PJERE, June 2020, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 20-42

A Conversation Analysis of Teacher Talk and Learners' Involvement in a Pakistani ESL Classroom

Muhammad Ahmad
PhD Candidate,
Department of Applied Linguistics,
Government College University,
Faisalabad, Pakistan
E-mail: ahmad453@yandex.com

Dr. Aleem Shakir,
Assistant Professor,
Department of Applied Linguistics,
Government College University,
Faisalabad, Pakistan

Amna Arshad
PhD Candidate,
Department of Applied Linguistics,
Government College University,
Faisalabad, Pakistan (38000)

KEY WORDS

conversation analysis; ESL classroom; quality of teacher talk; teacher questions; teacher talk

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to investigate the amount of teacher talk, frequently asked teacher questions, and the quality of teacher talk in terms of facilitation to language acquisition in an ESL classroom. A teacher and 53 students of grade 10, from a public sector school, participated in the study. Data were collected for observation in the form of audio-recording and evaluated through conversation analysis. Resultantly, teacher talk was observed to dominate in the classroom, convergent questions were asked in maximum percentage, and teacher talk was observed being obstructive to language acquisition. These results lead to conclude that: classroom is dominated and directed by the teacher talk; content-based and limited response questions are in teacher's frequent use; and teacher talk poses hindrance to interaction and negotiation process in the EFL classroom. The study proposes to: create a right balance between teacher and student talk; make skillful use of convergent and divergent questions; and enhance the quality of teacher talk to facilitate language acquisition in.

Introduction

What happens in the classroom is the key concern of classroom-centered studies (Allright & Baily, I991). Classroom-centered studies, in the view of Xiao-Yan (2006), investigate teaching-learning process as it occurs in the classroom aiming to identify the phenomenon that obstruct or support learning. Gaies (1983) calls classroom-centered study as the study of communication in the classroom. Discourse analysis, interaction analysis, and teacher talk are the different forms of classroom communication (Ellis, 1985). Teacher talk (TT) has become a key focus of the research. Its reason is that different aspects of the classroom teaching-learning process (e.g. instructing the learners, asking questions from them, giving feedback on their performance, or disciplining them), involves TT (Xiao-Yan, 2006). TT has been defined as a special language, used by the teachers, to address L2 in the classrooms (Ellis, 1985). Richards, Platt and Platt (1992) define TT as a language variety that teachers use to communicate with the learners while teaching. Lynch (1996) calls TT as a language used typically by the teachers in foreign language classrooms. Based on these definitions, this study will take TT as a language used by the teacher to communicate with the learners in EFL/ESL classrooms.

TT is important from two perspectives i.e. classroom organization, and language acquisition. In terms of classroom organization, TT helps teachers implement teaching plans and provide learners with comprehensible target language input to facilitate language acquisition (Nunan, 1991). This study will focus on the second perspective i.e. the importance of TT for language acquisition. TT has its own unique features (i.e. formal, and linguistic) due to which TT is treated as a register (Ellis, 1985). Modification, pause, repetition, and speed are formal features. Whereas, interactional modifications, quality of TT, quantity of TT, teachers' feedback on learners' performance, and teachers' questions (TQs) are the linguistic features of TT. The focus of this study will be the linguistic/functional features of TT with main focus on TT quanlity, TT quantity, and TQs. Therefore, formal features will not be discussed here.

Amount of Teacher Talk (TT Qauantity)

Studies on TT (e.g. Davies, 2011; Kareema, 2014; Nunan, 1999; Paul, 2003; Van Lier, 2001; Willis, 1990) have critically evaluated the quality (effectiveness) and quantity (amount) of TT as teacher talk time (TTT). TTT means how much the teachers talk time should be allowed in the classroom during a lesson (Kareema, 2014). Studies have discussed negative impacts of TTT e.g. teachers who talk too much in the classroom are not teaching effectively (Allright, 1981), constant TT during the lesson does not improve learners' communication skills (Ross, 1992), greater TTT amount makes the lessons less effective (Paul, 2003), large amount of TT for explanations, and instruction management restricts students' talk (Xiao-Yan, 2006). These studies seem suggesting to avoid TT in the classroom. TT is

also treated as the only source of providing target language input to the learners (Nunan, 1991; Wong-Fillmore, 1985). Therefore, TT is the need of the classroom (Trisnawati, 2014) since it: helps communicate with the learners and deliver them the material (Ellis, 1985); is a decisive factor behind the failure or success in the classroom (Hakansson, 1986); plays a significant role in language learning (Incecay, 2010); allows mutuality and reciprocity (Mercer, 2010); and shapes the types of talk in the classroom (Boyd, 2015). Thus, realizing the significance of TT, studies (see Ellis, 1984; Paul, 2003; Van Lier, 2001) have stressed the effectiveness (quality) instead of its quantity. This study, therefore, will also focus to check the quality of TT. In addition, it will check the quantity of TT to see how much TT is the part of the lesson in this study.

Different TT features have been the focus of TT research (İnceçay, 2010). Sinclair and Brazil (1982) introduced initiation-response-follow up (IRF) pattern as the characteristic TT feature that was opposed by Clifton (2006) for supporting traditional teaching method by entrusting class control to the teacher and thus by disempowering the student. 'Facilitator talk' is another TT feature (Clifton, 2006) that is one of the main TT features (İnceçay, 2010) and serves as a substitute to the 'teacher-fronted' classroom (Clifton, 2006). This study will check the facilitation in the lesson.

TT studies report the classrooms being dominated by the teacher e.g. Inamullah, Hussain and Din (2008) report 'two thirds rule' practice which means that talking consumes two thirds of the classroom time of which teacher consumes about two thirds time and the other two thirds time is spared to direct instruction. Based on these results, they conclude that the teacher dominates classroom verbally. Ulfah (2013) investigated teacher-student talk in the classroom to: identify the characteristics of teacher-student talk; and to check the percentage of students' and teacher's talk in the classroom. Data were collected through classroom observation. The teacher was observed to be more active and dominant as compared to the students. The percentages of TT, student talk (ST), and silence were 78.15, 21.16, and 0.69 respectively. Azhar, Iqbal and Khan (2019) analyzed 12 sessions of 30 hours to see the amount of teacher talk time (TTT), and student talk time (STT) in Pakistani ESL classrooms using observation technique. The results revealed that 65 percent of the total time was consumed in TTT and on average 22 seconds were spared for one student. In the light of these results, the study suggested to enhance learner talk time (LTT) engaging them in meaningful activities, encouraging classroom interaction, and employing blended learning model.

Teacher's Questions

Questions are the discursive move of teachers' choice in an ELL classroom (Boyd, 2015). Questions: form a significant component of the classroom discourse (Chin, 2006; Lee & Kinzie, 2011); play a key role in learning and are considered as an indicator of quality teaching (Boyd, 2015;

Carlsen, 1993; Roth, 1996; Smith, Blakeslee & Anderson, 1993). That is why teachers' questions (TQs) are the most common practice in the classroom (Kim, 2015; Richards & Lockhart, 1994), and help learners learn the topic (Kim, 2015). Questions are also considered as the key factor behind successful teaching and learning (Carlsen, 1993; Chin & Osborne, 2008; Graesser & Person, 1994; Haneda & Wells, 2008; Kim, 2015; Lee & Kinzie, 2012; Myhill, 2006; Roth, 1996; Sedova, Sedlacek & Svaricek, 2016; Smith, Blakeslee & Anderson, 1993). TQs function as corrective or supportive (Myhill, 2006) in: broadening or narrowing the scope (Burbules, 1993); extending as well as validating learners' thinking (Boyd & Rubin, 2002; Haneda & Wells, 2010); and signaling to discover further by establishing and verifying shared knowledge (Boyd, 2015). Thus, teachers' questions, according to Boyd (2015: 397) do not only encourage ST but also help teachers direct classroom talk, and induct the learners into particular ways of thinking and language use. This study will consider teacher's questions as a significant part of TT in an EFL classroom.

Nunan (1991) mentions two types of questions i.e. display, and referential. Display questions are called known-information questions whereas referential questions are called information-seeking questions. In case of display questions, the answer is already known to the questioner. In contrast, for referential questions the questioner does not know the answer (Mehan, 1979; Richards & Schmidt, 2002; Wright, 2016). Display questions are used while addressing people in groups e.g. students in the classroom (Farahian & Rezaee, 2012) that help: elicit short answers (Erlinda & Dewi, 2016); and know whether the students have understood the lesson (Boyd & Rubin, 2006). Referential questions, on the other hand, are used while brainstorming a certain topic and collecting information (Bozorgian & Fallah, 2017) that help seek new information and fill information gaps (Erlinda & Dewi, 2016). The use of display and referential questions is common in language classrooms. However, referential questions are preferred to the display questions in communicative language teaching (CLT) classrooms (Richards & Schmidt, 2002; Wright, 2016). Long and Sato (1983) were first to introduce these questions for second language teaching. Display questions were defined as the questions to which the answer was already known to the teacher, whereas referential questions were defined as questions to which the answer was required to know by the teacher. For example:

1. Q: Is this a book?

A: Yes, it's a book (Display question from Richards & Schmidt, 2009).

2. Which character in the story you admire most and why? (Referential question from Omari, 2018).

The same classification of questions i.e. display, and referential (see Long & Sato, 1983; Nunan, 1991) was supported by Brown (2001).

Richards and Lockhart (1994) divided questions into three categories i.e. convergent, divergent, and procedural. Procedural questions are concerned with classroom routines e.g. classroom management. In contrast, convergent and divergent questions are asked to involve the learners in the lessons. Convergent questions demand 'yes' or 'no' type of short and limited answers from the learners. Closed-questions are the example of convergent questions. Contrary to convergent questions, divergent questions engage learners in higher level thinking, and demand long and varied answers based on their own information. Open questions are the example of divergent questions. Being similar to closed questions, display questions are categorized as convergent questions. Whereas being similar to open questions, referential questions are categorized as divergent questions (Erlinda & Dewi, 2016). This study will treat closed/display, and open/referential questions as convergent questions (CQs) and divergent questions (DQs) respectively to avoid the expected confusion caused by the use of display and referential questions with closed and open questions respectively. Procedural questions were excluded on the ground that they did not match with Long and Sato (1983) classification that was the principle guide for this study.

Research indicates that the use of CQs is common among EFL teachers e.g. Hasan (2006) reports the teacher using CQs (227 times) and DQs (0 time) out of 235 questions (8 questions were reasoning). Qashoa (2013) reports the use of CQs more (i.e. 62%) than DQs (i.e. 38%) by the public secondary school EFL teachers in UAE. Erlinda and Dewi (2016) explored the frequency of questions asked by the teacher in an EFL classroom. Analysis of the video-taped transcripts revealed the use of CQs in maximum frequency i.e. 496 and DQs in minimum frequency i.e. 134. So far as the number of responses was concerned, the study reported shorter responses for CQs as compared to that of DQs which produced longer responses. The study, therefore, suggested to use DQs more than CQs. Vebriyanto (2015) observed the use of CQs much more (i.e. 69%) than that of DQs (i.e. 31%). Similar results (i.e. the frequency of CQs [74] was more than DQs [48]) were reported by Hetzelein (2016). Results in Fitriani and Amilia (2017) also reported the use of CQs (i.e. 120) more than DQs i.e. (i.e. 101). Omari (2018) investigated the use of CQs and DQs in Jordanian EFL classrooms by 77 public and private school teachers. T-test analysis revealed that the teachers used CQs in maximum frequency i.e. 86% of the total of 1574 questions. This study will focus on knowing which questions (i.e. CQs or DQs) are common among ESL teachers in Pakistan.

Research Questions

RQ1: What is the amount of teacher talk in a Pakistani secondary school level ESL classroom?

RQ2: Is the teacher talk facilitative in language acquisition as practiced in a Pakistani secondary school level ESL classroom?

RQ3: What type of teacher questions are frequently asked by the teacher in a Pakistani secondary school level ESL classroom?

RQ4: Do the questions, asked by the teacher in a Pakistani secondary school level ESL classroom, facilitate learning?

Methodology

This study employs descriptive and qualitative methods to describe, explore and investigate teacher talk (TT) in an EFL classroom that forms the part of classroom talk and, according to Mercer (2010), is essential to understand classroom education.

Subjects of the study comprise of one teacher and 53 students of grade-10 from a public sector secondary school located in a town city of Okara district in the central Punjab, Pakistan. The students (aged between 14-17 years) belonged to diverse social status. Some belonged to rural and others belonged to the urban area and spoke Urdu and Punjabi languages at home, school, and other places of interaction. Their parents were from mixed professions e.g. agrarians, public/private servants, and traders. The students completed eight years of education at private and public schools located in rural and urban areas through English and Urdu media of instruction and enrolled at current school in grade 9 in April 2018. They were in grade 10 when became the subjects in this study.

The school provides education to the students from grades 6-10 through both media of instruction i.e. English and Urdu. The medium of instruction for the subjects of this study was English. However, teachers and students were not good at English language communication skills. Therefore, the teachers used Urdu as a medium of instruction for all of the subjects. The rationale for it might be provided from Airey and Linder (2006, 2007) who found that high school students asked, and responded fewer questions in English medium lectures. Other studies (e.g. Marsh, Hau & Kong, 2000) showed that the impact of English medium instructions was negative and less accessible to learners. Recent studies (e.g. Arsad, Bauniyamin & Manan, 2014; Lo & Macaro, 2012) also found that students, proficient in their instructional language, were more successful on average than those whose medium of instruction was different from their native language.

The teacher, having a master degree with a bachelor level professional degree, has been teaching English to the students of grades 9 and 10 for over a decade. The students have studied English in grade 9 from the same teacher. Identity of the teacher and students is kept secret for ethical considerations. The topic of the lesson was ‘direct and indirect narration’ that was taught through Urdu medium of instruction. However, the teacher also used English, but it was limited to the core vocabulary items

related with narration e.g. inverted commas, reporting verb, reported speech etc.

Cohn, Manion and Morrison (2007) state that observation (as a research process) provides the researchers with an opportunity to collect data from natural social situations. Therefore, this study utilized observation to collect audio data recorded with the help of a mobile recorder relying on Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991) who said that an investigator could observe a language classroom data collected with the help of a data-collection device/instrument e.g. a recorder to record the observations. The recorded data, comprising of a 46 minutes and 21 seconds long lecture, was later transcribed to make usable in the study. The data was recorded with prior permission.

Data analysis process involved systematic search and arrangement of data following Bogdan and Biklen's (1992) concept of transcribing, organizing, and categorizing data and then deciding about what it did mean to inform others. TT quality and quantity were considered to analyze according to the principles laid down by Nunan (1991) and discussed in comparison with different studies (see results and discussion section). To analyze TQs, classification of convergent and divergent questions was considered (see teacher questions in introduction section for details).

The data were analyzed utilizing conversation analysis (CA). Being a demanding methodology, CA employs an in-depth and laborious analysis setting strict criteria for the interpretation of the recorded data and utilizing a detailed and specific transcription method (Mercer, 2010). CA has been used for talk analysis at work places (see e.g. Drew & Heritage, 1992; Van Lier, 1988) and is also being used in classroom talk analysis (see e.g. Baker, 1997; Markee, 2000; Stokoe, 2000; Walsh, 2002). CA, in fact, gives an opportunity to the researchers to test the results of data which the authors use in research. Due to this characteristic, CA ensures transparency of the results (Seedhouse, 2005). Moreover CA methodology, adds Seedhouse (2005), analyses instances of individual interaction and then refers it to universal interactional features that validate the research findings.

A limitation of the study is that its sample (comprising of one lesson only) is limited therefore its results cannot be generalized. For this purpose, another study (with a larger sample) is required.

Results and Discussion

Amount of Teacher Talk

Table 1

Amount of Teacher Talk

Category	Amount (in minutes/seconds)	Percentage
Teacher Talk	36.31	80.1
Student Talk	9.5	19.90
Total	46.21	100

Table 1 shows that in the class of 46 minutes and 21 seconds, most of the time has been used by the teacher i.e. 36 minutes and 31 seconds. Whereas, the students have used only 9 minute and 5 second time. The percentages of the time used by both teacher and students are 80.1 and 19.90 respectively. Thus the time occupied by TT in the lesson is maximum as compared to the time utilized by the students which is even less than one fourth of the time consumed in TT. These results, astonishingly, exceed the limit of the results of previous studies (e.g. Azhar, Iqbal & Khan, 2019; Inamullah, Hassain & Din, 2008; Ulfah, 2013). Inamullah, Hassain and Din (2008) reported TT as two thirds, Ulfah (2013) reported TT being 78.15 percent, Azhar, Iqbal and Khan (2019) reported TT as 65 percent. In comparison, the results of this study show TT (i.e. 81.1%) as more than four times higher than ST (i.e. 19.90%).

All of these four studies show TT being in maximum use as compared with ST. Similar findings are reported by many other past studies (see Table 2).

Table 2
Chronological Presentation of Results from Past Studies

Study	Year	Silence%	ST%	TT%
Dunkin and Biddle	1974		40	60
Legarreta	1977		23	77
Bialstok, Maria and Joan	1978		31.2 to 38.7	61.3 to 68.8
Enright	1984		64.4	35.6
Hitotuzi	2005	32.91	35.84	31.25
Hasan	2006		27	73
Inamullah, Hussain and Din	2008	>33	<22	>44

All of the seven studies (see Table 2), excluding Enright (1984) and Hitotuzi (2005), show that TT has been consuming maximum time. On the basis of these results (see Tables 1 and 2), it can be said that the classroom has continuously been dominated by the teacher ever since the distant past. Similar domination has been reported in different ways e.g.: TT takes up major portion of the class time (Sinclair & Brazil, 1982); teachers tend to do most of the talking in the classroom (Chaudron, 1988); teachers do approximately 50 to 80 percent of the talking in classrooms (Nunan, 2003, p. 55); TT takes a great portion in the classroom (Wasi'ah, 2016); TT dominates the interaction in the classroom (Huriyah & Agustiani, 2018): and TT takes more than half of the class time ranging from 62-72 percent (Azhar, Iqbal & Khan, 2019).

Now the question is: is this amount of TT (as shown in Tables 1 and 2) facilitative for the students? Before going to answer this question, it is important here to give a review of studies that support TT in the classroom

e.g.: teachers utilize TT to implement teaching plans and provide target language input (Nunan, 1991); TT is utilized for instruction and interaction in the classroom (Cullen, 1998); TT is important in the classroom not only for the classroom management but also for target language acquisition (Nunan, 1991); and TT can encourage interaction and support learning in the classroom (Lei, 2009; Wasi'ah, 2016). Embarking on Karashen's (1985) input hypothesis (i.e. learners improve and progress along the natural order when they are provided with comprehensible target language input) these studies regard TT as the main source of target language input for the learners.

Now coming to the question i.e. is high TT amount good for the learning process and should be allowed in the classroom? In the view of Nunan (1991: 190):

> Of course, whether or not it is considered a good thing for teachers to spend 70 or 80 percent of class time talking will depend on the objectives of a lesson and where it fits into the overall scheme of the course or programme. Normative statements sometimes appear that teacher talk is 'bad', and while it can be argued that excessive teacher talk is to be avoided, determining what is or is not 'excessive' will always be a matter of judgement. It can also be argued that in many foreign language classrooms, teacher talk is important in providing learners with the only substantial live target language input they are likely to receive.

Nilton (in Kareema, 2014) explains the above view of Nunan (1991) saying if the lesson is about some non conversational topics e.g. description/essay writing, the learners may expect a TTT period providing instructions on paragraph construction process followed by a silent period to utilize those instructions for essay writing. Nilton (in Kareema, 2014) adds that he utilizes 40-60 percent TTT for elementary and 60-80 percent TTT for intermediate level learners for oral communication classes. Nilton (in Kareema, 2014) regards these figures beyond adequate level. The reasons can be that: the teacher who works too much in the classroom does not teach successfully (Allwright, 1981); continuous TT in the classroom does not develop communication and listening comprehension skills in the learners (Nunan, 1999; Ross, 1992); much use of TT makes the lesson ineffective by hindering learners' L2 practice in the classroom (Paul, 2003); too much TT and too less ST make the classroom communication asymmetrical and inauthentic (Grimm, Meyer & Volkmann, 2015); TT makes the learners passive and does not provide them with the chance to talk (Huriyah & Agustiani, 2018); and teacher's dominant role in the classroom limits the learners role to that of a respondent which further limits the development of speaking skills. As a result, the learner does not own the responsibility to learn rather relies on what the teacher decides. In this way, learner's autonomy is also limited (Kostadinovska-Stojchevska & Popovikj, 2019).

Therefore, TT needs to be minimized in the classroom to support the meaningful involvement of the learners in the L2 acquisition process. In this regard, the teacher's role is determined as an initiator of classroom activities (Klein, 1986) or simply as a class mediator (Larsen-Freeman, 2000).

Now another question arises here i.e. how much time should TT be given in the classroom? Pareto, an Italian economist, observed that 80 percent of the land in Italy was owned by 20 percent people and 80 percent of the peas in his garden were contained by the 20 percent of the pea-pods. From these observations he generalized that most of the events (i.e. 80%) resulted from 20 percent of the causes. Based on this logic he determined 80-20 ratio for many things which later came to be known as 80/20 rule. This rule emerged as a common thumb rule in business where 80 percent of the sales came from 20 percent of the clients (Newman in Cárdenas, 2013). This rule seemed to repeat itself everywhere (Baker, 2012) and expanded to every area where statistic analysis was possible. Thus, education was no exception (Cárdenas, 2013). Here Baker (2012: 3) comments:

> Isn't there a rule of thumb that teachers are supposed to speak something like a ratio of 20:80? Don't we call this the 80/20 Rule?… From someplace, somewhere, somehow – that number is hardwired into my brain.

Baker (2012) does not refute the importance of 80 percent ST and 20 percent TT in the classroom. However, he seems to advocate the use of common sense by the teachers to reduce TT for the learners saying:

> Rather than set an arbitrary goal for how much time the teacher speaks and how much time the student speaks, it might be more beneficial for both teachers and students to be guided by common sense, speaking as much as necessary, as little as possible (Baker, 2012, p. 29).

Thus, the proportion of 80 percent ST and 20 percent TT does not seem anymore relevant (Cárdenas, 2013). Instead, a need to create a right balance between ST and TT is felt (Grimm, Meyer & Volkmann, 2015; Myhill, Jones & Hopper, 2005). In this regard, Pesce (2008) suggests 70 percent for ST and 30 percent for TT. She suggests to maximize ST upto 90 percent and reduce TT upto 10 percent for advance level learners. However, for the beginner level learners she suggests 50-50 ratio. Kostadinovska-Stojchevska and Popovikj (2019) agree with Pesce (2008) saying 70 percent of ST and 30 percent of TT work well in most of the classroom situations. Therefore, they suggest limiting TT to 20-30 percent only. Hetzelein (2016), however, takes somewhat different position. He argues that there can be no uniform answer to the question of right balance between ST and TT, and proposes 50 percent as a guide value of combined ST to be split between student-teacher talk (STT) and student-student talk (SST) to ensure symmetrical practice of language. The rest of the 50 percent time should be spared for TT (without too much silence) that will provide the learners with

enough target language input. In Hetzelein's (2016) view it is not sufficient to increase ST, there should also be a considerable share of symmetrical student-student communication (SSC).

Teacher Questions

Table 3. Teacher Questions

Teacher Questions					
Question Type	**Questions Asked**	**Percentage**	**Number of Students**	**Wait Time**	**Wait Time Extension**
Convergent	62	89	53	Varied i.e. ranging from 2-16 seconds	Varied i.e. 2-5 seconds
Divergent	8	11			
Total	**35**	**100**			

The learners were asked questions in two rounds. First round comprised of the questions asked at the start of the lesson. This round was utilized to check learners' previous knowledge about the lesson. The second round was started at the end of the lesson to assess the effect of instruction. 70 questions were asked from 53 learners of grade-10 out of which the number of CQs, and DQs was 62(89%) and 8(11%) respectively (see Table 3). In this way, CQs were asked in maximum whereas the DQs were asked in minimum frequency. It shows that CQs are the common ones among teachers in Pakistani ESL classrooms. Varied wait time (ranging from 2-16 seconds) was provided. In some cases, wait time was extended (2-5 seconds). Wait time, and extension in wait time did not prove much useful. The learners failed to answer questions asked in the first round even with the extension in wait time and they successfully answered the questions asked during the second round even without wait time extension. It might be because of the reason that, during the first round, the learners did not have the basic knowledge of the topic therefore they could not answer the questions. While during the second round, the learners were asked questions from the lesson taught to them. Therefore, they could easily answer the questions. Thus, wait time does not seem that much significant here. The results i.e. the teacher uses CQs more than DQs align with the results in Erlinda and Dewi (2016), Fitriani and Amilia (2017), Hasan (2006), Hetzelein (2016), Omari (2018), Qashoa (2013), and Vebriyanto (2015). It indicates that CQs are not only in frequent use of the teacher in a Pakistani ESL classroom, but also are the main choice of the teachers in other countries of the world.

CQs have been criticized for: producing choppy and short exchanges (Cazden, 2001); inhibiting student's learning (Kim, 2015); having low cognitive demand (Sedova, Sedlacek & Svaricek, 2016); and producing short and simple responses (Vrikki, Wheatley, Howe, Hennessy & Mercer, 2019). In contrast, DQs have been praised and recommended for: revoking and scaffolding learners' reasoning (Smith, Blakeslee & Anderson, 1993;

enriching vocabulary and providing the learners with an environment to share ideas comfortably (Peterson, Jesso & McCabe, 1999); inviting a range of responses (DfES, 2004); producing more authentic, more complex, more involved, and qualitatively better answers (Dalton-Puffer, 2007); ensuring language learning (Haneda & Wells, 2008); increasing ST, and inviting wide-range responses (Juzwik, BorsheimBlack, Caughlan, & Heintz 2015); and giving the learners a chance to think critically (Fitriani & Amilia, 2017).

Now a question arises i.e. should the teachers stop asking CQs in favour of DQs? In this regard, Boyd (2015) argues that TQs are not mainly used to invite ST, rather they are utilized by the teachers to direct talk in the classroom and to help the learners into a particular line of inquisition and induct them into a particular thought process and language use. Questions, adds Boyd (2015), have been categorized basing on their form i.e. display/ test/closed, and authentic/genuine/open questions. The former are used to assess learning whereas the later are utilized to depict a teacher's inquisition, and encourage responses based on one answer. The use of DQs alone is not sufficient (Beck & McKeown, 2001; Purdy, 2008). Sometimes, the learners have to be supported with CQs to direct additional speech, and signal new understanding (Boyd & Rubin, 2006; Boyd, 2015). For this reason Boyd (2015: 398) stresses that:

> As teachers, we need to know how to wield questions to support and direct students as they connect with materials and struggle to construct meaning together. Different patterns of questions yield differing talk outcomes. If teachers sought only one type of student talk but not the other, then student language and content learning would be compromised.

Therefore, it would be better to use both CQs and DQs. In the view of Boyd (2015) the purposeful utilization of CQs can help the learners review learning material or plan foundation for more exploration, and the utilization of DQs can direct classroom talk to engage learners' intentions and resources into classroom talk.

Quality of Teacher Talk

Some of the studies (Ellis, 1984; Paul, 2003; Van Lier, 2001) stress on the quality of TT. Nunan (1991) adds the aspect of quality by associating appropriateness to TT. To determine the appropriateness of the TT, Nunan (1991: 190) suggests considering certain principle factors e.g.

1. The point in lesson in which talking occurs;
2. What prompts the teacher talk: whether it is planned or spontaneous, and, if spontaneous, whether the ensuing digression is helpful or not; and
3. The value of the talk is potentially useful input for acquisition.

Besides being appropriate, TT should also be supportive (Cullen, 2002); and facilitative in teaching-learning process (Clifton, 2006). In recent

past years, studies have been conducted to investigate the relationship between teacher talk with regard to facilitation or hindrance to learning process (Can-Daskin, 2015; Incecay, 2010; Musumeci, 1996; Walsh, 2002; Walsh & Li, 2013; Waring, 2008). Fewer studies are found that directly address the issue of teacher interruption in language classroom. Musumeci (1996) found rare or no negotiation between the teacher and the learner in content-based instruction classroom and majority of the exchanges were limited to CQs; teacher rarely asked DQs and most of the time he himself interrupted to fill in the gaps. This hinders learners' engagement in classroom that affects negatively on learning process. These findings are aligned with the results of this study where teacher interrupts immediately after raising the question without acknowledging the students' understanding and listening their answer of the asked question. For instance, teacher initiated by asking "*what is verb?"* without giving sufficient time to learners, he interrupted saying *"it is a tense"* because tense and verb are alike. Walsh (2002) also provides empirical evidence for teacher's interruption i.e. it is a non-desirable classroom interactional discourse which obstructs learners' comprehension. He suggests that teacher talk can maximize learner contribution by teacher's scaffolding talk, giving content related feedback, direct error correction, extended wait time and checking to confirm correct responses. Current findings of teacher's interruptions consist of anticipating learner's responses what they will say in response to question shows similarity with the findings in Musumeci (1996), Walsh (2002), Yaqubi and Rokni (2013), Yataganbaba and Yildirim (2016). Moreover, code-switching and teacher echo is extensively used in the present data. Teacher echo, in the current data, enables the students to participate and make classroom completely interactive. Instances from the data i.e.

Teacher: How many parts does a sentence divide in?
Student: Three.
Teacher: How many parts does speech divide in?
Student: Two.
Teacher: Name them…
Student: Reporting speech and reported speech.
Teacher: What the speech i.e. placed outside of the inverted commas, is named?
Student: Reporting speech.
Teacher: What is name of the verb in reporting speech?
Student: Reporting verb.

Show that initiation-response-follow up (IRF) model is strictly followed by the teacher. By analyzing the above instances of data, it is noted that turn-taking is highly dominated by teacher talk. At times, when students responded incorrectly, teacher himself interrupted for receiving correct responses without giving wait time e.g.

Teacher: We make a change in tense to change a direct into an indirect form. Can you tell any change related with tense in the reported speech?
Student: Present tense changes into the past… (Teacher interrupts)
Teacher: Give complete detail… there are four types of past tense…
Student: Past indefinite changes into past perfect tense… (Teacher interrupts)
Teacher: What will be the present tense related change?
Student: Present tense will change into past tense…

The overall findings contribute to understand the negative impact of teacher's interruption to learners' talk. Moreover, the teacher has used L1 in the lesson. It is against the requirement of target language input. Thus, teachers should be informed about the increase in target language input and improvement in teaching practices. They should be informed about extended learners' turn, less teacher interruption and most importantly increased wait-time (here wait-time is needed to minimize interruptions).

For further enhancement of the quality of TT, certain guidelines might be followed e.g.: TT should influence to develop learners' reasoning (Mercer, 2010); and attract and engage them in active teaching-learning process (Trisnawati, 2014). To reduce TT amount and enhance its quality certain measures have been proposed e.g.: involving the learners in group/pair work (Paul, 2003; Richards & Lockhart, 1994; Willis, 1990); response and elicitation management (Chaudron, 1988; Van Lier, 2001); giving the learners enough wait time after elicitation (Richards & Lockhart, 1994); clarifying expectations and instruction (Rosenshine & Stevens, 1986); allocating teacher-student interactions in the classroom to make listening a meaningful impetus to target language acquisition (Allwright, 1981; Paul, 2003; Willis, 1990); error correction management (Allwright & Bailey, 1991; Richards & Lockhart, 1994; Willis, 1990); adopting person-centered approach towards classroom management which assures shared-leadership, community development, and balance between teachers' as well as learners' needs (Rogers & Freiberg, 1994); following intrinsic motivation principle i.e. helping the learners discover language through actual use instead of telling them about the language (Choudhury, 2005); involving the learners in engage, study, and activate (ESA) phases (Harmer, 2007); utilizing learner-driven projects like problem-solving (Ripp, 2012); utilizing the features of Paideia model i.e. text selection, questioning strategy, and constant assessment of listening and speaking skills (Billings & Roberts, 2014); reducing teachers' frontal work by limiting their role to that of a guide or monitor (Ellis, 1994); and adopting learner-centered approach (Kostadinovska-Stojchevska & Popovikj, 2019).

Conclusion

TT consumed most of the classroom time i.e. 80.1 percent. In contrast the learners were given only 19.9 percent of the overall classroom talk. This amount forms less than even one fourth of the overall classroom talk time and is seen less than the time reported by the previous studies. Such a high amount of TT is neither seen as good nor bad. In fact, there is clear divide among the experts on this issue. If one group of experts argues in favour of increasing the amount of ST to enhance language acquisition, another group strongly opposes the decrease in the amount of TT on the ground that TT provides target language input. Keeping it in view, the study cannot decide about the decrease or increase TT. Instead, it proposes to create a right balance between the both to ensure a symmetrical teacher-student, student-teacher, and student-student language practice.

Convergent questions were observed, being asked by the teacher in the classroom, in maximum percentage (i.e. 89). In contrast the divergent questions were noticed being 11 percent only. Again, there is a huge difference between the percentages of the both types of questions, and these results too, align with the results reported in previous studies. Wait-time or extension in wait-time did not seem of any use to the students. Students answered some of the questions even without any wait-time, and some of the questions were not answered even with wait-time extension. The reason was that the teacher frequently asked content-based closed questions to check learners' previous knowledge. Being empty, they could not answer even with the help of wait-time extension. Similar questions were asked after the instruction was complete. The learners answered all of the questions. The reason was that they had been provided with the information related to those questions during the lesson. Therefore, they did not need any wait-time. The study goes neither against nor in favour of the use of any single question type. Rather, it proposes the skillful use of CQs to help the learners review learning material or plan foundation for more exploration, and DQs to direct classroom talk to engage learners' intentions and resources into classroom talk.

Instead of being facilitative to EFL learning process, TT has been observed being obstructive. High amount of TT, frequent use of content based closed questions, and teachers' interruptions hindered the teacher-student, student-teacher, and student-student interaction and negotiation in the classroom. This type of TT appeared to dominate the classroom which meant to support IRF pattern. In addition, it was seen as having a negative impact on learning process. The study proposes to enhance the quality of TT in the light of given guidelines.

References

Airey, J., & Linder, C. (2007). Disciplinary learning in a second language: A case study from university physics. In R. Wilkinson & V. Zegers (Eds.), *Researching Content and Language Integration in Higher Education* (pp. 161–171). Maastricht, the Netherlands: Maastricht University Language Centre.

Allwright, R. L. (1981). What do we want teaching materials for? *ELT Journal*, *36*(1), 5-18.

Allwright, D., & Baily K. M. (1991). *Focus on the language classroom.* Cambridge University Press.

Arsad, P. M., Bauniyamin, N., & Manan, J. A. B. (2014). Students' English language proficiency and its impact on the overall students' academic performance: An analysis and prediction using neural network model. *WSEAS Transactions on Advances in Engineering Education*, *11*, 44-53.

Azhar, K. A., Iqbal, N., & Khan, M. S. (2019). Do I talk too much in class? A quantitative analysis of ESL classroom interaction. *OKARA: Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra*, *13*(2), 193-202.

Baker, C. (1997). Ethnomethodological studies of talk in educational settings. In B. Davies & D. Corson (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Education, vol. 3: Oral Discourse and Education* (pp. 43–52). Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Baker, T. J. (2012). *Teacher talking time: The 80 – 20 rule revisited.* CreateSpace.

Beck, I. L., & McKeown, M. G. (2001). Text talk: Capturing the benefits of read-aloud experiences for young children. *The Reading Teacher*, *55*(1), 10-20.

Bialystok, E., Maria, F., & Joan, H. (1978). *The teaching and learning of French as a second language in two distinct learning settings.* Ontario Department of Education

Billings, L., & Roberts, T. (2014). From mindless to meaningful. *Educational Leadership*, *72*(3), 60-65.

Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. R. (1992). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods.* Simon & Schuster.

Boyd, M. P., & Rubin, D. L. (2002). Elaborated student talk in an elementary ESoL classroom. *Research in the Teaching of English, 36,* 495-530.

Boyd, M., & Rubin, D. (2006). How contingent questioning promotes extended student talk: A function of display questions. *Journal of Literacy Research*, *38*(2), 141-169.

Boyd, M. P. (2015). Relations between teacher questioning and student talk in one elementary ELL classroom. *Journal of Literacy Research*, *47*(3), 370-404.

Bozorgian, H., & Fallah, S. (2017). EFL learners' speaking development: Asking referential questions (Pembangunan pertuturan pelajar EFL: Pertanyaan soalan rujukan). *Jurnal Pendidikan Malaysia (Malaysian Journal of Education), 42*(2), 99-106.

Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principal: An interactive approach to language pedagogy.* New York: Pearson Education Company.

Burbules, N. C. (1993). *Dialogue in teaching: Theory and practice.* Teachers College Press.

Can Daşkın, N. (2015). Shaping learner contributions in an EFL classroom: Implications for L2 classroom interactional competence. *Classroom Discourse, 6*(1), 33-56.

Cárdenas, F. L. (2013). *Teacher talking time vs. student talking time: Fostering speaking in the EFL classroom.* Escuela de Pedagogía en Comunicación en Lengua Inglesa, Lead Universidad Austral de Chile, Valdivia, Chile.

Carlsen, W. S. (1993). Teacher knowledge and discourse control: Quantitative evidence from novice biology teachers' classrooms. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 30*(5), 471-481.

Cazden, C. B. (2001). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning.* Heinemann.

Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms. Research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge University Press.

Chin, C. (2006). Classroom interaction in science: Teacher questioning and feedback to students' responses. *International Journal of Science Education, 28*(11), 1315-1346.

Chin, C., & Osborne, J. (2008). Students' questions: a potential resource for teaching and learning science. *Studies in Science Education, 44*(1), 1-39.

Choudhury, S. (2005). Interaction in second language classrooms. *BRAC University Journal, 2*(1), 77-82.

Clifton, J. (2006). Facilitator talk. *ELT Journal, 60*(2), 142-150.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2005). *Research methods in education*. Routledge.

Cullen, R. (1998). Teacher talk and the classroom context. *ELT journal, 52*(3), 179-187.

Cullen, R. (2002). Supportive teacher talk: The importance of the F- move. *ELT Journal, 56*(2), 117-127.

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2007). *Discourse in content and language integrated learning (CLIL) classrooms*. John Benjamins Pub.

Davies, M. J. (2011). *Increasing students' L2 usage: An analysis of teacher talk time and student talk time* (unpublished master thesis). Centre for English Language Studies, University of Birmingham, UK.

DfES. (2004). *Primary national strategy excellence and enjoyment: Learning and teaching in the primary years.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (Eds.), (1992). *Talk at work.* Cambridge University Press.

Dunkin, M. J., & Biddle, B. J. (1974). *The study of teaching*. Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Ellis, R. (1984). *Classroom second language development: A study of classroom interaction and language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding second language acquisition.* Shangai Foreign Language Education Press.

Ellis, N. C. (1994). *Implicit and explicit learning of languages.* Academic Press.

Enright, D. S. (1984). The organization of interaction in elementary classrooms. In J. Handscombe, R. A. Orem & B. P. Taylor (Eds.), *On TESOL'83: The Question of Control* (pp. 23-38). Pantagraph Printing.

Erlinda, R., & Dewi, S. R. (2016). Teacher's questions in EFL classroom. *Ta'dib*, *17*(2), 177-188.

Farahian, M., & Rezaee, M. (2012). A case study of an EFL teacher's type of questions: An investigation into classroom interaction. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *47*, 161-167.

Fitriani, S. S., & Amilia, K. (2017). Frequency of questions in an EFL conversation class. *English Education Journal*, *8*(4), 457-468.

Gaies, S. J. (1983). The investigation of language classroom processes. *TESOL Quarterly*, *17*(2), 205-217.

Graesser, A. C., & Person, N. K. (1994). Question asking during tutoring. *American Educational Research Journal*, *31*(1), 104-137.

Grimm, N., Meyer, M., & Volkmann, L. (2015). *Teaching English*. Narr Francke Attempto Verlag.

Hakansson, G. (1986). Quantitative aspects of teacher talk. In G. Kasper (Ed.), *Learning, Teaching and Communication in the Foreign Language Classroom* (pp. 83-98). Aarhus University Press.

Haneda, M., & Wells, G. (2008). Learning an additional language through dialogic inquiry. *Language and Education*, *22*(2), 114-136.

Haneda, M., & Wells, G. (2010). Learning science through dialogic inquiry: Is it beneficial for English-as-additional-language students? *International Journal of Educational Research*, *49*(1), 10-21.

Harmer, J. (2007). *How to teach English.* Pearson Education Limited.

Hasan, A. S. (2006). Analysing bilingual classroom discourse. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *9*(1), 7-18.

Hetzelein, J. (2016). *Teacher talk and student talk: Is there a right balance? And how much do teachers really speak? A study on teacher and*

student talk in an EFL classroom (master thesis). Institut für Englische Philologie, Freie Universität, Berlin, Germany.

Hitotuzi, N. (2005). Teacher talking time in the EFL classroom. *Profile Issues in Teachers Professional Development*, (6), 97-106.

Ho, D. G. E. (2005). Why do teachers ask the questions they ask? *RELC Journal*, *36*(3), 297-310.

Huriyah, S., & Agustiani, M. (2018). An analysis of English teacher and learner talk in the classroom interaction. *Linguistic, English Education and Art Journal*, *2*(1), 60-71.

Inamullah, H. M., Hussain, I., & Din, M. N. U. (2008). Teacher-students verbal interaction at the secondary level. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning*, *5*(9), 41-44.

İnceçay, G. (2010). The role of teacher talk in young learners' language process. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *2*(2), 277-281.

Juzwik, M. M., Borsheim-Black, C., Caughlan, S., & Heintz, A. (2015). *Inspiring dialogue: Talking to learn in the English classroom*. Teachers College Press.

Kareema, M. I. F. (2014). Increasing student talk time in the ESL classroom: An investigation of teacher talk time and student talk time. In *Proceedings of the 04th International Symposium* (pp. 233-238). South Eastern University of Sri Lanka, Oluvil, Sri Lanka.

Kim, S. (2015). *An analysis of teacher question types in inquiry-based classroom and traditional classroom settings* (doctoral dissertation). Graduate College, The University of Iowa, Iowa City.

Klein, W. (1986). *Second language acquisition*. Cambridge University Press.

Kostadinovska-Stojchevska, B., & Popovikj, I. (2019). Teacher talking time vs. student talking time: Moving from teacher-centered classroom to learner-centered classroom. *The International Journal of Applied Language Studies and Culture*, *2*(2), 25-31.

Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. Longman.

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Long, M. H. (1991). *An introduction to second language research*. Longman.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford University Press.

Lee, Y., & Kinzie, M. B. (2012). Teacher question and student response with regard to cognition and language use. *Instructional Science*, *40*(6), 857-874.

Legarreta, D. (1977). Language choice in bilingual classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, *11*(1), 9-16.

Lei, X. (2009). Communicative teacher talk in the English classroom. *English Language Teaching*, *2*(1), 75-79.

Lo, Y. Y., & Macaro, E. (2012). The medium of instruction and classroom interaction: Evidence from Hong Kong secondary schools. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *15*(1), 29-52.

Long, M., & Sato. C. (1983). Classroom foreigner talk discourse: Forms and functions of teachers' questions. In H. Seliger & M. Long (Eds.), *Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition* (pp. 268-286). Newsbury House.

Lynch, T. (1996). *Communication in the language classroom*. Oxford University Press.

Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation analysis.* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Marsh, H., Hau, K. T., & Kong, C. K. (2000). Late immersion and language of instruction in Hong Kong high schools: Achievement growth in language and nonlanguage subjects. *Harvard Educational Review*, *70*(3), 302-347.

Mehan, H. (1979). 'What time is it, Denise?": Asking known information questions in classroom discourse. *Theory into Practice*, *18*(4), 285-294.

Mercer, N. (2010). The analysis of classroom talk: Methods and methodologies. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *80*(1), 1-14.

Musumeci, D. (1996). Teacher-learner negotiation in content-based instruction: Communication at cross-purposes? *Applied Linguistics*, *17*(3), 286-325.

Myhill, D. (2006). Talk, talk, talk: Teaching and learning in whole class discourse. *Research Papers in Education*, *21*(1), 19-41.

Myhill, D., Jones, S., & Hopper, R. (2005). *Talking, listening, learning: Effective talk in the primary classroom.* Open University Press.

Nunan, D. (1991). *Language teaching methodology: A textbook for teachers*. Prentice Hall.

Nunan, D. (1999). *Second Language Teaching & Learning*. Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Nunan, D. (2003). *Practical English.* McGraw Hill.

Omari, H. A. (2018). Analysis of the types of classroom questions which Jordanian English language teachers ask. *Modern Applied Science*, *12*(4), 1-12.

Paul, D. (2003). *Teaching English to children in Asia.* Longman Asia ELT.

Pesce, C. (2008). *5 worst mistakes all beginner ESL teachers make (And you too?).* Retrieved July 26, 2019 from http://busyteacher.org/4113-5-worst-mistakes-all-beginner-esl-teachers-make.html

Peterson, C., Jesso, B., & McCabe, A. (1999). Encouraging narratives in preschoolers: An intervention study. *Journal of Child Language*, *26*(1), 49-67.

Purdy, J. (2008). Inviting conversation: Meaningful talk about texts for English language learners. *Literacy*, *42*(1), 44-51.

Qashoa, S. H. (2013). Effects of teacher question types and syntactic structures on EFL classroom interaction. *The International Journal of Social Sciences*, *7*(1), 52-62.

Richards, J. C., & Lockhart, C. (1994). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms*. Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C., Platt, J., & Platt, H. (1992). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics.* Longman.

Richards, J. & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. Longman.

Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2009). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. Longman.

Ripp, P. (2014). Cultivating passionate learners in common core classrooms. *The Education Digest*, *80*(4), 11-14.

Rogers, C. R., & Freiberg, H. J. (1994). *Freedom to learn.* Merrill.

Rosenshine, B., & Stevens, R. (1986). Teaching functions. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 376-391). Macmillan.

Ross, S. (1992). Program-defining evaluation in a decade of eclecticism. In J. C. Alderson & A.

Beretta (Eds.), *Evaluating Second Language Education*, (pp. 167-195). Cambridge University Press.

Roth, W. M. (1996). Teacher questioning in an open- inquiry learning environment: Interactions of context, content, and student responses. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, *33*(7), 709-736.

Sedova, K., Sedlacek, M., & Svaricek, R. (2016). Teacher professional development as a means of transforming student classroom talk. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *57*, 14-25.

Seedhouse, P. (2005). Conversation analysis and language learning. *Language Teaching*, *38*(4), 165-187.

Sinclair, J. M., & Brazil, D. (1982). *Teacher talk*. Oxford University Press.

Smith, E. L., Blakeslee, T. D., & Anderson, C. W. (1993). Teaching strategies associated with conceptual change learning in science. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, *30*(2), 111-126.

Smith, H., & Higgins, S. (2006). Opening classroom interaction: the importance of feedback. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, *36*(4), 485-502.

Stokoe, E. H. (2000). Constructing topicality in university students' small-group discussion: A conversation analytic approach. *Language and Education*, *14*(3), 184-203.

Trisnawati, Y. (2014). A study of teacher talk used by eleventh grade teacher in teaching writing hortatory exposition. *Retain*, *2*(3), 1-8.

Ulfah, S. (2013). *The study of the teacher and the students talk in the classroom interaction of the eighth grade of SMP Negeri 18 Purworejo in the academic year 2012/2013* (doctoral dissertation). English Department, Muhammadiyah University of Purworejo, Purworejo Regency, Central Java, Indonesia.

Van Lier, L. (1988). *The classroom and the language learner: Ethnography and second-language classroom research*. Longman.

Van Lier, L. (2001). Constraints and resources in classroom talk: Issues of equality and symmetry. *English language teaching in its social context*. In C. N. Candlin & N. Mercer (Eds.), *English Language Teaching in its Social Context: A Reader* (pp. 90–109). Routledge.

Vebriyanto, D. A. (2015). Teacher's Questions in EFL Classroom Interaction. *Vision: Journal for Language and Foreign Language Learning*, *4*(2), 279-303.

Vrikki, M., Wheatley, L., Howe, C., Hennessy, S., & Mercer, N. (2019). Dialogic practices in primary school classrooms. *Language and Education*, *33*(1), 85-100.

Walsh, S. (2002). Construction or obstruction: Teacher talk and learner involvement in the EFL classroom. *Language Teaching Research*, *6*(1), 3-23.

Walsh, S., & Li, L. (2013). Conversations as space for learning. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *23*(2), 247-266.

Waring, H. Z. (2008). Using explicit positive assessment in the language classroom: IRF, feedback, and learning opportunities. *The Modern Language Journal*, *92*(4), 577-594.

Wasi'ah, N. (2016). A study of teacher talk in classroom interaction at an Islamic Senior High School. *OKARA: Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra*, *10*(1), 29-43.

Willis, J. D. (1990). *The lexical syllabus.* London: Collins ELT.

Wong-Fillmore, L. (1985). When does teacher talk work as input? In S. Cass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 17-50). Newbury House Publishers.

Wright, B. M. (2016). Display and referential questions: Effects on student responses. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, *15*(4), 160-189.

Xiao-Yan, M. A. (2006). *Teacher talk and EFL in university classrooms* (unpublished master's thesis). School of Foreign Languages and Literature, Chongqing Normal University & Yangtze Normal University, China.

Yaqubi, B., & Rokni, M. P. (2013). Teachers' limited wait-time practice and learners' participation opportunities in EFL classroom interaction. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, *4*(10), 127-161.

Yataganbaba, E., & Yıldırım, R. (2016). Teacher interruptions and limited wait time in EFL young learner classrooms. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 232*, 689-695.

....✳ ✳ ✳....

Citation of this Article:

Ahmad, M., Shakir, A, & Arshad, A. (2020). A conversation analysis of teacher talk and learners' involvement in a Pakistani ESL classroom. *Pakistan Journal of Educational Research and Evaluation, 8*(1), 20-42.