

WALSH'S SETT FRAMEWORK IN 12 GRADE'S ENGLISH CLASS

Asnaul Husna Tenri Baji Anjely¹, Nifa Hanifah², Inggri Azzahra³

English Education Study Program
Faculty of Teacher Training and Education
Universitas Kuningan
asnaullhusna0001@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Efektivitas suatu kelas ditentukan oleh tingkat interaksi antara guru dan siswa. Jenis interaksi di kelas tatap muka versus sekolah online tentu akan berbeda, yang mempengaruhi baik kualitas maupun jumlah partisipasi di dalam kelas. Oleh karena itu, tujuan penelitian ini adalah untuk menyelidiki interaksi di kelas pada mata pelajaran Bahasa Inggris kelas XII di SMAN 3 Kuningan menggunakan kerangka kerja SETT (Situasi, Tujuan, Taktik, dan Tujuan) yang dikembangkan oleh Walsh (2006), termasuk mode yang digunakan dan aspek interaksi yang diidentifikasi. Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif. Analisis dokumen digunakan untuk mengumpulkan informasi berupa video pembelajaran dari salah satu kelas XII.2. Video tersebut kemudian ditranskrip, dan temuan dianalisis menggunakan kerangka kerja SETT Walsh (2006). Temuan menunjukkan bahwa tidak semua mode kelas dan fitur interaksional diterapkan dalam kelas. Hanya tiga dari empat mode kelas yang digunakan, dengan beberapa mode memiliki tingkat penggunaan yang lebih tinggi. Selain itu, hanya 12 dari 14 fitur interaksional yang ditemukan, dengan tingkat penggunaan yang bervariasi. Kesimpulannya, interaksi di kelas masih berpusat pada guru.

Kata kunci: Diskursus kelas; SETT; fitur interaksional; mode kelas; pembicaraan guru

ABSTRACT

The effectiveness of a class is determined by the range of interaction between the teacher and students. The sort of interaction in face-to-face classrooms vs online schools will undoubtedly differ, affecting both the quality and amount of participation within the classroom. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to investigate classroom interactions in the 12 Grade's English class in SMAN 3 Kuningan using Walsh's (2006) SETT framework, including the modes used and the interactional aspects identified. This study employed a qualitative approach. Document analysis was used to collect information in the form of a learning video from one of the classes of the class XII.2. The video was eventually transcribed, and the findings were analysed using Walsh's (2006) SETT framework. The findings indicate that not all class modes and interactional features were implemented in the class. Only three of the four class modes are used, with some modes having a higher usage amount. In addition, only 12 of 14 interactional features were found, with varying rates of use. In conclusion, the class interactions still teacher-centred.

Keywords: Classroom discourse; SETT; interactional feature; classroom modes; teacher talk

INTRODUCTION

The teacher-centred approach, where the teacher dominates the class and the learners' participation is limited, has become an issue in the educational field. Indonesia introduced and implemented the Merdeka curriculum in 2021, encouraging students to participate more actively in class. In such a scenario, it becomes crucial for the teacher to sustain the interaction with the students in the classroom.

Classroom interactions are essential in the learning process (Ikhsan, 2024). Effective learning is strongly dependent on meaningful classroom interactions. The type of interactions that take place in the classroom determines whether or not learning is

successful. Classroom relationships between teachers and students play important roles in creating a well-functioning classroom. However, teacher talk is especially significant in the classroom because it includes all communication involved in student management, task organization, and facilitation of the teaching and learning process (Valentika & Yulia, 2020).

Ikhsan (2024) suggested that non-interactive classes are less appealing to pupils. As a consequence, teachers must develop and implement tactics and approaches to achieve a balance of contact in the classroom. Walsh (2006) identified this issue and developed the SETT framework to address it. The use

of SETT analysis helps teachers build contextualized and successful teaching practices.

Classroom Modes

Self-Evaluation of Teacher Talk (SETT), which was developed by Walsh (2006), is a tool to help teachers to analyse and evaluate how they talk in class. By using this tool, teachers can get insight about how their language use can affect the learning process. Eventually this thing can improve the effectiveness of the teacher at once and make the learning environment become student-centered. The SETT framework identifies four different modes, each with its own pedagogic goal and interactional feature.

The first mode is managerial, which focuses on the organization and management of class activities. In this mode, the teacher gives instruction, organizes tasks, and maintains the fluency of the learning process, making sure it runs smoothly and the students stay involved. On the other hand, material mode emphasizes the presentation and explanation of the learning material, especially language practice that relates to the specific content. This mode plays a crucial role in assisting students in gradually understanding the material and providing them with structured practice.

Skill and systems mode intend to develop language skills, such as listening, speaking, reading, and writing—with the language system, including grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation. Through this mode, teachers give practice that focuses on

improving student competency and accuracy in learning language. The last, Classroom Context Mode, prioritizes eloquence and meaningful communication. This mode allows students to express their emotions, experiences, attitudes, and opinions, enhancing the authenticity of the interaction, focusing the learning on the students or student-centred, and fostering creativity and personal expression.

Each mode has its unique function; create the interaction between teacher and students more dynamic. By understanding and implementing these four modes, teachers can reflect on their teaching practice, adjust the strategy in accordance with students' need, and eventually improve the quality of the teaching and learning process.

Interactional Features of Self Evaluation Teacher Talk (SETT)

Walsh's classroom modes and interactional features, often known as interactivities, are related notions. The discussion of Walsh's four classroom modes would be incomplete without addressing the features. Walsh (2011) claimed that each of the four modes is linked together. According to Walsh (2011), each mode is meant to address unique learning objectives and interaction features. Although each mode has distinctive features, not any attribute can be selected. According to Narvacan & Metila (2022), the choice of interaction characteristics is determined by the learning objectives. The detail description of each feature is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Interactive Features of Teacher Talk

Interactive Features of Teacher Talk	Description
Scaffolding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Reformulation : Restating what the student said in a clearer or more ordered manner. b. Extension : Providing additional information to expand the student's response. c. Modelling : Showing the proper version of the student's work.
Direct repair	It refers to the immediate and direct rectification of student faults.
Content feedback	It is a feedback that focuses on the meaning or message delivered rather than the actual words used.
Extended wait time	Allowing learners a few seconds to consider and react to a question.
Referential questions	Referential questions are true questions that the teacher does not know what the answer is to.
Seeking clarification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Teacher asks learners to elaborate on their comments

	b. Students ask the teacher to clarify what they have said.
Confirmation check	This ensures that the teacher has accurately understood the student's response or remark.
Extended learner turns	Allows students to express more than one phrase or clause.
Teacher echo	a. Teachers may repeat their own statements to emphasize or clarify. b. The teacher repeats what the students say to ensure understanding.
Teacher interruptions	It includes cutting off or stopping students as they talk
Extended teacher speaking turns	The teacher says more than one sentence or clause at a time.
Turn completion	The teacher completes a student's unfinished response.
Display questions	Asking a question for which the teacher already knows the answer.
Form-focused feedback	It refers to providing correction or comment on the language used rather than the ideas or content.

A number of studies examined teacher conversation using SETT analysis (Ikhsan, 2024; Valentika & Yulia, 2020; Junior et al., 2021; Raharja, 2020). The findings indicate that teachers use diverse classroom modes in conjunction with specific interactional features. However, most of these studies were conducted in online or general classroom settings, and there is still limited research focusing on offline face-to-face English classes in Indonesian senior high schools.

In fact, classroom interactions may differ depending on the learning environment, school context, and student characteristics. Therefore, it is essential to examine how SETT modes and interactional features appear in real offline classroom practices, particularly in a traditional face-to-face setting where students and teachers interact directly.

Thus, the aim of this study is to investigate the classroom interaction patterns in an offline English class at SMAN 3 Kuningan using Walsh's (2006) SETT framework. The findings of this study will answer the following questions:

1. How are Walsh's classroom modes employed in an offline English classroom at SMAN 3 Kuningan?
2. What interactional features are found in the teacher-student interactions during the lesson?

METHOD

This research employed a qualitative approach using classroom observation as the main instrument. The data were collected from a video recording of an English lesson in class XII.2 of SMAN 3 Kuningan. The class consisted of 36 students with varied backgrounds and levels of English proficiency. The recording lasted for one hour and twenty-eight minutes and was fully transcribed for analysis.

The transcript was analyzed using Walsh's (2006) SETT framework, focusing on the four classroom modes and interactional features. The unit of analysis in this study was teacher utterances, while student utterances were used as contextual support. Each teacher utterance was coded based on its dominant pedagogical function, and only one interactional feature was assigned to each utterance to avoid overlapping categories.

The percentage of each interactional feature was calculated using the following formula:

$$P = \frac{F}{N} \times 100\%$$

where P refers to the percentage of a feature, F is the frequency of a particular interactional feature found in teacher utterances, and N is the total number of all identified interactional features. The calculation was based solely on teacher utterances as the main unit of analysis.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Four Classroom Modes

1. Managerial mode (45%)

The managerial mode found the most in this class. The teacher used managerial mode to open the class, give instruction to learners, for the transition to another mode, and to end the class. Thus, the teacher used this method at the beginning, the middle, and the end of class.

Extract 1 demonstrates the implementation of the managerial mode at the start of the class to check students' attendance.

Extract 1

- 1) **Teacher:** *Okay Nizan, thank you... and I will take your attendance first. As usual, if I call your name please raise your hand and say present. Understood?*
- 2) **Student:** *Yes.*
- 3) **Teacher:** *Eh... Ajeng, Anggini. Arril. Alisha. Azkia.*
- 4) **Student:** *Present.*
- 5) **Teacher:** *Chelsea. Dina. Fadri. Felisah. Hilmiaga. Lutfi. Muhammad Faisal. Muhammad Royan. Muhammad Zidan. Nabila. Na Ramadanti. Midaya Putri. Ninis. Nisrina Naa. Nisrina Rehana. Mizan. Okavi. Rakam. Sahrul Ramadan. Sekar. Siska. Syahira. Syarif. Tiara. Yulia Rahayu. Zahra Afriz. Zahra Citra. Zahra Nandita.*
- 6) **Teacher:** *Oke thank you. So kalian tahu kita hari ini mau belajar apa?*

In the extract 1, it showed the teacher succeeded in implementing the managerial mode. In line 1, the teacher used managerial mode to check students' attendance, and in line 6, it showed how the teacher started the class by asking the students what are they going to learn.

Extract 2 showed how the teacher implemented the managerial mode to instructed the students.

Extract 2

- 28) **Teacher:** *I'm sorry before we start the class I want you to put down your... put down*

your... pay attention to me. Don't open any other books from any other subject. Yes?

29) *Student: Yes.*

2. Material mode (35%)

Material mode is one of the modes in the SETT framework that focuses on the teaching material. The pedagogic goals of this mode are to provide more explanation regarding the material, obtain responses from learners, and provide clarification when required. This class frequently utilizes the material mode, and this mode was the second most used after the managerial mode.

Extract 3

46) *Teacher: Kemudian di bawahnya itu ada the days letter atau hari di mana kamu menuliskan si surat tersebut. Kemudian eh ada companies information. Apa itu companies information?*

47) *Student: Perusahaan. Informasi perusahaan.*

48) *Teacher: Yes! Kira-kira apa aja sih yang biasanya ada di informasi perusahaan? Sebelum nama perusahaan biasanya ada nama rekruter. Nama rekruter. Kemudian ada apa lagi? Posisi rekruter misalnya sebagai HRD atau sebagai pemasaran. Kemudian ada ee nama company-nya. Nama company dan juga alamat company. Company itu ada di heading. Paham?*

49) *Student: Paham. Paham.*

In extract 3, the teacher implemented the material mode by using the IRF pattern. IRF stands for Initiative-Response-Feedback; it starts with the teacher's initiation by asking a question or giving instruction, then the student gives a response, and then lastly the teacher gives feedback (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). In extract 3, the teacher posed a display question related to the material, followed by a response from one of the learners. Finally, the teacher provided feedback by confirming the students' answer. Beside that in line 48 the teacher also used material mode to elaborate and gave example regarding the material.

Extract 4

70) *Teacher: Objek apa sih yang pakai S/ES ini apanya?*

71) *Student: Kalau lebih dari... kalau misalnya subjeknya itu... she, he, it.*

72) *Teacher: Yes, that's right! Kalau subjeknya Dewi itu pakai S enggak?*

73) *Student: No. Enggak.*

The teacher implemented the material mode in extract 4, and the teacher still used the IRF pattern.

3. Skill and System mode (18%)

The skill and system mode rarely used in the class. This mode appeared when the students analysed part of the text and when the teacher discussed the language features of the text (simple present tense & simple past tense)

Extract 5

68) *Teacher: Kemudian yang kedua itu menggunakan simple present untuk mendeskripsikan tentang kemampuan yang dimiliki, kemampuan yang sekarang dimiliki dan juga pekerjaan yang sekarang sedang dilakukan. Kemudian ee eh kalian masih ingat enggak simple present apa itu? Rumusnya?*

69) *Student: Subject plus V1 plus s/es.*

70) *Teacher: Objek apa sih yang pakai S/ES ini apanya?*

71) *Student: Kalau lebih dari... kalau misalnya subjeknya itu... she, he, it.*

72) *Teacher: Yes that's right! Kalau subjeknya Dewi itu pakai S enggak?*

73) *Student: No. Enggak.*

74) *Teacher: Nah ini kan kalimat verbal ya. Kalau misalnya kalimat nominalnya? Subject... to be... to be-nya kayak apa?*

75) *Student: Am, is, are.*

76) *Teacher: Kemudian ada objek. Tapi kalau di kalimat nominal... Nah kemudian di sini ada simple past. Nah kalau simple past...*

77) *Student: Simple past... yang sudah terjadi di masa lalu.*

78) *Teacher: Tahu rumusnya apa? Subjek... subjek apa?*

79) *Student: Subjek. Kemudian verb two. Yes. Kemudian objek. Objek. Yes.*

80) *Teacher: Harus pakai s/es enggak?*

81) *Student: No. Enggak.*

In extract 5, the teacher did the skill and system mode by discussing the grammar simple present tense and simple past tense with the students. One of the pedagogic goals of the skill and system mode is

to provide the learners with an opportunity to enhance their grammar skills.

4. Classroom Context Mode

The classroom context mode was not found in this class. This mode allows students to express their emotions, experiences, attitudes, and opinions, enhancing the authenticity of the interaction, focusing the learning on the students or student centred, and fostering creativity and personal expression. This means the class were teacher-centred.

Interactional Features of Online English Class

Based on the analysis of the full offline classroom transcript on Job Application Letter, twelve of Walsh's (2006) interactional features were successfully identified throughout the teacher-student exchanges. The discourse in this class was shaped by several contextual factors: (1) the session was a review session, not the first introduction of the material, (2) the learning took place offline but was recorded from a distance, which affected audibility, and (3) the interaction relied heavily on mixed Indonesian-English language use to scaffold comprehension. These conditions contributed to the dominance of teacher talk, which governed the pace, structure, and direction of the lesson.

The percentage of each interactional feature was calculated based on its frequency relative to all identifiable teacher moves in the transcript. The following sections present the findings in detail, beginning with the most frequently occurring features. Each feature is supported with extracts taken directly from the classroom discourse.

1. Extended teacher turn (27,5%)

Extended teacher turns were the most frequently observed feature in this study. The teacher frequently produced long stretches of uninterrupted talk, often spanning several lines of the transcript. These extended turns mostly occurred when the teacher explained concepts such as the structure of a job application letter, the meaning of each section, grammatical rules (simple present, simple past), and the rationale behind job application writing. Because the class was designed as a content recall session, the teacher had more reason to take control of the floor for explanation and re-clarification.

Extract 6

43) T: Jadi di heading ini itu isinya tuh tentang informasi kontak dari si pelamar. Contohnya kayak apa aja? Just

like the name and then the address, telephone number, and then email address... Kemudian di bawahnya itu ada the days letter was written, dan juga companies information. Jadi di heading ini biasanya ada nama rekruter, posisi rekruter, nama company, alamat company. Itu semua masuk ke heading. Paham?

This extract illustrates how the teacher used extended talk to build students' conceptual foundation before allowing them to analyze a sample text. These long explanations helped regulate the flow of the lesson and ensured that students had the necessary knowledge to participate meaningfully. The use of bilingual explanation further supported learners with lower proficiency.

2. Teacher echo (14,2%)

Teacher echo was the second most common feature. The teacher often repeated students' answers to confirm correctness, make the response more audible to the class, or highlight key terms. This was especially important in this mixed-language environment, where students often mispronounced English terms or used unclear phrasing.

Extract 7

149) S: Surat lamaran...
150) T: Surat lamaran, yes.
151) S: Riwayat hidup.
152) T: Riwayat hidup, iya benar.

Echoing served two pedagogical functions: it validated student contributions while simultaneously reinforcing the correct forms for others.

3. Content feedback (11,6%)

Content feedback refers to teacher responses that focus on the meaning or accuracy of student ideas rather than grammar or language form. This feature frequently surfaced when students answered conceptual questions. The teacher consistently acknowledged their ideas and expanded on them.

Extract 8

20) S: Apply... apply...
21) T: Apply this job, right? Good. Betul, kalian harus apply dulu pekerjaan yang kalian inginkan.

The pauses allowed students to process instructions without being rushed, which is especially important in a mixed-proficiency classroom.

4. Scaffolding (9,4%)

Scaffolding occurred when the teacher restated student responses more clearly (reformulation) or added further explanations (extension). This helped bridge comprehension gaps and strengthen understanding of the job application letter structure.

Extract 9

35) T: *Ibarat kalian tuh kayak mempromosikan diri kalian sendiri. Misalnya "Saya lulusan IT, saya bisa apply nih..."*. Kalian bisa tulis itu di application letter.

Extension scaffolding provided deeper conceptual grounding by offering relatable examples of self-promotion in application letters.

5. Extended wait time (8,1%)

Extended wait time was evident whenever the teacher paused to let students think, respond, or overcome hesitation. This feature appeared when students were asked to read aloud, answer conceptual questions, or check visibility of the projected text.

Extract 10

- 30) T: *Ada yang mau baca enggak? ... Nizan, kelihatan enggak yang belakang? (hening sebentar)*
31) S: *Kelihatan Miss.*
32) T: *Oke, silahkan.*

The pauses allowed students to process instructions without being rushed, which is especially important in a mixed-proficiency classroom.

6. Seeking clarification (6,3%)

This feature was used when student responses were ambiguous, unclear, or incomplete. The teacher often sought clarification to ensure accurate comprehension.

Extract 11

- 13) T: *Kenapa tidak mau jadi Teacher?*
14) S: *It's hard.*
15) T: *It's hard? Maksudnya gimana hard-nya? Being a doctor is also hard.*

Through clarification questions, the teacher encouraged students to elaborate, deepening engagement and understanding.

7. Display questions (5,2%)

Display questions were used to check students' factual or conceptual knowledge. The teacher already knew the expected answers.

Extract 12

- 70) T: *Apa sih yang pakai S/ES itu apanya?*
71) S: *Kalau lebih dari satu...*
72) T: *Kalau misalnya subjeknya she, he, it.*

Display questions served as checkpoints to verify whether students remembered previously learned grammar rules

8. Form-focused feedback (4,1%)

Form-focused feedback appeared when the teacher corrected language form, such as pronunciation or word choice.

Extract 13

- S: *Hiding (salah pengucapan heading)*
T: *Heading, bukan hiding ya. Pengucapannya heading.*

Corrective feedback helped ensure students used appropriate terminology relevant to the lesson.

9. Direct Repair (3,5%)

The teacher occasionally provided immediate corrections without prompting student self-correction.

Extract 14

- S: *Telepon number.*
T: *Telephone number.*

10. Extended Learner turns (3,1%)

Extended learner turns were observed mainly during group presentations. Students produced longer stretches of speech while presenting their analysis of job application letter structure.

Extract 15

- S: *Assalamualaikum warahmatullahi wabarakatuh. Good morning everyone... (lanjut mempresentasikan analisisnya)*

Although teacher talk dominated the lesson, structured tasks still provided space for students to speak more extensively.

11. Referential questions (2,4%)

Referential questions occurred when the teacher asked about students' opinions or experiences questions to which the teacher did not know the answer.

Extract 16

- T: *Is there any different from my material and with the one that you learned before?*

These questions fostered authenticity and encouraged personal expression.

12. Confirmation check (1,8%)

Confirmation checks were used to verify the teacher's interpretation of student responses.

Extract 17

16) S: *Freelance.*

17) T: *Freelance? Oh, maksudnya kamu mau jadi barista sebagai freelance?*

18) S: *Yes.*

This feature ensured shared understanding between teacher and students.

CONCLUSION

The findings indicate a heavily teacher-centered pattern of interaction, similar to previously analyzed online classroom contexts. Extended teacher turn dominated the discourse, reflecting the teacher's role as the primary source of content explanation and classroom regulation. The use of bilingual scaffolding, combined with the review-oriented nature of the session, further contributed to the teacher's central role.

However, compared to online learning situations, the offline environment in this study allowed for slightly higher instances of extended learner turns, group discussion, and referential questioning. Students could move, form groups, and present their responses more freely, creating opportunities for richer learner contributions.

Despite these opportunities, the discourse remained teacher-led, and the majority of interactional features aligned with those typically found in teacher-fronted instruction. The consistent use of features such as scaffolding, echo, content feedback, and confirmation checks reflects the teacher's active effort to facilitate understanding and

maintain engagement in a mixed-proficiency classroom.

REFERENCES

- Ikhsan, M. (2024). The Analysis Of Teacher-Learner Talk In A Narrative Classroom Interaction. *UIN Ar-Raniry Fakultas Tarbiyah Dan KeTeacheran*. https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=en&user=DNERW74AAAJ&cstart=100&pagesize=100&citation_for_view=DNERW74AAAJ:0izLIjtjcgwC
- Junior, S. R., Rukmini, D., & Yuliasri, I. (2021). Walsh's Classroom Modes and Interactional Features of Teacher Talk in Science Class at DCS Semarang. *English Education Journal*, 11(4), 608–618. <https://doi.org/10.15294/ej.v11i4.52184>
- Narvacan, C. I., & Metila, R. A. (2022). Investigating the features of teacher talk in an online English classroom: A discourse analysis. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, 11(15), 67–81. <https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrse.2022.b032>
- Raharja, B. J. (2020). Discourse analysis on teacher-students interaction pattern of English teaching learning process in vocational high school. *Journal of English Language and Pedagogy*, 3(1), 36–40. <https://doi.org/10.36597/jelp.v3i1.2900>
- Sinclair, J. M., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: the english used by teachers and pupils*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Valentika, R., & Yulia, Y. (2020). An analysis of teachers' classroom interaction by using self-evaluation of teacher talk. *Journal of English Language and Pedagogy*, 3(1), 41–51. <https://doi.org/10.36597/jelp.v3i1.2903>
- Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating classroom discourse*. Routledge.
- Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse: Language in action*. Routledge.