

Investigating the features of teacher talk in an online English classroom: A discourse analysis

Narvacan, Cristian I. ✉

Philippine Science High School – Central Visayas Campus, Philippines (cinarvacan@cvisc.pshs.edu.ph;
cinarvacan@up.edu.ph)

Metila, Romylyn A.

University of the Philippines Diliman, Philippines (rametila@up.edu.ph)



ISSN: 2243-7703
Online ISSN: 2243-7711

OPEN ACCESS

Received: 1 August 2022

Revised: 20 September 2022

Accepted: 4 October 2022

Available Online: 20 October 2022

DOI: 10.5861/ijrse.2022.b032

Abstract

The success of teaching and learning can be attributed to positive classroom interaction, which depends essentially on a teacher's language use. That being so, it is vital to analyze classroom discourse to reveal the aspects of one's teaching practices and examine how language is applied to fulfill pedagogical goals. Anchored in Walsh's (2006) Self-Evaluation of Teacher Talk (SETT) framework, this study aimed to investigate the teacher talk features of a Filipino teacher in an online English classroom. Based on the results of the study, it was revealed that only the managerial mode and materials mode were evident in the interaction. Moreover, the teacher utilized 10 out of the 14 interactional features: scaffolding, direct repair, extended wait-time, seeking clarification, confirmation checks, extended learner turn, teacher echo, extended teacher turn, teacher interruption, and display questions. Results further revealed that topic initiation, clarification, confirmation checks, extended wait-time, scaffolding, and teacher echo facilitated student learning, while IRF pattern, display questions, and absence of skills and systems and classroom context modes restricted learning opportunities. In addition, this study identified a new L2 classroom mode, the elicitation mode, which aims to enable learners to recognize or identify grammatical forms and patterns.

Keywords: teacher talk, online class, classroom discourse, SETT, classroom interaction, discourse analysis

Investigating the features of teacher talk in an online English classroom: A discourse analysis

1. Introduction

Teachers are primarily viewed as classroom managers (McBer, 2000). They organize, facilitate, and regulate the various tasks and activities that transpire inside the classroom through what is called teacher talk. According to Parrish (2004), teacher talk refers to the language employed by teachers that could significantly influence the quality of teacher-student interactions in class. Successful classroom interactions mainly stem from effective teacher language that engages and encourages learners (Starr, 2017). The use of focused and dynamic teacher talk can foster active involvement and a favorable disposition to learning among students (Webster-Stratton, 2012).

Teacher talk plays a pivotal role in language teaching (Cook, 2000). It provides learners with a “rich listening input” (Anandan, 2014, p. 20). Teacher talk comprises approximately 70% of the language in class (Chaudron, 1988). In English language teaching, there have been several conflicting views about the extent to which teachers should engage in teacher talk. Gebhard (1999) pointed out that extended learner participation and little teacher turns are vital components of an interactive classroom. However, Lei (2009) argued that the focus should be more on the quality and not the quantity of teacher talk. She added that an effective teacher talk is one that enables learning and encourages communication in the classroom regardless of frequency.

Due to the threats of the COVID-19 pandemic, schools worldwide suspended in-person classes and shifted to virtual learning. In the Philippines, over 28 million students have been affected by school closures (UNESCO, 2020). With distance learning modalities in place, teachers and learners have faced new concerns and challenges (Tria, 2020; Chin et al., 2022), especially in English language classes (Hartshorn & McMurry, 2020; Atmojo & Nugroho, 2020; Karuppanan & Mohammad, 2020). One of the major issues in remote learning is limited student participation (Werang & Radja Leba, 2022) caused by unengaging teacher talk (Izzati, 2021), which hampers the vibrance of class interaction.

Previous studies that delved into teacher talk were mainly focused on identifying the features of language use without directing the discussions to how the features impact class interaction and students’ learning productivity (Izzati, 2021). Additionally, most class interaction analyses were concentrated on discourse in physical classrooms. With the migration of classes to digital spaces in pandemic education, it is imperative to investigate how interactions are carried out in technology-mediated oral communication. Therefore, the present study aimed to examine the characteristics of teacher talk in an online English classroom. Drawing from Walsh (2006), this study utilized the Self-Evaluation of Teacher Talk (SETT) framework to identify features of classroom interaction and analyze how teacher talk facilitates or hinders opportunities for learning. Conducting this study in the Philippine context addressed the call for the localization of research involving teaching and learning practices (Çakıroğlu & Çakıroğlu, 2003; Walsh, 2006; Sert, 2010, as cited in Korkut & Ertas, 2016).

1.1 Teacher Talk

Nunan (1991) defined teacher talk as the language that teachers use to manage their class. Teacher talk is used to provide directions, organize tasks, and monitor students’ understanding (Sinclair & Brazil, 1982). As one who possesses authority, a teacher oversees all the tasks that occur in the classroom. Corollary to this special status is the tendency of most teachers to control patterns of interaction (Johnson, 1995). It is within the power of teachers to decide “how, when, where and with whom language is to be used in the classroom” (Ribas, 2010, p. 11). Breen (1998) echoed the same view by saying that the teacher “orchestrates the interaction” (p. 119). In the qualitative study conducted by Mulyati (2013) in a primary school, it was revealed that the teacher emerged as

the dominant interlocutor during the interaction. In addition, the teacher assumed the roles of director, manager, and facilitator in the classroom. Similarly, Nasir et al. (2019) found out in their study involving an English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom that class interaction was dominated and controlled by the teacher. Further, the teacher talk was mostly about giving directions, commands, or orders. Their study corroborates the findings of Rafieerad and Rashidi (2010) in their research on the patterns of interaction in Iranian EFL classrooms. Results showed that classroom discourse was characterized by Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) pattern and teacher-centered interaction.

In language classrooms, teacher talk is imperative for attaining teaching goals and providing a “source of input for students” (Jing & Jing, 2018, p. 320). Teacher talk actively operates in the classroom, especially when teachers structure, synthesize, reformulate, or direct the language that they and their students use (Blanchette, 2009). According to Long and Porrtter (1985), successful teaching is dependent on language use and the kind of interaction that occurs between teachers and students. An effective teacher talk promotes high-quality classroom interaction, which in turn positively impacts learning. Tuan and Nhu (2010) pointed out that “teachers’ verbal behaviors improve the level of learners’ participation such as applying open and direct approaches to error correction, using of real-life conversational language appropriately when giving feedback, allowing extended wait-time for learners’ responses, scaffolding by providing needed language to pre-empt communication breakdowns and offering communication strategies to maintain and extend learners’ turns” (p. 526). In the case study by Rido et al. (2014) that focused on the classroom interaction strategies of a master teacher in a secondary vocational school, the findings indicated that four strategies were utilized, namely interaction management, questioning, feedback, and error repair. Moreover, the strategies were found to be effective in encouraging interactive learning in the classroom. Conversely, the study of Gharbavi and Iravani (2014) showed that the teacher's excessive use of display questions failed to establish genuine or authentic communication. What’s more, the predominance of IRF pattern made the discourse repetitive and monotonous. According to Cullen (1988), teachers should minimize the use of non-communicative teacher talk strategies such as display questions, form-focused feedback, teacher echo, and the IRF sequence.

1.2 Self-Evaluation of Teacher Talk Framework

The Self-Evaluation of Teacher Talk (SETT) framework was developed by Walsh (2006). It is a model used for analyzing teachers’ language use and how it impacts interaction in an L2 classroom. The framework has been applied in various contexts, such as teacher education programs and English as a Second Language (ESL) and EFL classrooms. Through SETT, teachers can examine the dynamics of interactions in their classrooms, reflect on their teacher talk, and enhance their teaching performance by addressing features of class interaction that hinder the fulfillment of teaching and learning goals. Put simply, using SETT could result in the improvement of teaching practices and student learning.

SETT is comprised of four modes. Walsh (2006) defined mode as an L2 classroom micro-context with its own set of pedagogic goals (teaching purposes) and interactional features (language use). The four modes are managerial, materials, skills and systems, and classroom context. Each mode has a distinctive fingerprint that sets it apart from the others. That is, each has different goals, although specific interactional features can be present in all of them. There exists a “reflexive relationship between pedagogy and instruction in the L2 classroom” (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 16). Because of that, “the pedagogical goal in each mode inevitably shapes the interactional features of the language classroom” (Sert, 2010, p. 72).

The pedagogic goals and interactional features in each L2 classroom mode can be seen in the table below:

Table 1

L2 classroom modes in the SETT framework (Walsh, 2006)

Mode	Pedagogic goals	Interactional features
Managerial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To transmit information - To organize the physical learning environment - To refer learners to materials - To introduce or conclude an activity - To change from one mode of learning to another 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A single, extended teacher turn which uses explanations and/or instructions - The use of transitional markers - The use of confirmation checks - An absence of learner contributions
Materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To provide language practice around a piece of material - To elicit responses in relation to the material - To check and display answers - To clarify when necessary - To evaluate contributions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Predominance of IRF pattern - Extensive use of display questions - Form-focused feedback - Corrective repair - The use of scaffolding
Skills and systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To enable learners to produce correct forms - To enable learners to manipulate the target language - To provide corrective feedback - To provide learners with practice in sub-skills - To display correct answers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The use of direct repair - The use of scaffolding - Extended teacher turns - Display questions - Teacher echo - Clarification requests - Form-focused feedback
Classroom context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To enable learners to express themselves clearly - To establish a context - To promote oral fluency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Extended learner turns. - Short teacher turns - Minimal repair - Content feedback - Referential questions - Scaffolding - Clarification requests

The managerial mode is concerned with the organization of learning. This mode frequently occurs at the beginning of lessons, wherein the teacher sets the physical conditions and prepares learners to engage in class discussions or activities. Also, the managerial mode involves the transitions done between tasks or activities (Aşık & Gönen, 2016). The materials mode covers the interaction that revolves around information from learning materials like textbooks, worksheets, or videos. On the other hand, the skills and systems mode provides learners with L2 practice in relation to language systems (phonology, grammar, vocabulary, discourse) or language skills (reading, listening, writing, speaking) (Walsh, 2006). Accuracy instead of fluency is emphasized in this mode. The last mode is the classroom context mode. Unlike the skills and systems mode, classroom context puts a premium on oral fluency. This mode allows learners to express themselves freely. Although only four modes were identified in the framework, Walsh (2006) asserted that “there are almost certainly other modes which could be incorporated” (p. 64). SETT is made up of 14 interactional features, also called interactures, which are mainly determined by a teacher's use of language (Walsh, 2006).

Table 2 below shows the different interactures and their descriptions.

Table 2

Interactional features in SETT framework (Walsh, 2006)

Interactional feature	Description
Scaffolding	(1) Reformulation (rephrasing a learner's contribution) (2) Extension (extending a learner's contribution) (3) Modelling (correcting a learner's contribution)
Direct repair	Correcting an error quickly and directly
Content feedback	Giving feedback to the message rather than the words used
Extended wait-time	Allowing sufficient time (several seconds) for students to respond or formulate a response
Referential questions	Genuine questions to which the teacher does not know the answer
Seeking clarification	(1) Teacher asks a student to clarify something the student has said. (2) Student asks teacher to clarify something the teacher has said.
Confirmation checks	Making sure that the teacher has correctly understood the learner's contribution
Extended learner turn	Learner turn of more than one clause
Teacher echo	(1) Teacher repeats a previous utterance. (2) Teacher repeats a learner's contribution.
Teacher interruptions	Interrupting a learner's contribution
Extended teacher turn	Teacher turn of more than one clause
Turn completion	Completing a learner's contribution for the learner
Display questions	Asking questions to which the teacher knows the answer
Form- focused feedback	Giving feedback on the words used, not the message

These interactional features “can be found in varying degrees in any classroom” (Walsh, 2011, p. 126). Depending on the teaching goals, some interactures are more commonly utilized than others. A descriptive qualitative study by Izzati (2021) examined the teacher talk of secondary English teachers ($n=3$) in Indonesia using SETT. The results indicated that only ten out of fourteen interactures were used: confirmation check, display question, direct repair, extended teacher turn, extended wait time, form-focused feedback, scaffolding, seeking clarification, teacher echo, and teacher interruption. Additionally, only the managerial, materials, and skills and systems modes were found in the classroom discourse. The study identified lecture as an additional classroom mode. These results imply that teacher talk was dominant while learner contributions were limited in the classrooms. In another study conducted by Ekinici (2020) on the interactures of a teacher in a Turkish state university, he claimed that the teacher used all SETT features, except seeking clarification and form-focused feedback. Furthermore, the findings showed that teacher echo was used by the teacher to provide confirmation, language repair, scaffolding, and time while speaking English. Afzali and Kianpoor (2020) revealed that teacher echo and asking questions were the most frequent strategies by teachers ($n=2$) in a college-level EFL classroom. In contrast, the discourse analysis by Raharja and Ghozali (2020) divulged that display questions were the most commonly used feature in a secondary English classroom. Results further showed that the feature prevented students from expressing their ideas.

Features that facilitate the attainment of desired learning outcomes are called mode convergent, while those that hinder learning opportunities are mode divergent (Walsh, 2011). Jeanjaroonsri's (2018) research findings on the class interaction in a Thai public university found that topic initiation by students, teachers' clarification, and

minimal repair are features of constructive teacher talk. In contrast, the lack of extended learner turns restricts learners' participation and learning.

1.3 Research Questions

This study investigated the features of teacher talk in an online English classroom using the SETT framework. Specifically, this research sought to address the following questions:

- What interactional features characterize online teacher talk in the different modes?
- Which features of online teacher talk facilitate or restrict students' opportunities for learning?
- Are there new modes or interactional features that emerged from the discourse?

2. Method

2.1 Research Design

With the purpose of investigating the features of teacher talk in an online English classroom in the Philippine context, this study used a qualitative research design that employs discourse analysis as a method. The qualitative methodology was appropriate for this study because it enabled the researcher to examine classroom events in a natural setting (Walia, 2015). Further, the qualitative design allowed this study to explain 'how' and 'why' the classroom interaction "operates as it does in a particular context" (Mohajan, 2018, p. 2). According to Domholdt (1993), the objective of the qualitative method is a "deep understanding of the particular." Mackey and Gass (2005) asserted that "qualitative research findings are rarely directly transferable from one context to another" (p. 180). Hence, this study did not attempt to generalize the results.

2.2 Locale and Participants

The data for this study were taken from a two-part video of an English class obtained from Youtube. According to Silverman (2007), informed consent for publicly available content or data is not required by the majority of institutional ethics committees. In addition, Smith (2003) explicated that the APA Ethics Code permits skipping of informed consent for research works that pose no harm to participants, such as "the study of normal educational practices, curricula or classroom management methods conducted in educational settings" (p. 56). Capturing naturally occurring data through video recording is advantageous since it "allows for exact and repeated analysis of the linguistic material, and for data verification by other researchers" (Golato, 2017, p. 23). The video recordings were selected through convenience sampling, which "relies on available subjects- those who are close at hand or easily accessible" (Berg, 2009, p. 32). Since one of the researchers is a language educator in a secondary school, they intended to focus on the features of teacher talk in a junior high classroom. The setting was an online English grammar class for Grade 9 learners during the school year 2021-2022. The class was composed of a male English teacher and students, males and females aged 13-15 years, from a private institution in Bohol, Philippines.

2.3 Data Collection

Using a qualitative research design (Strauss & Corbin, 2008; Levitt et al., 2017), this study aimed to gain insights into the features of teacher talk in online classroom interactions. In collecting the data, the researcher obtained a two-part video recording of naturally occurring interactions (Gentles et al., 2015) in an online language classroom. Part I (56:02) <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hLavcUh5aQc&t=1467s> shows an online class about S-IV, S-LV-C, and S-TV-DO basic patterns of English sentences, while Part II (1:02:40) <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HhYuUhl7FYk> presents a discussion on S-TV-IO-DO and S-TV-DO-OC patterns. The recordings were transcribed based on the transcription system adopted from Walsh (2011).

2.4 Data Analysis

After the transcription, the data were then examined using the SETT framework. SETT is suitable for a variety of contexts, including online discourse (Lee, 2010), as it provides “appropriate metalanguage” (Walsh, 2011, p. 147) to describe and analyze classroom interactions. In this study, the researcher adapted the step-by-step process by Walsh (2011) for analysis. First, the data were read and reread. Second, the classroom modes were identified. Next, the researcher determined the interactional features under each mode. Finally, the interaction was evaluated to determine which features facilitate or restrict students’ learning and to check for emerging modes or interactional features.

3. Results

3.1 Modes and interactional features of teacher talk

Based on the transcript analysis, the following features were identified:

Managerial mode - As illustrated in extract 1, the managerial mode occurred at the beginning of the class. It is apparent in the extract that the teacher’s primary pedagogic goal was to introduce a new lesson to the students. A single, extended teacher turn characterized the teacher talk, and there was a total absence of student inputs. Moreover, the teacher performed confirmation checks to ensure there were no barriers to learning.

Extract 1:

- **T:** We are now going to enter a grammar lesson... one which I personally have learned to love to the point that... whatever the question is that could be asked about it I feel like I could... find my way out... to determine an answer to the question (3) this is a topic that I have learned to love since I was in high school (3) eventually when I was in college I found the opportunity to have it mastered all the more especially when I was (3) uh... when I was in my English one subject (3) then... continuous exposure to grammar lessons (2) made me SO... well acquainted to this topic (2) I’m referring to the topic on **(writes on the board)** (6) the BASIC (3) sentence (3) patterns (5) I HOPE (2) you are fine that I’m writing in cursive... just to check just to check (2) is it clear (2) from your end? can you clearly see the words? basic sentence patterns (4) is it clear enough? (3) also I’ll be writing in cursive... because that’s kind of my comfort I write in cursive I just hope... that my handwriting is not going to be a problem to you (2) we BEGIN with... understanding first... why it’s called (3) the basics and its patterns why it has to begin with that... not just call it sentence patterns (2)

Extract 2 shows the teacher using the managerial mode to give reminders, explanations, and instructions to students about an activity. Transitional markers such as *in order to*, *secondly*, *for example*, *then*, *meaning*, and *okay* were evident in the extended teacher turn. These markers were used to organize information and to focus students’ attention to the activity.

Extract 2:

- **T:** shall we go over your answers for FT 1? (4) take note (2) the task in FT 1 begins by identi... by underlining the most important elements found in every sentence... you might have noticed that that in the examples I have given to you... I did NOT underline ALL (2) words in a sentence (2) I underlined only those which are... the ones I consider to be... SIGNIFICANT... necessary to be underlined... in order to... HAVE... our sentence pattern completely identified (2) second... secondly... you are to... provide LABELS... below each... of those underlying components or elements of the sentence... the labeling is to supposedly guide you in determining your sentence... pattern for example this of number one **(refers to the material)** (2) what are not to be what are to be underlined? we begin WITH... our (2) I (3) and then you underline... COULD... together with that

is... find (2) and then we HAVE (2) ANSwer... SIR... what if I underlined everything?... (2) when you underline everything at LEAST... you should have... you should have still done it in segments... meaning... you underline this group... SEPARATELY... while this one is taken as a separately underlining component (2) okay I'll consider that

Materials mode - The interaction below displays an example of materials mode, in which the discourse is centered around a piece of material. In extract 3, the teacher and students were answering a formative test on sentence patterns. The teacher managed the interaction flow and directed the learner's contributions. The exchange followed the IRF sequence, in which the teacher posed a question (turn 3), the student responded (turn 4), and the teacher provided feedback and initiated once more (turn 5). The teacher used display questions (turns 3, 5) primarily to check the student's understanding and to elicit responses in relation to the worksheet.

Extract 3:

- **T: (referring to the worksheet)** can THAT person... can THIS person... represented by the pronoun myself BE the president?... Alanis (9) Alanis? (3) in this sentence... can the person represented by the pronoun myself BE this president? (4) no response from Alanis... Ralph (3)
- **L1:** yes sir=
- **T:** =yes... can the president BE the person represented by the pronoun myself? Ralph?
- **L1:** yes=
- **T:** =and SO... we shall call president OUR... oh wait I think the color isn't chosen yet... OUR... objEctive complement

In extract 4, the teacher's pedagogic goal was to check and clarify the answer to a particular item in the worksheet. Turn 12 shows the teacher applying repair to correct the error and giving an explanation of why the learner's answer was wrong.

Extract 4:

- **T:** Krisha which number did you get wrongly?
- **L1:** um number one *unintelligible* (4)
- **T:** again? sorry sorry what's your answer for number one?
- **L1:** S-LV-C=
- **T:** =OH S-LV-C... but the thing there is the person the poor person I cannot be the answer... nor can the answer be the person I so we cannot have an S-LV-C pattern there

3.2 *Facilitative and restrictive features of teacher talk*

Based on the data analysis, the following teacher talk features facilitated students' learning opportunities:

Student's topic initiation, clarification, and confirmation checks - As presented in extract 5, the teacher provided the learners an opportunity to initiate questions about the topic. Turn 16 indicates that the topic of the interaction was determined by the student; thus, it provided her with a better chance of learning that particular part of the lesson. In turn 18, the student sought clarification as there was still confusion on her part. To further clarify the S-LV-C pattern, the teacher provided an example (turn 19). Turn 20 demonstrates the student's extended turn, which revealed her engagement in the communication. However, the teacher interrupted the learner's contribution (turn 21). The teacher performed confirmation checks in turns 17, 19, and 23 to ensure the question was adequately addressed.

Extract 5:

- **T:** questions regarding the S-LV-C sentence pattern?=
 - **L1:** =excuse me sir=
 - **T:** =go go (2)
 - **L1:** is it possible for the subject to be at the end of the sentence?=
 - **T:** is it possible for a subject to be placed at the end of a sentence? that's possible... given that your sentence is in the inverted order but in THIS case Shania (2) (**points at writings on the board**) the subject remains to be knowing the reason of your absence... if you have a sentence with these... words arranged in this manner (2) take note in this sentence the main concern... in this structure... that main concern of our meeting is not the subject it is the complement (2) if you interchange the placement of the TWO... that makes the main concern of our meeting is knowing the reason the subject of your absence... that makes this part the subject now (3) so Shania does that answer your question? (2)
 - **L1:** um... kind of I'm still confused a bit=
 - **T:** =let me give you a sentence... can I erase this? can I erase this? Is it alright to erase this? Okay (2) (**erases the writings on the board**) the question of Shania is... can a subject take place at the end of a sentence? yes it can be (2) very simple example (**writes on the board**) (6) there is a dog (3) dog is the subject (3) so Shania does this answer your question? (3)
 - **L1:** um... yes sir so (2) meaning... eh... the subject can be placed on the last part of the sentence but... since it we're talking about sentence pattern... the subject ay... the subject should be... the first=
 - **T:** =the first entry...
 - **L1:** oh (2)
 - **T:** because... if you look at these sentence patterns they all begin with? (2) the subject (3) does that uh... answer your question? (2)
 - **L1:** yes sir... I just realized thank you

Extended wait-time - In the next extract, the learners were provided sufficient time (line 25) to formulate their response to the teacher's invitation to initiate questions. It afforded the students a period to reflect on several points they might have difficulty understanding and frame appropriate questions.

Extract 6:

- **T:** questions regarding the S-IV sentence pattern? (5) any questions... can I start erasing this? (**points at the writings on the board**) (3)
- [okay]
- **L:** [uh I] I still don't get the *ano*... S-IV sir=
- **T:** =again again sorry?=
 - **L:** =I'm still confused with the... with that part=
 - **T:** =which part is the confusing part for the S-IV? (3)

Scaffolding - Extract 7 shows the teacher asking the student to identify the complete subject of the sentence on the board. Realizing that the learner's contribution was incorrect, the teacher provided scaffolding (turn 34) instead of direct repair to lead the learner to the right answer. This feature of the teacher talk promoted dialogic interaction, where the student was offered a moment to realize the correct answer on her own.

Extract 7:

- **T: (pointing at the sentence on the board)** give me the subject of the sentence... what is our complete subject here? Claire (5)
- **L1:** the reason of your absence?=
➤ **T:** =again?
- **L1:** the reason of your absence=
➤ **T:** =is it just the reason of your absence? try to carefully examine... what is the sentence all about? Is it about the REASON? or something is yet to be done regarding that reason? (2)
- **L1:** knowing the reason of your absence=
➤ **T:** =correct (2) take note this sentence has not drawn any reason yet of the person's absence... there is going to be a discussion of trying to know what the reason is for the absence made by the person so this is OUR SUBJECT (**writes on the board**)

Teacher echo - Based on the transcript analysis, the teacher used echoes (turns 39, 47, 53) to confirm and display learners' correct contributions. In echoing, the teacher gave extra stress to some syllables and words, including the direct repair in turn 45, to indicate their importance and make them more audible for the students.

Extract 8:

- **T: (writes on the board)** I hope it's clear... my father wanted to talk to my teacher (2) what is the subject in this sentence? I'd like to ask Nikki (2)
- **L1:** my father=
➤ **T:** =FATHER correct (**writes on board**) so our subject what is our verb here Krishna? (4)
- **L2:** talk...
➤ **T:** sorry?=
➤ **L2:** =talk=
➤ **T:** =is it talk? take note of the verb... you look at carefully what the verb is (4)
- **L2:** wanted to talk=
➤ **T:** =WANTED correct (2) sir what about talk? talk is part of an infinitive to talk (2) infinitives are not verbs though they show actions they are not verbs... they take on a different function in a sentence now... let's go back to questions that could be answered by a transitive... by a direct object my father wanted what?... what is it that my father wanted what's the answer? Avril...
➤ **L3:** to talk to my teacher=
➤ **T:** =to TALK to my TEACHER... take note all of these (points at the board) all of these answered the question what... so how do we classify this? Erwin (3)

- **L4:** you called me sir?=
T: =again?=
L4: =uh... did you ask me?=
T: =yes yes since this part answered the question what... how will we call it?=
L4: =direct object=
T: =it's the diRECT OBject (**writes on board**) correct... and once again if you have a direct object that means your verb is a... transitive verb sentence pattern S-TV-DO

On the other hand, the following are regarded as restrictive features of the teacher talk.

Prevalence of IRF sequence and display questions - The predominance of IRF pattern made the teacher-student interaction tightly structured and monotonous. As shown in the previous extracts (see 3, 7, & 8), the teacher predominantly controlled the flow of communication; thus, there was minimal space for student participation. Moreover, the type of questions used by the teacher was mostly display questions, which restricted extended learner turns and rendered the classroom interaction less communicative.

Absence of skills and systems mode and classroom context mode - Drawing from the SETT framework, this study found that there were only two modes evident in the classroom interaction, namely, managerial mode and materials mode. The teacher did not provide language practice to the students in relation to the lesson, which is the primary pedagogic goal of the skills and systems mode. Additionally, the extensive use of display questions hindered the students from expressing their thoughts freely. There was no opportunity to develop fluency, a goal unique to the classroom context mode.

3.3 New L2 classroom mode

This study identified an additional classroom mode, which is the elicitation mode. Its pedagogic goals and interactional features are closely similar to those of materials mode and skills and systems mode. However, unlike materials and skills and systems, this new mode neither uses teaching or learning materials nor provides language practice to students. Under elicitation, teacher talk is focused on enabling learners to recognize or identify grammatical forms and patterns.

Extract 8 is an example of the elicitation mode. In the extract, the teacher asked the students to identify the parts of the sentence presented on the board. The IRF sequence was prominent in the interaction, and display questions were extensively used (turns 37, 39, 45, 47, & 51). The teacher also employed direct repair (45), teacher echo (39, 47, 53), scaffolding (43), clarification requests (41, 49), and extended turns (37, 45, 47, 53).

4. Discussion

Out of the 14 interactional features of SETT, 10 were evident in the classroom interaction: scaffolding, direct repair, extended wait-time, seeking clarification, confirmation checks, extended learner turn, teacher echo, extended teacher turn, teacher interruption, and display questions. The finding is parallel with Izzati's (2020) study that examined the online teacher talk of secondary English teachers in Indonesia. On the other hand, content feedback, referential questions, turn completion, and form-focused feedback were not observed in the discourse. This is in contrast with Ekinci's (2020) study of interactures in the Turkish context, where he noted that only two features, seeking clarifications and form-focused feedback, were not utilized.

This research confirmed the relationship between the pedagogic goals and interactional features in each classroom mode (Seedhouse, 2004; Sert, 2010). Two of the four modes under SETT were identified in this study, namely, the managerial mode and materials mode. The teacher used the managerial mode to prepare learners to

engage in the discussion (Walsh, 2006), manage his class (Nunan, 1991), provide instructions, and organize students' activity (Sinclair & Brazil, 1982). The result echoed the view of McBer (2000) who stated that teachers are chiefly classroom managers. All interactional features identified by Walsh (2006) for this mode were confirmed in this study. In the materials mode, the teacher's main pedagogic goal was to elicit responses from students in relation to their worksheet. The interaction was characterized by the IRF pattern and primarily controlled by the teacher. This finding is in consonance with the claims of Blanchette (2009), Johnson (1995), Ribas (2010), Breen (1998), and Chaudron (1988) on the tendency of most teachers to dominate communication inside the classroom. Similarly, the interaction was teacher-centered in the inquiries of Nasir et al. (2019), Rashidi (2010), and Mulyati (2013). The absence of skills and systems and the classroom context modes in this study implies that the online classroom interaction was dominated by teacher talk, and students' participation was indeed limited.

An additional L2 mode, the elicitation mode, was identified. Its principal pedagogic goal is to enable learners to recognize or identify grammatical forms and patterns. This finding echoes Walsh's (2006) assertion that "there are almost certainly other modes which could be incorporated" (p. 64).

Aligned with the literature (Jing & Jing, 2018; Long & Porrter, 1985; Rido et al., 2014), the findings of this study suggest that some features of teacher talk promote teaching-learning, while others obstruct successful communication. In terms of interactional features, topic initiation, clarification, confirmation checks, extended wait-time, scaffolding, and teacher echo were found to be facilitative of student learning. This finding is parallel with Tuan and Nhu's (2010) study which showed that the teacher's language use can improve learners' level of engagement. Further, the result corroborates the study of Jeanjaroonsri (2018) in the Thai context where it was found that topic initiation by students, teachers' clarification, and minimal repair are features of a constructive teacher talk. On the contrary, the prevalence of IRF sequence and display questions and the absence of skills and systems mode and classroom context mode, were considered restrictive features of the teacher talk. This result affirmed the findings of Raharja and Ghazali (2020) who found that secondary school teachers extensively used display questions in class. Based on the result, these interactional features made the interaction non-communicative and monotonous. This is congruent with the findings of Gharbavi and Iravani (2014) that revealed the excessive use of display questions and IRF sequence impeded authentic and active communication. Moreover, the result supports the contention of Cullen (1998) that non-communicative strategies, such as display questions, IRF sequence, and form-focused feedback should be avoided.

5. Conclusion

This qualitative study focused on investigating the features of teacher talk in an online English classroom using the SETT framework. Based on the findings, it can be inferred that the success or failure of classroom interaction to foster learning opportunities heavily depends on the teacher's language use. This is parallel with the claim of Long and Porter (1985) who posited that successful teaching is dependent on language use and the kind of interaction that transpires in class. Considering the extent of their authority and influence in the classroom (Ribas, 2010), teachers should be cognizant of the features of their teacher talk and promote communicative interactions by utilizing interactures that provide more space for student participation (Starr, 2017; Webster-Stratton, 2012; Gebhard, 1999). As shown in the results, the lack of language practice and opportunities for extended learner contributions hindered students' mastery of and engagement in the lesson. In this study, the SETT framework provided a metalanguage to vividly describe the complexities of teacher-student interaction. Teachers can adopt the framework to examine their language use and reflect on whether their teacher talk positively or negatively impacts student learning productivity. As a recommendation for future study, researchers could investigate the frequency of use of SETT interactures and its impact on English classroom interaction in an online setting.

6. References

- Afzali, K., & Kianpoor, G. (2020). Teachers strategies used to foster teacher-student and student-student interactions in EFL conversation classrooms: A conversation analysis approach. *The Journal of Applied Linguistics and Applied Literature: Dynamics and Advances*, 8(2), 119-140.
- Anandan, K. N. (2014). Teacher talk in the second language classroom. *Language and Language Teaching*, 3(5), 20-24.
- Aşık, A., & Kuru Gönen, S. İ. (2016). Pre-service EFL teachers' reported perceptions of their development through SETT experience. *Classroom Discourse*, 7(2), 164-183.
- Atmojo, A. E. P., & Nugroho, A. (2020). EFL classes must go online! Teaching activities and challenges during COVID-19 pandemic in Indonesia. *Register Journal*, 13(1), 49-76.
- Berg, B. L. (2009). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. Allyn & Bacon.
- Blanchette, J. (2009). Characteristics of teacher talk and learner talk in the online learning environment. *Language and Education*, 23(5), 391-407.
- Breen, M. P. (Eds.). (1998). *Navigating the discourse: on what is learned in the language classroom*. Learners and Language Learning. SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
- Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge University Press.
- Chin, J. M.-C., Ching, G. S., del Castillo, F., Wen, T.-H., Huang, Y.-C., del Castillo, C. D., Gungon, J. L., & Trajera, S. M. (2022). Perspectives on the barriers to and needs of teachers' professional development in the Philippines during COVID-19. *Sustainability*, 14, 470. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14010470>
- Cook, V. (2000). *Second language learning and language teaching* (2nd ed.). Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- Cullen, R. (1998). Teacher talk and the classroom context. *ELT Journal*, 52(3), 179-187.
- Domholdt, E. (1993). *Physical therapy research: Principles and applications*. W B Saunders.
- Ekinci, M. (Eds.). (2020). Examining teacher echo in an EFL classroom based on SETT framework: A case study. *Interdisciplinary Language and Literature Studies*, 322-329.
- Gebhard, M. (1999). Debates in SLA studies: Redefining classroom SLA as an institutional phenomenon. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(3), 544-557. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587679>
- Gentles, S. J., Charles, C., Ploeg, J., & McKibbin, K. (2015). Sampling in qualitative research: Insights from an overview of the methods literature. *The Qualitative Report*, 20(11), 1772-1789.
- Gharbavi, A., & Iravani, H. (2014). Is teacher talk pernicious to students? A discourse analysis of teacher talk. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 552-561.
- Golato, A. (Eds.). (2022). *Naturally occurring data*. Routledge Handbooks Online.
- Hartshorn, K. J., & McMurry, B. L. (2020). The effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on ESL learners and TESOL practitioners in the United States. *International Journal of TESOL Studies*, 2(2), 140-157.
- Izzati, N. (2021). The use of teacher talk through online teaching and learning process in EFL classroom during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 539, 8-13.
- Jeanjaroonsri, R. (2018). A study of constructive or restrictive features of classroom discourse in an EFL adult classroom in Thai context. *Language Education and Acquisition Research Network Journal*, 11(1), 125-139.
- Jing, N., & Jing, J. (2018). Teacher talk in an EFL classroom: A pilot study. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 8(3), 320-324. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0803.07>
- Johnson, K. E. (1995). *Understanding communication in second language classrooms*. Cambridge University Press.
- Karuppanan, S., & Mohammed, L. A. (2020). Predictive factors associated with online learning during Covid-19 pandemic in Malaysia: A conceptual framework. *International Journal of Management and Human Science*, 4(4), 19-29.
- Korkut, P., & Ertas, A. (2016). The interactional features of English classroom discourse in the Muğla context. *The Online Journal of Quality in Higher Education*, 3(4), 40-51.

- Lee, E. H. (2010). An analysis of online lecture discourse of a Korean NNS teacher and an American NS teacher. *Linguistic Research*, 27(1), 209-229.
- Lei, X. (2009). Communicative teacher talk in the English classroom. *English Language Teaching*, 2(1), 75-79.
- Levitt, H. M., Motulsky, S. L., Wertz, F. J., Morrow, S. L., & Ponterotto, J. G. (2017). Recommendations for designing and reviewing qualitative research in psychology: Promoting methodological integrity. *Qualitative Psychology*, 4(1), 2-22.
- Long, M. H., & Porrtter, P. A. (1985). Group work, interlanguage talk and second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19(2), 207- 227.
- Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2005). *Second language research: Methodology and design*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- McBer, H. (2000). Research into teacher effectiveness: A model of teacher effectiveness. *DfEE, Research Report*, 216.
- Mohajan, H. (2018). Qualitative research methodology in social sciences and related subjects. *Journal of Economic Development, Environment and People*, 7(1), 23-48.
- Mulyati, A. (2013). A study of teacher talk and student talk in verbal classroom interaction to develop speaking skill for young learners. *Journal of English and Education*, 1(1), 1-10.
- Nasir, C., Yusuf, Y., & Wardana, A. (2019). A qualitative study of teacher talk in an EFL classroom interaction in Aceh Tengah, Indonesia. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8(3), 525-535.
<https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v8i3.15251>
- Nunan, D. (1991). *Discourse analysis for language teachers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Parrish, B. (2004). *Teaching adult ESL: A practical introduction*. McGraw Hill.
- Raharja, B., & Ghozali, I. (2020). Discourse analysis on teacher-students interaction pattern of English teaching learning process. *Journal of Applied Linguistics, Translation, and Literature*, 1(1), 1-6.
- Rashidi, N., & Rafieerad, M. (2010). *Analyzing patterns of classroom interaction in EFL classroom in Iran*.
https://www.asiatefl.org/main/download_pdf.php?i=161&c=1419304107
- Ribas, W. (2010). *Instructional practices that maximize student achievement: For teachers by teachers*.
- Rido, A., Ibrahim, N., & Nambiar, R. M. K (2014). *Investigating EFL master teacher's classroom interaction strategies: A case study in Indonesian secondary vocational school*.
http://ac.els-cdn.com/S1877042814015870/1-s2.0-S1877042814015870-main.pdf?_tid=51be1d74-7079-11e6-a137-00000aacb35d&acdnat=1472757884_88bceb08a941939fc710309da9e9241c
- Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. Blackwell.
- Sert, O. (2010) A proposal for a CA-integrated English language teacher education program in Turkey. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 12(3), 62-97.
- Silverman, D. (2007). *A very short, fairly interesting and reasonably cheap book about qualitative research*. Sage.
- Sinclair, J., & Brazil, D. (1982) *Teacher talk*. Oxford University Press.
- Smith, D. (2003, January). *Five principles for research ethics*. American Psychological Association.
https://www.apa.org/monitor/jan03/principles?fbclid=IwAR2iyWyR0FETedernT_1NUfadSOyd-Z5iAG-xrkx9KO2GGc4KaMeXr2ptM8
- Starr, S. (2017). Teacher-talk: Supporting teacher practice. *KAIRARANGA*, 18(2), 29-39.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Tria, J. Z. (2020). The COVID-19 pandemic through the lens of education in the Philippines: The new normal. *International Journal of Pedagogical Development and Lifelong Learning*, 1(1), ep2001.
<https://doi.org/10.30935/ijpdll/8311>
- Tuan, L. T., & Nhu, N. T. (2010). Theoretical review on oral interaction in EFL classrooms. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 1(4), 29-48.
- UNESCO. (2020). *COVID-19 educational disruption and response*.
<https://en.unesco.org/covid19/educationresponse>
- Walia, R. (2015). A Saga of Qualitative Research. *Social Crimonol*, 5(2), 124.

Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating classroom discourse*. Routledge.

Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse: Language in action*. In R. Carter & G. Cook (Eds.). Routledge.

Webster-Stratton, C. (2012). *Incredible teachers nurturing children's social emotional and academic competence*. Incredible Years, Inc.

Werang, B. R., & Radja Leba, S. (2022). Factors affecting student engagement in online teaching and learning: A qualitative case study. *The Qualitative Report*, 27(2), 555-577.

<https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2022.5165>

