



AN ANALYSIS OF "TEACHER TALK" IN THE EFL CLASSROOM

Halimova Muqaddas Hakim qizi

Abstract. *Teacher Talk (TT) refers to the specific variety of language employed by teachers when interacting with language learners in instructional settings. In English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms, where the target language often constitutes the primary — and sometimes sole — medium of communication, the nature, quality, and quantity of Teacher Talk are widely recognized as pivotal determinants of learner acquisition, motivation, and communicative development. This article offers a comprehensive analysis of Teacher Talk in EFL contexts, examining its defining characteristics, key functions, theoretical underpinnings, and pedagogical implications. Drawing on a range of empirical studies and theoretical frameworks spanning the last four decades, the paper explores how modifications in speech rate, vocabulary, syntax, questioning strategies, and feedback provision collectively shape the EFL learning environment. The discussion further addresses debates around the optimal amount of Teacher Talk time (TTT) versus Student Talk Time (STT), the role of code-switching, and the implications of digital and blended learning environments on contemporary Teacher Talk practices. Ultimately, the article argues that rather than minimizing Teacher Talk, teachers should strive to optimize it by aligning their verbal behaviour with learners' evolving linguistic needs and pedagogical goals.*

Keywords: *Teacher Talk, EFL classroom, input modification, questioning strategies, feedback, Student Talk Time, second language acquisition.*

1. Introduction



Language classrooms are unique social environments where communication simultaneously constitutes both the medium and the object of instruction. Within this dual function, the language produced by the teacher — commonly termed “Teacher Talk” — occupies a central and contested position. First systematically examined in the context of caretaker speech and foreigner talk research of the 1970s and 1980s (Ferguson, 1971; Long, 1983), Teacher Talk has since become one of the most extensively studied phenomena in applied linguistics and second language acquisition (SLA).

In EFL settings, the significance of Teacher Talk is amplified by the fact that classroom interaction frequently represents the learner’s primary — or even exclusive — exposure to authentic or near-authentic English use. Unlike English as a Second Language (ESL) contexts, where learners may access the target language through everyday social interactions outside the classroom, EFL learners in countries such as China, Japan, Turkey, or Uzbekistan often rely almost entirely on their teachers as living models of the target language. Under such circumstances, the way teachers speak — the words they choose, the grammatical complexity of their utterances, the types of questions they pose, and the manner in which they provide corrective feedback — becomes extraordinarily consequential.

Despite its acknowledged importance, Teacher Talk remains a subject of vigorous academic debate. Some scholars and practitioners, influenced by communicative language teaching (CLT) principles, have advocated for minimizing teacher-fronted talk in favour of increased learner interaction, pair work, and group activities (Nunan, 1991; Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Others contend that this perspective overly simplifies the pedagogical value of well-



managed Teacher Talk, arguing that the teacher’s voice, when used strategically and responsively, is an irreplaceable source of comprehensible input, cultural modeling, and metalinguistic guidance (Allwright & Bailey, 1991; Walsh, 2006). This article seeks to interrogate and synthesize these perspectives, offering a nuanced picture of Teacher Talk as a multidimensional pedagogical tool.

2. Defining Teacher Talk: Origins and Scope

The construct of Teacher Talk is rooted in broader sociolinguistic research on register variation and speech accommodation. Early studies of “foreigner talk” — the simplified speech that native speakers naturally adopt when addressing non-native speakers — provided the conceptual foundation for investigating how teachers modify their speech in instructional contexts (Ferguson, 1971; Corder, 1981). Researchers noted that much like the “motherese” or child-directed speech observed in first language acquisition, Teacher Talk represents a systematic and purposeful adaptation of language for an audience perceived to have limited proficiency.

Long (1983) offered an influential early typology distinguishing between “pre-modified input” — in which the speaker anticipates comprehension difficulties and adjusts speech before delivery — and “interactionally modified input,” which emerges dynamically through negotiation of meaning during actual interaction. Both forms of modification are observable in Teacher Talk, though their relative frequency and effectiveness have been debated in subsequent scholarship (Pica, 1994; Ellis, 2003).

More recently, the concept of Teacher Talk has been broadened to encompass not merely phonological and syntactic simplification but the entire



communicative repertoire of the teacher, including discourse management strategies, questioning routines, the use of wait time, and the organisation of repair sequences (Walsh, 2006; Cullen, 1998). This expanded definition recognizes that Teacher Talk is not merely a linguistic phenomenon but a pedagogically purposeful interactional practice embedded in the social and institutional context of the classroom.

3. Linguistic and Paralinguistic Features of Teacher Talk

3.1 Phonological Adjustments

Teachers in EFL contexts typically adjust their speech at the phonological level in several recognizable ways. Speech rate is frequently reduced compared to native-speaker norms, particularly when addressing lower-proficiency learners. Chaudron (1988) observed that slower delivery allows learners more processing time and reduces the cognitive load associated with decoding unfamiliar phonological patterns. Pronunciation is often made more deliberate and “clearer,” with teachers hyper-articulating consonants and vowels that might otherwise be reduced or elided in natural speech. Pausing is used strategically — both to demarcate syntactic boundaries and to provide learners with time to formulate responses.

Stress and intonation patterns are also modified, with teachers frequently placing emphatic stress on key lexical items and employing exaggerated intonation contours to signal topic boundaries, convey enthusiasm, or direct learner attention. While such prosodic strategies can aid comprehension, Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005) caution that excessive exaggeration may produce an unnatural model of spoken English that ill-prepares learners for authentic communicative encounters.



3.2 Lexical and Syntactic Simplification

At the lexical level, teachers in EFL classrooms tend to favour high-frequency, contextually transparent vocabulary and avoid idiomatic expressions, colloquialisms, and culturally specific references that may be opaque to learners (Nation, 2001). Synonym elaboration — the practice of providing multiple words or expressions for the same concept — is a commonly observed strategy, as is the use of concrete examples and ostensive definition through gesture or visual aids.

Syntactically, Teacher Talk typically features shorter, less embedded sentences, fewer complex noun phrases, and a higher proportion of present-tense constructions (Chaudron, 1988). Repetition is employed both for emphasis and to ensure comprehension, with teachers frequently restating their own utterances or paraphrasing learner contributions. However, Pica and Long (1986) note that syntactic simplification is not always consistent across teachers or contexts, and that teachers sometimes unconsciously revert to native-speaker norms, particularly during periods of high interactional engagement.

4. Functions of Teacher Talk in the EFL Classroom

Teacher Talk serves a range of overlapping functions that extend well beyond the mere transmission of linguistic input. Drawing on Walsh's (2006) widely cited framework of classroom interactional competence (CIC), these functions can be broadly organised into four domains: the facilitation of comprehension, the management of classroom discourse, the provision of formative feedback, and the scaffolding of learner output.

4.1 Facilitating Comprehension and Input



Krashen's (1985) Input Hypothesis posits that language acquisition occurs when learners are exposed to input that is slightly beyond their current level of competence — the celebrated “i + 1” formula. Teacher Talk, by definition, constitutes a major source of this input in EFL classrooms, and its quality as comprehensible input is directly shaped by the modifications teachers make. Research by Loschky (1994) and others has demonstrated that input adjusted to be just above learner proficiency, combined with opportunities for clarification, is significantly more conducive to acquisition than either oversimplified input or input far in excess of learner capacity.

4.2 Managing Classroom Discourse

A substantial portion of Teacher Talk is dedicated to the organizational and procedural management of classroom activity. This includes the issuing of instructions, the transition between activity phases, the allocation of speaking turns, and the maintenance of classroom discipline. Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) seminal analysis of classroom discourse identified the Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) exchange structure as the dominant interactive pattern, in which the teacher initiates a topic, a student responds, and the teacher provides evaluative feedback. While critics have argued that the IRF pattern constrains genuine communicative interaction, proponents contend that it provides a scaffolding structure within which learners can rehearse target language use in a relatively low-risk environment (Cullen, 1998).

4.3 Providing Corrective Feedback

Corrective feedback constitutes one of the most pedagogically significant — and empirically debated — dimensions of Teacher Talk. Lyster and Ranta's (1997)



influential taxonomy identifies six types of corrective feedback: explicit correction, recasts, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition. Research has consistently shown that teachers in EFL classrooms overwhelmingly favour recasts — the implicit reformulation of a learner’s erroneous utterance — over more explicit forms of correction, largely for face-saving reasons and to preserve discourse flow (Mackey & Philp, 1998). However, studies also indicate that recasts may be insufficiently salient for many learners, who perceive them as mere confirmations rather than corrections (Lyster, 2004).

The debate between implicit and explicit feedback reflects broader theoretical tensions in SLA between focus-on-form and focus-on-meaning approaches. Long’s (1991) interaction hypothesis, which foregrounds the role of negotiated meaning in acquisition, suggests that feedback that triggers learner repair — such as clarification requests and elicitation — may be particularly effective because it compels the learner to attend to the gap between their production and the target norm.

4.4 Scaffolding Learner Output

In addition to providing input, Teacher Talk plays a crucial role in scaffolding learner output through strategies such as prompting, recapping, and collaborative completion of utterances. Swain’s (1995) Output Hypothesis argues that the production of the target language is itself a mechanism of acquisition, as it pushes learners to notice gaps in their interlanguage and to automatise linguistic forms. Teacher Talk that invites, extends, and cognitively challenges learner output is therefore a direct contributor to acquisition.

5. Questioning Strategies in Teacher Talk



Questions represent one of the most extensively researched dimensions of Teacher Talk, and their role in shaping classroom interaction is widely acknowledged. Long and Sato (1983) drew a foundational distinction between “display questions,” which request information the teacher already knows (e.g., “What tense is that?”), and “referential questions,” which request genuinely unknown information from the learner (e.g., “What did you do last weekend?”). Their analysis revealed that EFL teachers overwhelmingly rely on display questions, a pattern consistent with the institutional logic of assessment-oriented classrooms but at odds with the communicative demands of authentic language use.

Subsequent research has linked higher proportions of referential questions to increased learner production, more complex syntactic output, and greater learner engagement (Brock, 1986; Shomoossi, 2004). Yet recent scholarship has nuanced this picture considerably. Seedhouse (2004) argues that the pedagogical purpose of a question — rather than its formal category — determines its interactional value, and that display questions skillfully deployed in metalinguistic discussions can stimulate high levels of cognitive engagement.

Wait time — the interval between a teacher’s question and the expected learner response — is another dimension of questioning behaviour that has attracted significant empirical attention. Rowe (1986) demonstrated that even a modest increase in wait time from one to three seconds significantly enhanced the quality, length, and complexity of learner responses. Despite this evidence, observations of EFL classrooms consistently reveal that most teachers wait less than one second before either repeating the question, nominating a different



student, or answering the question themselves, thereby inadvertently suppressing opportunities for extended learner production.

6. Teacher Talk Time vs. Student Talk Time

One of the most persistent debates in communicative language teaching concerns the appropriate ratio of Teacher Talk Time (TTT) to Student Talk Time (STT). Proponents of CLT have long argued that excessive TTT crowds out the very communicative practice that learners need to develop fluency and interactional competence (Nunan, 1991). Classroom observation studies routinely reveal that teachers account for between 60 and 80 percent of classroom talk in conventional EFL settings (Chaudron, 1988), a distribution that critics argue reflects an over-reliance on teacher-fronted instruction at the expense of learner-centred activity.

However, the equation of “less Teacher Talk” with “better pedagogy” has been increasingly challenged. Walsh (2006) makes the compelling argument that the quality of Teacher Talk — its interactional responsiveness, its calibration to learner needs, and its capacity to create genuine communicative space — is far more important than its quantity. A teacher who speaks for fifty percent of class time but consistently elicits, extends, and responds to learner contributions may create richer acquisition opportunities than one who mechanically reduces TTT through unstructured group work with minimal facilitation.

Furthermore, research on classroom interaction in EFL contexts has highlighted the particular challenges of managing student talk in large classes, mixed-ability groups, and cultural contexts where learners are socialized into passive, receptive modes of classroom participation (Cortazzi & Jin, 1996). In such



settings, the teacher's voice may serve as a critical model and motivational anchor, and a precipitous reduction in Teacher Talk without corresponding pedagogical retraining may simply result in silence rather than productive learner interaction.

7. Code-Switching as a Feature of Teacher Talk

An important and often under-theorized dimension of Teacher Talk in EFL contexts is the practice of code-switching — the alternation between the target language (English) and the learners' first language (L1) within a single interaction. Historically, monolingual approaches to EFL instruction held that the exclusive or near-exclusive use of English in the classroom was both pedagogically optimal and symbolic of professional competence (Howatt, 1984). This perspective, while influential, is increasingly recognized as ideologically loaded and empirically insufficiently supported.

Contemporary research presents a more nuanced picture of L1 use in EFL teacher talk. Cook (2001) argues that the L1 is a natural cognitive resource that multilingual teachers and learners inevitably draw upon, and that its strategic deployment can enhance comprehension, manage classroom logistics, and build rapport, particularly with beginner and lower-intermediate learners. Macaro (2001) identifies a spectrum of positions ranging from the "virtuous native speakerism" of exclusive English use to the "bilingual position," which views judicious L1 use as a legitimate pedagogical tool.

Empirical observation of EFL classrooms across different cultural and institutional contexts reveals considerable variability in the extent and functions of L1 use in Teacher Talk. Studies in contexts such as South Korea (Kim & Elder, 2005), China (Littlewood & Yu, 2011), and the Arab world (Al-Nofaie, 2010)



suggest that teachers' L1 use tends to cluster around complex grammatical explanations, disciplinary interactions, and the introduction of culturally sensitive content. The challenge for teacher education programmes is to develop principled frameworks for L1 use that transcend both unreflective monolingualism and unstructured code-switching.

8. Teacher Talk in Digital and Blended EFL Environments

The rapid proliferation of digital technologies has substantially reconfigured the contexts in which Teacher Talk operates. In online synchronous learning environments — accelerated by the global COVID-19 pandemic — the affordances and constraints of video-mediated communication introduce new dimensions to Teacher Talk that are only beginning to be systematically investigated (Hampel & Stickler, 2012). The absence of full-body visual cues, the technical limitations of audio transmission, and the reduced social presence of screen-based interaction all affect the prosodic, interactional, and discourse management functions of Teacher Talk.

Research on teacher-learner interaction in platforms such as Zoom, Microsoft Teams, and Google Meet reveals that teachers tend to speak more slowly, pause more frequently, and rely more heavily on explicit verbal signposting of discourse structure in online contexts compared to face-to-face classrooms (Cinkara & Kocoglu, 2021). The use of chat functions, polls, and breakout rooms creates new interactional formats that challenge traditional IRF-based discourse patterns and demand novel forms of Teacher Talk for pedagogical orchestration.



In asynchronous blended learning environments, Teacher Talk manifests through recorded video lectures, audio feedback on assignments, and instructional screencasts. The loss of real-time interactional adjustment in these formats places a premium on the teacher's ability to pre-modify input effectively and to design instructional discourse that anticipates learner questions and difficulties in the absence of immediate feedback. This "planned" Teacher Talk represents a distinctive register that has received comparatively little scholarly attention.

9. Pedagogical Implications and Recommendations

The foregoing analysis has several practical implications for EFL teacher education and professional development. Perhaps most fundamentally, it suggests that Teacher Talk should be treated not as a regrettable necessity to be minimized but as a sophisticated professional skill to be consciously developed and refined. Pre-service and in-service teacher training programmes should incorporate systematic observation and analysis of Teacher Talk, equipping teachers with the metalinguistic awareness and reflective tools needed to monitor and improve their own classroom language use.

Second, the evidence regarding questioning strategies strongly supports a deliberate effort to increase the proportion of referential questions and to extend wait time. Providing teachers with structured reflection protocols — such as the analysis of audio or video recordings of their own lessons — can be an effective means of raising awareness of habitual questioning patterns and stimulating experimentation with alternative approaches (Walsh & Li, 2013).

Third, the debate around corrective feedback suggests that teachers should develop a varied feedback repertoire rather than defaulting uniformly to recasts.



The deployment of different feedback types should be responsive to the specific pedagogical focus of a given lesson segment: explicit correction and metalinguistic feedback may be appropriate during form-focused exercises, while recasts and clarification requests may better serve meaning-focused communicative activities.

Fourth, the evidence around code-switching calls for a more principled and contextually sensitive approach to L1 use in Teacher Talk. Rather than prohibiting or ignoring L1 use, teacher educators should help teachers develop the awareness and competence to deploy L1 strategically as a scaffold for complex concepts while maintaining English as the primary medium of interaction.

Finally, the challenges of digital EFL environments highlight the urgency of developing teacher competencies for online and blended contexts. This includes not only technical proficiency but the ability to adapt Teacher Talk strategies to mediated communication formats in ways that maintain interactional richness and learner engagement.

10. Conclusion

Teacher Talk in the EFL classroom is a complex, multifaceted, and pedagogically consequential phenomenon. Far from being simply the words a teacher happens to say, it constitutes a dynamic interactional practice shaped by the teacher's professional knowledge, the learners' linguistic needs, the institutional context of instruction, and the communicative affordances of the learning environment. This article has traced the defining features and functions of Teacher Talk — from phonological and lexical modification to questioning strategies, corrective feedback, and code-switching — and has examined the evolving debates around Teacher Talk Time and the challenges posed by digital learning contexts.



The overarching argument advanced here is that the quality of Teacher Talk, understood as its interactional responsiveness, its calibration to learner needs, and its capacity to create genuine opportunities for acquisition, is more pedagogically significant than its quantity. A well-designed, reflectively managed Teacher Talk practice can serve as a powerful engine of language learning, providing comprehensible and challenging input, modeling target norms, scaffolding learner production, and building the interactional competence that learners need to function in the wider world.

As EFL contexts continue to diversify — encompassing ever wider ranges of learner backgrounds, proficiency levels, and instructional formats — the study of Teacher Talk will remain a vital and generative field of applied linguistics research. Future research that integrates insights from conversation analysis, sociocultural theory, and SLA, and that attends to the situated specificity of diverse EFL classrooms, will be essential to advancing both theoretical understanding and professional practice in this domain.

REFERENCES

1. Al-Nofaie, H. (2010). The attitudes of teachers and students towards using Arabic in EFL classrooms in Saudi public schools. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, 4(1), 64–95.
2. Allwright, D., & Bailey, K. M. (1991). *Focus on the language classroom: An introduction to classroom research for language teachers*. Cambridge University Press.



3. Brock, C. A. (1986). The effects of referential questions on ESL classroom discourse. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20(1), 47–60.
4. Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge University Press.
5. Cinkara, E., & Kocoglu, Z. (2021). An analysis of EFL teacher talk in synchronous online classes during COVID-19. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 35(8), 2034–2058.
6. Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57(3), 402–423.
7. Corder, S. P. (1981). *Error analysis and interlanguage*. Oxford University Press.
8. Cortazzi, M., & Jin, L. (1996). Cultures of learning: Language classrooms in China. In H. Coleman (Ed.), *Society and the language classroom* (pp. 169–206). Cambridge University Press.
9. Cullen, R. (1998). Teacher talk and the classroom context. *ELT Journal*, 52(3), 179–187.
10. Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford University Press.
11. Ellis, R., & Barkhuizen, G. (2005). *Analysing learner language*. Oxford University Press.
12. Ferguson, C. A. (1971). Absence of copula and the notion of simplicity: A study of normal speech, baby talk, foreigner talk and pidgins. In D. Hymes (Ed.), *Pidginization and creolization of languages* (pp. 141–150). Cambridge University Press.



13. Hampel, R., & Stickler, U. (2012). The use of videoconferencing to support multimodal interaction in an online language classroom. *ReCALL*, 24(2), 116–137.
14. Howatt, A. P. R. (1984). *A history of English language teaching*. Oxford University Press.
15. Kim, S.-H. O., & Elder, C. (2005). Language choices and pedagogic functions in the foreign language classroom: A cross-linguistic functional analysis of teacher talk. *Language Teaching Research*, 9(4), 355–380.
16. Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. Longman.
17. Littlewood, W., & Yu, B. (2011). First language and target language in the foreign language classroom. *Language Teaching*, 44(1), 64–77.
18. Long, M. H. (1983). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input. *Applied Linguistics*, 4(2), 126–141.
19. Long, M. H. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 39–52). John Benjamins.
20. Long, M. H., & Sato, C. J. (1983). Classroom foreigner talk discourse: Forms and functions of teachers' questions. In H. W. Seliger & M. H. Long (Eds.), *Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition* (pp. 268–285). Newbury House.
21. Loschky, L. (1994). Comprehensible input and second language acquisition: What is the relationship? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 16(3), 303–323.



22. Lyster, R. (2004). Differential effects of prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26(3), 399–432.
23. Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 37–66.
24. Macaro, E. (2001). Analysing student teachers' code-switching in foreign language classrooms: Theories and decision making. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(4), 531–548.
25. Mackey, A., & Philp, J. (1998). Conversational interaction and second language development: Recasts, responses, and red herrings? *The Modern Language Journal*, 82(3), 338–356.
26. Nation, I. S. P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge University Press.
27. Nunan, D. (1991). *Language teaching methodology: A textbook for teachers*. Prentice Hall.
28. Pica, T. (1994). Research on negotiation: What does it reveal about second-language learning conditions, processes, and outcomes? *Language Learning*, 44(3), 493–527.
29. Pica, T., & Long, M. H. (1986). The linguistic and conversational performance of experienced and inexperienced teachers. In R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition* (pp. 85–118). Newbury House.
30. Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.



31. Rowe, M. B. (1986). Wait time: Slowing down may be a way of speeding up! *Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(1), 43—50.
32. Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. Blackwell.
33. Shomoossi, N. (2004). The effect of teachers' questioning behavior on EFL classroom interaction: A classroom research study. *The Reading Matrix*, 4(2), 96–104.
34. Sinclair, J., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. Oxford University Press.
35. Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics* (pp. 125–144). Oxford University Press.
36. Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating classroom discourse*. Routledge.
37. Walsh, S., & Li, L. (2013). Conversations as space for learning. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 23(2), 247–266.