Teacher-Student Interaction Management: A Study on the Practices and Principles in a Pakistani ESL Classroom[1]

Muhammad Ahmad, Government College University, Faisalabad, Pakistan
Ali Raza Siddique, Government College University, Faisalabad, Pakistan
Amna Arshad, Government College University, Faisalabad, Pakistan

ABSTRACT

This study investigated Teacher Talk (TT) quantity, TT quality, teacher questions and feedback to determine whether the teacher-student interaction practices in a Pakistani language classroom align with ESL (English as a Second Language) principles or not. For this purpose, two lessons in a Pakistani secondary level ESL classroom were recorded and analysed through conversation analysis (CA). TT was observed to dominate in the classroom. The teacher used display questions more than referential questions. There was a slight use of second language (L2) in the classroom that was limited to the use of key terms in the lessons. Feedback was romantic in nature. All of these practices were observed as less effective teacher-student interaction practices. Therefore, the study concluded that teacher-student interaction did not align with ESL classroom management principles. Since TT, teacher questions and feedback were the important forms of teacher-student interaction in an ESL classroom, this study suggested to manage TT, teacher questions and feedback in the Pakistani ESL classroom for effective L2 teaching.

Keywords: ESL classroom management, feedback, teacher questions, teacher-student interaction, teacher talk

1. INTRODUCTION

Generally, classroom management (CM) is considered as a classroom control (Debreli, Ishanova & Sheppard, 2019) to solve problems related to maintaining order or handling disciplinary actions (Chambers, 2003; Labaree, 2006). Consequently, a teacher is deemed as a control-establishing mechanism to manage the learners' behaviour in the classroom (Kaufman & Moss, 2010) which means that CM is all about classroom control or discipline. However, studies have added to the scope of CM, which includes teachers' decisions to support learning (Krause, Bochner & Duchesne, 2003); and the use of activities to create and maintain an encouraging and orderly environment (Tan et al., 2003). Other studies (see Evertson & Weinstein, 2006; Manning & Bucher, 2013) consider CM as a blend of discipline, teaching method and organisation of classroom utilities. All of these ideas can be synthesised to define CM as a wide variety of teachers' skills and techniques to organise and order the learners, and to keep them attentive, focused, on task, and academically productive in the class.

CM is an integral part of the teaching profession and is observed across all content areas (Macías, 2018). CM varies depending on a number of factors like education level, teaching place and subject matter (Martin & Yin, 1997). Therefore, management of ESL classrooms can be different from managing geography, history or math classrooms. The reason is that ESL CM particularly demands the use of English language along with other skills and capabilities (Ababneh, 2012). Macías (2018) distinguishes the management of ESL classrooms from other subjects' classrooms owing to the unique features like interaction patterns, target language (TL) use and teaching methodology. These features reflect three significant characteristics of language teachers in Borg (2006), which include (i) foreign language teaching demands interaction patterns like group work that is desired but not essential for teaching other subjects, (ii) foreign language teaching is the only subject that demands the teacher to use the same medium that is being taught (language) for effective instruction, and (iii) foreign language teaching methodology is diversified and aims to create contexts for communication and maximise learners' involvement.

Everything in the classroom happens through a live person-person interaction. Therefore, interaction can be called the key feature of classroom instruction (Ellis, 1994). Interaction (both verbal and nonverbal) is the basic requirement of the classroom events (Allwright & Bailey, 1991). Teacher-student interaction ensures the development and success of a class (Tsui, 1995) by facilitating acquisition through conversational and linguistic modification and provides the learners with essential input for language acquisition (Long, 1996). Interaction is regarded as a significant feature of ESL CM. Richards and Rodgers (2001) assert that ESL CM requires teachers' control over students' behaviour and teacher-student interactions. For Nunan (1991), teacher-student interaction and CM are integral to sound methodological practice. Thus, realising the significance of interaction, this study aims to investigate teacher-student interaction practices in a Pakistani ESL classroom.

1.1 Teacher Talk

TT is an important means of teacher-student interaction in the classroom. TT is a language used by the teachers while addressing L2 learners (Ellis, 1989; Ur, 2000). Nunan (1991) views TT as a tool which teachers use to organise a class for language teaching. He considers TT crucial not only for classroom organisation but also for language acquisition. Actually, TT is important for CM and organisation, in Nunan's (1991) view, because it is through the language that either a teacher fails or succeeds to implement his instructional plans. Similarly, TT is important for acquisition because it provides comprehensible teaching and learning input to the learners. Therefore, TT is an essential part of foreign language teaching in organising activities, and the way a teacher talks not only determines how well he or she makes his or her lectures, but also guarantees how well students will learn (Yanfen & Yuqin, 2010). Thus, whether a class is successful or not depends, to a large extent, on the effectiveness of TT (Hakansson, 1986).

TT has significant features (Yanfen & Yuqin, 2010). Hu Xuewen in Xiao-Yan (2006) categorised them into formal and functional features. Formal features are concerned with the form of TT and include speech modifications, pauses, repetitions and speed (see also Jing & Jing, 2018). Functional features, on the other hand, are concerned with the control and organisation of the class which include TT amount (quantity), TT quality (appropriateness or effectiveness), teacher questions and feedback on learners' performance (Hu Xuewen in Xiao-Yan, 2006; Nunan, 1991). Since the usefulness of language teaching depends on the type of interaction and language used in the classroom (Long & Porter, 1985), TT should be of high quality to create an effective and harmonious environment for student-teacher interaction. Otherwise, the teaching will be nothing more than a monodrama in the classroom (Jing & Jing, 2018). Hence, this study aimed to investigate the TT quality in a Pakistani language classroom and considered the functional features only. Research (Berlin, 2015; Boyd, 2015; Cook, 2016; Davies, 2011; Kareema, 2014; Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Paul, 2003; Yanfen & Yuqin, 2010) has already been conducted to explore TT features, talk turns

(between teachers and students) as well as what language the teachers use to manage the class. This study is an addition to these studies and aims to explore functional features of TT (quality, quantity), teacher questions, feedback and what language the teacher uses to manage the class, which no previous study has so far explored.

1.1.1 Amount of Teacher Talk

TT amount means the quantity of TT in a classroom. In simple words, TT amount means how much the teachers talk while instructing in the classroom (Kareema, 2014). Nunan (1991) believes that teachers by far do the most talking in the classroom. Research (Chaudron, 1988; Cook, 2016; Nunan, 1991) established that the teachers talk 70-80% of the whole class talk. Frey, Fisher and Allen (2009) have stated that the students are expected to sit hour after hour with little interaction with peers to take notes and answer occasional questions. Hurst, Wallace and Nixon (2013) reported a Kindergartener saying to his mother: 'what all teachers do is talk, talk, talk'. Similar words were repeated by him after his first days at high school and college. After analysing 12 (30 hours-long) sessions, Azhar, Iqbal and Khan (2019) observed the teachers using 65% of the total class time. Moreover, the teacher dominates the classroom by occupying more linguistic space than the students (Abbas, Ali & Hussain, 2017; Inamullah, Hussain & Din, 2008; Jule, 2002). These studies validate Nunan's (1991) belief that the teachers talk too much in the classroom. There is no doubt that Nunan (1991) considers TT good for providing TL input. However, he also recommends that teachers avoid excessive talk in the classroom. This may have serious implications as it may lead to the teachers' dominance in the class, which can severely restrict student talk (ST) in the classroom, which may further affect the development of language proficiency among learners. With this in view, this study aims to investigate TT in a Pakistani ESL classroom to know its amount (quantity) and see whether it is effective (quality) for TL learning.

1.1.2 Teacher Questions

As a discursive move of teachers' choice in an ELL classroom (Boyd, 2015), teacher questions are given greater importance in education (Wu, 1993) and are commonly used by the teachers (Chaudron, 1988; Harmer, 2000; Kim, 2015; Richards & Lockhart, 1994) to (i) assess what the learners know (Wu, 1993); (ii) help the learners to adjust to their language and make it more understandable (Harmer, 2000); (iii) extend and validate learners' thinking (Boyd & Rubin, 2002; Haneda & Wells, 2010); (iv) help the learners in learning the topic (Kim, 2015); and (v) help the teachers to induct the learners into particular ways of thinking and language use; (vi) direct classroom talk; and (vii) encourage ST (Boyd, 2015). That is why teacher questions have been attracting the attention of researchers (Boyd, 2015; Chin, 2006; Fitriani & Amilia, 2017; Haneda & Wells, 2010; Ho, 2005; Kim, 2015; Omari, 2018; Sedova, Sedlacek & Svaricek, 2016; Wright, 2016). These studies investigated teacher questions as a source of teacher-student interaction as well as the functions and types of teacher questions in ESL classrooms. This study adds to the existing literature on teacher questions by exploring the function and type of frequently asked questions by the teacher in a Pakistani ESL classroom, particularly from the CM perspective which no previous study has so far explored.

Long and Sato (1983) classified teacher questions into (i) display questions and (ii) referential questions. Display questions demand the learners to display the knowledge obtained in the class; and extract mechanical, short and simple answers (mostly require one-word answers like 'yes' or 'no') that (answers) are already known to the teachers. On the other hand, referential questions are exploratory in nature and mostly require complex and lengthy answers that are not already known to the teachers. Nunan (1991) added a third category, namely elicitation questions to display and referential questions. Richards and Lockhart (1994) later classified questions into convergent, divergent and procedural questions. Convergent and divergent questions were asked to involve the learners in the lesson whereas procedural questions were concerned with classroom routines like CM. Convergent questions were close-ended whereas

divergent questions were open-ended. Thus, convergent and divergent questions were similar to display and referential questions respectively. In the past, teacher questions have commonly been investigated in different categories such as closed and open questions, display and referential questions, and convergent and divergent questions, which often created the impression that there are six types while there are actually only two (display and referential questions). Therefore, this study considered teacher questions in two categories that were display and referential questions, after merging closed/convergent and open/divergent questions into display and referential questions respectively. Elicitation and procedural questions were excluded on the grounds that they did not fall under display or referential questions' categories.

Vebriyanto (2015) reported the use of display questions (69%) more than referential questions (31%). Similar results were reported by Erlinda and Dewi (2016) who observed the teachers asking display questions (495 times) more frequently than referential questions (134 times). Another study (Fitriani & Amilia, 2017) also reported display questions as the more frequently asked questions (120 times) as compared to referential questions that were asked 101 times. A similar lead of display questions (86%) has also been observed in Omari (2018). These studies show that display questions are common in teachers' use in the language classrooms. This study therefore aims to see which type of questions (display or referential) the teacher frequently asks and what function these questions perform in a Pakistani ESL classroom.

1.1.3 Teacher Feedback on Learner Performance

Feedback is another source of teacher-student interaction in the classroom. It is a significant constituent of TT (Liu & Le, 2012). It refers to the evaluation of learners' responses by the teacher (Cook, 2016). Giving feedback on learner performance is a significant aspect of teaching (Xiao-Yan, 2006). Feedback is usually provided by teachers on learner performance in the form of comments, praise or silence (Richards & Lockhart, 1994). Nanan (1991) refers to feedback in the form of negative and positive responses. Negative feedback shows the teacher repeating students' responses with a rising tone whereas positive feedback shows the teacher using short interjections, for example, alright, correct, good, ok. However, Nunan (1991) terms the use of words like 'alright', 'correct', 'good' and 'ok' as 'romantic feedback'. In fact, Nunan (1991) appreciates positive feedback; however, he is not in favour of providing feedback through short interjections. To Nunan (1991), positive feedback serves two functions: (i) it motivates the learners and (ii) it informs the learners about their correct performance. For this type of positive feedback, Nunan (1991) recommends the teachers to follow Brophy's (1981: 26) guidelines for effective praise (see Table 1).

Table 1:
Guidelines for Effective Praise

Effective Praise:
1. Is delivered contingently;
2. Specifies the particulars of the accomplishment;
3. Shows spontaneity, variety, and other signs of credibility;
4. Suggests clear attention to the student's accomplishment;
5. Rewards attainment of specified performance criteria (which can include effort criteria, however);
6. Provides information to students about their competence or the value of their accomplishments;

Effective Praise:

7. Orients students towards better appreciation of their own task-related behaviour and thinking about problem solving;

8. Uses students' own prior accomplishments as the context for describing present accomplishments;

9. Is given in recognition of noteworthy effort or success at difficult (for the student) tasks;

10. Attributes success to effort and ability, implying that similar successes can be expected in the future;

11. Fosters endogenous attributions (students believe that they expend effort on the task because they enjoy the task and/or want to develop task-relevant skills);

12. Focuses students' attention on their own task-relevant behavior; and

13. Fosters appreciation of and desirable attributions about task-relevant behavior after the process is completed.

This study aims to see whether the teacher feedback on learner performance in a Pakistani ESL classroom is positive or not.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This study was initiated to investigate Nunan's (1991) teacher-student interaction practices identifiers of CM in a Pakistani secondary level ESL classroom. In further detail, the study looked for answers of the main study question followed by four sub-questions:

- Do the teacher-student interaction practices in a Pakistani secondary level language classroom match with ESL classroom management principles?

    i.   What is the quantity and quality of teacher talk in a Pakistani secondary level ESL classroom?

    ii. Which language does the teacher use to manage teacher-student interaction practices in a Pakistani secondary level ESL classroom?

    iii. What function do the frequently asked teacher questions perform in a Pakistani secondary level ESL classroom?

    iv. What is the nature of feedback in a Pakistani secondary level ESL classroom?

2. METHODOLOGY

This case study examines Pakistani ESL classroom management practices within a classroom's institutional frame in order to investigate the quantity (amount) and quality of teacher talk, types of teacher questions and feedback practices. The researchers provide a comprehensive account by adopting a CM approach to study the naturally occurring discourse patterns during teacher-student interaction that are productively used in the analysis of learning and teaching practices in L2 classrooms (Sert, 2015; Waring, 2016). In L2 classrooms (where content is also the medium of instruction), language carries special significance for participation opportunity and learning (Long, 1983). While adopting the lens of CA, the researchers highlight the practices of a multimodal teacher in an ESL classroom as Stivers and Sidnell (2005) define it: face-to-face interaction in terms of 'multimodal interaction' where a teacher manages participation and learners expand their language use through this opportunity (Waring, 2014). Thus, a teacher's positive feedback in an ESL classroom encourages the students to extend their turns and engage themselves in L2 learning behaviours (Walsh, 2002).

For the purpose of this study, the focal audio-recording was taken from a public sector school located in a town city of Okara district in Punjab, Pakistan. The total number of participants of the study was 54: one

teacher and 53 students of Grade 10. The age group of the students was between 14-17 years and they belonged to different social backgrounds. Some of the students belonged to urban areas whereas others belonged to rural areas. They spoke Urdu and Punjabi languages with their parents and siblings as well as in other social settings. Their parents were associated with different professions like teaching in public or private sector schools, trade or agriculture. The majority of the students got formal education in the medium of instruction Urdu/English from private or public sector schools located in their nearby rural and urban areas. These students were enrolled at the current school in Grade 9 in April 2018. During the data collection phase, they became the Grade 10 students of the current school and English was mandatory as a medium of instruction in the English language classroom, though both teacher and students were not very competent in speaking the English language. Therefore, the teacher used Urdu as the medium of instruction in the English language classroom. The rationale behind using the Urdu language might be that English impacts negatively on learners and is less accessible to the students (Marsh, Hau & Kong, 2000). Moreover, (on average) students who are proficient in their instructional language tend to become more successful than those whose native language is different from their instructional language (Arsad, Bauniyamin & Manan, 2014; Lo & Macaro, 2012).

In instructed language-learning settings, the teacher holds a Master's degree and a Bachelor's-level professional degree. He has been teaching English over a decade to Grades 9 and 10. To record the teacher-students interactional classroom discourse, ethical considerations were carefully considered by the observer participants. The identity of the students and the teacher remained secret during data recording. Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2005) stated that by means of observational technique during the data collection phase, the researcher gets the opportunity to interact with natural social settings. The recorded data (recorded with the help of a mobile phone) comprised a total of 86 minutes and 8 seconds of teacher-student interactional discourse. The recording was used to produce a detailed written transcription by documenting the verbal conduct of teacher and students of classroom context. TT quality and quantity were considered to analyse according to the principles laid down by Nunan (1991) and discussed in comparison with different studies (see section 3). To analyse teacher questions, classification of display and referential questions was considered (see section 1.1.2 for details). The selected topic of the taught component was 'direct and indirect narration'. The topic was delivered in two lectures in which the teacher taught only a limited set of core vocabulary items like revising tense rules, reporting verbs, reported speech and inverted commas etc.

The data were analysed within the methodological and theoretical framework of CA. Despite there being a handful of theoretical and methodological frameworks, CA is being extensively used for analysing ESL/EFL classroom discourse (see Walsh, 2002). The basic argument of CA is that its main objective of investigation is social interaction (Sacks, 1984), which is highly ordered and this orderliness provides every detail of interaction and makes it potentially relevant (Sidnell & Stivers, 2013). This ensures the transparency of results (Seedhouse, 2005). Relying on micro-analysis of transcribed excerpts taken from actual ESL classroom interaction, the aim of CA is to categorise underlying structures and to illustrate organisation of social actions and activities (Sidnell & Stivers, 2013). Therefore, CA is a multimodal approach that particularly enhances the understanding of how teaching and learning is interactionally organised and achieved in ESL classrooms (Evnitskaya & Jakonen, 2017).

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results of the study are discussed according to each category.

3.1 Amount of Teacher Talk

Two lessons were delivered in the classroom that took 86 minutes and 8 seconds time out of which the teacher talked for 66 minutes and 24 seconds whereas the students were given 20 minutes and 4 seconds

to talk in the classroom. The percentages of TT and ST were 77% and 23% respectively. These percentages showed that TT consumed the most time (see Table 2).

Table 2:
Amount of TT in the Classroom

Lesson	Total Amount (in min/sec)	TT Amount (in min/sec)	ST Amount (in min/sec)
1	46.21	36.31	9.5
2	39.47	29.53	10.54
Total	86.08	66.24	20.04
Percentage		77	23
Total Number of Students			53
Average Time for Each Student			23 seconds

These results (see Table 2) align with the results of previous studies (see Azhar et. al., 2019; Cook, 2016) and thus confirm Nunan's (1991) belief that the teachers talk a lot in the classroom which has also been validated in different studies (see Abbas, Ali & Hussain, 2017; Azhar et. al., 2019; Cook, 2016; Frey, Fisher & Allen, 2009; Hurst, Wallace & Nixon, 2013; Inamullah et. al., 2008; Jule, 2002). Moreover, the teacher has been observed using L1 in the classroom. TL use was limited to the key terms such as direct speech, indirect speech etc. in the Pakistani ESL classroom.

Studies support such a high amount of TT (as shown in Table 2) in the classroom on the grounds that TT is of crucial importance (Nunan, 1991): TT determines the failure or success of a classroom (Hakansson, 1986; Nunan, 1991; Yanfen & Yuqin, 2010); it provides TL input (Liu & Le, 2012; Nunan, 1991); facilitates instruction and management in the classroom (Brown, 2001; Nunan, 1991); and it mediates learning (Boyd, 2016). All of these studies (that support TT) stand on Krashen's (1985) input hypothesis: learners improve and progress along the natural order when they are provided with comprehensible TL input.

But these studies (that support TT) contradict the philosophy that learning is mainly a social action (Dewey, 1963; Lindeman, 1926). Therefore, input alone cannot ensure TL acquisition. Swain's (1985) product theory confirms the significance of output in second language acquisition (SLA). For Swain (1985), SLA takes place only when the learners take turns into assimilation. Thus, for Swain (1985) input alone is not sufficient for SLA. Output is equally important for successful SLA which, in the view of Xiao-Yan (2006) can help the students to speak and use the language in useful ways. Thus, teachers' use of L1 (in this study) negated the idea of TL input. Moreover, learners' non-engagement in teacher-student interaction in the classroom did not provide the learner an opportunity to practise L2 and thereby contributes to the output in the classroom for successful SLA. Therefore, TT is suggested to be minimised in favour of ST on the grounds that too much TT hinders L2 practice by the learners (Paul, 2003) and limits learner autonomy (Kostadinovska-Stojchevska & Popovikj, 2019). In addition, teacher-student interaction and the use of L1 are suggested to be increased to enable the learners to contribute to the TL output and thereby facilitate SLA in the classroom.

According to Hurst (1998), the person who is doing the work is the person who is doing the learning. Normally, it is the teacher who works in the classroom. The teacher reads different texts, synthesises information, selects key points and organises them to present to the learners who sit passively in the classroom. In this way, the teacher is seen doing the work and, as a result, doing the learning. This

is undesirable for a successful teaching-learning process. Therefore, Vacca and Vacca (2002) suggest to shift the burden of learning from the teacher's shoulders to the students' shoulders. Probst (2007) agrees with Vacca and Vacca (2002) saying that it is the student who should work the most in the classroom. Moreover, the students can be enabled to work more in the classroom by engaging them in social interaction with their class fellows (Vacca, Vacca & Mraz, 2011). In the view of Routman (2005), students learn more when they talk to one another.

3.2 Quality of Teacher Talk

Although excessive TT has been criticised by many researchers (see Allwright, 1981; Kostadinovska-Stojchevska & Popovikj, 2019; Paul, 2003; Xiao-Yan, 2006), they do not advocate to minimise it as an objective (Van Lier, 2001). A number of studies (see Paul, 2003; Van Lier, 2001) have emphasised the effectiveness (quality) of TT. Nunan (1991) also emphasises TT quality. For Nunan (1991), TT quality depends on its appropriateness. According to Nunan (1991), TT is appropriate if it (i) is relevant to the point in a lesson in which the talk occurs; (ii) is planned and does not cause digression; and (iii) provides potential input for TL.

After listening to the audio lesson, it was found that the teacher observed two of Nunan's (1991) three criteria for the appropriateness of TT. Firstly, the teacher was observed to remain relevant to the topic. He discussed all of the points with clarity. Secondly, the lesson was well planned and there was no digression. However, the lesson could not fulfill the third criterion of TT appropriateness. The reason was that the teacher used Urdu (L2 of learners; Punjabi being L1) in the classroom. There was a slight use of English that was restricted to the use of key terms related with the topic, for example, direct and indirect speech, first person, second person, third person, reported speech and reporting speech.

The use of Urdu and other local languages is common in Pakistani schools (Shamim, 2008; Shamim & Allen, 2000). The reason is that Pakistani teachers have to follow certain practices like 'doing the grammar' or 'doing the lesson' which involve a number of activities like reading aloud of the texts, interpreting the texts in Urdu or other local languages, and telling the meanings of texts (Shamim, 2008). Moreover, the majority of the students in Pakistan is enrolled at non-elite schools where teachers' proficiency in English is limited, which hampers the use of the English language in the classroom (Shamim & Allen, 2000).

The use of L1 by the teacher in the classroom is also common in other countries. Hernández and Faustino (2006 in Viáfara, 2011) have reported EFL teachers in Colombia using L1 more than L2 in the classroom. Kerr (2019) states that the majority of the teachers makes greater use of L1 (90%) in the classroom. Actually, most of the researchers support the use of L1 in an L2 classroom on the grounds that the use of L1: (i) is an easy and quick way to make the difficult expressions understandable (Shin, 2006); (ii) makes the learners feel relaxed and avoids any possible confusion in the classroom (Ford, 2009); (iii) can enable the teachers to explain difficult terms, show empathy and scaffold comprehension (Crichton, 2009; Macaro, 2001); (iv) serves as a source of embedding new meanings (Forman, 2012); (v) supports TL development (Lee & Macaro, 2013; Moore, 2013); and (vi) is beneficial for TL instruction (Cenoz & Gorter, 2014; Krulatz, Neokleous, & Henningsen, 2016). Some researchers, on the other hand, discourage the use of L1 and support the use of TL on the grounds that TL (i) is important for providing TL input (Nunan, 1991); (ii) helps the students to acquire linguistic competence (Antón, 1999); (iii) serves as a content-communicating vehicle (Tedick & Walker, 1994); and (iv) provides an optimal as well as a richer learning environment (Polio & Duff, 1994).

The above comparison establishes that the majority of the researchers are in favour of the use of L1 in the classroom, which is supported by the findings of the largest project by Hall and Cook (2016) who have collected the data from 2785 teachers serving in 111 countries. However, use of TL in the classroom still

cannot be reduced. The reason is that it is significant for providing TL to the students in the classroom. Moreover, researchers who support the use of L1 (see Cenoz & Gorter, 2014; Crichton, 2009; Forman, 2012; Krulatz et. al., 2016; Lee & Macaro, 2013; Macaro, 2001; Moore, 2013; Shin, 2006) do not want to reduce the use of L2 in the classroom (Forman, 2012). Thus, Forman (2012) helps to establish that L1 can be used in the classroom with maximum use of L2. As far as the matter of maximum use of L2 is concerned, the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (2010) suggests making 90% use of L2 in the classroom sparing only 10% for the use of L1. The limited use of L1 not only facilitates the extended opportunities to use English in listening and speaking but also provides useful opportunities for language acquisition (Scrivener, 2012). Thus, TL appears to be the important factor for the appropriateness of TT.

3.3 Teacher Questions

Table 3:
Type and Frequency of Questions Asked by the Teacher in the Classroom

Lesson	Display Questions	Referential Questions	Total Questions
1	62	8	70
2	51	6	57
Grand Total	113	14	127
Percentage	89%	11%	

The teacher asked 127 questions from the students in both lessons out of which the frequencies of display and referential questions were 113 (89%) and 14 (11%) respectively. In this way, display questions were observed at maximum frequency. It indicates that the teachers in Pakistani secondary school language classrooms prefer asking display questions for which the answer is already known to them to asking referential questions which prompt the students to elicit longer and syntactically more complex answers. These results (shown in Table 3) are also very common and align with the results reported in previous studies (see Erlinda & Dewi, 2016; Fitriani & Amilia, 2017; Omari, 2018; Vebriyanto, 2015).

As far as the function of the questions is concerned, display questions (i) produce just one or a few words response (Dalton-Puffer, 2007); (ii) encourage the recall of information and look for factual answers (McNeill & Pimentel, 2010); (iii) pursue questioner's agenda (Boyd, 2015); and (iv) elicit correct but not diverse answers (Kim, 2015). Referential questions, on the other hand, help the students to (i) assimilate useful output that further improves language acquisition process (Brock, 1986); (ii) scaffold reasoning (Smith, Blakeslee & Anderson, 1993); (iii) create an environment where the students can comfortably share their ideas with peers (De Rivera, Girolametto, Greenberg & Weitzman, 2005); (iv) use talk to explore understanding, to hypothesize, reason, evaluate and consider diverse answers (Smith & Higgins, 2006); (v) elicit diverse answers (Elizabeth, Anderson, Snow & Selman, 2012; Juzwik, Borsheim-Black, Caughlan & Heintz, 2014); and (vi) foster critical thinking (Fitriani & Amilia, 2017).

In the light of the results (see Table 3), it can be said that the teacher questions in a Pakistani secondary school English language classroom function to produce factual, choppy and short answers. It signifies that the questions (display) asked by Pakistani language teachers, in light of Nunan's (1991) recommendation that teachers should ask more referential questions, are not appropriate. In fact, referential questions have been preferred to display questions for a number of reasons. Firstly, referential questions are seen as a way for the students to make significant use of language which, according to Wintergerst (1994), increases up

to three times more than any other type of questions. In addition, referential questions provide long and complex answers (Brock, 1986) which increase non-verbal communication and the use of dictionaries resulting in motivated interaction, and high quality and quantity output (Wright, 2016), whereas display questions (being limited-response questions) may inhibit the learning process (Kim, 2015). Secondly, referential questions help the students to provide diverse answers based on their experiences, judgements and opinions which further help the teacher to fill information gaps. In contrast, display questions elicit low-level, short answers that correspond to the answer expected by the teacher (Erlinda & Dewi, 2016). Thirdly, referential questions, as compared to display questions, promote a higher number of speaking turns. Therefore, referential questions are more engaging than display questions (Brock, 1986). Fourthly, referential questions stir critical thinking in the students and therefore produce higher-order responses while display questions prompt factual recall, which produces lower-order responses (Bozorgian & Fallah, 2017). Fifthly, because of stirring students' evaluation and judgement abilities, referential questions are related with the highest cognitive levels. In contrast, because of prompting the recollection of factual information in the students, display questions are associated with low cognitive levels (Brock, 1986). Lastly, referential questions prove useful for increasing students' oral participation in the classroom (Bozorgian & Fallah, 2017). Conversely, display questions limit communication in the classroom (Cullen, 1998).

For these reasons, display questions (asked in maximum frequency by the teacher in both lessons in the study) do not seem good for effective teacher-student interaction management. Thus, the management of teacher questions in the classroom is not seen at par with Nunan's (1991) recommendation that the teacher should use referential questions more than display questions. Excessive use of display questions is also seen as a sign of inexperienced teaching (Farahian & Rezaee, 2012; Pica & Long, 1986). This study suggests that the teacher reconsider the use of frequently asked questions in the classroom for a better teaching-learning process.

3.4 Teacher Feedback on Learner Performance

The teacher provided feedback to the learners. He used a number of words in an attempt to provide positive feedback to the students such as 'correct', 'good', 'ok' and 'right' (these words are the translated version of the Urdu words used by the teacher). The teacher used the word 'good' (*shabbash* in Urdu) most of the time as compared to the other words like 'correct', 'ok' and 'right'.

It indicates that the teacher in a Pakistani secondary school ESL classroom provides feedback on learner performance using words like 'correct', 'good', 'ok', and 'right' while 'good' is the word that the teacher most frequently uses to give feedback on learner performance. The reason for the use of 'good' for feedback can be traced in Pakistani culture where every elder says *shabbash* (good) to the young at the time of the completion of a task or after a certain achievement. The same tradition is, perhaps, followed by the teachers in Pakistan who consider themselves elders and provide feedback on young students' performance. Nunan (1991) sees this type of feedback (provided by using words like 'correct', 'good', 'ok' and 'right') as romantic. Thus, it shows that feedback provided by the teacher in the Pakistani ESL classroom is not appropriate.

Typical teacher-student interaction in the classroom follows a traditional pattern where the teacher initiates student responses and the teacher provides the feedback (Liu & Le, 2012). The teachers should avoid the use of certain traditional words, which Nunan (1991) calls romantic. Actually, Nunan (1991) idealises positive feedback which, according to Liu and Le (2012), not only informs the students that they have finished their task but also motivates them for learning. Thus, positive feedback, in the view of Nunan (1991) is good for promoting learning behaviour in the students. For positive feedback, Nunan (1991) recommends Brophy's (1981) 'effective praise' guidelines (see Table 1). Therefore, this study suggests that the teacher follows effective praise guidelines to provide positive feedback on learner performance.

4. CONCLUSION

This study explored TT quantity, TT quality, teacher questions and feedback to determine whether the teacher-student interaction practices in a Pakistani classroom aligned with ESL principles or not. TT was observed in the highest quantity (77%) which confirmed the belief that the teachers talked too much in the classroom. The high TT amount restricted teacher-student interaction in the classroom and spared a limited time for ST (23%), which further limited the opportunity to contribute to the L2 output. On average, only 23 seconds' time was given per student in the classroom. Similarly, the teacher used L1 in the classroom which hindered the provision of TL input by the teacher to the students. Thus, the use of L1 was observed against the quality criterion for the appropriateness of TT. Moreover, the teacher asked display questions more (113 times) than referential questions (14 times) which (display questions) made the students to elicit choppy, factual and short answers. As far as the feedback was concerned, the teacher used short interjections (such as 'good', 'right', 'ok', 'correct') to provide feedback on learner performance in the classroom which did not align with the feedback principles. These findings lead to the conclusion that the teacher-student interaction practices in a Pakistani secondary level language classroom did not match ESL classroom management principles.

ESL classroom management requires intensive teacher-student and student-teacher interaction in the classroom. TT, teacher questions and feedback are the different forms of teacher-student interaction and need to be effectively managed to facilitate the language learning in the classroom. In this regard, this study suggests that teachers (i) reduce TT in exchange for ST; (ii) increase the use of L2 to provide TL input to the students; (iii) use referential questions more than display questions to make the students to elicit varied as well as long answers; (iv) give the students more chances to speak in the classroom for output contribution; and (v) follow effective feedback guidelines (see Table 1) to provide positive feedback on learner performance for an effective ESL classroom management.

A limitation of the study is that its sample is very limited (comprises two audio-recorded lessons); therefore, its results are not generalisable.

REFERENCES

Ababneh, S. (2012) Towards a better English classroom: Implementing effective classroom management strategies. *International Journal of Education* 4(4) pp.300-312.

Abbas, Z., Ali, M. & Hussain, S. (2017) Exploring linguistic space occupied by the teacher and students of an ESL classroom in the context of Gilgit-Baltistan: Comparisons across gender. *Journal of Educational Research and Innovation* 6(1) pp.1-11.

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

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

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (2010) *National standards for foreign language learning.* www.actfl.org/files/public/StandardsforFLLexecsumm_rev.pdf (Accessed 12 June 2020).

Antón, M. (1999) The discourse of a learner-centered classroom: Sociocultural perspectives on teacher-learner interaction in the second-language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal* 83(3) pp.303-318.

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 pp.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) pp.193-202.

Borg, S. (2006) *Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice.* London: Continuum.

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

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

Boyd, M.P. (2016) Calling for response-ability in our classrooms. *Language Arts* 93(3) pp.226-233.

Bozorgian, H. & Fallah, S. (2017) EFL learners' speaking development: Asking referential questions. *Jurnal Pendidikan Malaysia* 42(2) pp.99-106.

Brock, C.A. (1986) The effects of referential questions on ESL classroom discourse. *TESOL Quarterly* 20(1) pp.47-59.

Brophy, J. (1981) Teacher praise: A functional analysis. *Review of Educational Research* 51(1) pp.5-32.

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

Cenoz, J. & Gorter, D. (2014) Focus on multilingualism as an approach in educational contexts. In A. Blackledge & A. Creese (Eds.), *Heteroglossia as Practice and Pedagogy.* Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer, pp.239-254.

Chambers, S.M. (2003) The impact of length of student teaching on the self-efficacy and classroom orientation of preservice teachers. Paper presented at the *Annual Meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association.* San Antonio, Texas, U.S. 13-15 February.

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

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

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

Cook, V. (2016) *Second language learning and language teaching.* UK: Routledge.

Crichton, H. (2009) Value added 'modern languages teaching in the classroom: An investigation into how teachers' use of classroom target language can aid pupils' communication skills. *Language Learning Journal* 37(1) pp.19-34.

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

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

Davies, M. (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.

Debreli, E., Ishanova, I. & Sheppard, C. (2019) Foreign language classroom management: Types of student misbehaviour and strategies adapted by the teachers in handling disruptive behaviour. *Cogent Education* 6(1) pp.1-21.

De Rivera, C., Girolametto, L., Greenberg, J. & Weitzman, E. (2005) Children's responses to educators' questions in day care play groups. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology* 14(1) pp.14-26.

Dewey, J. (1963) *Experience and education.* New York: Collier.

Elizabeth, T., Anderson, T., Snow, E. & Selman, R. (2012) Academic discussions: An analysis of instructional discourse and an argument for an integrative assessment framework. *American Educational Research Journal* 49 pp.1214-1250.

Ellis, R. (1989) *Understanding second language acquisition* (Vol. 31). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

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

Evertson, C.M. & Weinstein, C.S. (2006). *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues.* New York: Routledge.

Evnitskaya, N. & Jakonen, T. (2017) Multimodal conversation analysis and CLIL classroom practices. In A. Llinares & T. Morton (Eds.), *Applied Linguistics Perspectives on CLIL.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp.201-220.

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 pp.161-167.

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

Ford, K. (2009) Principles and practices of L1/L2 use in the Japanese university EFL classroom. *JALT Journal* 31(1) pp.63-80.

Forman, R. (2012) Six functions of bilingual EFL teacher talk: Animating, translating, explaining, creating, prompting and dialoguing. *RELC Journal* 43(2) pp.239-253.

Frey, N., Fisher, D. & Allen, A. (2009) Productive group work in middle and high school classrooms. In S. Parris, D. Fisher & K. Headley (Eds.), *Adolescent Literacy: Effective Solutions for Every Classroom.* Newark, US: International Reading Association, pp.70-81.

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

Hall, G. & Cook, G. (2013) *Own-language use in ELT: Exploring global practices and attitudes.* London: British Council.

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) pp.10-21.

Harmer, J. (2000) *How to teach English.* Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.

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

Hurst, B. (1998) Person working equals person learning. *Journal of Reading Education* 23(3) pp.23-24.

Hurst, B., Wallace, R. & Nixon, S.B. (2013) The impact of social interaction on student learning. *Reading Horizons: A Journal of Literacy and Language Arts* 52(4) pp.375-398.

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) pp.41-44.

Jing, N. & Jing, J. (2018) Teacher talk in an EFL classroom: A pilot study. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies* 8(3) pp.220-234.

Jule, A. (2002) Speaking their sex: A study of gender and linguistic space in an ESL classroom. *TESL Canada Journal* 19(2) pp.37-51.

Juzwik, M., Borsheim-Black, C., Caughlan, S. & Heintz, A. (2014) *Inspiring dialogue: Talking to learn in the English classroom.* New York: 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 4th International Symposium.* South Eastern University of Sri Lanka, Sri Lanka, pp.233-238.

Kaufman, D. & Moss, D.M. (2010) A new look at preservice teachers' conceptions of classroom management and organization: Uncovering complexity and dissonance. *The Teacher Educator* 45(2) pp.118-136.

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

Kerr, P. (2019) *The use of L1 in English language teaching. Part of the Cambridge papers in ELT series.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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, US.

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) pp.25-31.

Krause, K.L., Bochner, S. & Duchesne, S. (2003) *Educational psychology for learning and teaching.* Australia: Thomson.

Krulatz, A., Neokleous, G. & Henningsen, F.V. (2016) Towards an understanding of target language use in the EFL classroom: A report from Norway. *International Journal for 21st Century Education* 3(Special) pp.137-152.

Labaree, D.F. (2006). *The trouble with ed schools*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Lee, J.H. & Macaro, E. (2013) Investigating age in the use of L1 or English-only instruction: Vocabulary acquisition by Korean EFL learners. *The Modern Language Journal* 97(4) pp.887-901.

Lindeman, E.C. (1926) *The meaning of adult education*. New York: New Republic.

Lindholm-Leary, K.J. (2001) *Dual language education* (Vol. 28). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Liu, J. & Le, T. (2012) A case study on college English classroom discourse. *International Journal of Innovative Interdisciplinary* Research 2 pp.1-10.

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) pp.29-52.

Long, M.H. (1983) Linguistic and conversational adjustments to non-native speakers. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 5(2) pp.177-193.

Long, M.H. & 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*. Rowley: Newsbury House, pp.268-286.

Long, M.H. & Porter, P.A. (1985) Group work, interlanguage talk, and second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly* 19(2) pp.207-228.

Long, M. (1996) The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W.C. Ritchie & T.K. Bhatia (Eds.) *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition (Volume 2): Second Language Acquisition* pp.413-468) New York: Academic Press.

Macaro, E. (2001) Analysing student teachers' codeswitching in foreign language classrooms: Theories and decision making. *The Modern Language Journal* 85(4) pp.531-548.

Macías, D.F. (2018) Classroom management in foreign language education: An exploratory review. *Profile Issues in Teachers Professional Development* 20(1) pp.153-166.

Manning, M.L. & Bucher, K.T. (2013) *Classroom management: Models, applications, and cases*. New Jersey: Pearson Education.

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) pp.302-347.

Martin, N.K. & Yin, Z. (1997) Attitudes and beliefs regarding classroom management style: Differences between male and female teachers. http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com (Accessed 21 May 2020).

McNeill, K.L. & Pimentel, D.S. (2010) Scientific discourse in three urban classrooms: The role of the teacher in engaging high school students in argumentation. *Science Education* 94(2) pp.203-229.

Moore, P.J. (2013) An emergent perspective on the use of the first language in the English-as-a-foreign-language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal* 97(1) pp.239-253.

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

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

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

Pica, T. & Long, M.H. (1986) The linguistic and conversational performance of experienced and inexperienced teachers. In R.R. Day (Ed.) *Talking to Learn: Conversation in Second Language Acquisition.* Rowley: Newbury House, pp.85-98.

Polio, C.G. & Duff, P.A. (1994) Teachers' language use in university foreign language classrooms: A qualitative analysis of English and target language alternation. *The Modern Language Journal* 78(3) pp.313-326.

Probst, R.E. (2007) Tom Sawyer, teaching and talking. In K. Beers, R.E. Probst & L. Rief (Eds.) *Adolescent Literacy: Turning Promise into Practice.* Portsmouth: Heinemann, pp.43-60.

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

Richards, J.C. & Rodgers, T.S. (2001) *Approaches and methods in language teaching.* 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Routman, R. (2005) *Writing essentials: Raising expectations and results while simplifying teaching.* Portsmouth: Heinemann.

Sacks, H. (1984) Notes on methodology. In J.M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.) *Structures of Social Action*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.21-27.

Scrivener, J. (2012) *Classroom management techniques.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

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

Sert, O. (2015) *Social interaction and L2 classroom discourse.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Shamim, F. (2008) Trends, issues and challenges in English language education in Pakistan. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education* 28(3) pp.235-249.

Shamim, F. & Allen, P. (2000) *Activity types and pattern of interaction in language classrooms in Pakistan* (Unpublished research report). Karachi, Pakistan: Aga Khan University, Institute for Educational Development.

Shin, J.K. (2006) *Ten helpful ideas for teaching English to young learners.* https://mdsoar.org/bitstream/handle/11603/16931/06-44-2-b.pdf?sequence=1 (Accessed 11 June 2020).

Sidnell, J. & Stivers, T. (2013) *The handbook of conversation analysis. Blackwell handbooks in linguistics.* Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

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* 20 pp.111-126.

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

Stivers, T. & Sidnell, J. (2005) Introduction: Multimodal interaction. *Semiotica* 2005(156) pp.1-20.

Swain, M. (1985) Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.) *Input in Second Language Acquisition*, Rowley: Newbury House, pp.235-253.

Tan, O.S., Parsons, R.D., Hinson, S.L. & Sardo-Brown, D. (2003) *Educational psychology: A practitioner-researcher approach.* Australia: Thomson.

Tedick, D.J. & Walker, C.L. (1994) Second language teacher education: The problems that plague us. *The Modern Language Journal* 78(3) pp.300-312.

Tsui, A.B. (1995) *English conversation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ur, P. (2000) *A course in language teaching practice and theory.* Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.

Vacca, R.T. & Vacca, J.L. (2002) *Content area reading: Literacy and learning across the curriculum.* 7th ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Vacca, R.T., Vacca, J.L. & Mraz, M. (2011) *Content area reading: Literacy and learning across the curriculum.* 10th ed. Boston: Pearson.

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.* London, New York: Routledge, pp. 90-109.

Vebriyanto, D.A. (2015) Teacher's questions in EFL classroom interaction. *Vision: Journal for Language and Foreign Language Learning* 4(2) pp.279-303.

Viáfara, J.J. (2011) How do EFL student teachers face the challenge of using L2 in public school classrooms? *Profile Issues in Teachers Professional Development* 13(1) pp.55-74.

Waring, H.Z. (2014) Managing control and connection in an adult ESL classroom. *Research in the Teaching of English* 49(1) pp.52-74.

Waring, H.Z. (2016) *Theorizing pedagogical interaction: Insights from conversation analysis.* New York: Routledge.

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

Wintergerst, A.C. (1994) *Second-Language classroom interaction: Questions and answers in ESL classes.* Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press.

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

Wu, K.Y. (1993) Classroom interaction and teacher questions revisited. *RELC Journal* 24(2) pp.49-68.

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

Yanfen, L. & Yuqin, Z. (2010) A study of teacher talk in interactions in English classes. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics* 33(2), 76-86.