





The Effect of Instructing Teacher Talk and Classroom Language on EFL Student-Teachers' Linguistic Performance

Suhad Qais Ahmed¹ , Shaima Mahdi Saalh² 

Department of English, College of Education for Women, University of Baghdad, Iraq¹

Department of English, College of Education for Women, University of Baghdad, Iraq²

Sohad.Qais2203m@coeduw.uobaghdad.edu.iq¹

shaimaa.mehdi@coeduw.uobaghdad.edu.iq²

<https://doi.org/10.36231/coedw.v36i1.1799>

Received: 20 March 2024; **Accepted:** 17 May 2024; **Published:** March 30, 2025

Abstract

English Language Teachers have a crucial role in the process of learning and teaching since high-quality teachers lead to excellent educational outcomes. However, it is not easy to prepare proficient teachers in English language who can use English accurately and fluently inside the classroom. Thus, there is a need for specifically tailored training courses to prepare English language teachers qualified linguistically to use the English language in their classes. This study aims to find out the effect of instructing teacher talk and classroom language on EFL student-teachers' linguistic performance. The sample of this experimental study consists of (60) students, divided into equal control and experimental groups from the fourth stage, Department of English Language, College of Education for Women, University of Baghdad. The study instrument is an observational checklist prepared by the researcher. After ensuring its validity and reliability, it has been used to assess the linguistic performance of the student-teachers during the practicum period. The results obtained by statistical treatment of data have shown that there is a significant difference between the two groups in favor of experimental group. The findings revealed that the student teachers who have instructed with the expressions of teacher talk, and classroom language have achieved a higher level of performance than that of the student teachers who have not instructed. Accordingly, several recommendations and suggestions for further studies have been set forward.

Keywords: Classroom Language, Linguistic performance, Student-teachers, Teacher Talk



اثر تدريس كلام المعلم ولغة الصف على الاداء اللغوي للمعلمين- الطلبة الدارسين للغة الانكليزية لغة اجنبية

سهاد قيس أحمد¹ ، شيماء مهدي صالح²

قسم اللغة الإنكليزية، كلية التربية للبنات، جامعة بغداد، العراق¹
قسم اللغة الإنكليزية، كلية التربية للبنات، جامعة بغداد، العراق²

¹Sohad.Qais2203m@coeduw.uobaghdad.edu.iq

²shaimaa.mehdi@coeduw.uobaghdad.edu.iq

<https://doi.org/10.36231/coedw.v36i1.1799>

تاريخ الاستلام: ٢٠٢٤\٣\٢٠، تاريخ القبول: ٢٠٢٤\٥\١٧، تاريخ النشر الإلكتروني: ٢٠٢٥\٣\٣٠

المستخلص :

يلعب معلمو اللغة الانكليزية دورًا مهمًا في عملية التعليم والتعلم حيث يقود المعلمون ذو كفاءة عالية إلى نتائج تعليمية ممتازة. الا ان ليس من السهل إعداد معلمين كفونين في اللغة الإنجليزية يمكنهم استعمال اللغة الإنجليزية بدقة وطلاقة داخل الفصل الدراسي. وبالتالي، هناك حاجة إلى دورات تدريبية مخصصة لإعداد معلمي اللغة الإنجليزية المؤهلين لغويًا لاستخدام اللغة الإنجليزية داخل الفصول الدراسية. أجريت الدراسة الحالية لمعرفة أثر تدريس كلام المعلم ولغة الصف الدراسي على الأداء اللغوي للطلاب المعلمين في اللغة الإنجليزية. تكونت عينة الدراسة التجريبية من (٦٠) طالبة، مقسمين إلى مجموعتين ضابطة وتجريبية متساوية من المرحلة الرابعة، قسم اللغة الانكليزية، كلية التربية للبنات، جامعة بغداد. أداة الدراسة عبارة عن قائمة رصد من إعداد الباحثة. وبعد التأكد من الصدق والثبات، تم استخدام الاداة لتقييم الأداء اللغوي للطلبة المعلمين خلال فترة التدريب العملي. وقد أظهرت النتائج التي تم الحصول عليها من خلال المعالجة الإحصائية للبيانات وجود فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية بين المجموعتين لصالح المجموعة التجريبية. وأظهرت النتائج أن الطلاب المعلمين الذين درسوا تعابير كلام المعلم ولغة الفصل قد حققوا مستوى أداء أعلى من أداء الطلاب المعلمين الذين لم يدرسوها. وبناء على ذلك تم تقديم عدد من التوصيات والمقترحات لمزيد من الدراسات.

الكلمات المفتاحية: لغة الصف، الاداء اللغوي، الطلبة المعلمين، كلام المعلم.

1. Introduction

The language used by EFL teachers is one of the most important inputs in the classroom and it should be comprehensible. The input hypothesis of Krashen's (1982) theory stated that to acquire a foreign language, students must receive as much comprehensible input as possible. Ellis (1989) has presented teacher talk as the special language that teachers use when addressing second language learners in the classroom, Wang (2014) stated that teacher talk (TT) is an essential and reliable source of input for learners. If teachers provide comprehensible input during classroom instruction, learners can acquire knowledge at a faster and better rate. Using classroom language is essential in the process of teaching and learning to establish a routine of using English for classroom communication.

Classroom language is clear and meaningful forms of English speech that assist students, who are often focused on learning content, in becoming self-reliant individuals in everyday conversations (Hidayati, 2022). Using the target language in the classroom significantly enhances students' acquisition of the target language (Dickson 1996). This demonstrates that increasing the use of TL in the classroom is a beneficial practice (Turnbull, 2001).

English Language Teachers have a crucial role in the process of learning and teaching and high-quality teachers lead to excellent educational outcomes (Mahdi, 2009; Alsaadi and Mahdi, 2013; Saalh, 2014; Saalh and Salim, 2020). However, it is not easy to prepare proficient teachers in English language who can speak English accurately and fluently inside the classroom. Thus, there is a need for specifically tailored training courses to prepare English language teachers qualified linguistically to use the English language inside the classroom. Saeed (2015) revealed in her study some of the problems in teaching English in Iraq and one of them is that teachers need more training programs, and they overuse their native language (Arabic) as the language of instruction inside classrooms instead of using English. The problem of this study is that Iraqi secondary school teachers are not proficient linguistically enough to perform well inside the classroom because of their lack of linguistic competence. This lack is due they do not have any lessons or lectures in practicing classroom language or teacher talk during their stages of studies in colleges or teacher education programs. Therefore, the researcher suggests providing the student-teachers with lists of teacher talk and classroom language expressions to be used in their classes, which help them to improve their linguistic performance in terms of, complexity, accuracy, fluency, and functionally adequate language, within the needed language scope in the classrooms.

The current study aims to find out the effect of instructing classroom

language and teacher talk classroom language on the study sample's linguistic performance. This study hypothesized that there are no statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the experimental group and the control group in their linguistic performance during the post-test stage of the practicum.

The data was collected through video recording, the researcher observed the student-teachers' performance to assess them using an observational checklist. The researcher has prepared it according to complexity, accuracy, and fluency. Then, statistical treatment of data will be done to obtain the results.

In this study, there are scientific values and significance for all who are involved in the Ministry of Education and educational institutions. It will help in the training programs for teachers, and it can assist EFL teachers and student-teachers. The training programs can include the materials used in this study and emphasize classroom language. It will be the starting point for other research and studies, which can contribute to developing the teaching process.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1 Teacher Talk

Studies on teacher talk started in the early to mid-1980s. The development of Teacher Talk study was influenced by the idea of second language acquisition given by Krashen and Terrell (1983). Teacher Talk (TT) refers to the specific language that EFL teachers commonly use throughout the teaching process. Allwright and Bailey (1991) argued that communication is a significant method through which teachers provide knowledge to learners and a fundamental strategy for managing student's behavior.

2.1.1 Teacher Talk in EFL Classroom

The term "teachers' language" refers to the language used by the teachers, which is the target language of the students (Johnson, 1999). It plays a crucial role in the English teaching process. Based on SLA theory the language used within the classroom serves as both the medium of instruction and the target language of the students to facilitate the interaction between the teachers and students.

Meng & Wang, (2011) summarized in their action study some of the effective strategies that help EFL teachers to improve their language as followed:

1. It is important for EFL teachers to not only acquire knowledge of teaching theories but also implement them in their teaching process.
2. The strategies employed by teachers to facilitate language

learning should be focused primarily on serving the specific needs of the students.

3. Teachers need to know a lot about the target language, both in theory and in practice, to be able to speak and comprehend the target language which helps students communicate more effectively.

TT plays an essential role in the acquisition process of a foreign language. It serves as a tool for presenting and implementing teaching plans to achieve educational objectives. Nunan (1991) noted that Teacher Talk is essential in the classroom, serving as a tool for classroom management and monitoring, as well as being a natural part of second language learning. The management and administration of the classroom rely heavily on TT as it determines the success or failure of a teacher in delivering desired objectives. The teacher's input plays an essential role in helping students acquire language skills as it is their main means of exposure to the target language.

2.1.2 Kinds of Teacher Talk

Flanders (1970) classified teacher talk with seven kinds, which may be further categorized into two kinds: direct and indirect influence, as cited by Hai and Bee (2006).

The following are the categories of direct influence:

1. Lecturing: The teacher presents factual information or personal opinions about the subject matter or the process of expressing ideas. They provide their own explanations or reference an authoritative source, excluding input from the students.
2. Giving directions: the teacher imparts instructions, orders, or commands to which the student will be expected to comply.
3. Criticizing or justifying authority aims to change students' behavior from an undesirable to a desirable pattern. When the teacher advises students to stay away from bringing with irrelevant questions, this behavior can be categorized as such. This category also includes the teacher's questions regarding 'what' and 'why'.

On the other hand, the categories of indirect are:

1. Accepting feelings: the teacher acknowledges and accepts the feelings of students in a positive way, believing that they should not face punishment for expressing their feelings. Feelings may be either happy or bad, and the ability to anticipate and remember feelings is also involved.
2. Praise and encouragement: the instructor commends and motivates students' actions and responses. If a student responds to a instructor's

question, the instructor provides positive reinforcement using verbal expressions such as 'good,' 'very good,' 'better,' 'accurate,' 'great,' 'continue,' and so on.

3. Accepting or using students' ideas: in this type, only the ideas of the students are considered, not their emotions. If the student provides examples, the teacher has the option of repeating them using their style or phrasing. The teacher possesses the ability to clarify, construct, or enhance concepts or proposals provided by the student.

4. Asking questions: in this type, the teacher offers questions on the subject matter or techniques, depending upon their ideas, and anticipates a response from students. In many times the teacher asks a question and moves with the lesson without obtaining any response. Questions like this are then excluded from this category.

2.2 Classroom Language

Classroom language refers to the specific language used for communication and teaching inside the classroom. Willis (1982) as cited in Hadiatmi et al. (2020) stated that classroom language refers to the practice of teaching English using the English language itself. It means increasing the use of English in the classroom by English teachers, such as during instructional activities or informal conversations with students. Salaberri (1995) as cited in Herlianawati & Suwono (2017) said that classroom language is the English idiomatic terms specifically employed for instructing English, particularly to young learners.

2.2.1 Classroom Language in EFL Classroom

In teaching and learning process, classroom language is the specific linguistic expressions used by teachers and students to communicate inside the classroom. Cullen (2001) pointed out that teachers use these expressions for many purposes such as giving directions, presenting concepts, asking questions, assessing students' participation, and indicating both the beginning and the end of tasks and teaching stages. Scott and Ytreberg (2000) explained that classroom language is the clear and meaningful English expressions that help students who are overly focused on textbooks and became independent individuals in everyday interactions. Using classroom language is crucial in teaching and learning process in developing a habit of using English for classroom interactions.

Therefore, the language used by teachers in the classroom is an essential tool through which students get English input. The language used by teachers in the classroom facilitates the active participation of students in actual and significant communication. Zainil (2019) stated that the most effective method of teaching a foreign language is likely through continuous provision of input to the students.

2.3 Linguistic Performance

Linguistic performance refers to the capacity for producing and understanding sentences within a given language. Following the release of Noam Chomsky's book "Aspects of the Theory of Syntax" in 1965, the majority of linguists have differentiated between linguistic competence, which refers to a speaker's implicit knowledge of a language's structure, and linguistic performance, which refers to how a speaker applies this knowledge in practice (Lifrieri, 2011).

2.3.1 Complexity, Accuracy and Fluency (CAF)

Complexity, accuracy, as well as fluency (CAF) are important factors that researchers consider when studying how people learn a second language. CAF has been used as a method of evaluating written and spoken language skills, as well as tracking language learning development, for several decades as a substitute for standardized proficiency testing. (Housen and Kuiken, 2009).

2.3.1.1. Complexity

The measure of complexity is typically considered the most contentious among the three elements of proficiency measurement criteria. Complexity is commonly defined as using more complicated or difficult words. According to Ellis & Barkhuizen (2005), complexity refers to the degree that learners create good language that is complex and elaborate. Wolfe-Quintero, Inagaki, & Kim (1998) defined complexity as the availability of both simple and advanced structures or words for the student. Skehan (2009) argued that complexity is a 'linguistic challenge' while Ellis (1997) said that complexity refers to 'the ability for employing a more complex and correct language'.

2.3.1.2 Accuracy

Accuracy is commonly considered the most basic aspect of CAF and refers to the extent to which language usage follows a specific rule, particularly in terms of vocabulary and grammar. According to Wolfe-Quintero et al. (1998), accuracy refers to the extent to which second language knowledge conforms to the norms of the target language. Housen and Kuiken (2009) argued that accuracy refers to the degree that the second language performance is different from the normal. The measurement of accuracy within the CAF paradigm has been conducted by several methods. Revesz et al. (2014) used a percentage of errors per 100 words together with particular accuracy measurements of grammatical forms. In their study, Iwashita et al. (2008) discovered that the ability to use grammatical forms accurately, also known as global correctness, strongly predicted overall speaking performance.

2.3.1.3. Fluency

Fluency refers to an individual's overall ability to speak foreign languages. Lennon (1990) stated that fluency refers to a high level of linguistic proficiency that is specifically characterized by the sense of speaking or writing with ease and smoothness. Skehan (2009) defined fluency as the ability to speak at a typical rate without any interruptions. Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005,) argued that fluency refers to the ability to create words in real situation without unnecessary pauses and hesitation. The concept of temporal fluency in speaking performance is categorized into three sub- concepts: breakdown, repair, and speed fluency (Tavakoli & Skehan, 2005 as cited in Suzuki& Kormos, 2020). Breakdown fluency refers to the characteristics of pauses, such as their frequency, location, and length. Speed fluency is a measure of the speed at which information is delivered. Repair fluency focuses on dysfluency instances, such as repeats and false starts.

2.4 Related Works

This section explained the related previous studies which dealt with the same variables. The study conducted by Nasir et al. (2019), entitled A Qualitative Study of Teacher Talk in an EFL Classroom Interaction in Aceh Tengah, Indonesia, aims to examine the various types of teacher talk used during classroom interactions by using the Flanders Interaction Analysis Category System (FIACS) framework developed by Flanders (1970). In this study, the sample was the teacher of a second-grade class in a senior high school in Aceh Tengah, Indonesia. The study included audio recording and observation techniques to analyze three lessons, as well as conducting an interview with the teacher. The study concluded that all seven kinds of teacher talk used. Of all of the kinds, giving directions was the kind that the teacher did most often. It means that the teacher mostly controlled the students and told them what to do while they were learning.

Another study by Arianti (2020), entitled The Use of Classroom Languages for Beginning Lessons in Micro-Teaching class. This study attempted to investigate the variety of classroom languages, particularly the language used at the beginning of the lesson, by students from sixth-semester during micro-teaching program. The participants of the study are sixth-semester students in English Department at Veteran Bangun Nusantara University of Sukoharjo. The instruments of this study were observation and interviews. The data collected for this study relates to the students' interaction who participated in Micro-teaching activities as part of their teaching practice. The study found that there is minimal variation in the languages used to begin a lesson in the classroom, and they are typically restricted to specific phrases. The predominant form of the language that the students use in the classroom is greetings. The second most common kind of the classroom

language is register while the third type is using time for beginning the lesson.

Hidayati's study (2022) entitled Classroom Language Used by English Students in Microteaching Class aims to investigate the classroom language employed by student teachers engaged in a microteaching program, as well as identify the most common kinds of classroom language used by these student teachers. The subject of the study were 40 students from the sixth-grade level. The students took the microteaching lesson in the English Education Study Program at Muhammadiyah University of Bengkulu. The researcher will gather the data by recording and gathering data throughout the microteaching classes and then transcribing the recordings. The results of this study indicated that the student-teachers employed classroom language in excellent quality, as seen by using of eight different kinds of classroom language and the predominant type of classroom language used by them was simple instruction due to their simplicity of pronunciation and being consistent with the teaching process.

The last study conducted by Rouf & Mohamed (2022) entitled Secondary School EL Teachers' Classroom Language Proficiency: A Case Study in Bangladesh aims to determine the classroom language proficiency of English language teachers at secondary school in Bangladesh. The researchers selected the sample of this study through purposive sampling technique, they are six English language teachers at Secondary School. To collect the data for this study the researchers used two instruments on teachers' classroom language proficiency: a semi-structured classroom observation guide and a semi-structured interview checklist. The results of this study indicated that EL teachers' poor CLP demonstrated due to: 1. Limited use of grammatical structures and limited variety of vocabulary in the target language. 2. Insufficient proficiency in the target language for effective communication with students. 3. Limited use of the target language (TL) for instruction inside the classroom setting and overly dependent on the L1 in the classes.

In comparing the current study to the previous studies, the findings of the present study are similar to those of Arianti's study (2020) on the importance of classroom language lessons. Arianti's study shows that classroom language used by STs was restricted and tended to be repetitive due to the absence of detailed lectures in classroom language.

The results of the current study are also similar to the findings of Hidayati's study (2022), which indicated that the classroom language employed by student teachers is of excellent quality, as seen by the use of eight different kinds of classroom language.

Whereas the difference between the current study, Rouf & Mohamed's study (2022), and Nasir et al.'s study (2019) lies in the different target samples

used in the studies. The findings of the current study come close to Rouf and Mohamed's study as it indicated that EL teachers' poor CLP, as they demonstrated, is due to many reasons, and one of them is the limited use of the target language for instruction because they do not have the proficiency of classroom language and are overly dependent on L1 inside the classroom setting, which means that they need to know more about classroom language, which is done in the current study.

3. The Analytical Part

3.1 Methodology of the Study

The design of the current study is experimental nonrandomized control group pretest-posttest design. To achieve the aims of the study and verify its hypotheses. Two groups have been chosen, one group represents an experimental and the other group is a control group. The experimental design of this study is shown in Table 1.

Good (1973) states that the experimental design refers to the methodology used to choose the experimental group. The experimental procedures are carefully controlled, and their impact is assessed. Vandalen (1979) and Cook (1967) argue that choosing an appropriate experimental design for testing is a highly valuable option for a researcher to decide on

The present study is limited to EFL student-teachers from the Department of English Language/College of Education for Women/ University of Baghdad in the academic year 2023-2024.

The sample of the present study is chosen randomly from fourth-year college students. Out of (10) fourth-year EFL groups, group (4) is chosen randomly to represent the control group and group (6) as the experimental group. The total number of both groups is (60), each one comprises (30).

Table (1)

The Experimental Design of the Study

Group	Pre-Instructing	Independent variable	Post-Instructing
Experimental	Assessing the student-teachers performance before starting the experiment according to linguistic performance observational checklist.	Teacher Education training course with Teacher Talk & Classroom Language lists and expressions that are used practically within the course.	Assessing the student-teachers performance after 5 weeks of their starting with practicum period according to linguistic performance observational checklist.
Control		Teacher education training course with Teacher Talk & Classroom Language definitions and theories.	

3.1.1 Equivalence of the Two Groups

Many factors should be taken into consideration which may affect the result of the test, otherwise, they could affect the results of the study. Before administering the test, the two groups must be equalized based on the following variables: the mother and father's level of education, the student's scores from the previous year in methodology subject, the student's age in year and the two groups' pretest. (Good, 1973).

3.1.2. The Instrument of the Study

To achieve the aims of the present study, an observational checklist has been prepared to be the main instrument used in this study. The researcher has prepared an observational checklist to evaluate the student-teachers' performance during their practicum period. This checklist consists of ten items that can be used in evaluating the student-teachers' linguistic performance according to CAF measurement. Ross (1974) defines an observational checklist as a tool used to collect information in real time. It usually consists of a list of items, with options to indicate their presence or absence. As stated by Ross, this device organizes and simplifies the process of recording observations, while also ensuring that the significant aspects of the observed object or action are considered.

The researcher has prepared an observational checklist to evaluate the STs' performance during their practicum period. This checklist consists of ten items that can be used in evaluating the STs' linguistic performance according to CAF measurement. The items on the checklist have been derived from the definitions of complexity, accuracy, and fluency as mentioned in detail in chapter two. Items (1, 2, and 3) are related to complexity, and items (4, 5, 6, and 7) are related to accuracy, while items (8, 9, and 10) are related to fluency. The scoring scheme ranges from (2 - 0.5) with, (2) points for each item as the higher score whereas (0.5) is as the lower one. The highest score the ST could get is (20) while the lowest score is (5) because the checklist includes ten items.

3.1.3. Validity

As defined by Messick (1989), validity refers to the extent to which theoretical explanations and empirical data support the suitability and sufficiency of interpretations and decisions made in response to test results. In the current study, three types of validity can be used: face, content, and construct validity.

3.1.3.1. Face Validity

Face validity refers to a review of experts' opinions regarding whether an instrument effectively measures a specific concept (Heale & Twycross

2015).

In the current study, face validity is ensured by exposing the instrument to the jury members who specialized in methods of teaching, and they have been asked to validate the observational checklist and its items according to the intended aims.

3.1.3.2. Content Validity

Content validity assesses if the instrument sufficiently encompasses all the relevant content relating to the variable and whether the instrument includes every part of the domain associated with the variable or not (Heale & Twycross 2015).

In the current study, the researcher depends on the definitions of complexity, accuracy, and fluency which are the important components of measuring linguistic performance as illustrated in the theoretical background section in detail.

3.1.3.3. Construct Validity

Construct validity refers to the ability of a test to accurately measure a learner's knowledge of the relevant areas of interest. The test must be appropriate, suitable, and effectively used, with a primary emphasis on the integration of data that generates deductions regarding evaluation outcomes. For construct validity to be achieved, the inferences made must possess significance, and reliability, and match the desired goal of the assessment (Messick, 1989).

In this study, item-total correlation and discrimination power have been used to achieve the construct validity as illustrated below.

3.1.3.3.1. Item-Total Correlation

To check the significance of the items, person correlation coefficient was used. All the items are significant since the computed person correlation coefficients are higher than the critical value which is (0.27) at (59) degree of freedom and level of significance (0.05), see Table 2:

Table (2)

The computed person correlation coefficients of the Items

No. Items	Computed Person Correlation	Critical Value	DF	Level of Significance (0.05)
1	0.885**	0.27	59	Significant
2	0.919**			
3	0.914**			

4	0.789**			
5	0.818**			
6	0.668**			
7	0.856**			
8	0.917**			
9	0.897**			
10	0.621**			

3.1.3.3.2. Discrimination power

The two groups from the extremes were divided into higher and lower groups due to the fact that the sample was less than 100. The extreme group method is used to estimate item discrimination. By using the t-test for the two groups to determine the significance of the checklist items, the mean scores and standard deviation of the two groups were computed. It is found that the computed t-value of all the items is higher than the critical value (1.68) at a degree of freedom (58) and level of significance (0.05), which indicates that all the items are statistically significant, see Table 3.

Table (3)

The Mean Score, Standard Deviation, and the T-Value of the items of the observational checklist

No.	Higher Group		Lower Group		Compute t-Value	Critical t-Value	DF	Level of Significance (0.05)
	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score	Standard Deviation				
1	1.38	0.42	0.71	0.25	7.33	1.68	58	Statistically
2	1.48	0.38	0.71	0.25	9.16			
3	1.45	0.37	0.70	0.28	8.69			
4	1.61	0.31	1.05	0.33	6.81			

5	1.40	0.42	0.95	0.20	5.25	Significant
6	1.66	0.27	1.33	0.30	4.47	
7	1.40	0.40	0.85	0.23	6.47	
8	1.40	0.44	0.61	0.25	8.41	
9	1.38	0.33	0.63	0.26	9.60	
10	1.46	0.34	1.13	0.22	4.42	

3.1.4. The Reliability

Reliability is an important feature and quality of a good test. Drost (2011) defines reliability as the extent to which evaluations of the same thing or ability can be made by different people at different times, in different settings, and supposedly using different tools. It could also mean how consistent or reliable the measure of an idea or concept is.

Hence, in this study to measure the reliability of the pre-posttest Alpha-Cronbach formula is used. The coefficient is found to be (0.95), which is considered highly reliable.

3.1.4.1. Inter-Rater Reliability

Inter-rater reliability refers to the consistency of data recorded by multiple raters who measure the same subjects during a single trial. Inter-rater reliability is a quantitative measure that assesses the level of agreement among various judges while making assessment decisions (Scheel et al, 2018).

In the current study, the second researcher was the other rater who watched the videos with the researcher and evaluated the STs. To find out the consistency between two judges, Cohen 's kappa coefficient is used, which is computed to be (0.87), which is considered reliable.

3.2 Data Analysis

To find out the significant differences between the two groups, a t-test for two independent samples was used at level of significance (0.05) and degree of freedom (58), the result reveals that the mean score of the experimental group is (27.31) and that of the control group is (12.45) with standard deviation (6.91) for the experimental group and (3.92) for the control one. The computed t-value (10.23) is higher than the critical t-value (1.69), as illustrated in Table 4.

Table (4)

The Mean Scores, Standard Deviation and T-value of the Experimental and Control Groups in the Post-test

Groups	Mean Scores	Std. Deviation	DF	Computed t-value	Critical t-value	level of significance
Experimental	27.31	6.91	58	10.23	1.69	Significant
Control	12.45	3.92				

This result indicates that there are statistically significant differences between the two groups. The experimental group is found to be better than the control one in the post-test. Therefore, the first hypothesis is rejected, and an alternative hypothesis is accepted which states that there are statistically significant differences between the mean scores in the pretest and the mean scores in the posttest between the two groups in favor of the experimental group which has been instructed with expressions of teacher talk and classroom language. The findings of the current study come close to Nasir et al. study (2019), which concluded that all seven kinds of teacher talk were found, which means that the teacher mostly controlled the students and told them what to do while they were learning by using all kinds of teacher talk.

4. Conclusion

In the light of the results obtained, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. EFL student-teachers who are instructed the expressions and phrases of TT and CL have achieved higher level of performance than those who have not.
2. Using TT and CL by student-teachers helped them improve their target language and enhance their way of teaching, which give them a motivation to practice more.
3. The instruction of TT and CL increase the student-teachers' knowledge and repertoire of many examples of phrases and expressions. Such phrases and expressions make them able to produce well-organized and accurate language and develop their linguistic performance.
4. Student-teachers' teaching performance improved when their linguistic performance is improved. The student- teachers are able to manage the classroom by using English accurately.

5. By increasing the practice with the appropriate language, student-teachers developed the three main elements complexity, accuracy, and fluency. Accuracy have been developed better than the others.
6. Native-like proficiency may not be necessary for student-teachers or teachers to teach well; they need to have a good level of proficiency in CL to deliver effective lessons. They may fail to teach effectively in EFL classes because they have poor language.
7. EFL student-teachers lack comprehensive knowledge of TT and CL due to the absence of detailed lessons specifically addressing this topic.

5. Recommendations of the Study

Upon considering the results of the current study, some recommendations have been listed, as the following points:

1. The Ministry of Education should provide training courses and programs for EFL teachers on how to use classroom language when teaching English. For in-service teachers, there should be courses and training programs that include the materials used in this study and emphasize classroom language.

2. In order to increase language exposure for students, EFL teachers should minimize using Arabic and use English whenever possible.

3. Teacher talk and classroom language should be shifted from theory to practice during the stages of student studies in colleges of Education. It may start in the second year.

4. The curriculum in colleges of education should include studying the grammar of all stages of secondary school to make the students practice the subjects that they are going to teach.

5. Teachers of English can initially focus on developing their language proficiency, which is important and can help them communicate with their students in EFL classrooms.

6. The Ministry of Education is to take into account addressing the EFL teachers' poor classroom language proficiency.

7. Teacher Education can significantly enhance the process of teaching and learning. All teacher education programs should include modules of teacher talk and classroom language in order to improve teachers' classroom proficiency.

6. Suggestions of the Study

The following are some suggestions for further studies:

1. Investigating teacher talk, and classroom language used by the Student-teachers in the practicum period.
2. Finding out the effect of Teacher Talk on the student's achievement and comprehension by using the target language only in EFL classrooms.

References

- Alsaadi, S. & Mahdi, S. (2013). The Effect of a Mediator on Scaffolding EFL Student Teachers' Teaching Competencies, Self-Efficacy and Self-Awareness. *Journal of the College of Education for Women*, 24(4), 1272-1295.
- <https://jcoeduw.uobaghdad.edu.iq/index.php/journal/article/view/1119>.
- Arianti, A. (2020). The Use of Classroom Languages for Beginning Lesson in Micro Teaching Class. *Surakarta English and Literature Journal*, 3(2), 86-92.
- Cook, David, R. (1967). *A Guide to Educational Research*, (3rd ed.) United States of America.
- Cullen, R. (2001). The use of lesson transcripts for developing teachers' classroom language. *System*, 29(1), 27-43.
- Dickson, P. (1996). *Using the Target Language: A View from the Classroom: Research Summary*. National Foundation for Educational Research.
- Drost, E., A. (2011). Validity and reliability in social science research. *Education Research and Perspectives*, 38 (1), 105-124.
- Ellis, R. (1997). Second language acquisition. *The United States: Oxford*, 98.
- Ellis, R. (1989). *Understanding second language acquisition* (Vol. 31). Oxford: Oxford university press.
- Ellis, R., & Barkhuizen, G. (2005). *Analysing Learner Language*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Good, C. V. (1973). *Dictionary of Education*, (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hadiatmi, I., Wilian, S., & Yusra, K. (2020). Classroom Languages As Used By English Teachers At An Indonesian Junior High School In Smpn 1 Keruak. *Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Indonesia*, 2(1), 81-90.
- Hai, S. K., & Bee, L. S. (2006). Effectiveness of interaction analysis feedback on the verbal behavior of primary school Mathematics teachers. *Jurnal Pendidik dan Pendidikan*, 3(2), 115-128.
- Heale, R., & Twycross, A. (2015). Validity and reliability in quantitative studies. *Evidence-based nursing*, 18(3), 66-67.
- Herlianawati, A., Lestari, L., & Suwono, M. (2017, October). Learning English through the Use of Classroom Language in Community Service. In *Social Sciences, Humanities and Economics Conference*

- (*SoSHEC 2017*) (pp. 81-86). Atlantis Press.
- Hidayati, S. (2022). Classroom Language Used by English Students in Microteaching Class. *Teaching English and Language Learning English Journal*, 2(1), 13-21.
- Housen, A., & Kuiken, F. (2009). Complexity, accuracy, and fluency in second language acquisition. *Applied Linguistics* 30 (4), 461-473.
- Iwashita, N., Brown, A., McNamara, T., & O'Hagan, S. (2008) . Assessed levels of second language speaking proficiency: How distinct? *Applied Linguistics*, 29 (1) , 24-49. doi: 10.1093/applin/amm0
- Johnson, K. E., & Ma, P. (1999). *Understanding language teaching: Reasoning in action*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Krashen, S. D., & Terrell, T. D. (1983). *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Lennon, P. (1990). Investigating fluency in EFL: A quantitative approach. *Language Learning*, 40(3), 387–417.
- Lifrieri, V. (2011). Kristin Denham & Anne Lobeck, *Linguistics for everyone: An introduction*. Boston, MA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning, 2010. Pp. xviii, 534. Pb. \$160. *Language in Society*, 40(4), 521-522.
- Mahdi, S. (2009). Self-Efficacy of English Language Teachers and Its Effect On their Pupils' Achievement In Baghdad Secondary Schools/Karkh2. *Journal Of Educational and Psychological Researches*, 6(21), 374-390.
- <https://jperc.uobaghdad.edu.iq/index.php/jperc/article/view/742>
- Meng, X. & Wang, X. (2011). Action Study of Teacher's Language on EFL Classroom Interaction. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1(1), 98-104.
- Messick, S. (1989). Meaning and values in test validation: The science and ethics of assessment. *Educational researcher*, 18(2), 5-11.
- Nasir, C., Yusuf, Y. Q., & Wardana, A. (2019). A qualitative study of teacher talk in an EFL classroom interaction in Aceh Tengah, Indonesia. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8(3), 525-535
- Nunan, D. (1991). *Language teaching methodology: A textbook for teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Revesz, A., Ekiert, M., & Torgensen, E. N. (2014) . The effects of complexity, accuracy, and fluency on communicative adequacy in oral task performance. *Applied Linguistics*, 37 (6) , 1-22. doi: 10.1093/applin/amu0
- Ross, R. (1974). *Research, An Introduction*. New York: John Wiley and
- Rouf, M. A., & Mohamed, A. R. (2022). Secondary School EL Teachers'

- Classroom Language Proficiency: A Case Study in Bangladesh. *The Qualitative Report*, 27(3), 691-715.
- Saeed, N. R. (2015). Problems of Teaching English in Iraqi Public Schools in Mosul for the Intermediate Stage from the Teachers' Point of View. *Middle East University*, 6(1), 53-60.
- Saah, S.M. (2014). The effect of combining video lectures and Kolb experiential learning on EFL student-teachers' ability to teach communicative course book and their teaching competencies. *Journal of College of Education for Women*, 25(4), 1139- 1156.
<https://jcoeduw.uobaghdad.edu.iq/index.php/journal/article/view/885>.
- Saah, S.M. & Salim, H. (2020) The habits of mind in constructing typical EFL teacher's stereotypes. *Asian EFL Journal*, 27(4.3),152-172.
<https://www.asian-efl-journal.com/wp-content/uploads/AEJ-Volume-27-Issue-4.3-October-2020.pdf>
- Scheel, C., Mecham, J., Zuccarello, V., & Mattes, R. (2018). An evaluation of the inter-rater and intra-rater reliability of OccuPro's functional capacity evaluation. *Work*, 60(3), 465-473.
- Scott, Wendy A. and Lisbeth H. Ytreberg. 2000. *Teaching English to Children*. New York: Longman Group UK Ltd.
- Skehan, P. (2009). Modelling second language performance: Integrating complexity, accuracy, fluency, lexis. *Applied Linguistics*, 1-23
- Suzuki, S., & Kormos, J. (2020). Linguistic dimensions of comprehensibility and perceived fluency: An investigation of complexity, accuracy, and fluency in second language argumentative speech. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 42(1), 143-167.
- Turnbull, M., & Lamoureux, S. (2001). L1 and L2 use in core French: A focus on pre-service students' views and classroom practice. In *the annual meeting of the Canadian Association of Applied Linguistics, Québec*.
- Vandalen, Deobold, B. (1979). *"Understanding Educational Research"*. (4th ed) USA: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Wang, H. (2014). The analysis of teacher talk in "learner-centered" teaching mode. *International Journal of Social, Behavioral, Educational, Economic, Business and Industrial Engineering*, 8(4), 1172-1174
- Wolfe-Quintero, K., Inagaki, S., & Kim, H. Y. (1998). *Second language development in writing: Measures of fluency, accuracy, and complexity*. University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.
- Zainil, Y. (2019). An Analysis of Language Input in EFL Classrooms at Junior High School in Padang. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities*.