JoLaCE

sciendo

Teacher-student interaction and management practices in Pakistani English language classrooms

Muhammad Ahmad, Aleem Shakir, Ali Raza Siddique
Government College University in, Faisalabad, Pakistan
ahmad453@yandex.com

Abstract
This study aimed to investigate the amount and type of teacher-talk, frequently asked questions and feedback provided by the teacher on learners' performance in a language classroom. For this purpose, a lecture was recorded from a secondary level English language classroom of a public sector school and interpreted in the light of teacher-student interaction and classroom management model by David Nunan. Results revealed that the maximum amount of time (i.e. 80.1%) was consumed by the teacher which was appropriate. However, certain deviations from classroom management principles were also observed regarding frequently asked questions (i.e. 50% of the total questions were elicitation questions) and the feedback (it was 'romantic' in nature). Moreover, wait-time was sufficient but it was of no use to the learners. The study concluded that classroom practices did not conform to the principles therefore, it proposed to ask questions and provide feedback appropriately.
Keywords: classroom management; feedback on learners' performance; language classroom; teacher-student interaction; teacher-student interaction practices

1 Introduction

"Classroom management and teacher-student interaction are integral to sound methodological practice" (Nunan, 1991, p. 189). In its narrowest sense, classroom management means the avoidance of disrupting behaviour of learners (Berliner, 1988). But in its broader sense, classroom management means: (a) the process of conducting and organising classrooms to ensure maximum learning and prevent disturbances (Callahan & Clark, 1998); (b) refers to the teachers' decision to support and offer maximum learning opportunities (Krause, Bochner & Duchesne, 2003) and (c) in the view of Tan, Parsons, Hinson and Sardo-Brown, classroom management involves activities to facilitate orderly and encouraging environment. Common classroom activities include: material preparation, planning and organisation, classroom decoration and enforcement of classroom rules (2003) which, according to Berliner (1988), entail activities to maintain an atmosphere to

provide positive conditions for learning and in the view of Farris (1996), classroom management activities involve the management of time, communication and engagement of learners. From the learners' perspective, classroom management involves clear communication of academic and behavioural expectations and the creation of cooperative learning atmosphere (Allen, 1986).

Classroom management is a difficult task. Many teachers leave teaching due to the problems related with classroom management. In 1981, the US National Educational Association reported 36% of the teachers saying that they would not join teaching profession if they had to decide again. The main reason for teachers' disliking was reported to be related with discipline and attitude problems (Wolfgang & Glickman, 1980). Martin and Yin add that managing a classroom varies depending on the number of factors including subject matter, place of teaching and level of education. As such, managing language learning classrooms is expected to be dissimilar from managing math, history and geography classes (1997). EFL classroom management demands certain skills and capabilities and the most important of which is using English to manage a classroom (Ababneh, 2012). Richards, Platt and Platt portray the management of language classrooms as: "classroom management includes procedures for grouping students for different types of classroom activities, use of lesson plans, handling of equipment, aids, etc., and the direction and management of student behaviour and activity" (1992, p. 52). In another classification, Brown and Lee (1994) propose that EFL classroom management encompasses the handling of physical setting including light, seating, and facilities in the classroom. In addition to all these aspects, Richards and Rodgers (2014) assert that EFL classroom management requires teachers' control over students' behavior and teachers-students interactions. This study considers teacher-student interaction as an important aspect of classroom management.

Interaction is a significant factor of a good student-teacher relationship (Duffy, Warren & Walsh, 2001) and classroom is a place where the closest interaction between the students and the teachers takes place (Muhammad & Ismail, 2001). The way a teacher interacts with the learners serves as a determining factor in terms of impact. In this regard, personality plays an important role i.e. teachers' personality determines interaction style in the classroom. Moreover, the knowledge of different aspects of interaction helps a teacher become influential on learners. In fact, student learning outcomes are determined by the way the students and teachers interact with each other. In their meta review, Wang, Haertel and Walberg reported student-teacher interaction as being among top three most important factors (1990). The fact is that the way the teachers interact with learners, helps translate into such products as are vital to education process (Englehart, 2009).

Literature on classroom research shows that the interaction between teachers and learners differs on account of certain characteristics (Englehart, 2009). Among these characteristics include; race (Cornbleth & Korth, 1980), learners' academic ability (Ilatov, Shamai, Hertz-Lazarovitz & Mayer-Young, 1998), socioeconomic status (Goddard, Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001), and gender (Drudy & Chatháin, 2002). In the view of Englehart (2009) awareness is the solution to this problem (Englehart, 2009). Englehart bases his claim on Brophy and Good (1974) who write, "once teachers are made aware of inappropriate teaching on their part, the vast majority are willing and eager to change" (p. 270). This study, therefore, aims to highlight classroom management and student-teacher interaction practices in a Pakistani secondary level (Grade-10) language classroom and thereby make the teachers aware of the ways they are interacting in the language classrooms and suggesting them to interact the way as prescribed by the experts.

1.1 Problem statement

This study aimed to highlight the factors of classroom management in a Pakistani secondary level (Grade-10) language classroom as defined by experts (e.g. Berliner, 1988; Brown & Lee, 1994; Callahan & Clark, 1995; Krause, Bochner & Duchesne, 2003; Richards, Platt & Platt, 1992; Richards & Rodgers, 2014; Tan et al., 2003) in general and by Nunan (1991) in particular. As defined by Nunan (1991), it is student-teacher interaction practices that correspond to classroom management as discussed in the introduction and literature review sections. Therefore, this study investigates teachers' talk, teachers' questions, and teachers' feedback as the contributors to student-teacher interaction which further contribute to effective language classroom management (Nunan, 1991).

1.2 Objective of the study

This study was initiated to investigate teacher-student interaction practices (as postulated by Nunan, 1991, as the identifier of classroom management) in a Pakistani secondary level language classroom. In further details, the study looked for answers to four sub-research questions followed by one main question:
1. Do the classroom management and teacher-student interaction practices in a Pakistani secondary level language classroom match with the principles proposed by the experts for effective language classroom management and positive teacher-student interaction?
I. What is the amount and type of teacher talk practiced in Pakistani secondary level language classroom?
II. What type of teachers' questions is frequently asked in a Pakistani secondary level language classroom?
III. How do the teachers provide feedback on learners' performance in a Pakistani secondary level language classroom?

IV. What are the main Pakistani language classroom management problems and how they can be overcome?

2 Literature review
2.1 Teacher talk

Teacher talk is a special language which the teachers use when addressing L2 learners in a classroom (Ellis, 1989; Richards & Schmitt, 2010). In Nunan's view, teacher talk means the language which the teachers use to organise a class for language teaching (1991). Xiao-Yan (2006) defines it as the language that the teachers use in classroom for instruction purposes. All above definitions, agree on one point i.e. teacher talk means the language used by the teachers in the classroom. However, this study focuses on Nunan's as an operational definition. The reason for selecting Nunan's definition is that the aim of this study surrounds the theme of a language class organisation which is the kernel of Nunan's definition. Teacher talk plays an important part in language learning process (Xiao-Yan, 2006). For, in the view of Nunan:

> "*Teacher talk is of crucial importance, not only for the organization of the classroom but also for the processes of acquisition. It is important for the organization and management of the classroom because it is through language that teachers either succeed or fail in implementing their teaching plans. In terms of acquisition, teacher talk is important because it is probably the major source of comprehensible target language input the learner is likely to receive*" (1991, p. 189).

Teacher talk works as tool which helps the teachers implement teaching plans. It also serves as an input source for the learners (Blanchette, 2009; Jing & Jing, 2018). The teachers utilise teacher talk to cultivate intellectual ability, for instruction purpose, and to manage activities in the classroom (Feng, 2007). In addition, teacher talk helps organise, explain, reformulate, summarise and redirect what the teachers and students say in the classroom (Blanchette, 2009). Therefore, the usefulness of language teaching depends on the type of interaction and language used in the classroom (Long & Porter, 1985). Thus, the teacher talk should be of high quality to create effective as well as harmonious environment for student-teacher interaction. Otherwise, teaching will be nothing more than a monodrama in the classroom (Jing & Jing, 2018).

Different studies (e.g. Hu Xuewen cited in Xia-Yen, 2006; Nunan, 1991) have enlisted a number of features of teacher talk. Among these features, the first one, according to Jing and Jing (2018), is concerned with the form of teacher talk which involves speech modifications, pauses, repetitions and speed. However, Nunan (1991) has called these forms as the 'types of teacher talk'. The second feature is concerned with the control and organisation of the class which involves; teacher questions, feedback on learners' performance, the quality as well as quantity of the

teacher talk (Hu Xuewen cited in Xia-Yen, 2006; Nunan, 1991). Hu Xuewen calls the first feature as the 'formal feature' and the second as 'the functional feature' of the teacher talk. Since, one of the aims of this study is to investigate the appropriateness of teacher talk in a Pakistani language classroom; the formal feature does not seem relevant here. Therefore, this study will focus only on the functional factor of teacher talk.

2.1.1 Amount of teacher talk

Teachers do by far the most talking in the classroom (Nunan, 1991). In an inservice teacher training program, teachers were asked to record and analyse their lessons. After, the analysis was complete, the teachers were asked about what surprised them. In response, most of them replied that they were surprised by the amount of talk they did in the classroom (Nunan, 1990, 1991).

A number of studies (see Chaudron, 1988; Cook, 2016; Nunan, 1991), conducted in language classrooms, have established that the teachers talk forms 70-80 percent of the whole class talk. According to Nunan, the materials overburden the users with an 'embarrassment of riches' to which Breen and Candlin (1987) have called 'abundance of data'. In Nunan's view, the embarrassment of riches (i.e. abundance of data) forces the teachers to consume more time. Whatever the reason may be, Nunan considers it good for a teacher to talk 70-80 percent of the whole class talk time with the logic that teacher talk provides substantial live target language input. However, Nunan recommends the teachers to avoid excessive talk in the classroom. Excessive teacher talk might have serious implications i.e. excessive explanations or instructions by the teacher in the classroom may restrict student talk severely. In addition, excessive teacher talk may lead to the dominance of the teacher in the classroom which may limit the student talk and as a result, it may affect the development of language proficiency among learners. Therefore, the teachers should try to maximise the student talk in the classroom (Zhao Xiaohong cited in Xiao-Yan, 2006). Same view has been shared by Harmer (2000) who says that the best lessons are those in which student talk is maximised.

2.1.2 Teacher's questions

Teachers' questions are given greater significance in education and are thought to be the only way to assess what the learners know (Wu, 1993). Questioning is the most commonly used technique by teachers (Richards & Lockhart, 1994) to maintain interaction in the classroom (Xiao-Yan, 2006). The tendency to ask many questions is very common among the teachers (Chaudron, 1988). Teachers take more than half of the total class time in questioning-answering sessions (Richards & Lockhart, 1994). That is why teachers' questions have been attracting the attention of many researchers in the past (see Barnes, 1969; Brock, 1985, 1986;

Chaudron, 1988; Ellis, 1994; Gerot, 1990; Good & Brophy, 1987; Ho, 2005; Long & Sato, 1983; Richards & Lockhart, 1994; Rowe, 1974, 1986).

Most used way of analysing teachers' questions in classroom research has been the way of classifying questions. Therefore, this study also adopts classification technique to analyse teacher's questions. Barnes (1969) and Long and Sato (1983), in their studies classified teachers' questions into two categories i.e.: (1) closed or display questions; and (2) open or referential questions. Closed or display questions are those questions of which the answer is already known to the teachers e.g. 'what is the opposite of up in English?' These questions extract mechanical, short and simple answers (mostly require one-word answers like 'yes' or 'no'). These questions demand the learners to display the knowledge obtained in the class. On the contrary, open or referential questions are such questions as for which the answer is not already known to the teachers. Such questions are exploratory in nature and mostly require complex and lengthy responses e.g. 'why don't you do your homework?' Ho (2005) adds that an implication of display questions is that these questions prompt restricted and short responses but do not ensure "genuine communication" (p. 298). Major purpose of display questions is to extract such knowledge from the learners as is already known to the teachers and which the learners have recently learned in the class. Referential questions, in contrast with the display questions, prompt the learners to answer in the light of their personal viewpoints or life experiences. These responses are not factual or text embedded rather they are longer and communicative responses which are quite similar to the real communication. Nunan (1991) adds a new category to the teachers' questions i.e. elicitation questions. Elicitation is, in fact, a technique which is utilised to extract information or knowledge directly from the people (Cooke, 1994). In a language learning classroom, the teacher utilises this technique during the lesson which helps the learners discover and understand the language (ESL Focus, 2017). Chaudron (1988) called it "socratic method" (p. 129) while Nunan (1991) named it "elicitation method" (p. 195).

Most of the studies in the past have been found to report closed or display questions in maximum use of teachers in the language classrooms. One of such studies has been conducted by Barnes (1969) which reports that factual (display) questions are the most frequently asked questions by teachers in the language classrooms at the secondary level. In Barnes view, display questions do not prompt such long and thoughtful responses from the learners as do the referential questions. Same findings (i.e. teachers ask display questions more than the referential questions) have been reported by Ho (2005), Long and Sato (1983) and Nunan (1987). These questions, in their view, require short responses which are restricted to the learners only.

2.1.3 Teachers' feedback on learners' performance

Feedback refers to the evaluation of the learners' response by the teacher (Cook, 2016). Giving feedback on learners' performance is a significant aspect of teaching (Xiao-Yan, 2006). Feedback is provided by the teachers on learners' performance in the form of silence, praise or comments (Richards & Lockhart, 1994). Nunan (1991) categorises feedback into negative and positive. Negative feedback, in Nunan's view, consists exclusively of the teacher repeating students' response with a rising intonation. Positive feedback, on the other hand, consists of short interjections (i.e. good, ok, alright etc). However, Nunan calls the use of words like; good, ok, correct, alright as a 'romantic' feedback. In fact, Nunan supports such a positive feedback as having two functions: (1) it should let the learners know that they have performed correctly; and (2) it should motivate the learners. According to Ur (2008), feedback comprises of two distinct components i.e. (1) assessment and (2) correction. The second component is not the part of this study. Therefore, it will not be discussed here.

Assessment refers to the procedures, techniques or tools to collection and interpret information about what the students can do and what they cannot do. Assessment informs the learners about how well or poor they have performed (Ur, 2008). Teachers' assessment of learners' performance helps promote EFL learning. Therefore, teacher talk should be full of encouragement, confirmation and approval (Xiao-Yan, 2006). Commonly used assessment words or phrases include: (1) confirmation (e.g. good, excellent, that is perfectly correct, no, that is wrong); (2) encouragement (don't worry, that wasn't very good, you can better do that, you fool, idiot, stupid etc.).

2.2 Classroom management problems in Pakistan

Pakistani schoolteachers are facing classroom management problems (Ahmad, Rauf, Zeb, Rehman, Khan, Rashid & Ali, 2012). Major cause of teachers' problems are the children studying in Pakistani schools. According to Ali, many schools in Pakistan, both rural and urban, contain such learners as are disenchanted, disruptive and disturbed. Most of these children, living particularly in rural areas, belong to uneducated families having disturbed relationships (2000). Most of the learners have low self-esteem and they show deviant attitudes. They use abusive language and are fond of delinquency as well as truancy (Ahmad et al., 2012). Similarly, some of the learners, studying in Pakistani schools, live under such community conditions as badly affect learners' readiness for the school. Subjugated environment is the worst community condition which badly affects the learners' behaviour (Ali, 2000). In the view of Omar (2000), children living in subjected environment have more chances to depict inappropriate behaviour as compared to the children living in unsubjugated communities. The inappropriate (negative) behaviour proves to be lethal for both i.e. the learners as well the

teachers which, in turn, badly affects the process of teaching and learning. Such type of negative behaviour should immediately be checked by controlling classroom management problems. For, in the view of Saad (1999), the continuation of classroom management problems causes the development of anti-social behaviour among the learners. This study intends to present a solution for these problems by introducing 'student-teacher interaction' as a useful technique for 'classroom management' in Pakistani language classrooms at secondary level.

3 Research methodology

This study is descriptive in nature based on classroom data which has been obtained in the form of an audio lecture recorded in an ELT classroom of a public sector secondary school located in the central Punjab, Pakistan. The lecture was delivered by a teacher who had been teaching English for over a decade to the secondary school level students (grades-9 and 10). The lecture for this study was recorded in May, 2019 which was delivered to the students of grade-10 on the topic of 'direct and indirect narration' and the duration of this lecture was 45 minutes.

The data was interpreted in different categories i.e.: (1) amount and type of teacher talk; (2) teacher questions; and (3) feedback on learners' performance. All of these three categories were further divided into subcategories. These categories were retrieved from chapter 10 titled 'Focus on the Teacher: Classroom Management and Teacher-Student Interaction' of a book titled 'Language Teaching Methodology' written by David Nunan.

Nunan (1991), citing some studies (will be mentioned in the upcoming paragraphs), discusses first category i.e. 'amount and type of teacher talk' in a number of sub headings i.e.: (i) principles to determine the appropriateness of teacher talk; (ii) issue of code switching; (iii) speech modifications; (iv) input (simplified and elaborated); and (v) comprehension. Similarly, Nunan discusses the second category i.e. 'teacher questions' under subheadings i.e.: (a) distribution of questions; (b) types of questions (i.e. display, referential, and elicitation questions). Lastly, he divides the discussion of third category i.e. 'feedback on learners' performance' in two subheadings i.e.: (i) positive feedback and (ii) negative feedback (for details about these categories, refer to literature review and discussion sections).

The audio was carefully listened and all of the points, related with the mentioned categories, were marked by the researcher himself focusing the on frequencies and time spared for each category or subcategories. After completing the process, assistance of a mathematician was sought to calculate the percentage of frequencies of different categories.

4 Results

4.1 Amount and type of teacher talk

The lecture was delivered in 45 minutes and 36 seconds out of which the teacher talked for 36 minutes and 31 seconds whereas the students talked for 9 minutes and 5 seconds. The percentage of the amount of time consumed by the teacher and students is 80.1 and 19.91 respectively. These percentages indicate that the maximum amount of time in Pakistani secondary school level language classroom is consumed by the teachers.

So far as the type of teacher talk and its appropriateness is concerned, results reveal that most of the teacher talk in Pakistani secondary level language classroom is appropriate. For, the whole of the teacher talk meets two, out of three, criteria of appropriateness (see Nunan, 1991). The teacher remained relevant to the topic. The points, he discussed, were directly related with the topic of the lecture. All of the content of the lecture was well planned. However, there were a number of spontaneous references, but they did not cause any digression from the topic. These findings indicate that the amount and type of teachers' talk in Pakistani secondary level language classrooms is appropriate. It is important to mention here that the teacher does not use target language i.e. English. Rather, he has been found to use Urdu, which is the second language of the learners (Punjabi being their L1) which means that learners are not provided with 'potential input for learning'. The less use of target language in the classroom might also be caused by another common practice by the Pakistani teachers i.e. 'doing a lesson' or 'doing grammar' which comprises of a set of activities e.g. reading of the texts aloud, telling the meanings and interpreting the texts in Urdu or other local languages. Due to these practices, Urdu is used as a dominant language in the language classrooms in Pakistan (Shamim, 2008). In addition, most of the students in Pakistan study in non-elite English or Urdu medium schools where the teachers' proficiency in English is limited which restricts the use of English language in the classrooms for communication purpose (Shamim, 1993; Shamim & Allen, 2000).

4.2 Teachers questions

4.2.1 Type of questions

The teacher asked 70 questions, during the lecture, from the students out of which frequency of display, elicitation and referential questions was 27(39%), 35(50%) and 8(11%). Thus, the elicitation questions were asked in maximum whereas referential questions were asked in minimum frequency. The findings indicate that the teacher in a Pakistani secondary school language classroom focuses more on asking such questions (i.e. elicitation) as extract the information from the learners or such questions (i.e. display) as for which the answer is already known to the teacher instead of asking such questions (i.e. referential) as may prompt learners to provide longer and syntactically complex responses. It signifies

that the questions asked by Pakistani language teachers, in the light of Nunan's (1991) recommendations (i.e. the teachers should ask more referential questions), are not appropriate.

4.2.2 Distribution of questions

So far as the distribution of questions is concerned, the teacher named 6 students from different groups of the class and directed them to answer. Some of the questions were asked without nominating any students. These questions were answered by different students from the class. This technique distributed the questions among maximum number of students. These findings show that the distribution of questions by the teacher is appropriate i.e. the teacher engages the maximum number of learners.

4.2.3 Wait time

The teacher asked questions in two rounds. In first round, the teacher asked questions before or during the lecture to check the previous knowledge whereas, in the second round the teacher asked questions after completing the instruction process. The wait time, for both rounds, was found to be different. In first round, the teacher increased the wait time upto many seconds (different every time i.e. 16 sec, 2 sec, 3 sec, 6 sec etc.). But mostly, the learners could not provide the answer. Then, the teacher extended wait time upto 2 to 5 seconds but the learners could not answer.

However, during the second round the teacher did not need to increase wait time. The learners provided the answer instantly after the question was asked by the teacher. Therefore, there was no need to extend the wait time. These findings indicate that wait time is not helpful to know the previous knowledge of the learners. On the other hand, students do not need to extend wait time after the lecture.

4.3 Feedback on learners' performance

The teacher provided feedback to the learners. He used a number of words in a try to provide positive feedback to the students such as; good, right, ok and correct (these words are the translated version of the Urdu words used by the teacher). But this type of feedback, as called by Nunan (1991), is 'romantic'.

5 Discussion
5.1 Amount and type of teacher talk

First sub question of the study was raised to know about the amount and type of teacher talk practiced in the Pakistani secondary level language classroom. In this regard, the results reveal that the teacher consumes maximum amount of time i.e. 81.1 percent. These results validate the results of studies by Chaudron (1988), Cook (2016) and Nunan (1991) which claim that the teachers consume 70-80

percent of the whole talk time in the classrooms. This amount, (i.e. 70-80%) in the light of Nunan's statement, "whether or not it is considered a good thing for teachers to spend 70 to 80 per cent of class time talking" (p. 190), is ideal. In the light this statement, it is ideal to find that the teacher has used 80 percent of the 'class talk time'. Nunan (1991) stresses the significance of 70-80 percent teacher-talk time on the plea that:

"*Teacher talk is of crucial importance, not only for the organization of the classroom but also for the processes of acquisition. It is important for the organization and management of the classroom because it is through language that teachers either succeed or fail in implementing their teaching plans. In terms of acquisition, teacher talk is important because it is probably the major source of comprehensible target language input the learner is likely to receive*" (p. 189).

In the light of above quote, the talk of teacher of this study can be seen as important from the perspective of 'class organisation'. After listening the audio lecture, it comes to know that the teacher is consuming maximum talk time on one hand. But on the other hand, we also find that the class is well managed. All of the students are listening attentively to the teacher. They are also answering teacher's questions. This means that the teacher talk, even being more than the students' talk, is meaningful for the learners.

Nunan (1991) permits teachers to use maximum amount of talk time if it is appropriate. To determine the appropriateness of the talk, Nunan introduces three factors i.e. (i) it should be relevant to the point in lesson in which the talk occurs, (ii) it should be planned and should not cause digression and (iii) it should provide 'potential input for target language'.

When we listen the audiolecture we find that, no doubt, the teacher has used maximum amount of talk time. But when we see that all of the points, discussed by the teacher, are relevant to the topic and the lecture is well planned and there is no digression in the lecture, we cannot help saying that the teacher's talk is appropriate. However, the audio of the lecture also shows that the teacher is using Urdu language which is an L2 of the learners (Punjabi is their L1). Therefore, he is not fulfilling the third criteria of appropriateness i.e. providing the 'potential input of target language'. The reasons for not using target language need to be explored. Some of the reasons, given in previous studies, might include common practices by the Pakistani teachers i.e. 'doing a lesson' or 'doing grammar' which comprise of a set of activities e.g. reading of the texts aloud, telling the meanings and interpreting the texts in Urdu or other local languages. Due to these practices, Urdu is used as a dominant language in the language classrooms in Pakistan (Shamim, 2008). In addition, most of the students in Pakistan study in non-elite English or Urdu medium schools where the teachers' proficiency in English is limited which

restricts the use of English language in the classrooms for communication purpose (Shamim, 1993; Shamim & Allen, 2000).

However, setting the last factor (i.e. not providing target language input) aside, it can be said that the teacher talk is appropriate which has been helpful in organising and managing the class and the acquisitioning/learning process. For, it was well planned, relevant to the topic and free from digression.

5.2 Teachers' questions

The second question was raised to know, 'what type of teachers' questions is frequently asked in a Pakistani secondary level language classroom'? In this regard, results of the study revealed that Pakistani secondary level teachers asked elicitation question most frequently as compared to display or referential questions.

To Chaudron (1988) and Nunan (1991) elicitation is unacceptable. To Chaudron this technique is unacceptable because he appreciates the role of a teacher as a guide for the students toward the specific bits of information or knowledge. Whereas, Nunan criticises this technique for being the wastage of time in extracting such information, from the learners, as can well be provided by the teachers.

Nunan (1991) suopprts the use of referential questions in the language classroom. Referential questions are such questions as for which the teacher does not know the answer. These questions activate learners' thinking ability and prompt the learners to provide longer and syntactically complex responses (Brock, 1985, 1986; Nunan, 1991). Therefore, Pakistani teachers, in a language classroom, should increase the number of referential questions for better results. For, these questions prompt complex and lengthy responses (Barnes, 1969; Long & Sato, 1983), ensure genuine communication based on learners' personal viewpoints as well as life experiences (Ho, 2005) which, in turn may enhance the speaking ability of the learners (Brock, 1985, 1986). According to Gerot (1990), teachers' questions have been the focus of attention for the researchers (e.g. Good & Brophy, 1987; Nunan, 1991; Richards & Lockhart, 1994; Rowe, 1974, 1986; Suter, 2001; Xiao-Yan, 2006) for many years. According to Richards and Lockhart (1994), teachers take more than half of the total class time in questioning-answering sessions. Good and Brophy (1987) have criticised the teacher questions on grounds that the said questions seem more like an oral test and are parrot like sessions. Moreover, teachers' questions are boring which, most of the time, accomplish very little. They assess factual knowledge and mere discussions based on questions become fragmented rituals rather than a meaningful learning process. Suter (2001) critisises the use of questions in the classroom saying, "asking questions is neither the only nor the best stimulus to set classroom interaction in motion" (p. 8). However, despite this criticism, no one can deny the fact that teachers' questions

are the only way by which the teachers can assess what the learners know (Wu, 1993). That is why the tendency to ask many questions is common among teachers (Chaudron, 1988; Richards & Lockhart, 1994) particularly, to maintain interaction in the classrooms (Xiao-Yan, 2006). Therefore, teacher questions can be used as a meaningful tool for a better teaching-learning process if the teacher is able to skillfully manage 'distribution of questions' and 'wait time'. So far as the distribution of questions is concerned, in the view of Nunan, the teacher should distribute questions among the maximum number of students in the classroom (1991). It will be helpful to engage passive learners (Good & Brophy, 1987). Similarly, wait time is also very helpful to increase learners' participation, increase in average length of responses, increase in speculative responses, increase in student-teacher comparison data, increase in student-initiated questions and decrease in failure to respond (Rowe, 1974, 1986). Therefore, the teachers, in a language classroom should increase wait time to maximise facilitations (Nunan, 1991). For, in the view of Nunan greater processing time is required to interpret and comprehend questions in a foreign or second language classroom. The question remains that how much wait-time should a language teacher increase. In this regard, Rowe (1974, 1986) recommends 3-5 seconds.

5.3 Teachers' feedback on learners' performance

The third question of this study aimed to know 'how do the teachers provide feedback on learners' performance in a Pakistani secondary level language classroom'. The results reveal that the Pakistani secondary level language teacher provides feedback on learners' performance using words like; good, right, ok, and correct. This type of feedback, in the view of Nunan (1991), is romantic. In fact, feedback means the evaluation of the learners' response by their teachers (Cook, 2016) and giving feedback on learners' performance is a significant aspect of teaching (Xiao-Yan, 2006). Therefore, the teachers should avoid using traditional words to which Nunan (1991) calls 'romantic'.

Actually, Nunan idealises positive feedback. Positive feedback, in Nunan's view, has two functions i.e.: (a) it lets the learners know that they have performed correctly; and (b) it motivates the learners. According to Nunan (1991) 'effective praise' by Brophy (1981) has both of these functions. Brophy's effective praise: is given contingently; specifies learners' achievements; shows the signs of credibility, spontaneity and variety; gives information about the learners' achievement as well as competence; refers to the context for praising achievements; appreciates significant efforts during difficult hours; attributes learners' achievements to their abilities as well as efforts and expects more from them in future; and cultivates endogenous attributes among the learners i.e. they think that they make efforts on learning tasks because they enjoy in doing so.

Brophy (1981) differentiates effective praise from ineffective one. Ineffective praise: is provided in unsystematic as well as random ways; appreciates without mentioning learners' performance; does not provide any information about learners' status; tends to compare or compete the learners with others; uses others' achievements as a context; is given without any reference to the learners' efforts; attributes learners' achievements to their abilities supplemented with external factors like easiness of the task or luck and cultivates exogenous attributes among the learners i.e. they start thinking that they put efforts to the tasks for external factors e.g. competition, teacher's pleasure or rewards.

Feedback, as mentioned earlier, is a type of evaluation (Cook, 2016) which informs the learners about how well or poor they have performed (Ur, 2008) utilising different procedures, techniques and tools to collect as well as interpret information about what the learners can and cannot achieve. The evaluation of learners' performance by the teachers helps enhance EFL learning. Therefore, teacher talk should be full of encouragement, confirmation and approval. Commonly used assessment words or phrases include: (a) confirmation (e.g. good, excellent, that is perfectly correct, no, that is wrong; (2) encouragement (don't worry, that wasn't very good, you can better do that, you fool, idiot, stupid etc.) (Xiao-Yan, 2006).

5.4 Pakistani classroom problems

The last sub question of the study intended to investigate about 'what are the main Pakistani language classroom management problems and how they can be overcome'? In the view of Ahmad et al., teachers in Pakistani classrooms face classroom management problems (2012).Classes are overcrowded. Practice of planning in advance is rare. Training is ideal. The learners are neither told about expectations and nor they are praised for appropriate behaviour. These things make the classroom such a place where information is conveyed to the learners without any consideration for rules, regulations or ethics (Rashid, Abbas, Hussain, Khalid & Salfi, 2014). Classrooms are dominated by 'teacher-led activities' and topic selection is controlled by teachers (Shamim & Allen, 2000). Common classroom practices, in Pakistan, involve teachers' concentration on 'doing grammar' or 'doing a lesson'. 'Doing a lesson' mainly involves a predictable set of activities i.e. reading a text aloud by teachers and/or students; explaining the text in Urdu or local languages, giving the meanings of difficult words in English and/or Urdu/the local language; and getting the students to do follow-up textbook exercises in their notebooks (Shamim, 2008). In addition, the teachers dictate essays for examination purpose and encourage the students for rote-learning (Shamim, 1993; Shamim & Allen, 2000).

Teaching and learning of English in Pakistani school classrooms indicate that the practice of teaching English in all school types in Pakistan leaves much to be

desired with regard to current principles and practice of English language teaching. (Shamim, 2008). There can be many solutions to be considered for these problems. But in the light of the discussion of this study, teacher-student interaction as well as classroom management, (particularly focusing on the management of the amount and type of teacher talk, using questioning technique and providing feedback on learners' performance), the classroom problems might well be overcome. For, interaction is a vital factor for the development of a good relation between the students and their teachers (Duffy, Warren & Walsh, 2001). The way the students and teachers interact with each other is an important factor in determining the learners' outcomes (Englehart, 2009). In a meta review of 30 variables marked as being most influential to the learning in the literature, Wang, Haertel and Walberg (1990) found student-teacher social interaction to be among the top three most important factors. According to Alerby, the learners rank the relation with the teachers among the most significant parts of their learning experience (2003). In fact, the way the teachers interact with the learners, translates into such products as are important to education (Englehart, 2009). The interaction can well be maintained with the help of teachers' questions, teacher talk and positive feedback on learners' performance (cf. Nunan, 1991) which will further help in the classroom management. Teacher-student interaction and classroom management will further lead to successful language teaching-learning process. For, "classroom management and teacher-student inteaction are integral to sound methodological practice" (Nunan, 1991: 189).

6 Conclusion

Teacher-student interaction and classroom management are important factors for a successful language teaching-learning process. Asking questions from the learners and distributing questions among the maximum number of learners with main focus on asking referential questions, managing the amount of teacher talk appropriately i.e. being relevant to the topic and avoiding digressions in case of spontaneous talk and providing target language input with the help of teacher-talk might help the teachers maintain a positive teacher-student interaction which further might help language classroom management process and that, in turn, might ensure successful language teaching and learning. Moreover, teacher-student interaction might help overcome language classroom problems. Therefore, the study recommends the proper utilsation of teacher-student interaction and classroom management techniques particularly amount and type of teacher talk, teachers' questions, and teachers' feedback on learners' performance.

References

Ababneh, S. M. O. (2012). Towards a better English classroom: Implementing effective classroom management strategies. *International Journal of Education, 4*(4), 300-312. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ije.v4i4.2563

Ahmad, I., Rauf, M., Zeb, A., Rehman, S., Khan, W., Rashid, A., & Ali, F. (2012). Teachers' perceptions of classroom management, problems and its solutions: Case of government secondary schools in Chitral, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. *International Journal of Business and Social Science, 3*(24), 173-181.

Alerby, E. (2003). During the break we have fun: A study concerning pupils' experience of school. *Educational Research, 45*(1), 17-28. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/0013188032000086091

Ali, M. A. (2000). Supervision for teacher development: An alternative model for Pakistan. *International Journal of Educational Development 20*(3)*,* 177-188. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0738-0593(99)00020-6

Allen, J. D. (1986). Classroom management: Students' perspectives, goals, and strategies. *American Educational Research Journal, 23*(3), 437-459. doi: https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312023003437

Barnes, D. (1969). Language in the secondary classroom. In D. Barnes, J. Britton, & H. Rosen (Eds.), *Language, the Learner, and the School* (pp. 11-76). Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books.

Berliner, D. C. (1988). *Effective classroom management and instruction: A knowledge base for consultation.* Washington, DC: National Association of School Psychologists.

Blanchette, J. (2009). Characteristics of teacher talk and learner talk in the online learning environment. *Language and Education, 23*(5), 391-407. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/09500780802691736

Breen, M., & Candlin, C. N. (1987). Which materials? A consumer's and designer's guide. In L. Scheldon (Ed.), *ELT Textbooks and Materials: Problems in Evaluation and Development. ELT Document 126*. London: Modern English Publications.

Brock, C. A. (1985). *The effects of referential questions on ESL classroom discourse.* Department of English as a Second Language, University of Hawaii at Manoa.

Brock, C. A. (1986). The effects of referential questions on ESL classroom discourse. *TESOL Quarterly, 20*(1), 47-59. doi: https://doi.org/10.2307/3586388

Brophy, J. (1981). Teacher praise: A functional analysis. *Review of Educational Research, 51*(1), 5-32. doi: https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543051001005

Brophy, J. E., & Good, T. L. (1970). Teachers' communication of differential expectations for children's classroom performance: Some behavioral data. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 61*(5), 365. doi: https://doi.org/10.1037/h0029908

Brophy, J. E., & Good, T. L. (1974). *Teacher-student relationships: Causes and consequences.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Brown, H. D., & Lee, H. (1994). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (Vol. 1). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.

Callahan, J. F., & Clark, L. H. (1998). *Teaching in the middle and secondary schools.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

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

Cook, V. (2016). *Second language learning and language teaching.* New York: Routledge. Cooke, N. J. (1994). Varieties of knowledge elicitation techniques. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies, 41*(6), 801-849. doi: https://doi.org/10.1006/ijhc.1994.1083

Cornbleth, C., & Korth, W. (1980). Teacher perceptions and teacher-student interaction in integrated classrooms. *Journal of Experimental Education, 48*(4), 259–263. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/00220973.1980.11011743

Drudy, S., & Chanthain, M. U. (2002). Gender effects in classroom interaction: Data collection, self-analysis and reflection. *Evaluation and Research in Education, 16*(1), 34–50. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/09500790208667005

Duffy, J., Warren, K., & Walsh, M. (2001). Classroom interactions: Gender of teacher, gender of student, and classroom subject. *Sex Roles, 45*(9-10), 579-593. doi: https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1014892408105

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

Ellis, R. (1994). The study of second language acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University.

Englehart J. M. (2009). Teacher–student snteraction. In L.J. Saha & A.G. Dworkin (Eds), International Handbook of Research on Teachers and Teaching. Springer International Handbooks of Education, vol 21 (pp. 711-722). Boston: Springer, Boston. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-73317-3_44

ESL Focus. (2017, January 1). *Techniques for eliciting.* Retrieved on May 8, 2019 from http://www.eslfocus.com/articles/techniques_for_eliciting_-445.html

Farris, P. J. (1996). *Teaching, bearing the torch.* Madison, WI: Brown & Benchmark Publishers.

Feng, Q. (2007). *A study on teacher talk in intensive reading class of English majors* (*Master Thesis).* Central China Normal University, Wuhan, China.

Gerot, L. (1990). A question of legitimate answers (doctoral dissertation). Macquarie University, Sydney.

Goddard, R. D., Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, W. K. (2001). A multilevel examination of the distribution and effects of teacher trust in students and parents in urban elementary schools. *The Elementary School Journal, 102*(1), 3–17. doi: https://doi.org/10.1086/499690

Good, T., & Brophy, J. (1987). *Looking in classroom.* New York: Harper and Row.

Harmer, J. (2000). How to teach English Beijing. *Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press, 5*, 1-2.

Ho, D. G. E. (2005). Why do teachers ask the questions they ask? *RELC Journal, 36*(3), 297-310. doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688205060052

Ilatov, Z. Z., Shamai, S., Hertz-Lazarovitz, R., & Mayer-Young, S. (1998). Teacher-student classroom interactions: The influence of gender, academic dominance, and teacher communication style. *Adolescence, 33*(130), 269–277.

Jing, N., & Jing, J. (2018). Teacher talk in an EFL classroom: A pilot study. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 8*(3), 220-234. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0803.07

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

Long, M. H., & Porter, P. A. (1985). Group work, interlanguage talk, and second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly, 19*(2), 207-228. doi: https://doi.org/10.2307/3586827

Long, M., & Sato, C. (1983). Classroom foreigner talk discourse: Forms and functions of teachers' questions. In H.W. Seliger & M.H. Long, *Classroom-Oriented Research in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 268-286). Newbury, UK: Rowley.

Martin, N., & Yin, Z. (1997). *Attitudes and beliefs regarding classroom management style: Differences between male and female teachers*. Paper presented at the 20th annual meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, Austin, TX (ERIC Document Reproduction Series No. ED 404738).

Muhammad, T. & Ismail, M. (2001). *Violence against children within the family & in schools.* Committee on the Rights of the Child. September 28. OHCHR, Geneva: NGOs Coalition on Child Rights-Pakistan. No. 2.

Nunan, D. (1987). Communicative language teaching: Making it work. *ELT Journal*, *41*(2), 136-145. doi: https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/41.2.136

Nunan, D. (1990). Action research in the language classroom. In J. Richards and D. Nunan (Eds*), Second Language Teacher Education.* Cambridge University Press.

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

Omar, H. E. H. (2000). Improving the quality of learning: Global education as a vehicle for school reform. *Theory into Practice 39*(2): 97-103. doi: https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip3902_6

Rashid, K., Abbas, A., Hussain, A., Khalid, N., & Salfi, N. A. (2014). Perceptions of students about classroom management as a contributing factor towards learning at secondary school. *Journal of Education and Human Development, 3*(2), 713-728.

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

Richards, J. C., Platt, J., & Platt, H. (1992). *Language teaching and applied linguistics.* London: Longman.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge university press.

Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. W. (2010). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics.* London, New York: Pearson.

Rowe, M. B. (1974). Wait-time and rewards as instructional variables, their influence on language, logic, and fate control: Part one--wait-time. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 11*(2)*,* 81-94. doi: https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.3660110202

Rowe, M. B. (1986). Wait time: slowing down may be a way of speeding up! *Journal of Teacher Education, 37*(1), 43-50. doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/002248718603700110

Saad, I. (1999). *Education in Pakistan. Pakistan prospects and perspectives.* Karachi: Royal.

Shamim, F. (1993). Teacher-learner behaviour and classroom processes in large ESL classes in Pakistan (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), School of Education, University of Leeds, UK.

Shamim, F. (2008). Trends, issues and challenges in English language education in Pakistan. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 28*(3), 235-249. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/02188790802267324

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.

Suter, C. (2001). *Exploring teachers' questions and feedback.* Retrieved on May 20, 2019 from https://www.birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/college-artslaw/cels/essays/languageteaching/suter1.pdf

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

Ur, P. (2008). *A course in language teaching.* Stuttgart, Germany: Ernst Klett Sprachen.

Wang, M. C., Haertel, G. D., & Walberg, H. J. (1990). What influences learning? A content analysis of review literature. *The Journal of Educational Research, 84*(1), 30-43. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.1990.10885988

Wolfgang, C. H., & Glickman, C. D. (1980). *Solving discipline problems: Strategies for classroom teachers.* Allyn and Bacon, Inc., Longwood Division, College and Professional Publications, 470 Atlantic Avenue, Boston, MA 02210.

Wu, K. Y. (1993). Classroom interaction and teacher questions revisited. *RELC Journal, 24*(2), 49-68. doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/003368829302400203

Xiao-Yan, M. A. (2006). *Teacher talk and EFL in university classrooms* (Unpublished master's Thesis)*.* Chongqing Normal University & Yangtze Normal University, China.

Contacts

Muhammad Ahmad, Aleem Shakir, Ali Raza Siddique
Department of Applied Linguistics
Government College University
Faisalabad
Pakistan (38000)
ahmad453@yandex.com