



International Journal of Educational Best Practices

Volume 10, Number 1, 42-59

ISSN: 2581-0847

<https://ijebp.ejournal.unri.ac.id/>

AN ANALYSIS OF TEACHER'S TALK IN THE EFL CLASSROOM INTERACTION AT ABDURRAB FOUNDATION SCHOOL, PEKANBARU

Santoso Aguswan¹, Jismulatif²

^{1,2} Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Riau, Indonesia

Corresponding author: santoso.aguswan7637@grad.unri.ac.id

Article Info

Received: February 11, 2026
Revised: March 25, 2026
Accepted: April 4, 2026
Published: April 30, 2026

Abstract

This research aims to analyze types of Teacher's Talk, characteristics of Teacher's Talk, and patterns of interaction in the class in EFL learning at Abdurrab Foundation School, Pekanbaru, Indonesia. This research used observation classes, audio recordings, and semi-structured interviews with one English teacher. Three meeting classes from different classes were observed to ensure variation interactional. Data analysis used a deductive thematic approach guided by Flanders' Interaction Analysis Categories System (FIACS) and the concept of Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC). The research results indicated that asking and giving directions are the most frequent types of Teacher's Talk used, suggesting a pattern of teacher-centered learning. The absence of criticizing or justifying authority indicates that the classroom atmosphere was generally supportive and non-threatening. In terms of the characteristics of Teacher's Talk, the teacher frequently employed questioning, scaffolding, and adaptive language to facilitate students' understanding and participation. However, the use of extended wait time and opportunities for student-student interaction were still relatively limited. The classroom interaction patterns further revealed that teacher-whole-class interaction was dominant, whereas peer interaction occurred less frequently. These findings confirm the importance of maintaining a balance between instructional control and creating interactional space, particularly in EFL classrooms where increasing learner-centered participation is essential for communicative language development.

Keywords:

Teacher's talk, Classroom Interaction, EFL classroom, FIACS, Classroom Interactional Competence

To cite this article: Aguswan, S., & Jismulatif. (2026). An analysis of teacher's talk in the EFL classroom interaction at Abdurrab Foundation School, Pekanbaru. *International Journal of Educational Best Practices*, 10(1), 42-59. <https://doi.org/10.32851/ijebp.v10n1.p42-59>

INTRODUCTION

Teacher's Talk plays a central role in shaping classroom interaction in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms. In EFL contexts, particularly in Indonesia, English is rarely used outside the classroom; therefore, classroom interaction becomes the primary source of language input and opportunities for students to practice the target language. As a result, the way teachers use language during instruction strongly influences students' comprehension, participation, confidence, and communicative development. Teacher's Talk refers to all verbal language used by teachers to explain lesson content, ask questions, provide feedback, give directions, and respond to students' contributions (Walsh, 2011; Ghazali et al., 2024). Effective teacher talk can foster meaningful interaction, encourage student participation, and support language learning through questioning, scaffolding, repair strategies, and emotional support (Goestina & Sugirin, 2024). Conversely, when teacher talk is excessively dominant, students may have limited opportunities to speak, negotiate meaning, and develop communicative competence.

In recent years, one of the main problems with interaction in EFL classrooms has been the predominance of teacher-centered teaching. Numerous studies conducted in Asian and Indonesian contexts have reported high levels of Teacher Talk Time (TTT), low levels of Student Talk Time (STT), and minimal student-initiated interaction (Aisyah, 2016; Pham & Hamid, 2021; Tupalessy et al., 2024; Nursehag & Amalia, 2024). These interactive patterns are often influenced by students' limited English proficiency, exam-oriented curricula, large class sizes, and sociocultural expectations that position the teacher as the primary authority in the classroom.

The concept of Teacher's Talk has evolved over time. Early second language acquisition theories viewed teacher language primarily as comprehensible input that facilitates acquisition. Later research shifted attention to classroom discourse and interaction, emphasizing that Teacher's Talk functions not only as input but also as an interactional tool that can either create or restrict learning opportunities (Walsh, 2006, 2011; Jiang & Zhang, 2021). From this perspective, language learning occurs through interaction rather than through explanation alone. Teachers who use questioning, scaffolding, repair strategies, and extended wait time strategically are more likely to create interactive classrooms that support learners' participation and language development (Sert, 2019; Zhang & Cheng, 2023; Bao & Du, 2022). Scaffolding practices, in particular, help learners participate more actively and develop interactional competence despite limited language proficiency (Han & Wang, 2021). In addition, recent studies have highlighted the affective dimension of Teacher's Talk, showing that praise, encouragement, acceptance of students' ideas, and emotionally supportive language can reduce anxiety and increase students' willingness to communicate (Dewaele & Li, 2020; Khajavy et al., 2021). Supportive teacher talk has also been found to increase learner engagement and classroom participation (Weisi & Aliabadi, 2023). Positive classroom interaction may increase learners' willingness to communicate in English (Fan, 2022).

One of the most widely used frameworks for analyzing classroom interaction is the Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories System (FIACS) developed by Flanders (1970). FIACS categorizes classroom discourse into teacher talk, student talk, and silence, enabling researchers to systematically identify the types and frequencies of verbal interaction. Although the framework was developed several decades ago, it remains relevant and widely used in contemporary classroom discourse research for its clarity and systematic structure. To complement FIACS, Walsh (2011) introduced the concept of Classroom Interactional

Competence (CIC), which focuses on teachers' ability to use language strategically to maximize learning opportunities. CIC includes interactional features such as questioning, scaffolding, repair strategies, wait time, and the balance between Teacher Talk Time and Student Talk Time. Recent studies have also shown that Classroom Interactional Competence involves not only verbal interaction but also embodied classroom actions that facilitate learner participation and engagement (Sugianto & Khoirunnisa, 2024). By combining FIACS and CIC, researchers can examine Teacher's Talk from instructional, interactional, and affective perspectives (Sert & Walsh, 2022). Classroom Interactional Competence is now considered an essential component of effective EFL teaching and professional development (Li & Walsh, 2023; Aziz & Arar, 2024).

Despite the substantial body of research on Teacher's Talk, several important gaps remain. First, many previous studies have focused mainly on identifying the types and frequencies of teacher talk without examining in depth how its interactional characteristics shape classroom discourse. Second, relatively few studies have explored the affective dimension of Teacher's Talk, particularly the pedagogical significance of avoiding criticizing or justifying authority. Third, research that integrates the analysis of Teacher's Talk types, teacher talk characteristics, and classroom interaction patterns within a single analytical framework is still limited, especially in Indonesian vocational school contexts. These gaps indicate the need for a more comprehensive study that investigates not only what types of teacher talk are used, but also how they function interactionally and affectively to influence classroom interaction.

To address these gaps, this study offers a comprehensive approach by combining the Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories System (FIACS) and Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC). This integrated framework enables the researcher to analyze Teacher's Talk from three complementary dimensions: the types of Teacher's Talk, the characteristics of Teacher's Talk, and classroom interaction patterns. This approach constitutes the study's novelty because it provides a holistic analysis of how teacher discourse functions as an instructional, interactional, and affective resource in the EFL classroom. The study is expected to offer practical solutions by identifying effective interactional practices that can help teachers reduce excessive Teacher Talk Time, increase Student Talk Time, promote student–student interaction, and create more communicative and emotionally supportive learning environments.

This study was conducted at Abdurrab Foundation School, Pekanbaru, where English is taught as a compulsory subject, and students have limited exposure to English outside the classroom. In this context, classroom interaction serves as the main environment for language learning, making Teacher's Talk particularly influential in shaping students' opportunities to participate and develop communicative competence. To the researcher's knowledge, no in-depth qualitative case study has examined the types of Teacher's Talk, the characteristics of Teacher's Talk, and classroom interaction patterns at this school. Therefore, this study was undertaken to provide a contextualized understanding of how Teacher's Talk facilitates or constrains classroom interaction in an Indonesian vocational school setting.

The findings of this study are expected to be significant both theoretically and practically. Theoretically, the study contributes to the literature on classroom discourse by integrating FIACS and CIC to analyze Teacher's Talk in a comprehensive manner. Practically, the findings are expected to benefit English teachers by helping them reflect on their interactional practices and improve their questioning, feedback, and scaffolding strategies. Teacher educators may use the findings in professional development programs, while school administrators and curriculum developers can utilize the results to design policies and training that promote

communicative and student-centered instruction. In addition, future researchers may use this study as a reference for further investigations into Teacher's Talk and classroom interaction in different educational contexts.

Based on the issues, gaps, and significance described above, this study seeks to answer the following research questions:

- 1) What types of Teacher's Talk are used in the EFL classroom at Abdurrah Foundation School Pekanbaru?
- 2) What are the characteristics of Teacher's Talk in classroom interaction at Abdurrah Foundation School Pekanbaru?
- 3) What interaction patterns occur between the teacher and students during EFL classroom interaction at Abdurrah Foundation School Pekanbaru?

METHOD(S)

Research Design

This study employed a qualitative case study design. A case study was selected because it enables an in-depth examination of a bounded system—in this case, one English teacher's classroom interaction practices in a specific school context (Creswell, 2014). The design was appropriate because the study sought to understand how teacher talk functioned naturally during classroom instruction.

Setting and Participants

The study was conducted at Abdurrah Foundation School, Pekanbaru, during the 2024/2025 academic year. The sample of this research was one English teacher at Abdurrah Foundation School, Pekanbaru. The participant was chosen by using purposive sampling, since the researcher aimed to obtain rich and relevant information about Teacher's Talk in classroom interaction. Patton (2015) explained that purposive sampling enables the researcher to select an individual who can provide in-depth data that meets the research objectives. The teacher was selected based on several criteria: having at least three years of teaching experience, teaching English at the senior high school level, using English actively as the medium of instruction, being willing to participate and allow classroom observation, and regularly applying interactive teaching strategies and having completed a Master's degree(s) in English education or a related field. Three classes taught by the teacher were observed. The students were secondary-level EFL learners aged approximately 15–17 years with mixed English proficiency levels.

Data Collection Method(s) and Analysis

Using a qualitative research approach, the data were collected through classroom observations, audio recordings, and interviews to gain a deeper understanding of Teacher's Talk in English class. As emphasized by Creswell (2014), qualitative research prioritizes rich and detailed data to explore participants' experiences and interactional processes within educational settings.

Classroom Observation

Classroom observations were conducted using a structured observation checklist. The checklist was developed by integrating two analytical frameworks with distinct functions: Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC/FIACS) and Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC). In this study, FIAC was used exclusively to analyze the types of Teacher's Talk, while CIC was employed to examine the characteristics of Teacher's Talk and the resulting classroom interaction patterns.

To maintain the naturalness of classroom interaction during the observation process, the researcher minimized the intervention in teaching and learning activities. The researcher positioned himself at the back of the classroom and refrained from participating in classroom interaction. Before collecting the data, the teacher was given information to implement learning as normal without changing his teaching process because of the researcher's presence. The development of the observation checklist involved the following steps.

a. Reviewing the Literature

The researcher first reviewed Flanders' Interaction Analysis theory (1970) to establish the categories and types of Teacher's Talk. Next, the researcher reviewed Classroom Interactional Competence (Walsh, 2011) and classroom discourse analysis to pinpoint key characteristics of teacher talk and interactional features for inclusion in the observation instrument.

b. Identifying Research Variables

Based on the literature review, three main research variables were identified:

1. Types of Teacher's Talk, analyzed using FIAC categories;
2. Characteristics of Teacher's Talk, analyzed using CIC constructs;
3. Classroom Interaction Patterns, examined through CIC to identify how Teacher's Talk organizes interaction in the classroom.

c. Defining Categories and Descriptions

To support consistency in data collection, each research variable was divided into observable categories, each with clear operational definitions. For example, in Asking Questions (FIACS) refers to Teacher's Talk that aims to gain the students' verbal response, while extended wait time (CIC) is defined as the period of time the teacher waits after asking a question before students respond. It allows students sufficient time to formulate responses.

d. Designing the Checklist Format

The observation checklist was organized in the form of a table. It consisted of four main columns: Research Variable, Category, Operational Description, and Frequency. The frequency column recorded the number of occurrences of each category during classroom observation. The researcher was able to quantify this format to distribute Types of Teacher's Talk (FIACS) systematically and analyze the relative prominence of interactional characteristics and classroom interaction patterns (CIC) across multiple classroom observations.

Video Recordings

Classroom interactions were documented to capture Teacher's Talk in its natural setting. To minimize the potential observer effect, the video recording device was placed in the classroom before the actual observation sessions, allowing students to become accustomed to its presence. During classroom observation, the researcher was passive and did not join in, including responding to students' questions or gestures, thereby allowing teacher– student interaction to develop organically.

Three separate classroom observations were conducted during English classes. Class X TLM 2 was the first class chosen. It was recorded on Tuesday, April 22, 2025, from 07.15 to 08.45. Class X TLM 1 was the second class chosen. It was also recorded on Tuesday, April 22, 2025, from 8.45 to 10.15. Class X Pharmacy Technology was the third choice. It was recorded on Wednesday, April 23, 2025, from 08.45 to 10.15. Each observation lasted approximately 90 minutes. These extended observation periods allowed the researcher to capture a complete learning session, including Teacher's Talk, its characteristics, and the resulting interaction patterns.

Interview

The interview questions were designed based on the objectives of the study, focusing on the types of Teacher's Talk, characteristics of Teacher's Talk, and classroom interaction. Follow-up questions were also asked depending on the participant's responses, enabling a deeper exploration of classroom practices. An interview was conducted with Mr. Syahrizan, M.Pd., the English teacher at SMK Abdurrah Pekanbaru. The interview was carried out on Monday, May 5, 2025, after the researcher had completed the three classroom observations. The duration of the session was approximately fifty-five minutes. To ensure accuracy in transcription and analysis, the interview was also recorded.

After data from classroom observations, video recordings, and interviews were collected, all recorded data were transcribed verbatim by the researcher. The transcription process served as the foundation for the analysis, enabling careful and repeated examination of Teacher's Talk and classroom interaction. The transcribed data were then analyzed using thematic analysis.

This study employed a deductive or theory-driven thematic analysis, in which the analytical process was guided by predetermined theoretical frameworks rather than being entirely data-driven. In this study, Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories System (FIACS) was employed as the primary coding framework to classify Teacher's Talk into indirect and direct talk categories. FIACS was used to systematically identify the types and distribution of Teacher's Talk occurring during classroom interaction, providing a structured and objective basis for analyzing verbal behavior in the EFL classroom.

In addition, this study used Walsh (2011) Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC) framework to go beyond classification and investigate how Teacher's Talk operates interactively. To analyze the characteristics of Teacher's Talk and classroom interaction patterns, particularly focusing on interactional features such as questioning strategies, extended wait time, repair strategies, scaffolding, and turn-taking, used CIC. These features reflect how teacher talk opens or restricts interactional space and shapes opportunities for student participation.

Although this study adopted a qualitative research design, frequency counts were used to support the qualitative interpretation of the data. The frequency data helped the researcher identify recurring patterns and determine which types of Teacher's Talk, characteristics of Teacher's Talk, and classroom interaction patterns were more dominant throughout the instructional process.

Braun and Clarke (2006) divide step-by-step doing thematic analysis into 6 phases, there are:

1. Familiarizing with the Data
The researcher repeatedly read the dataset before beginning the coding process. The researcher transcribed the interview data verbatim and then repeatedly read the transcripts, identifying early patterns.
2. Generating Initial Codes
After familiarizing themselves with the data, researchers identified interesting features and generated initial codes. This stage helps filter and organize relevant information.
3. Searching for Themes
Researchers grouped similar codes into potential themes. At this stage, some codes were combined to form broader categories
4. Reviewing Themes
In this stage, the researcher reviewed and refined the themes at two levels. They are checking the coherence of the coded extracts within each theme and evaluating the validity of themes in relation to the entire dataset.
5. Defining and Naming Themes
Every theme was defined and named clearly. The researcher interpreted the meaning of every theme and ensured that the theme answered the research questions.
6. Producing the Report
The final stage was writing the analysis report. The researcher described the coding process, presented the findings, and connected them with the research questions and theoretical framework. Furthermore, the researcher compared the findings with previous studies to determine whether they aligned or contrasted.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

Based on classroom observations and video recordings from three teaching sessions, the distribution of the Types of Teacher Talk was analyzed using the Flanders' Interaction Analysis Categories System (FIACS). Table 1 presents the frequency types of Teacher Talk identified during classroom interaction. In addition, the characteristics of Teacher Talk and classroom interaction pattern analyzed using the Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC) framework. The distribution frequency of Teacher's Talk characteristics and classroom interaction patterns is presented in Table 2 and Table 3, respectively.

Table 1*Frequency of Teacher's Talk Types*

No	Indicator	Meeting 1	Meeting 2	Meeting 3	Total
1.	Accept Feeling	2	3	3	7
2.	Praise or Encouragement	4	5	4	13
3.	Accepts or Uses Ideas of Students	4	3	3	10
4.	Asking Questions	11	15	8	34
5.	Lecturing	6	5	4	15
6.	Giving Directions	8	7	7	22
7.	Criticizing or Justifying Authority	0	0	0	0

The analysis showed that all FIACS categories were present except criticizing or justifying. Asking questions emerged as the most dominant type of Teacher's Talk, followed by giving directions and lecturing. Indirect talk, such as praising, accepting students' ideas, and accepting feelings, occurred less frequently. Notably, the absence of critical talk suggests a supportive and non-authoritarian classroom environment.

Table 2*Frequency of the Characteristic of Teacher's Talk*

No	Indicator	Meeting 1	Meeting 2	Meeting 3	Total
1.	Modifications & Adaptations	2	3	3	8
2.	Use of Questions	11	15	8	34
3.	Extended Wait Time	2	4	2	8
4.	Repair Strategies	2	4	2	6
5.	Scaffolding	4	5	5	14
6.	Balancing TTT and STT	3	2	1	6

Table 2 shows that the use of questions was the most dominant characteristic of Teacher's Talk, followed by scaffolding, while other interactional features occurred less frequently. This distribution indicates that, although the teacher demonstrated effective CIC in managing interaction and supporting comprehension, classroom discourse remained predominantly teacher-centered with limited opportunities for extended student talk.

Table 3*The frequency of Classroom Interaction*

No	Interaction Type	Meeting 1	Meeting 2	Meeting 3	Total
1.	Teacher–Student Interaction	6	6	5	18
2.	Student–Student Interaction	3	3	3	9
3.	Teacher–Whole Class Interaction	12	15	15	42

Table 3 shows that Teacher-Whole Class interaction was the dominant interaction type, followed by Teacher-Student Interaction, while Student–Student Interaction occurred least frequently. This distribution indicates that classroom discourse was largely teacher-centered, with the teacher CIC focusing on managing whole-class interaction and individual responses rather than facilitating sustained peer interaction.

The following sub-section illustrates types of teacher talk, characteristics, and classroom interaction patterns found in the data.

1. Types of Teacher Talk

Based on the analysis of classroom observations conducted over three meetings, six types of Teacher's Talk were identified from the seven categories in the Flanders Interaction Analysis System. One category, "Criticizing or Justifying Authority," did not occur during the observed classroom interactions. The frequency distribution shows that the teacher used various types of talk for specific pedagogical functions to manage classroom discourse and support students' learning in the EFL context.

Asking Questions

Asking questions appeared as the most dominant type, occurring 34 times. The teacher frequently used questions to check students' understanding, activate prior knowledge, and maintain the flow of the lesson. An example of this type is presented in Excerpt 1.

Excerpt 1

T: "What was the last time you learned with Miss Arma?"

SS: "Recount text."

T: "Yes, you have learned about recount text. Do you still remember what a recount text is?"

(OBS-M1/TTT-AQ/L21)

Excerpt 1 shows that the teacher's questions were mainly content-related and aimed at eliciting factual responses from students. As the most frequent type of Teacher's Talk in this study, asking questions functioned as a central interactional strategy to monitor comprehension and guide classroom discourse at different stages of the lesson. This finding supports previous studies in EFL classrooms, which highlight questioning as a key mechanism for structuring interaction and sustaining student engagement (Walsh, 2011; Wang & Loewen, 2021).

Giving Directions

Giving directions was the second most frequently used type of Teacher's talk. It occurred 22 times during three classroom observations. The teacher employed this type primarily to organize classroom activities, manage transitions, and ensure that students followed instructional procedures. Excerpt 2 illustrates this category.

Excerpt 2

T: "Berarti semuanya paham. Kalau begitu, you can prepare your textbook dan notebook."

("That means everyone understands. Now, you can prepare your textbook and notebook.")

(OBS-M2/TTT-GD/L18)

As shown in excerpt 2, the teacher gave clear and direct instructions to guide students' actions. The frequent use of giving directions suggests that students require explicit guidance to carry out learning tasks effectively. This finding aligns with previous EFL research indicating that

procedural directions are commonly used in classrooms where learners have limited proficiency and need structured support to participate in learning activities (Aisyah, 2016).

Lecturing

The lecturing occurred 15 times during observed meetings. This type of Teacher's Talk was used especially to explain learning material and clarify concepts that students found difficult. Excerpt 3 provides an example.

Excerpt 3

T: "Report text is a text which presents information about something as it is a result of systematic observational analysis."

(OBS-M2/TTT-LC/L62)

The use of lecturing in excerpt 3 shows that teachers rely on long explanations to prevent misunderstandings, especially when introducing a new genre like a report text. This practice reflects a common instructional pattern in Indonesian EFL classrooms, where teachers often use lecturing to compensate for students' limited linguistic resources and background knowledge (Maulana et al., 2012).

Praise or Encouragement

Praise or encouragement was identified 13 times. This type was usually used after the student gave a correct answer or participate active. An example is shown in the following excerpt 4.

Excerpt 4

Q: "Very good. Recount text tells events or experiences that happened in the past."

(OBS-M2/TTT-PE/L17)

Excerpt 4 illustrates how the teacher used positive verbal reinforcement to acknowledge students' responses. The use of praise and encouragement functioned as an effective strategy to build students' self-confidence and motivation. The interview data further confirmed this intention, as the teacher stated that encouragement was intentionally used to maintain students' participation during the lesson.

Accepting or Using Students' Ideas

Accepting or using students' ideas occurred 10 times during the three meetings. This type appeared when the teacher acknowledged students' contributions and developed them further to encourage continued interaction. Excerpt 5 provides an example of this category.

Excerpt 5

T: "So, where are we going to visit?"

S: "Zoo."

T: "Okay, the zoo. Have you ever been to the zoo before?"

(OBS-M2/TTT-AUSI/L29)

In Excerpt 5, the teacher received the student's response and expanded it by posing a follow-up question. This interactional step allowed the students' ideas to become part of the ongoing

discourse and encouraged sustained participation. Such practices are known to promote student confidence and create a more interactive environment.

Accepting Feelings

Accepting feelings was the rarest type observed, occurring seven times during classroom interactions. This type was used when a student expressed an emotional condition, such as flustered or anxious. Excerpt 6 presents an example.

Excerpt 6

S: "Well, I'm nervous, Mister."

("I'm nervous, sir.")

T: "That's okay, Raka. I understand. Just try it, don't worry."

("It's okay, Raka. I understand. Just try it, don't worry!")

(OBS-M3/TTT-AF/L45)

Excerpt 6 shows that the teacher responded empathetically to the students' emotional expressions. By accepting students' feelings, teachers help create a supportive and safe learning environment. Although this type occurred rarely, its presence shows the teacher's awareness of students' affective needs during language learning.

Criticizing or Justifying Authority

No instances of criticizing or justifying authority were found in the data. The Absence of this type indicates that the teacher avoided confrontational or authoritarian Language. This finding was reinforced by interview data, in which the teacher explicitly stated a preference for explaining expectations rather than scolding the students.

2. Characteristics of Teacher Talk

In addition to identifying types of Teacher Talk, this research also examined the characteristics of Teacher's Talk to reveal how interaction was formed and managed in the EFL classroom. Based on transcript coding and frequency analysis conducted during three classroom meetings, six characteristics of Teacher's Talk were identified. These characteristics illustrate the competence of teacher interaction in the direct discourse classroom, facilitating understanding and supporting student participation.

Use of Questions

The use of questions appeared as the most dominant characteristic of Teacher's Talk, covering 34 of all identified interactional steps. Observation class reveals that the teacher was consistently using questions to involve students, checking their understanding, and structuring the flow of the lesson. Excerpt 14 illustrates this characteristic.

Excerpt 14

T: "Good. A report text gives factual information. It's different from a descriptive text because it's more general and scientific. Can you tell me what the three keywords of the report text are?"

(OBS-M3/CTT-UQ/L51)

Excerpt 14 shows that the teacher's questions are especially focused on content and require students to remember specific information related to the lesson. As the most prominent characteristic, the use of questions shows that classroom interaction was largely driven by teacher-initiated questioning rather than student-initiated talk. Interview data further confirmed that the teacher deliberately adjusted the level of difficulty of questions to suit students' abilities, demonstrating a strategic use of questioning to manage participation. This pattern reflects a teacher-centered discourse commonly found in EFL classrooms, where questioning functions as a primary tool for controlling interaction and monitoring learning (Walsh, 2011).

Scaffolding

Scaffolding appeared as the second most frequent characteristic, occurring 14 times during classroom interaction. The teacher gave help gradually with instructions, partial explanations, and a trigger for helping students build an appropriate response. An example of scaffolding is shown in excerpt 16.

Excerpt 16

Q: "Yes, you have learned about recount text. Do you still remember what a recount text is... a text...?"

(OBS-M1/CTT-SC/L21)

In Excerpt 16, the teacher deliberately stopped and gave trigger incomplete prompts to activate students' prior knowledge before formulating their response. An interactional move allowed students to participate while still receiving necessary support. Such scaffolding practices enable learners with limited proficiency to engage in classroom discourse and gradually develop independence, as proposed by Wood, Bruner, and Ross (1976). Interview data also indicated that the teacher preferred guiding students step by step rather than directly providing answers, reinforcing the role of scaffolding in promoting active learning.

Modifications and Adaptations

Modification and adaptation were identified 8 times during observed lessons. These characteristics happened when the teacher adapts the linguistic input, simplifying it explanation, or switches language to ensure the understanding of students. Excerpt 20 provides the illustration.

Excerpt 20

T: "Right, the reason why we must write a text report, where later, when in the world of work, especially you, you will be the ones meeting with the world of health fields, automatically you will make a report like a report practicum and so on, or an annual report and other reports. So, you need to have report text skills. Any questions so far?"

(OBS-M1/CTT-MA/L59)

Excerpt 20 shows how teachers modify input with simplified language and combine English with Indonesian for greater clarity. This Adaptation is very important when students show doubt or limited responses. The use of modified input in a way often reflects teacher awareness of students' skill levels and needs, providing input that can be understood in the EFL classroom, which is essential for maintaining interaction and participation.

Extended Wait Time

An extended wait time was observed eight times, making it the fourth most frequently used characteristic. The teacher deliberately paused after asking questions to give students sufficient time to process the questions and formulate their responses. Excerpt 22 illustrates this practice.

Excerpt 22

T: "What is the generic structure of report text? ... Anyone?"

(OBS-M2/CTT-EWT/L63)

In Excerpt 22, the teacher's pause reduces pressure directly to students and encourages participation from less confident students. These findings are in line with research that shows that extended wait time can increase the quantity and quality of students' responses in the language classroom. Interview data more carry on support this practice, because the teacher admits to giving students time to think before answering.

Repair Strategies

The repair strategy occurred 6 times during classroom interaction. The teacher usually overcomes students' linguistic errors by reformulating incorrect utterances without explicitly pointing out mistakes. An example is shown in Excerpt 24.

Excerpt 24

S: "Good for following their children."

Q: "Good. So, pandas are mammals, and they take care of their young."

(OBS-M2/CTT-RS/L39)

Excerpt 24 shows that the teacher fixed the student's utterance through reformulation while maintaining positive feedback. This approach allowed the correction to occur without threatening students' confidence. The Use of indirect repair strategies reflects an effort to balance accuracy and affective support, which is considered beneficial for maintaining students' participation in EFL classroom interaction (Walsh, 2011).

Balancing Teacher and Student Talk Time (TTT and STT)

Balancing Teacher Talk Time (TTT) and Student Talk Time (STT) was the least frequently observed characteristic, occurring six times. These characteristics appeared when the teacher deliberately reduced his own talk and encouraged students to interact with peers. Excerpt 26 illustrates this situation.

Excerpt 26

T: "Right, kangaroo... What else did you find? Now I want you to explain to your partner about animal food. I will listen."

(OBS-M2/CTT-BTTSCTT/L50)

Excerpt 26 indicates that the teacher provided space for the interaction of student-centered learning with divert focus to pair discussion. However, the relatively low frequency of these characteristics suggests that classroom discourse is still dominated by the teacher. Although the teacher tried to improve student talk, the overall interaction pattern still reflected a teacher-centered approach, with limited opportunities for extended student-initiated discourse

3. Classroom Interaction

The Classroom Interaction analysis class identified three interaction patterns: Teacher-Whole Class Interaction, Teacher-Student Interaction, and Student-Student Interaction. A total of 69 interactional instances were recorded across three meetings. The findings reveal a clear dominance of teacher-led interaction.

Teacher-Whole-class Interaction occurs most frequently, especially during opening lessons, explanations of materials, and instructions for the assignment. This pattern positions teachers as initiators and controllers of the classroom discourse. Teacher-Student Interaction occurs with moderate frequency, especially in the form of teacher-initiated questions to individual students. However, the students' responses were generally brief and limited in elaboration.

Student-Student Interaction was the least frequent pattern, occurring especially during activity partner or group teacher-initiated short opportunities for interaction. This is limited in duration and scope, showing an opportunity limited for students to engage in extended sustainable peer interaction in English.

These interaction patterns demonstrate a predominantly teacher-centered classroom discourse. While this structure supported classroom management and ensured lesson progression, it limited students' opportunities to produce extended language and initiate interaction independently. Interview data suggested that students' limited English proficiency contributed to the teacher's reliance on teacher-led interaction.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study indicate that Teacher's Talk played a dominant role in shaping classroom interaction in the EFL context at Abdurrah Foundation School Pekanbaru. Among the seven categories of Teacher's Talk identified through the Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories System (FIACS), asking questions emerged as the most frequent type, followed by giving directions and lecturing. In terms of interactional characteristics, the teacher most frequently employed questioning, scaffolding, and modifications or adaptations to support students' comprehension and participation. Regarding classroom interaction patterns, teacher-whole class interaction was the most dominant pattern, followed by teacher-student interaction, while student-student interaction occurred least frequently. Although classroom discourse remained predominantly teacher-centered, the teacher consistently created a supportive and emotionally safe learning environment through praise, encouragement, acceptance of students' ideas and feelings, and the complete absence of criticizing or justifying authority.

The predominance of asking questions suggests that questioning functioned as the teacher's principal pedagogical strategy for activating students' prior knowledge, monitoring comprehension, sustaining attention, and regulating lesson flow. However, most questions required brief and predictable responses, indicating that display questions were used more frequently than referential questions. As a result, questioning increased student participation but did not always promote extended responses or higher-order thinking. Giving directions was the second most frequent type of teacher's talk, reflecting the teacher's important role in organizing classroom procedures, managing transitions, and guiding students through learning tasks. Lecturing was also used regularly, particularly when introducing new concepts and clarifying text structures and language features. In this context, lecturing functioned as an instructional support strategy rather than as excessive domination. In addition, affective-oriented teacher talk, such as praise or encouragement and accepting feelings, played a substantial role in reducing anxiety and increasing students' confidence to participate.

Scaffolding, repair strategies, and language modifications further demonstrated the teacher's interactional competence in adapting instruction to students' proficiency levels.

These findings are consistent with previous studies on Teacher's Talk in EFL classrooms. The dominant use of questioning supports the findings of Walsh (2011), Aisyah (2016), and Park and Lee (2022), who reported that questioning is the primary mechanism for structuring classroom discourse and maintaining student engagement. The extensive use of giving directions and lecturing also agrees with Nguyen (2020) and Li and Zhang (2021), who found that teacher talk is frequently used to manage classroom activities and ensure students' understanding. Furthermore, the positive role of praise and emotionally supportive teacher talk supports the findings of Dewaele and Li (2020) and Khajavy et al. (2021), which emphasize the importance of psychological safety in language learning. However, this study differs from some earlier studies conducted in Asian EFL contexts that reported frequent use of authoritative or corrective language. In contrast, no instances of criticizing or justifying authority were observed, suggesting that the teacher deliberately adopted a more supportive and dialogic approach to classroom interaction.

The novelty of this study lies in its integration of the Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories System (FIACS) and Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC) to analyze teachers' talk from three complementary perspectives: the types of teachers' talk, the interactional characteristics of teacher discourse, and classroom interaction patterns. While most previous studies have focused on only one of these dimensions, this study offers a more comprehensive framework for understanding how teacher talk functions simultaneously as an instructional, interactional, and affective resource in EFL classrooms.

The significance of this study lies in its practical implications for improving classroom interaction. The findings demonstrate that effective Teacher's Talk is not merely a means of delivering content and managing instruction, but also a powerful tool for fostering emotional support, reducing anxiety, and encouraging participation. These results highlight the need for teachers to balance instructional control with greater opportunities for student-initiated talk and peer interaction (Dincer et al., 2019).

This study contributes to the growing body of research on classroom discourse by providing empirical evidence from the Indonesian EFL context and by showing how supportive teacher talk can coexist with teacher-centered interaction. The study also offers practical insights for teachers, teacher educators, and curriculum developers by identifying specific interactional strategies—such as questioning, scaffolding, adaptive language use, and affective support—that can enhance communicative language learning.

Several limitations should be acknowledged. First, the study involved only one English teacher from a single school, which limits the generalizability of the findings. Second, the data were collected from only three classroom meetings and may not fully represent the teacher's long-term instructional practices. Third, the study focused primarily on verbal interaction and did not analyze nonverbal communication.

CONCLUSIONS

This study aimed to investigate Teacher's Talk in EFL classroom interaction at Abdurrab Foundation School, Pekanbaru, by examining three specific objectives: (1) to identify the types of Teacher's Talk used in the classroom, (2) to analyze the characteristics of Teacher's Talk in classroom interaction, and (3) to describe the patterns of interaction between the teacher and students. To achieve these objectives, the study employed a qualitative case study design and

analyzed data obtained from classroom observations, video recordings, and a semi-structured interview using the Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories System (FIACS) and Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC) frameworks.

The findings revealed that Teacher's Talk played a central role in shaping classroom interaction. Asking questions was the most dominant type of teacher's talk, followed by giving directions and lecturing. The most prominent characteristics of Teacher's Talk were questioning, scaffolding, and modifications or adaptations to students' proficiency levels. In terms of classroom interaction patterns, teacher-whole class interaction occurred most frequently, followed by teacher-student interaction, while student-student interaction was the least common. Although classroom discourse was predominantly teacher-centered, the teacher consistently created a supportive and emotionally safe learning environment through praise, encouragement, acceptance of students' ideas and feelings, and the absence of criticizing or justifying authority.

The findings imply that effective Teacher's Talk should function not only as a means of delivering content and managing classroom activities, but also as a tool to reduce students' anxiety, build confidence, and encourage active participation. To foster more communicative and student-centered learning, teachers should provide greater opportunities for student-initiated talk, extended responses, and peer interaction.

The results of this study are expected to benefit several parties. English teachers can use the findings to reflect on and improve their classroom interaction strategies. Teacher educators can incorporate the identified interactional strategies into teacher training programs. School administrators and curriculum developers can use the findings to design professional development activities and instructional policies that promote communicative language teaching and student-centered learning.

Because this study focused on a single teacher and a limited number of lessons, future research should involve broader samples and additional data sources to provide more comprehensive insights into teacher talk in EFL classrooms.

Acknowledgment

The authors would like to express sincere gratitude to Abdurrah Foundation School, Pekanbaru, for granting permission and support during the data collection process. Special appreciation is extended to the English teacher and students who participated in this study. The authors also thank the academic supervisors and colleagues for their valuable guidance and constructive feedback throughout the research process. This research received no external funding.

Authorship Contribution Statement:

Santoso Aguswan conceptualized the study, conducted data collection, performed data analysis, and drafted the manuscript. Jismulatif contributed to research design, theoretical framework development, and critical revision of the manuscript. All authors approved the final version of the manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Aisyah, N. (2016). An analysis of teachers' talk in an EFL classroom. *Journal of English and Education*, 4(2), 63–79.
- Aziz, A., & Arar, S. (2024). Teachers' classroom interactional competence: An analysis in micro-contexts of teacher-class interaction. *ALTRALANG Journal*, 6(1), 330–348. <https://doi.org/10.52919/altralang.v6i1.430>
- Bao, D., & Du, X. (2022). Classroom interactional competence and teacher questioning in EFL classrooms. *System*, 110, 102902. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102902>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Dewaele, J.-M., & Dewaele, L. (2020). Are foreign language learners' enjoyment and anxiety specific to the teacher? An investigation into the dynamics of learners' classroom emotions. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 10(1), 45–65. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2020.10.1.3>
- Dewaele, J.-M., & Li, C. (2019). The effect of classroom emotions, attitudes toward English, and teacher behavior on willingness to communicate among English foreign language learners. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 38(4), 523–535. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X19864996>
- Dincer, A., Yesilyurt, S., Noels, K. A., & Vargas Lascano, D. I. (2019). Self-determination and classroom engagement of EFL learners: A mixed-methods study of the self-system model of motivational development. *SAGE Open*, 9(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019853913>
- Fan, X. (2022). The development of EFL learners' willingness to communicate and self-efficacy: The role of flipped learning approach with the use of social media. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 1001283. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1001283>
- Flanders, N. A. (1970). *Analyzing teaching behavior*. Addison-Wesley.
- Ghozali, A. S., Marshalina, A., Hanafi, M., & Aylet, Y. T. (2024). Speech act analysis of teacher talk in Indonesian EFL classroom: A case study at secondary school. *Jurnal Pendidikan Humaniora*, 12(4), 170–179. <https://doi.org/10.17977/um011v12i42024p170-179>
- Goestina, G., & Sugirin, S. (2024). The role of teacher talk in enhancing communicative competence in EFL classrooms in Indonesia. *Pedagogy Review*, 3(1), 50–60. <https://doi.org/10.61436/pedagogy.v3i1.pp50-60>
- Han, J., & Wang, Y. (2021). Teacher scaffolding and interactional competence in English language classrooms. *Language Teaching Research*, 25(6), 897–918. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820938812>
- Jiang, Y., & Zhang, L. J. (2021). Understanding teacher talk in communicative EFL classrooms: A systematic review. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 41(4), 725–742. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2020.1832047>
- Khajavy, G. H., MacIntyre, P. D., & Hariri, J. (2021). A closer look at grit and language mindset as predictors of foreign language achievement. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 43(2), 379–402. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263120000480>
- Li, C., & Dewaele, J.-M. (2020). The predictive effects of classroom environment and enjoyment on willingness to communicate in English. *Language Teaching Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688221111623>



- Li, H., & Walsh, S. (2023). Classroom interactional competence and teacher development in EFL classrooms. *Language Teaching Research*, 27(2), 356–377. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688211004581>
- Maulana, R., Opdenakker, M.-C., den Brok, P., & Bosker, R. (2012). Teacher–student interpersonal relationships in Indonesian lower secondary education. *Learning Environments Research*, 15(2), 149–166. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-012-9107-z>
- Nguyen, H. T. M. (2020). Teacher talk in EFL classrooms: A review of interactional practices. *International Journal of Instruction*, 13(3), 123–138.
- Nursehag, D. A., & Amalia, L. L. (2024). An investigation of teacher talk and student talk in Indonesian EFL classroom interaction. *Paedagogia*, 27(2), 298–308. <https://doi.org/10.20961/paedagogia.v27i2.84086>
- Park, M., & Lee, H. (2022). Teacher questioning strategies and classroom interaction in EFL contexts. *System*, 105, 102728. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102728>
- Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Pham, T. T. H., & Hamid, M. O. (2021). Teacher talk and classroom interaction in EFL classrooms. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 6(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-021-00117-8>
- Sert, O. (2019). *Classroom interaction and language learning*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Sert, O., & Walsh, S. (2022). Classroom interactional competence revisited: Current perspectives in language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 56(3), 1045–1062. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3078>
- Sugianto, A., & Khoirunnisa, S. F. (2024). From teacher talk to embodied actions: Investigating an EFL primary school teacher’s classroom interactional competence. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics*, 9(3).
- Tupalessy, H., et al. (2024). Teacher talk and student participation in Indonesian EFL classrooms. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 15(1), 45–57. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1501.05>
- Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating classroom discourse*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203015711>
- Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse: Language in action*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203827826>
- Wang, W., & Loewen, S. (2021). Teacher questioning and learner interaction in EFL classrooms. *RELC Journal*, 52(3), 451–468. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688219894267>
- Weisi, H., & Aliabadi, R. B. (2023). Teachers’ strategies to promote learners’ engagement: Teachers’ talk in perspective. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, 5, 100262. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2023.100262>
- Wood, D., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 17(2), 89–100. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.1976.tb00381.x>
- Zhang, Y., & Cheng, X. (2023). Classroom interactional competence in EFL teaching: A systematic review. *System*, 114, 103020. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2023.103020>