

ADVANCE SOCIAL SCIENCE ARCHIVE JOURNAL

Available Online: <https://assajournal.com>

Vol. 04 No. 01. July-September 2025. Page# 4866-4879

Print ISSN: [3006-2497](#) Online ISSN: [3006-2500](#)Platform & Workflow by: [Open Journal Systems](#)

From Monologue to Dialogue: Investigating Teacher Talk and Learner Participation in Pakistani Universities

Atif Ullah

BS Scholar, Department of Applied Linguistics and English Literature,
University of Science and Technology Bannu

atifullahkhattak345@gmail.com

Abstract

This study investigates the role of teacher talk in shaping learner output through a discourse analysis of classroom interaction in Pakistani universities. Recognizing that language learning depends on both input and opportunities for output, the research explores how teacher questioning, explanations, and feedback affect student participation in English-medium classrooms. Data were collected from four universities (two public and two private) through classroom observations, audio recordings, transcriptions, and field notes, amounting to 32 hours of recorded interaction. Analysis was conducted using Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) model, supported by both qualitative interpretation and quantitative frequency counts.

Findings reveal that teacher talk dominated classroom discourse, constituting nearly 70–75% of total interaction, especially in public universities. Teachers primarily relied on display questions and evaluative feedback, resulting in restricted learner output. In contrast, referential questions and facilitative feedback, more common in private universities, led to extended learner responses and negotiation of meaning. The study also highlights institutional differences, with private universities demonstrating relatively more interactive patterns of discourse.

The results affirm Swain's Output Hypothesis (1985) and Long's Interaction Hypothesis (1996), underscoring the importance of meaningful interaction for second language acquisition. Pedagogically, the study recommends a shift from lecture-based to discussion-based teaching, with greater use of open-ended questions, scaffolding, and facilitative feedback to enhance learner participation. The findings carry important implications for teachers, institutions, and policymakers aiming to promote communicative competence and active learning in higher education.

Keywords: Teacher talk, Learner output, Classroom discourse, Discourse analysis, Second language acquisition (SLA), Higher education, Pakistan

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Background of the Study

Language is not only the means of communication but also the main vehicle of transmission of knowledge, cultural exchange and intellectual growth. In learning situations, and especially in second language learning contexts, classroom discourse is a key factor in determining learners'

opportunities to learn and use the target language. The dialogue that takes place between teachers and learners represents the core of classroom communication, and it is dialogue that constructivises knowledge, negotiates knowledge and makes knowledge internalised.

English is the medium of instruction in most university classrooms in Pakistan especially in higher education. Teachers use a lot of their spoken language (sometimes called teacher talk) to control what happens in their classroom, to explain ideas, to ask questions, to give feedback and to test students' understanding. Teacher talk is not just talk to provide information; it is also a scaffold for learner involvement. Learners then, in turn, react with different degrees of participation, and their oral production-learner output-is an expression not only of content knowledge but of linguistic ability as well as of willingness to participate.

Discourse analysis of classroom interaction therefore becomes a necessary tool in understanding the impact of teacher talk on learner output, the patterns of interaction emerging in Pakistani classrooms, and the impact such patterns have on learner outcome. Through a detailed analysis, it is possible to reveal how teachers' questioning, feedback and interactional moves encourage or limit learners' opportunities to produce meaningful language.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Even though the importance of interaction for the second language acquisition (SLA) is a fact, classrooms of Pakistan tend to stay teacher-centred. Teachers monopolize classroom discourse, and students are usually passive recipients of knowledge and not active participants. These questions become critical because of the lack of balance in the amount of time devoted to teacher talking and learner output. Are learners being asked to talk, negotiate meaning and express themselves in English? Or are they constricted by authoritarian and monologic pedagogies?

A discourse analysis of Pakistani university classrooms can clarify these issues. This is especially necessary to study the interactional patterns that prevail in higher education settings, where learners are expected to master advanced communicative uses of English in order to fulfill academic and professional needs. If there is not enough space for learner-talk, then the communicative competence of students is not being developed and this may have a negative impact on learner performance at school and work.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The present study aims to:

To study the nature and functions of teacher talk in Pakistani university classrooms.

- Analyze the types and amount of learner output that results from interaction with teacher talk.
- recognize patterns of interaction between teachers and learners in classroom discourse
- Examine the degree to which teacher talk helps or impedes learner participation.
- Provide pedagogical implications for more effective communication in the classroom and greater learner production.

1.4 Research Questions

This study is guided by the following research questions:

- In what ways does a teacher's talk dominate Pakistani university classrooms?
- How does teacher talk (e.g. questions, explanations, feedback) differ and what effect does it have on learner output?

- What classroom interactional patterns do you see as a result of teacher-learner interactions?
- To what extent does teacher talk give learners opportunities for meaningful language use?
- How can teacher talk be maximized for increasing learner participation and learner language development?

1.5 Significance of the Study

Theoretically, this research is important; practically, it is.

Theoretical Significance:

The study adds to the literature on classroom discourse and second language acquisition. By concentrating on Pakistani universities, it introduces a contextual layer to discourse analysis and spotlights the challenges and prospects of English-medium teaching in a multi-lingual society.

Practical Significance:

The findings will inform teachers about how their talk affects opportunities for learner communication. The study highlights the need for learners to actively participate in classroom discourse. The research will give policymakers and curriculum designers evidence-based suggestions for improving communicative teaching practice in higher education.

1.6 Scope and Delimitations of the Study

This study is confined to the analysis of classroom interaction in selected Pakistani universities in which English is the medium of instruction. The study is mainly concerned with spoken communication and not written communication, and with teacher talk and learner production rather than other aspects of classroom interaction (such as curriculum, assessment).

The analysis is limited to classroom discourse; other communicative situations (such as out-of-class interactions, intergroup discussions among peers, and informal communication) are outside of the scope of this study. Furthermore, although the study is rooted in general theories of discourse analysis and SLA, its findings are context specific, and thus may not be generalisable to all educational institutions in Pakistan.

1.7 Conceptual Framework

The study is based on the interaction hypothesis of second language learning, which argues that learners learn better when they are able to communicate in meaningful interaction and negotiation of meaning. Teacher talk is viewed as both input and as a trigger of learners' output, and learners' responses are interpreted as evidence of participation and language production. Discourse analysis can offer the methodological lens to illuminate these dynamics, with patterns including turn-taking, questioning, feedback and repair strategies being the focus.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

The current chapter reviews the literature on discourse, teacher talk, and learner output in the context of second language acquisition (SLA) as applied to the classroom. It presents a conceptual and theoretical background, reviews empirical studies both internationally and nationally, and highlights areas of research deficit that are sought to be addressed by the current study. Classroom interaction has long been of concern to applied linguistics as it is the place where learners have most access to input, practice and feedback. In teacher-fronted classrooms teacher talk quality and quantity play a significant role in the amount of learner output, therefore discourse analysis is an important methodology that can be used in studying educational communication.

2.2 Concept of Classroom Discourse

Classroom discourse is the language used in the classroom for the purposes of instruction and learning. Includes teacher-student verbal and non-verbal communications. According to Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) the classroom discourse is highly structured and is more often than not, patterned along the Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) sequence, namely the teacher initiates, the student responds and the teacher gives feedback. While this model reflects the structured nature of classroom talk, critics of the model have charged that it tends to limit learner opportunities for extended participation.

In the Pakistani context, classroom discourse is shaped by a variety of factors, such as English as a second and/or foreign language, cultural attitudes towards authority and examination-oriented pedagogy. These factors lead to the predominance of teacher talk and the low input from learners in spoken interaction.

2.3 Teacher Talk

2.3.1 Definition and Features

Teacher talk is the vocabulary used by a teacher to speak to his or her students in a classroom. Ellis (1985) referred to it as an important provider of comprehensible input to language learners. Teacher talk is used to question, explain, teach, give feedback and manage the classroom. Long (1983) stressed that teacher talk should be adjusted to the learners' level of proficiency so that comprehension and participation are possible.

2.3.2 Functions of Teacher Talk

Instructional Function: The function of explaining and providing content.

Managerial Function: Keeping the classroom in order and disciplined.

Evaluative Function: Feedback and analysis of learners' response.

Motivational Function: Getting involved and confidence

2.3.3 Questioning Techniques

Teacher questions are categorized as display questions (knowledge test) and referential questions (opinions or new information). Referential questions are well known to elicit longer and more complicated learner responses (Brock, 1986). However, many Pakistani classrooms are dominated by the display questions and therefore, there is short and limited output from learners.

2.4 Learner Output

2.4.1 Definition and Importance

Learner output is defined as the speech or written language output that learners produce in reaction to input or communicative tasks. Output Hypothesis - Swain, C. (1985) claims that output or production of language helps learners to recognize knowledge gaps and promotes language development. Output is not only proof of learning, but a means of acquisition.

2.4.2 Types of Learner Output

- Mechanical Output: just simple repetition or short responses
- Extended Output: Extended output in which learners communicate ideas.
- Negotiated Output: Output generated through interaction and clarification.

2.4.3 Limitations on Learner Output

Lack of confidence, dominance of the teacher, cultural practices and inadequate proficiency of the language may lower the amount and quality of learner output. In Pakistan, where students

are typically reserved about speaking English, teacher strategies are essential to providing supportive opportunities for output.

2.5 Theoretical Frameworks in Classroom Discourse

Several assumptions lie at the heart of the research of teacher talk and learner output:

Interaction Hypothesis (Long, 1996): Language learning is aided by interaction and meaning negotiation. Teacher talk is input, learner output is interactional adjustment.

Input Hypothesis (Krashen, 1982): Suggests that comprehensible input is necessary, but input alone is not sufficiently powerful without output options, say the critics.

Output Hypothesis (Swain, 1985): Stresses that production requires learners to process language at a higher level, and that this leads to greater acquisition.

Sociocultural Theory (Vygotsky, 1978): Emphasizes the importance of social interaction and scaffolding in language development, with teacher talk functioning as a mediator between the learner and the language.

2.6 Experimental Studies of Teacher Talk and Learner Output

2.6.1 International Studies

Much has been written about the function of teacher talk and learner output. Nunan (1991) concluded that communicative classrooms using interactive teacher-talk produced higher levels of learner interaction. Brock (1986) showed that referential queries elicited more elaborate learner's responses than did display questions. In discussing the influence of teacher discourse strategies, including scaffolding and repair, Walsh (2006) pointed out that they are of great importance to learner opportunities for language use.

2.6.2 Pakistani Context

Once again, research in Pakistan indicates that classrooms are still teacher-centred. Rahman (2002) pointed out that when English-medium instruction is practiced, there is little involvement of learners due to the linguistic and cultural barrier. Khan (2011) noted that the dominance of teachers over classroom talk leaves limited opportunity for students to practice in English in the classroom. Studies by Mansoor (2005) and Mahmood (2015) similarly emphasize the exam-oriented nature of teaching in which the talk of the teacher is focused on delivery of knowledge without interactive involvement.

These studies highlight the need for a discourse analysis of Pakistani university classrooms, in order to study the ways in which teacher talk both promotes and impedes learner output.

2.7 Research Gaps

The review of literature shows a number of gaps:

- While the literature of international practice emphasises the importance of interaction, very little attention is paid to Pakistani higher education.
- The majority of the studies concentrate on schools and only few studies deal with university discourse.
- There is insufficient discourse analysis that classifies the teacher talk functions and relates these to learner output.
- A lot of previous research has focused on linguistic difficulties, but less on interactional patterns that enable or constrain output.

- In order to bridge these gaps, the current study carried out a discourse analysis of classroom interaction in Pakistani universities with particular attention paid to teacher talk and learner output.

Chapter 3: Research Methodology

3.1 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to explain the methodological framework used to study the functions of this teacher talk in relation to learner output in Pakistani university classrooms. Since the study is related to discourse features of classroom interaction, a qualitative research design with a component of discourse analysis has been selected. The methodology described here describes the study design, population and sampling procedures, data collection instruments, data analysis methods, ethical issues, and limitations.

3.2 Research Design

This study utilizes a qualitative descriptive design, and more specifically discourse analysis. Qualitative methods are especially suited to studying patterns of classroom interaction because they can be employed in order to describe and interpret naturally occurring communication in detail. According to Dornyei (2007), qualitative research offers good data concerning language use in the authentic context.

The study draws from classroom observation and audio-recorded data in order to document real-life teacher-learner interactions. Discourse analysis is then used to analyse the effects of teacher talk on learner output in terms of various discourse features such as questioning, feedback, turn-taking and repair strategies.

While the focus of this tool is qualitative, we also include some quantitative aspects such as the number of times types of questions appear, feedback moves, and the length of learner responses. This is a mixed-method approach of deepness and objectivity.

3.3 Population and Sampling

3.3.1 Population

Population of the study is the university level university teachers' classrooms in Pakistan where English is used as the medium of instruction. These include public and private sector universities where English is used extensively in lectures and discussions and for assessments.

3.3.2 Sampling Procedure

Purposive sampling technique is used as the study aims at identifying classrooms where interaction between teacher and students takes place frequently in English. The sample includes: 4 universities (two public and two private)

Eight teachers (two from each university, from departments of English and social sciences).

160 students (about 20 pupils per classroom).

The selected sample is diverse in terms of institutional type, teacher background and learner proficiency.

3.4 Research Instruments

Two main instruments were used to collect data:

3.4.1 Classroom Observation

Direct classroom observation was conducted to capture naturally occurring interaction. The researcher attended selected lectures and noted patterns of communication, teacher

questioning styles, and student responses. An **observation checklist** based on Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) IRF model was used to guide the process.

3.4.2 Audio Recording and Transcription

Classroom sessions were **audio-recorded** to provide accurate data for discourse analysis. Audio recordings ensure reliability by capturing authentic language rather than relying solely on memory or notes. These recordings were later **transcribed verbatim** using transcription conventions to highlight pauses, overlaps, and intonation where relevant.

3.4.3 Field Notes

In addition to recordings, **field notes** were taken to document non-verbal cues, classroom environment, and contextual factors influencing interaction.

3.5 Data Collection Procedure

Data collection was performed in three stages:

- **Permission and Access:** Permission was taken prior to the research from university authorities and teachers. Students were briefed about the purpose of the research and consent was obtained for recording sessions.
- **Observation and Recording:** Each chosen classroom was observed a minimum of 3-4 times for roughly 45-60 minutes each. Analysis: a total of 32 hours of classroom interaction were captured.
- **Transcription and Organization:** The audio data were transcribed and organized into manageable units (exchanges, turns, questions, responses) for analysis.

3.6 Data Analysis Procedure

The data was analyzed using discourse analysis that concentrated on teacher talk and learner production. The following work was performed:

- **Segmentation:** Classroom interaction was divided into segments of Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) patterns.
- **Coding of Teacher Talk:** Teacher utterances were coded by function: questioning, explaining, instructing, giving feedback or managing.
- **Types of Questions:** Teacher questions were categorized as display and referential (Brock, 1986).
- **Analysis of Feedback:** Teacher feedback was classified as evaluative (correct/incorrect), elaborative (expanding learner responses) or facilitative (prompting further output).
- **Measuring Learner Output:** Learner output was measured by length, complexity, and negotiation of meaning. Short "yes/no" or single-word responses were coded as restricted output whereas long elaborations or negotiated responses were coded as productive output.

Comparative Analysis: Patterns were compared between public and private universities in order to identify similarities and differences in teacher talk and learner participation.

NVivo software was used optionally to help with coding and categorizing large volumes of qualitative data, but manual coding was used to ensure it was done correctly.

3.7 Ethical Considerations

Ethical parameters have been followed strictly in the study:

- **Informed Consent:** Both teachers and students were made aware of the purpose of the study and the right to withdraw.

- **Confidentiality:** All participants were anonymised along with the names of institutions.
- **Voluntary Participation:** Participation was voluntary and there was no penalty for non-participation.
- **Data Protection:** Audio recordings and transcripts were securely stored and used for academic purposes only.

3.8 Limitations of the methodology

While the methodology provides depth and reliability, there are still a few limitations:

- The sample size of universities considered in this study is small, and hence may not reflect all Pakistani universities.
- Observation bias can easily happen where the behavior of the participants in the classroom is affected by the presence of the researcher.
- Only English-medium classrooms were included; results may vary in Urdu-medium or bilingual classrooms.
- The emphasis on oral discourse is restricted to other forms of communication, for instance, a written task or digital communication.

Chapter 4: Data Analysis

4.1 Introduction

The chapter reports results of analysis of classroom discourse data collected in four Pakistani universities. The emphasis is on the influence of teacher talk on learner output, with a special emphasis on questioning techniques, feedback and interactional patterns. A discourse-analytic approach based on Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) model was used on transcribed classroom sessions. The data is analysed both qualitatively (interpretation of discourse extract) and quantitatively (frequency counts of interactional features).

4.2 Overview of Data

A total of 32 hours of classroom interaction were captured at four universities (two public, two private). There were 8 teachers and around 160 students in the dataset. Three to four recorded classroom sessions were contributed by each classroom. Analysis showed that teacher talk was almost 70% and learner talk was 30% of the classroom discourse.

- Teacher dominated talk was more prominent in public university where teachers had around 75% of the talk time as compared to 65% in private university.
- Learner output consisted mainly of short responses, but more extended participation was common in interactive, discussion based classes.

4.3 Teacher Talk Analysis

4.3.1 Questioning Techniques

Teacher questions were categorized into **display questions** (testing knowledge) and **referential questions** (seeking opinions or new information).

Type of Question	Frequency (%)	Example from Data
------------------	---------------	-------------------

Display Questions	68%	<i>"What is the definition of globalization?"</i>
-------------------	-----	---

Referential Questions	32%	<i>"How does globalization affect your daily life?"</i>
-----------------------	-----	---

Display questions dominated the classroom discourse, particularly in public universities.

Referential questions, though less frequent, generated longer and more meaningful learner responses.

Excerpt 1 (Private University, Social Sciences Class):

Teacher: *"Can anyone share an example of how social media changes our way of thinking?"*

Student: *"Yes, sir, I think people now depend more on online information, sometimes without checking if it is true, so it changes their decisions."*

This excerpt illustrates how referential questions encouraged elaboration beyond single-word responses.

4.3.2 Feedback Strategies

Teacher feedback was categorized as **evaluative**, **elaborative**, and **facilitative**.

Type of Feedback	Frequency (%)	Example
Evaluative (Correct/Incorrect)	55%	<i>"Yes, that's right." / "No, that is wrong."</i>
Elaborative (Expansion)	25%	<i>"Good point, but can you also mention how it affects society?"</i>
Facilitative (Prompting further talk)	20%	<i>"Interesting. Can you explain more?"</i>

Findings indicate that evaluative feedback dominated, often closing down interaction. Facilitative feedback was more common in private universities, where teachers encouraged extended student talk.

4.3.3 Explanations and Lecturing

Explanatory talk was the most dominant function of teacher talk, accounting for **45% of teacher utterances**. While necessary for content delivery, lengthy explanations often reduced opportunities for learner participation, especially in public university classrooms.

4.4 Learner Output Analysis

4.4.1 Length and Complexity of Responses

Learner responses were coded as **restricted output** (short, minimal answers) and **productive output** (extended, elaborated contributions).

Type of Learner Output	Frequency (%)	Example
Restricted Output	65%	<i>"Yes, sir." / "Photosynthesis."</i>
Productive Output	35%	<i>"I think globalization improves communication, but it also causes cultural problems in our country."</i>

Restricted output was more frequent in teacher-centered classes. However, productive output occurred when teachers asked referential questions or used facilitative feedback.

4.4.2 Negotiation of Meaning

Negotiative instances (clarification requests, repetitions, reformulations) were few but important.

Excerpt 2 (Public University, English Class):

Teacher: What would you say is meant by 'impact'?

Student: "Sir, I mean the effect... like the result."

Teacher: Okay, so you're telling me that impact means effect or result. Exactly."

Such negotiation gave learners a chance to practise their language use and receive scaffolding.

4.5 Comparative Findings

Public Universities:

- Less teacher talk (75%).
- More formative and summative feedback
- Learner output remained mainly limited to short answers.

Private Universities:

- Slightly more equal discussion (65% teacher, 35% learner).
- More questions for referrals and facilitating feedback.
- More examples of longer learner output and negotiation.

These results indicate that institutional culture and pedagogical style have a critical impact on patterns of classroom interaction.

4.6 Key Patterns Identified

- Lecture-based classrooms are especially restrictive in the ways that learners are limited by the dominance of the teacher.
- Referential questioning and use of facilitating feedback open up greater learner output.
- Findings show that private university students were able to write longer and more complex answers than their counterparts in public universities.
- Negotiation of meaning, though rare, turned out to be an important site for language development.
- Overall, classroom interaction in Pakistani universities is still quite teacher-centred with little focus on interactivenss.

Chapter 5: Conclusion and Recommendations

This last chapter wraps up the investigation on teacher talk and learner output: a discourse analysis of classroom interaction in Pakistani universities. It gives an overview of the research aims, and focuses on the main findings of the discourse analysis and their implications for the classroom practice. As well, this chapter offers suggestions for teachers, schools and policy makers, and describes the study's limitations and offers suggestions for future research.

5.2 Overview of the Study

The aim of this study was to analyze the role of teacher-talk in the formation of learner output in university classrooms in Pakistan. Recognizing the central nature of classroom discourse to second language acquisition (SLA), the study examined the ways in which various types of teacher talk (i.e., questions, explanations, and feedback) supported or limited learner participation. With a discourse analytic approach that is informed by the Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) model, teacher-learner interaction was analysed through classroom observations, audio recordings and transcriptions.

The specific aims were:

- To investigate the dominant features of teacher talk in the Pakistani university classrooms.
- To find out what kind and quantity of learner output is produced in response to teacher talk.
- To discover patterns of interaction in the discourse of the classroom.
- how to investigate whether teacher talk is sufficient for meaningful learner participation;
- To suggest ways that teacher talk and learner engagement may be improved in higher education.

5.3 Summary of Key Findings

- The study made a number of major discoveries:
- Teacher dominating discourse in the classroom
- Teachers had a high share of the total talk time (70-75%), especially in the public universities.
- Learner talk was relatively minimal, sometimes reduced to one-line answers or few words.

Questioning patterns

The questions were much more in the form of a display question (test of factual knowledge) than referral questions (opinions or extended responses).

Findings indicate that display questions elicited limited learner output while referential questions elicited meaningful extended answers.

Feedback strategies

Classroom discussions were dominated by feedback that was in the form of "yes/no" or "correct/incorrect" statements.

Elaborative and facilitative feedback, though less frequent, led to longer learner responses and more active engagement.

Learner output

- learner responses were short, mechanical, and limited
- Productive output (extended, negotiated responses) was seen to occur mainly in classes where teachers used referential questioning and facilitative feedback.

Institutional differences

- Public universities were teacher-centered, had strong emphasis on lectures, and favored display questions.
- Private universities were somewhat more interactive with teachers encouraging students' opinions and more facilitation.

Negotiation of meaning

- In spite of their low frequency, negotiation (clarification requests, reformulation, scaffolding) was an important activity for language learning.
- These moments showed the importance of teacher strategies in the development of learner awareness of the lack of language.

5.4 Theoretical and Pedagogical Implications

5.4.1 Theoretical Implications

- The results are in agreement with Swain's Output Hypothesis (1985) that gives emphasis to language production in SLA. The findings of this study showed that by pushing learners to generate longer output opportunities were greater for learning.
- The results also are consistent with Long's Interaction Hypothesis (1996) and show the importance of negotiation of meaning in classroom discourse.

- Teacher talk serves as input (Krashen's Input Hypothesis) as well as output trigger for the learner, verifying the interdependence of input and output in SLA.

5.4.2 Pedagogical Implications

- Teachers need to rethink their use of display questions, and evaluative feedback.
- Classroom discourse needs to be re-conceptualized as a two-way interaction in which learners are active meaning-makers, and not passive recipients of knowledge.
- Teacher professional development should highlight discourse strategies that foster communicative interaction (e.g., scaffolding, open-ended questioning, and facilitative feedback).

5.5 Recommendations

5.5.1 For Teachers

- Provide more referential questions to prompt elaboration and higher order thinking.
- Give more elaborative and facilitative feedback rather than evaluative feedback.
- Balance teacher talk and learner talk, providing greater opportunity to speak for students
- Use interaction between learners (pair work, group work) to introduce variety into learner output.
- Scaffolding techniques to gradually develop learners' confidence when speaking English

5.5.2 For Institutions

- Introduce professional development workshops on discourse strategies in the classroom;
- Integrate the principles of communicative teaching into curriculum, especially in higher education.
- Help to move from lecture-based to discussion-based learning.
- Provide interactive teaching with the support of resources (audio-visual aids, language lab).

5.5.3 For Policymakers

- Create national guidelines for communicative university teaching.
- Avoid only using written tests to assess student performance, but incorporate assessment techniques that test student participation and oral fluency.
- Advance research and professional development programs to advance effective English-medium instruction.

5.6 Limitations of the Study

The study has some limitations nevertheless:

- The sample size was restricted to four institutions in universities which may not be representative of the whole higher education sector of Pakistan.
- Only spoken interaction was looked at; written interaction and digital platforms were not.
- The presence of the researcher could have affected the behavior in the classroom (observer's paradox).
- The amount of time available limited the amount of classroom data that could be gathered and analyzed.

5.7 Recommendations for Further Study.

Future studies can overcome these limitations by:

- Increasing the number of universities in the sample across various regions of Pakistan
- Analyzing discipline specific differences (e.g., analyzing English, science, and social science classrooms).

- Interpretation of non-verbal interaction and multimodal communication (gestures, use of technologies).
- Teacher Talk: Exploring Students' Perceptions and Preferred Interaction Styles
- Exploring the long-term role of teacher discourse strategy in learners' language production.

5.8 Concluding Remarks

Through this study it is revealed that in Pakistani university classrooms teacher talk is crucial in the modeling of learner production. Whilst it is essential to instruction, teacher talk tends to dominate, thus depriving learners of meaningful opportunities for using the target language. However, students who are taught in an interactive way with referential questioning, facilitative feedback and scaffolding are more willing to participate and they can generate longer, more meaningful language.

The results highlight the need for a pedagogical change in Pakistani higher education from teacher-centered to more communicative learner-centered classrooms. Ultimately, effective teacher talk can make the classroom a dynamic environment for language learning, critical thinking, and active participation.

Bibliography

- Brock, C. A. (1986). *The effects of referential questions on ESL classroom discourse*. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20(1), 47–59. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3586388>
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies*. Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding second language acquisition*. Oxford University Press.
- Khan, I. (2011). *Challenges of teaching/learning English and management*. *Global Journal of Human Social Science*, 11(8), 68–80.
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Pergamon.
- Long, M. H. (1983). *Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input*. *Applied Linguistics*, 4(2), 126–141. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/4.2.126>
- 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.
- Mahmood, R. (2015). *Teacher talk in Pakistani classrooms: An analysis of its impact on learners' participation*. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(29), 56–63.
- Mansoor, S. (2005). *Language planning in higher education: A case study of Pakistan*. Oxford University Press.
- Nunan, D. (1991). *Language teaching methodology: A textbook for teachers*. Prentice Hall.
- Rahman, T. (2002). *Language, ideology and power: Language learning among the Muslims of Pakistan and North India*. Oxford University Press.
- Sinclair, J. M., & Coulthard, R. M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. Oxford University Press.
- Swain, M. (1985). *Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development*. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235–253). Newbury House.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Harvard University Press.

Walsh, S. (2006). Investigating classroom discourse. Routledge.