, learner Response, teacher Feedback), illustrating an effective approach to fostering interaction. Each teacher rotation serves both as an appraisal of the student's response and a stimulus for continued engagement.

4.3 Skills and Systems Mode

The following extracts are taken from a 10-minute class towards the beginning of the lesson. In skills and systems mode, the data indicates that the pre-service teacher used classroom talk to train students' pronunciation and maintain their vocabulary. The following extracts display how the talks correspond to interactional features as an extended teacher turn in a classroom language situation.

Extract 4

T : Okay, something like that, and this occasion held outside the room not inside the room... but outside, okay? And the last one is (writing the word on the board) **say together "town". Okay, say it together.**

Ss : **Town**

T : Okay, what is town?

S4: Kota (in Bahasa Indonesia)

Extract 5

T : It is step when you conclude the letter. Write here, you put this one (point the conclusion word) if you can close and then take that "I hope we can have another holiday together". So, in this part, you have to close the letter, Okay? Do you get it?

Ss : Yes

T : And the last "love" ...

Ss : (laughing)

T : Okay, here is called closing. **Or you can use other words such as love, with love, okay, yours, or any other clauses. You can use any other words, okay?**

Ss : **yes**

T : And the last one is Angela. This is the name of the sender of the letter. Okay, so far, any questions?

Extract 6

SG5 : Uh Miss... Where else should we send the letter?

T : It's up to you. If you only go to one place, just say one place. Two places, three places, it's all up to you, okay? Good job.

In this exchange, the primary focus is on specific elements of the language system, such as pronunciation, vocabulary, or listening and speaking skills. The central aim of this type of talk is the core of the language, as seen in the ongoing process and conforming "learning talk" directed at students. Teacher turns within this IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback) structure are often more extended, typically including explanations, comprehension checks, and display questions. In contrast, student turns are generally shorter (Extract 4), consisting of brief responses or requests for additional clarification (Extract 5).

The extracts reveal overlapping features between the materials mode and the skills and systems mode. In the skills and systems mode, turn-taking is centered on providing enlightenments and feedback, with a focus on linguistic systems and skills. Meanwhile, in the materials mode, turn-taking is structured pertaining to the materials being used. Both modes demonstrate clear IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback) patterns, with the pre-service teacher maintaining control over the interaction [39]. Learner participation in student talk is typically limited to brief inputs related to the subject matter or language being discussed.

4.4 Classroom Context Mode

This passage is sourced from the final moments of a 35-minute session where all students were involved in composing personal letters. The interaction occurred as the teacher assessed the students' understanding of the language system (specifically vocabulary) and observed how they used their native language in the classroom to clarify and confirm their approach to completing the task.

Extract 7

T : (Walking to the whiteboard and pointing at her notes on the board) Okay, please, what do you write in the first paragraph?

SS : Opening

T : Ok. The second paragraph?

SS : Content

T : Ok. The last?

SS : Conclusion

T : Great. (Moving back to her chair).

T : (Approaching the first group, checking the students' work)

T : Okay. The **vocabulary** is it difficult or is it easy? *Bisa kan nyarinya?* (Can you find it out?) (Teacher used Bahasa Indonesia in asking)

SG5 : Not quite difficult, miss. We have the dictionary.

T : (Laughing) Okay, good job.

SG5 : **Miss, do we give the letter to the other group?**

T : No, just collect it.

SG5 : ***Terus miss, yang lain dibuat sama gitu suratnya?*** (Then, Miss, should we make a similar letter for the next task?)

T : No, I think in the next meeting, if there are possibilities to make it again, we can discuss it later.

SG5 : ***Oh, jadi satu ini saja dulu.*** (Oh, so it is only one task for today)

T : Yeah. Okay, another question?

SSG5 : No.

The classroom context mode is most related to 'ordinary conversation' [9]. In extract 5, students have been enquired about the composition of the personal letter. Then, they could respond to some questions that were addressed to them. The teacher almost manages the turn-taking, which is a typical scaffolding feature. The teacher assisted students in answering the questions from the task given. She asked students to write personal letters in groups, and they understood how to do the task carefully. Based on the extract, it can be seen that they can answer every question delivered to students dealing with understanding the materials. Moreover, the use of classroom language by students and teachers is joint language talks, which are easy to say, even though some students still need to learn how to ask questions or clarify using English as their target language. However, it can usually happen in a foreign or second language classroom. Second language learners encounter varying circumstances. Despite possessing significant prior experiences in their native languages, the classroom serves as an essential, if disputed, setting for developing discourse resources in other languages [40].

In a nutshell, teacher talk should be negotiated well when it proposes pedagogical goals and has an important effect on learners' interaction. Based on these findings, the pre-service teacher has dominated classroom talk because the learners' background in using classroom language is still limited [41]. This challenge stems from the context of acquiring English as a non-native language, where the exclusive use of the intended language remains a topic of debate [42], in non-native environments where L2 learners' exposure is possibly confined to academic instruction, engagement in and observation of linguistic activities is particularly crucial. Students observe and perceive teachers' physical expressions in the second language associated with conduct and the physical surroundings [8]. Besides, the findings also correspond with the features of TT as in line with this argument, classroom interaction can be divided into two categories: functional features and formal features, with functional features being the primary focus. Functional features relate to the teacher's language utilized for managing and organizing the classroom. This includes the amount and quality of teacher talk, The sorts of questions posed, adjustments made through interactions, and the comment provided to students [34]. Thus, teacher talk impacts classroom interaction, which may lead to the successful instructions process.

5 Conclusion and Recommendation

This study identifies the characteristics of teacher talks employed by an Indonesian pre-service teacher in an EFL classroom. The characteristics are classified into two categories: pedagogical objectives and interactional features. The results demonstrate that the pre-service teacher continues to prevail in the classroom talk. Nonetheless, they can promote communication and interaction among learners during the instructional process. The best lesson to be said here is about the English language teachers use. She could use English fluently and effectively as a target language in the EFL classroom. She can take her position to choose the teacher talk as completing the four modes employed in this paper as the framework. All modes—managerial, materials, skills and systems, and classroom context—manifested and aligned with the characteristics of interaction, which promote language exposure for learners utilising English, although through brief turn-taking responses.

Even with the relatively limited number of participants, which is only one, this work offers valuable insights into critical classroom talk, which can be conducted through teacher talk and student talk. Further study can expose more on the effectiveness of classroom talk as a part of classroom interaction and how it is intertwined with discourse classroom analysis. This study has raised numerous questions that require further exploration. It supports another recommendation to build awareness of the importance of TT towards all aspects of students, such as student motivation, student learning strategy, student achievement, and student interest. Hopefully, conducting this study will give valuable insight into improving language proficiency development in the classroom milieu. This can be improved by preparing the teacher candidates to be good language teachers in the future and supporting them in developing better communicative competence and skills.

Acknowledgement. We would like to acknowledge the participation of a student-teacher at teaching practicum program in the Faculty of Teacher Training of Universitas Siliwangi Tasikmalaya, West Java, Indonesia.

Disclosure of Interests. The authors state that they have no competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have influenced the work presented in this paper.

References

1. D. Barnes and F. Todd, *Communication and Learning in Small Groups*, London, U.K.: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1977.
2. N. Mercer, *The Guided Construction of Knowledge*, Clevedon, U.K.: Multilingual Matters, 1995.
3. A. Lefstein and J. Snell, *Better Than Best Practice: Developing Teaching and Learning through Dialogue*, London, U.K.: Routledge, 2014.
4. N. Mercer, "Sociocultural discourse analysis: Analysing classroom talk as a social mode of thinking," *J. Appl. Linguist.*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 137–168, 2004.
5. R. Alexander, *Towards Dialogic Teaching: Rethinking Classroom Talk*, Cambridge, U.K.: Dialogos, 2008.
6. R. M. C. Newman, "Working talk: Developing a framework for the teaching of collaborative talk," *Res. Pap. Educ.*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 107–131, 2016.
7. H. Takahashi-Breines, "The role of teacher-talk in a dual language immersion third grade classroom," *Biling. Res. J.: J. Natl. Assoc. Biling. Educ.*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 461–483, 2002.
8. P. Mickan, "Socialisation through teacher talk in an Australian bilingual class," *Int. J. Biling. Educ. Biling.*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 342–358, 2006.
9. S. Walsh, "Developing interactional awareness in the second language classroom through teacher self-evaluation," *Lang. Aware.*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 124–141, 2003.
10. S. Walsh, "Talking the talk of the TESOL classroom," *ELT J.*, vol. 60, no. 2, pp. 133–141, 2006.
11. L. Vygotsky, *Mind and Society*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press, 1930.
12. B. Skinner, "Let's move on: Second language trainee teachers' talk and its impact on learner interaction," *Lang. Learn. J.*, pp. 1–14, 2019.
13. R. Donato, "Sociocultural contributions to understanding the second language classroom," in *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning*, J. P. Lantolf, Ed., Oxford, U.K.: Oxford Univ. Press, 2000, pp. 27–50.
14. M. H. Long, "Linguistic and conversational adjustments to non-native speakers," *Stud. Second Lang. Acquis.*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 177–193, 1983.
15. M. Swain, "Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development," in *Input in Second Language Acquisition*, S. Gass and C. Madden, Eds., Cambridge, MA: Newbury House, 1985, pp. 235–253.
16. J. Lantolf, *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning*, Oxford, U.K.: Oxford Univ. Press, 2000.
17. L. S. Vygotsky, *Thought and Language*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1986.
18. A. N. Leontiev, *Activity, Consciousness, and Personality*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1978.

19. P. Gibbons, *Scaffolding Language, Scaffolding Learning*, Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 2002.
20. M. H. Long, "The role of linguistic environment in second language acquisition," in *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition*, W. C. Ritchie and T. K. Bhatia, Eds., San Diego, CA: Academic Press, 1996, pp. 413–454.
21. M. Swain, "The output hypothesis: Theory and research," in *Handbook on Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning*, vol. 1, E. Hinkel, Ed., Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2005, pp. 471–483.
22. D. Consolo, "Classroom oral interaction in foreign language lessons and implications for teacher development," *Linguagem & Ensino*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 33–55, 2006.
23. R. Ellis, *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*, Oxford, U.K.: Oxford Univ. Press, 1994.
24. R. Ellis, *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*, Oxford, U.K.: Oxford Univ. Press, 2015.
25. V. Cook, *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching*, 2nd ed., Beijing, China: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press, 2000.
26. C. Chaudron, *Second Language Classrooms: Research on Teaching and Learning*, Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1988.
27. C. Chin, "Classroom interaction in science: Teacher questioning and feedback to students' responses," *Int. J. Sci. Educ.*, vol. 28, no. 11, pp. 1315–1346, 2006.
28. S. Thornbury, "Teachers research teacher talk," *ELT J.*, vol. 50, no. 4, pp. 279–289, 1996.
29. H. Smith and S. Higgins, "Opening classroom interaction: The importance of feedback," *Cambridge J. Educ.*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 485–502, 2006.
30. D. Nunan, *Language Teaching Methodology: A Textbook for Teachers*, Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1991.
31. Zhou, X., and Zhou, Y., "Survey of teacher talk in college English," *Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, vol. 1, pp. 59–68, 2002.
32. İnceçay, G., "The role of teacher talk in young learners' language process," *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 2, pp. 277–281, 2010.
33. Xiao-yan, M., *Teacher Talk and EFL in University Classrooms*, dissertation, Chongqing Normal University & Yangtze Normal University, China, 2006.
34. Sahlim, M., "The functional characteristic of teacher talks in English classroom," *Jurnal Pendidikan PEPATUDZU - Media Pendidikan dan Sosial Kemasyarakatan*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 24–30, 2017.
35. Creswell, J. W., *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches*, London: Sage, 2007.
36. Huang, X., and Lian, C., "Empirical analysis of teacher talk based on SLA theories—evidence from Zhengji High School," *Scholars International Journal of Linguistics and Literature*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 35–42, 2004.
37. Zou, L., Jeyaraj, J. J., and Ismail, L., "A systematic review of teacher talk and its effects on English language learning outcomes," *World Journal of English Language*, vol. 14, no. 5, pp. 454–454, 2024.
38. Martin, J. R., *English Text: System and Structures*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1992.
39. Lomotey, C. F., and Gyima-Aboagye, G. E., "The IRF exchange as a pedagogical tool: a study of ESL classrooms in Pokuase Township, Ghana," *Journal on English Language Teaching*, vol. 6, no. 5, pp. 121–148, 2021.
40. Duff, P., "The discursive co-construction of knowledge, identity, and difference: an ethnography of communication in the high school mainstream," *Applied Linguistics*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 289–322, 2002.

41. Tupalessy, P., Ferdinandus, M. S., and Loppies, H. J., "Teacher talk and students talk in EFL class activity: secondary school context," *Wiralodra English Journal*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 68–82, 2024.
42. Canagarajah, A. S., "Functions of codeswitching in ESL classrooms: socialising bilingualism in Jaffna," *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 173–195, 1995.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

