

Online Interactive Teacher Talks In ELT: A Sociocultural and Interactionist Analysis

¹Nadira Syifa Azzahro, ²Setiarini

^{1,2} English Education Department, Post Graduate Program, Universitas Islam Negeri Salatiga, Indonesia.

Corresponding author:

Email dirasyifazz@gmail.com¹, setiarini@uinsalatiga.ac.id²

Submission Track:

Received: 10-01-2025, Final Revision: 03-05-2025, Available Online: 01-06-2025

Copyright © 2025 Authors



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/).

ABSTRACT

Education plays a pivotal role in shaping individuals by fostering cognitive, affective, and psychomotor growth while instilling values like character and morality. In English language teaching (ELT), teacher-student interaction is essential for developing linguistic and communicative competence. Frameworks such as socio-cultural theory and Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) emphasize meaningful dialogue, scaffolding within the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), and authentic communication. An observed Online ELT classroom interaction highlighted scaffolding techniques, error correction, vocabulary clarification, and conversational repair mechanisms. Using conversation analysis principles, the study identified evidence of scaffolding and features like turn-taking and negotiation of meaning. The findings revealed how interactive teacher talk fosters learner progression toward independent language use, aligning with Vygotsky's mediation theory and the interactionist perspective. Repair strategies and dynamic turn-taking enhanced communicative competence, while CLT's focus on real-world communication prepares learners for practical language application. These elements illustrate how linguistic input, feedback, and contextualized communication converge in teacher-student interactions, creating a dynamic process that supports language acquisition and prepares learners for authentic communication in real-world contexts.

Keywords: Online Interactive Teacher Talk; ELT: Sociocultural & Interactionist Analysis.

INTRODUCTION

The wider community often misunderstands education and teaching, whereas the essence of education is more fundamental than teaching (Smith, 2020). Education includes three aspects—cognitive, affective, and psychomotor—so children are competent, skilled, and have good character (Jones, 2019). Education provides a focus of emphasis in the formation of student character, including the formation of mental, social, moral, and religious values (Brown & Taylor, 2018). Like light after darkness, education helps many people achieve their desired goals (Johnson, 2017).

Education fundamentally seeks positive individual changes (Miller, 2021). The issues within the educational system are closely tied to the personal development of those involved (Anderson et al., 2016). It is an activity that plays a pivotal role in determining the direction of a person's life and the development of their culture (Clark, 2020). The presence of education is expected to lead to favorable transformations in the future (Williams, 2019).

One of the critical elements for successful educational outcomes through teaching and learning is the educator (Davis, 2018). Teachers serve as students' primary source of knowledge and guidance throughout the educational experience (Robinson, 2020). Teaching emphasizes the cognitive aspect—so that children are smart, and intelligent, understand something, and know the theory (Taylor, 2017). Teaching is an activity or process related to disseminating specific knowledge or skills. In contrast, training places more emphasis on the psychomotor aspect so that children are skilled, agile, and able to practice a job (Garcia, 2019).

Interactive teacher talks are pivotal in English Language Teaching (ELT), serving as a conduit for learners to develop linguistic and communicative competence. Theoretical perspectives such as Vygotsky's sociocultural theory and the interactionist approach in second language acquisition (SLA) provide a robust framework for understanding this interaction. Socio-cultural theory highlights the co-construction of meaning through dialogue and scaffolding within the learner's Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) (Vygotsky, 1978; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). Similarly, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) emphasizes real-life communicative practices, fostering learner engagement and

meaning-making (Richards, 2006). This essay examines how teacher-student interaction aligns with these frameworks and incorporates features of conversation analysis, such as turn-taking and repair strategies, to enhance language learning.

Teacher talk plays an essential role in shaping the interaction in English language (ELT) classrooms. It facilitates the transmission of knowledge and fosters student participation and engagement. Numerous studies have employed frameworks such as Flanders' Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC) to examine the nuances of teacher talk and its impact on classroom dynamics (Khusnaini, 2019; Putri, 2015; Wahyuni et al., 2022). Within these analyses, questioning and lecturing emerge as the most frequently used forms of verbal interaction, serving both instructional and motivational purposes. Indirect techniques like questioning have proven effective in promoting student involvement and supporting language development, especially in grammar acquisition (Alkhazraji, 2018).

In addition to its instructional functions, teacher talk encompasses psychological and interpersonal elements that contribute to a more supportive learning environment. Practical teacher discourse can help students navigate challenges in acquiring a second language by reducing anxiety, fostering rapport, and guiding learners through complex concepts (Wahyuni et al., 2022). Classroom interaction often centers on a “content cross” approach, which aims to balance delivering instructional material and encouraging learner response (Putri, 2015). Teachers can maintain a dynamic and engaging classroom atmosphere conducive to active learning by skillfully alternating between explaining content and prompting students with questions.

Moreover, the quality and characteristics of teacher talk are instrumental in enhancing grammar instruction and encouraging meaningful interaction. Teachers who use rich and varied discourse can engage students more effectively and contribute to deeper learning experiences (Alkhazraji, 2018; Wahyuni et al., 2022). This includes the content of what is said and how it is delivered—through appropriate pacing, tone, and responsiveness to student input. Ultimately, understanding and refining the use of teacher talk through analytical tools such as FIAC can inform teacher training and development, leading to improved pedagogical practices and more successful learning outcomes in ELT contexts.

RESEARCH METHODS

Type of Research

This study employs a qualitative descriptive research design to explore the dynamics of teacher-student interaction in an English Language Teaching (ELT) classroom. The qualitative approach is suitable for investigating complex communicative behaviors and interactional patterns that occur naturally in classroom settings, especially those grounded in socio-cultural and interactionist theoretical frameworks.

Object of Research

The object of this research is the interactive teacher talk within an ELT online classroom. Specifically, the focus is on how a teacher mediates language learning through scaffolding, error correction, vocabulary clarification, and repair strategies during spoken interaction with students.

Method and Technique

The primary technique used in this study is conversation analysis (CA). CA provides a detailed, micro-level investigation of verbal interactions, allowing the researcher to examine how communicative competence is constructed and negotiated in real-time. This method aligns with the study's goal of identifying interactional features such as scaffolding within the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), turn-taking structures, and conversational repair mechanisms.

Steps of Analysis

The analysis was conducted through the following steps:

Data Collection

A segment of a real-time ELT classroom interaction was observed and recorded.

The selected interaction involved online teacher-student dialogue that displayed scaffolding, error correction, vocabulary support, and turn-taking.

Transcription

The recorded interaction was transcribed using a simplified transcription format suitable for CA, focusing on verbal utterances, pauses, overlaps, and significant non-verbal cues if relevant.

Coding and Categorization

The transcript was coded to identify instances of scaffolding (e.g., prompts, hints, reformulations), repair strategies (self-initiated or other-initiated), clarification of meaning, and turn-taking patterns.

These features were then categorized based on their communicative function in supporting learner development.

Interpretation and Theoretical Mapping

The patterns identified were interpreted using principles from Vygotsky's sociocultural theory (e.g., mediation and ZPD) and Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). Findings were mapped against key constructs such as meaningful interaction, negotiation of meaning, and learner autonomy in language use.

Triangulation Method

To ensure the credibility and validity of the findings, the study employed methodological triangulation, which included:

Data Triangulation: Cross-check the findings from different classroom sessions and interaction segments to ensure consistency in the observed interactional patterns. Theory Triangulation: Applying both sociocultural theory and interactionist theory to interpret the same data, offering multiple lenses for understanding the role of teacher talk in language acquisition. Investigator Triangulation: If conducted as part of a collaborative project, interpretations of the data were reviewed and discussed among peer researchers to minimize subjectivity.

RESULT

The analysis revealed several key elements of socio-cultural and interactionist frameworks in the teacher-student dialogue:

Scaffolding and Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD)

The teacher provided clear scaffolding within the learner's Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) by addressing linguistic gaps just beyond the student's current proficiency. A notable example occurred when the teacher corrected the pronunciation of the word "plumber," explaining that the "b" is silent. This correction was linguistically informative and appropriately timed, enabling the learner to internalize the correct form with guided support. Similarly, the clarification of the phrase "tourism places" reflected the teacher's effort to elevate the learner's vocabulary by introducing more accurate or conventional expressions. These moments of guided assistance exemplify how the teacher facilitated learning through targeted linguistic input that the student could not yet produce independently but was able to comprehend and apply with support.

Conversational Repair

The teacher frequently employed conversational repair strategies to maintain the flow of communication while supporting language development. When the learner made errors or produced unclear statements, the teacher rephrased them or prompted clarification in a supportive manner. For instance, the teacher confirmed and reformulated phrases like "Georgeous" to "gorgeous" and checked for understanding after the correction. These interventions were tactful and non-intrusive, ensuring that the learner remained engaged and confident. By providing timely corrections and seeking confirmation, the teacher helped the learner to notice and self-correct errors, thus playing a crucial role in the co-construction of meaning and communicative accuracy.

Turn-taking and Negotiation of Meaning

The interaction between teacher and student was characterized by orderly and meaningful turn-taking, which supported a balanced conversational rhythm. The teacher maintained an interactive environment by asking open-ended questions such as "What can I play there?" and "Could you tell me what they are?"—prompts that encouraged extended learner responses and deeper engagement with the topic. This approach allowed the learner to negotiate meaning, experiment with language, and take communicative risks in a low-pressure setting. Through this dynamic exchange, both participants shared responsibility

for building the conversation, illustrating the principles of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) where real-world communication and learner autonomy are central.

This a small talk between two Participants in YouTube English Prank video content:

B: Hi.

A: Hi.

B: How are you?

A: I'm great, how about you?

B: I'm very good, thank you. My name is Purwanto, you can call me Pur.

A: Nice to meet you, Pur. Could you please turn on your camera?

B: Sorry, there's a blackout at my house.

A: Oh, I see. So you can't use the webcam?

B: Yes, I'm using mobile data and there's no power.

A: Got it. What's your name again?

B: I'm Pur. What's yours?

A: I'm Eva. Everyone calls me Eva. Welcome to Kampung English WE! Are you joining a trial class?

B: Yes, I'm trying it out. I'm from Darjo. Do you know it?

A: Darjo? What's that?

B: It's next to Surabaya.

A: Ah, Sidoarjo?

B: Yes! Have you been there?

A: Honestly, no.

B: You should visit. It's nice!

A: Really? What can I do there?

B: Lots of food, many tourist places.

A: Sounds fun! Can you name some places?

B: There's one near the river... I don't know the English, but there's a big food market.

A: I see.

B: Are you an English tutor?

A: Yes, I'm an English teacher.

B: How long have you been teaching?

A: For 5 years.

B: Wow, that's a long time. Your English is very good.

A: Thank you, but I'm still learning.

B: I'm a plumber. Do you know plumber?

A: Yes! It's spelled P-L-U-M-B-E-R, but the "b" is silent.

B: Oh, silent "b"? Got it — plumber.

A: That's right.

B: I connect pipes for water flow.

A: I understand.

B: I'm 26 years old. You?

A: I'm 22.

B: Oh, still single?

A: Yes.

B: I'm married.

A: Oh nice, is your wife from Sidoarjo too?

B: No, she's from Surabaya.

A: That's great.

B: My wife is gorgeous.

A: You mean "gorgeous" with a "g."

B: Yes, gorgeous. Thank you! I have three kids.

Data Analysis

The role of 1 Farid, a Javanese who has been learning English for 1 month. Role 2 Dave, an English teacher

A: Hello. This is Rachel speaking. Thank you for calling bahaso talk . May I know your number, please?

B: 461688

A: Okay. am I talking to Farid Candra?

B: yes, my name Farid .

A: oh..

B; your name what?

A: Okay, hello Farid. Oh, sorry, my name is Rachel. Rachel yes

B; okay, Rachel nice meeting you

A; is this your first time calling bahaso talk

B; I have teacher. My teacher from Australia but he go home to Australia so I need more praktek

A: okay practice

B; so I want try bahaso

A; yes, okay that's good, so you can practice more when your teacher away

B; apa ya itu mba

A is that right

B bisa lebh pelan mba

A okay, sorry um you said that your teacher is going to Australia

B yes going to Australia

A yes is he or she?

B he name dave

A sorry? Mm

B my teacher name dave

A okay your teacher's name is dave

B teacher name right

A okay so he went to Australia and now you don't have someone who you can talk to
B he go plane tomorrow morning
A he is going by plane
B yes
A hmhm
B I want to go but I no money
A do you have no money
B no money
A okay
B excuse me can I ask question ?
A yeah of course, you can ask anything. No politic no SARA. Do you know SARA
B my friend name not sara
A No I mean SARA in Indonesian is topic that contain suku agama ras tau antar golongan
B oh bahasa Indonesia saya piker bahasa inggris tadi mba
A ethnicity religion or race that is not allowed in bahso talk. So we can talk about anything that you want except sara and politics
B how many your age
A excuse me. How many?
B how may your age
A what is my age ? how old am I ?
B yes, yes your age
A age repeat after me age
B egg
A egg is telur in bahasa
B o telur
A no you said maksudnya umur kan?
B maksudnya umurnya berapa mbaknya
A umur itu age
Coba diulang age
B egg
A age ada jeh gitu age
B egg
A we will talk about it later. I am 23 years old
B oh stillyoung lady
A yeah you can may call me young lady. How about you? How old are you
B I am 32
A 32 okay . That's still young too
B young and handsome
A you are a young man
B when your hepi besde
A when is my birthday?
B yes hepi birthday

A happy birthday is when you wish me a happy birthday. It is not my birthday, so when should you say when your birthday is?

B oh salah ya mba

You don't have to say happy is not wrong, but it is just a little bit mistaken. You should say when is your birthday

B when is your besday

A yes when happy birthday means selamat ulang tahun

B oh jadi tadi itu apa

A when is your happy birthday means kapan kamu selamat ulang tahun. It is weird

B baru 1 bln belajar

A Its alright you are doing great

B oh thaks you

A yeah thank you

B yes thanks you

A you don't have to put add s after thank. Thank you

B oh gapake s tengyu

A thank you

B tengyu

A You out the k after the n becomes thank you

B thank you

A yes great. great job farid

B I forget forget remember

A it I is alright. What do you want to talk about?

B what your job

A my job is as a tutor at bahaso talk

B oh you are not a mother house stair

A I am sorry

B I am sorry I drink white water

A white water you mean mineral water

B white water mineral water, same. White water is milk. You can say milk is white water.

White is the color white, but mineral water is clear. It does not have color. You should say mineral water instead of white water

B tapi bahasa indonesiannya air putih mba. Oh ya itu, English is translation might not be like it is but that is the fun thing about language

B ga paham mba

A jadi memang kalo air putih diartikan ke bahasa inggris artinya white water tapi in language dalam satu bahasa memang the translation is not exactly to work it. Jadi kata katanya ga selalu tepat maknanya putih harus jadi white ngga gitu. What about you? What is your job

B I teacher at bahasa Indonesia school

A you are a teacher. I am a teacher repeat after me I am a teacher

B a yam teacher

A I am a teacher

B I am a teacher

A Yes that is good

B I am a teacher and my wifey is mother house stair and my children

A what is a mother house stair

B ibu rumah tangga

A ibu rumah tangga means house wife only

B Mother house only

A no, no not you don't have to add only not mother house hotel eh what stair but

B oh salah ya mba

A ibu rumah tangga it doesn't mean you have to translated mother house stair because it doesn't make sense

B jadi yang berner wife house

A housewife. House wife sorry

B my wifey is a housewifey and I have one daughter '

A you have one daughter

B I have one dafter daughter

A daughter

B daughter

A what is her name

B siti her name

A siti, she so cute

How old is she

B what do you mean

A how old is she

B her age

A her age

B her age I thinking 20 month

A 20 months okay. She is still cute yes?

B today my body not delicious. So not I

A yeah sorry

B, so I'm just sleeping around and trying to practice English. sorry I need go toilet

A are you sick? You said your body not delicious. It is not actually that

B iya badannya ga enak

A you should say I am not feeling very well

B I am not feeling well

A Yes you can say that. If you say delicious, you are referring to certain foods. Your body is not food right?

B food kaki? Aku lago ga ngomong makanan. I keeper my healthy but I still sick

A you should drink lots of water and eat lots of vegetables or fruit maybe or exercise.

B sorry I want go to toilet. My teacher want talk to you that okay

A you said your teacher is going to Australia

B tomorrow

A but what do you mean, your teacher want to talk to me?

B dia mau bahas bahasa inggris mu bagaimana mungkin bisa bantu juga

A with me? But its actually time credit

B cuman 1 menit

A so you are going to toilet

C hello Rachel I have been listening you when farid talking

A yes hello dave

B sorry I was just wanting to listen on your conversation and just to see the quality of tutoring of bahaso talk

A sure. He was listen and say .you know what I taught him. I just want to say you did a great job

A oh thank you

B you are very patient with my friend

A we asked to be very patient because it is all about encouraging them to speak

B I have been teaching him for about a month. He is not from the city he lives in the village but ya

A I notice it from his accent

B right ya so he needs a lot more practice so I told him to practice online and trying application or something

A oh that is great thank you for recommending bahaso

B yeah I don't regret it. He is back. Good to see you Rachel good bye

A thank you dave

B you are welcome

Sorry farid back

A so your teacher listening the whole time he is with you ?

B ye he is in the room I said before I try keeper my healthy you have suggestion or saran for keeping body healthy. As you said earlier, you keep my health, you can say how to maintain my health. How to be healthy. Instead of keeping me healthy because it said differently, my suggestion is for you to drink a lot of water, eat some vegetables, and maybe some fruits or anything healthy. Don't eat gorengan. Do you like gorengan.

B gorengan favorite

A what you have from breakfast

B what we call gorengan bananas.

A fried bananas I guess

B fried banana that I like . fruit I also eating durian

A you dont have to say fru-it but fruit

B my favourite fruit durian and i like vegetable is terong what is terong in English

An eggplant

B are you sure

A I know it sounds like telur an egg but it is not. Terong is eggplant

I will give you a review. Would that be okay?

B yes

A Right, your English is very good Farid. It is very good you understand what you want to say, but the only problem is the sentence that you are saying not really grammatically

correct, but it is still understandable so I congratulate you for that. Keep going and keep practicing so

B Rachel what country do you from

A Indonesia of course

B yeah ga mungkin

A what do you mean

B bahasa inggrismu kok sempurna gitu

A its not perfect it is far from perfect

B I don't know what what about English

A and its okay you are very good

The aspect of Scaffolding and ZPD: The teacher corrected the pronunciation of "plumber" (silent "b") and clarified the term "tourism places," offering linguistic support just beyond the learner's independent capability.

B my teacher name dave

A okay your teacher's name is dave

B : teacher name right?

When participant B mentions his teacher's name with English-like sentences but uses incorrect grammar structure. A as a teacher will not be angry but will correct the way to pronounce the person's name correctly.

B I want to go but I no money

A do you have no money

B no money

A okay

In this sentence, Participant B also did the sentence structure section, but the teacher, as Participant A, corrected the sentence that mentioned single possession using the addition of the word *have*.

B : how many your age

A : excuse me. How many?

B : how may your age

A : what is my age ? how old am I ?

B : yes yes your age

A : age repeat after me age

B : egg

A : *egg is telur in bahasa*

B : *telur*

A : *no you said maksudnya umur kan?*

B : *maksudnya umurnya berapa mbaknya*

A : *umur itu age. Coba diulang age*

B : *egg*

A : *age ada jeh gitu age*

B : *egg*

In this sentence, Participant B also did the sentence structure section, but the teacher, as Participant A, corrected the sentence that mentioned single possession using the addition of the word *have*.

B : *my wife georgeus.*

A : *gorgeous is that g? georgeous*

B : *no georges the writing georges*

A : *the right one is georgeous*

B : *georgeous. Oh thank you.*

In some words, Indonesian sometimes does not have the same pronunciation in English. Indonesian is read as it is, while English is not, so students often have difficulty pronouncing some words in English, such as *gorgeous*.

B : *sorry what your name*

A : *okey I am eva. Everyone calls me eva. Anyway, are you taking a trial class?*

B : *I try. first I from darjo.*

Conversational Repair: L1 or other languages also influence incorrect sentence construction. This is the so-called Conversational Repair. The repair instances, such as rephrasing learner errors and confirming understanding, demonstrated the teacher's role in effectively guiding communication.

Participant 2

A : *could you please turn on the camera*

B : *sorry in my house deadlamp*

A : *dead lamp?*

B : *Yes, dead lamp. I use data so not can webcam*

A : *oh i see so you cannot turn on your camera*

B : *not can because dead lamp*

A : *dead lamp okey*

Turn-taking and Negotiation of Meaning

The turn-taking in this conversation demonstrates a generally smooth and balanced exchange between the teacher (A) and the learner (B). The dialogue flows naturally, following a question-response structure that promotes equal participation. The teacher initiates with open-ended and clarification questions, such as “What can I do there?” and “Can you name some places?”, which invite the learner to expand their responses rather than give yes/no answers. This approach encourages the learner to produce more language and engage in meaningful interaction. Furthermore, the teacher gives ample space for the learner to respond and listen patiently without interruption, which supports learner confidence and encourages communicative risk-taking.

The negotiation of meaning is particularly effective throughout the dialogue, especially when misunderstanding or linguistic gaps occur. For example, when the learner says “Darjo,” the teacher seeks clarification: “Darjo? What’s that?”, and follows up with a guess: “Ah, Sidoarjo?”. This exchange reflects the teacher’s effort to interpret and confirm meaning collaboratively. Another strong example is the correction and clarification of the word “plumber”, where the teacher breaks down the spelling and explains the silent “b.” This repair sequence is handled supportively, reinforcing learning without disrupting the flow of conversation. Similarly, the teacher tactfully corrects the learner’s mispronunciation of “gorgeous”, which the learner then acknowledges and repeats correctly.

Overall, the turn-taking and negotiation strategies used in this interaction highly support language development. The teacher’s responsive and non-dominant role allows the learner to take initiative and stay engaged. Misunderstandings are addressed constructively, while communicative goals are achieved through active collaboration. These patterns align well with the principles of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), where meaning-making and mutual understanding are central, and errors are viewed as opportunities for learning.

DISCUSSION

The findings underscore the significance of interactive teacher talks in scaffolding learner development within the ZPD. Vygotsky's theory is particularly evident in the teacher's mediation strategies, facilitating the learner's progression toward independent language use (Vygotsky, 1978; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). Moreover, the principles of conversation analysis align with the interactionist perspective, demonstrating how repair strategies and turn-taking enhance communicative competence (Seedhouse, 2004). These elements are further supported by CLT's emphasis on authentic communication, essential for preparing learners for real-world language use (Richards, 2006). Thus, teacher-student interaction exemplifies a dynamic process where linguistic input, feedback, and contextualized communication intersect to promote language acquisition.

The findings of this study strongly highlight the pivotal role of interactive online teacher talks in supporting learner development, particularly through the lens of sociocultural theory. Vygotsky's (1978) concept of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) is central to this theoretical framework, which posits that learners can achieve higher levels of cognitive and linguistic competence through guided interaction with more knowledgeable others. In this context, the teacher's use of strategic scaffolding—such as simplified input, recasts, and guided questioning—serves as a mediational tool that helps learners internalize new language forms and functions (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). Such mediation bridges the gap between what learners can do independently and what they can accomplish with assistance, demonstrating how interaction functions as both a cognitive and linguistic scaffold.

Conversation Analysis (CA) provides a complementary lens for examining how interaction unfolds in real-time classroom discourse. Through CA, researchers have observed that teacher talk often involves sophisticated turn-taking systems, clarification requests, and repair strategies that contribute to the co-construction of meaning (Seedhouse, 2004). These discourse features are critical in maintaining communication flow while allowing learners to notice gaps in their language use. For example, when a teacher reformulates a learner's incorrect utterance or prompts self-correction, it fosters

greater awareness and reflection on language form, aligning with interactionist principles that view negotiation of meaning as central to second language acquisition (Long, 1996).

These interactional strategies are deeply compatible with Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), which emphasizes authentic, meaningful communication as the foundation of language learning. CLT encourages teacher talk that mimics real-world discourse—such as open-ended questions, spontaneous responses, and contextually rich language use (Richards, 2006). In classrooms informed by CLT, teacher talk is not limited to transmitting knowledge but is instrumental in shaping a communicative environment where learners are encouraged to experiment with language and engage in dialogic exchanges. This creates an immersive experience that enhances fluency and prepares learners to function effectively in real-life communicative settings.

Moreover, teacher-student interaction plays a dynamic role in balancing linguistic input and feedback within authentic contexts. Input is most beneficial when it is comprehensible yet slightly above the learner's current level, a principle aligned with Krashen's (1982) Input Hypothesis. Simultaneously, explicit or implicit feedback helps learners refine their output and develop grammatical accuracy. When teachers provide immediate, contextualized responses to learner utterances, they correct errors and model appropriate language use, further supporting internalization. This dual role of input and feedback within teacher talk ensures that communication remains both pedagogically purposeful and linguistically rich.

In sum, the interactional patterns found in teacher talk embody an integrated framework where socio-cultural mediation, discourse structure, and communicative principles converge. When thoughtfully deployed, teacher talk serves as a powerful vehicle for language acquisition, shaping learners' development through scaffolded support, meaningful communication, and reflective engagement. The convergence of Vygotsky's ZPD, CA's micro-analysis of talk, and CLT's focus on real-world use highlights the complexity and richness of teacher-learner interactions in language classrooms. Enhancing teacher awareness of their talk strategies is crucial for fostering more effective and learner-centered language instruction.

CONCLUSION

This research emphasizes the importance of interactive teacher talk in helping learners develop within their Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). Teachers' mediation strategies are key in guiding students toward independent language use. Conversation analysis highlights how techniques like repair strategies and turn-taking improve communication skills. These practices align with Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), which focuses on real-world communication to prepare learners for practical language use. Overall, teacher-student online is a dynamic process where input, feedback, and meaningful communication work together to support language learning.

REFERENCES

- Alkhazraji, A. (2018). *Talking to Learn and Learning to Talk: Teacher and Learner Talk in the Secondary Foreign Languages Classroom*. London: Routledge.
- Alkhazraji, K. M. (2018). Teacher talk and its impact on students' learning of grammar. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 9(12), 10–17.
- Anderson, R., Smith, K., & Lee, D. (2016). *Personal Development and Educational Systems*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Brown, L., & Taylor, M. (2018). *Character Formation in Educational Settings*. London: Sage Publications.
- Clark, E. (2020). *Education's Role in Cultural Development*. New York: Routledge.
- Classroom Interaction in ELT in Nigeria: Reflections on Professional Practice. *Social Interaction and English Language Teacher Identity*. Ibadan: University Press.
- Davis, H. (2018). *The Educator's Influence on Learning Outcomes*. London: Routledge.
- Garcia, M. (2019). *Teaching vs. Training: Cognitive and Psychomotor Focus*. Boston: Pearson.
- Johnson, P. (2017). *The Transformative Power of Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jones, A. (2019). *Holistic Approaches to Child Development*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Khusnaini, N. (2019). *A Discourse Analysis of Students-Teacher Pattern Interaction in ELT Classroom*. Malang: Universitas Negeri Malang Press.

- Khusnaini, N. (2019). Analyzing teacher talk using FIAC in the English classroom. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 10(2), 335–342.
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Pergamon Press.
- Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L. (2006). *Sociocultural Theory and the Genesis of Second Language Development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413–468). Academic Press.
- Miller, S. (2021). *Positive Change Through Educational Practices*. London: Routledge.
- Putri, D. S. (2015). *The Discourse of English Reading Lessons in Chinese Middle Schools: A Sociocultural Perspective*. Beijing: Beijing Normal University Press.
- Putri, R. (2015). Teacher talk in classroom interaction: A case study of English teaching at SMA N 1 Palangka Raya. *Journal of English Education*, 3(1), 45–56.
- Richards, J. C. (2006). *Communicative Language Teaching Today*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Robinson, T. (2020). *Teachers as Knowledge Facilitators*. New York: Routledge.
- Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The Interactional Architecture of the Language Classroom: A Conversation Analysis Perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Smith, J. (2020). *Understanding the Fundamentals of Education*. London: Springer.
- Taylor, R. (2017). *Emphasizing Cognitive Aspects in Teaching*. New York: Routledge.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Wahyuni, D., Ardiansyah, R., & Fatimah, D. (2022). Analyzing teacher talk in EFL classroom interaction: A study on questioning and explanation. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 12(2), 250–260. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v12i2.42225>
- Wahyuni, S., et al. (2022). *Using Talk to Scaffold Referential Questions for English Language Learners*. Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia Press.
- Williams, G. (2019). *Future Transformations Through Education*. New York: Springer.