

TEACHER'S AND STUDENTS' QUESTIONS IN PUBLIC SPEAKING CLASS OF THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF SURABAYA

TEACHER'S AND STUDENTS' QUESTIONS IN PUBLIC SPEAKING CLASS OF THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF SURABAYA

Nur Iffah Muchallidah Isnaini

English Education, Languages and Arts Faculty, The State University of Surabaya
11020084031.nuriffah@gmail.com

Esti Kurniasih, S.Pd., M.Pd.

English Education, Languages and Arts Faculty, The State University of Surabaya
Estikurniasih87@yahoo.com

Abstrak

Pertanyaan kelas telah bekerja sebagai bagian awal dari interaksi kelas yang memediasi proses belajar mengajar dalam pengaturan berbagai kelas. Mempertanyakan menghasilkan tanggapan, ketika proses-proses sebab-akibat ini berulang, interaksi kelas yang hidup jelas ada. Memang, pertanyaan guru ini telah diteliti sejak bertahun-tahun yang lalu tanpa memperhatikan banyak pada pertanyaan siswa. Namun, penelitian ini berfokus pada pertanyaan yang diucapkan oleh kedua peserta (yaitu guru dan siswa) dalam saluran yang berkaitan dengan pentingnya mempertanyakan dalam interaksi kelas dan untuk mengklasifikasikan pertanyaan guru dan siswa. Untuk mengatasi masalah penulis meneliti pertanyaan guru dan siswa dalam Public Speaking Class di Universitas Negeri Surabaya. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menggambarkan tidak hanya bagaimana pertanyaan kelas terjadi dan bagaimana pertanyaan guru dan siswa diklasifikasikan, tetapi juga bagaimana setiap pertanyaan dianalisis. Penulis menggunakan penelitian deskriptif dengan pendekatan kualitatif untuk merancang penelitian. Subjek penelitian ini adalah dosen dan mahasiswa dalam Public Speaking Class di Universitas Negeri Surabaya. Data diambil dari hasil pengamatan empat pertemuan dan juga hasil wawancara. Temuan menunjukkan pertanyaan kelas terjadi didominasi oleh pertanyaan dosen. Pertanyaan siswa sangat kurang dari dosen, meskipun ada 25 siswa dalam satu kelas

Kata Kunci: Interaksi Kelas, Pertanyaan Kelas, Petanyaan Guru, Pertanyaan SIsiwa.

Abstract

Classroom questioning has worked out as an initial part of classroom interaction which mediates teaching and learning process in various classroom settings. Questioning results responses, when those cause-effect processes are repeated, alive classroom interaction is obviously existed. Indeed, teacher's questions have been already examined since many years ago without paying attention much on students' questions. However, this study focuses on questions uttered by both participants (i.e. teacher and students) in any channels related to the importance of questioning in classroom interaction and to the emergence of classifying teacher's and student's questions. To solve the problem the writer investigated teacher's and students' questions in Public Speaking Class of the State University of Surabaya. This research is aimed to describe not only how the classroom questioning occurred and how teacher's and students' questions are classified, but also how each question is analyzed. The writer used descriptive research under qualitative approach to design the research. The subject of this study was the lecturer and the students in a Public Speaking Class of the State University of Surabaya. The data were taken from the result of the four-meeting observation and also the result of the interview. The findings show the classroom questioning occurred was dominated by the lecturer's questions. Students' questions are very less than the lecturer's, although there were 25 students in a class.

Keywords: Classroom Interaction, Classroom Questioning, Teacher's Questions, Students' Questions.

INTRODUCTION

A wide range of studies focuses on how the learning process will be successful, so that the students enable to achieve the goal. Therefore, it is important for teachers to pay attention much to factors that may influence student's learning in teaching learning process. Indeed, student's learning in many ways is influenced by interactions created between students and teacher during teaching learning process. This is presumably as the result of Long's claim (1996) that interaction is the bridging facilitator of second language acquisition. Strengthened again by Allwright (1984:156), interaction in classroom is the most fundamental fact in pedagogy because everything that happens during teaching learning process is from a face-to-face interaction. Besides, forming the course of student's learning is also potentially a result of interactions between students and teacher (Oord and Rossem, 2002). In addition, we may conclude that classroom interaction mediates teaching and learning process.

Interaction also takes a part as a comprehensible input for the learner as stated by Renandya (2001:124-130) which has some new elements, yet, the learners sometimes fail to understand them because of linguistic, paralinguistic, or situational cues, or world knowledge backup. Interaction also refers to exchanges in which there are some indications that an utterance has not been entirely understood and participants need to interrupt the flow of the conversation in order for both parties to understand what the conversation is about (Gass & Selinker, 2001). Implicitly, there is a continuous communication because both the sender and the receiver must be dealing with the same meaning of purpose. Surely, there must be questions and responses in that process, because without questioning and responding, there will be no continuous interaction in the classroom.

Questioning and responding are correlated to each other. People will not respond anything if they are not given a stimulus. This stimulus often appears as questions in daily conversation, especially in classroom, where students learn. Therefore, it is important to learn more about questioning.

Questioning is one of the most familiar forms in classroom interaction. This is the important part in student's learning, because questions have the best role to diagnose students' academic progress or to assess students (Good and Brophy, 2003). By questioning, teacher can check students' learning related to how far they absorb the lesson. For students, they can check whether their understanding is equal to input that their teachers deliver or not. Besides, appropriate questioning is also able to measure the critical thinking of the students along with reinforcing their understanding (Croom and Staire, 2005). It is undeniable anymore that questioning in classroom interaction has some important roles to support both the teacher and the students in teaching learning process.

However, the dominant one to talk in the classroom is the teacher. Besides, student's questions have not been paid attention. Probably, it is as the result of the fact that teachers are the default inquiries in many classroom settings (Cazden, 2001). It cannot be ignored that the stereotype of questioning is that the teacher who must ask questions in any purposes. Students rarely deliver their ideas by questioning. Here, it is the homework of teachers to be able to stimulate their students to question in teaching learning process regarding to the importance of questioning.

There are so many researches related to classroom questioning. Most of old studies focus on the characteristics of teacher's questions; they rarely discuss the contextual factors and social aspects of teacher's questions and also hardly state in depth about the characteristics of student questions. In recent studies, there are many researchers starting to put their interest in discussion of characteristics of teacher's and student's questions. Although they have different points of view in characterizing and classifying teacher's and student's questions, they have the same purposes which are to understand how questions in classroom interaction can assist both teacher and students to achieve the goal of teaching learning process.

Cotton (2005) in her classroom questioning, divides questions based on the cognitive level using Bloom's Taxonomy of social learning, they are knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. Another study was conducted by Smith (2003) that analyzes three categories of questioning. The first type is closed or two-choice questions which have one right answer; they are criticized for not only failing to encourage pupils' deep thinking but also inhibiting their intellectual activity. Wood (ibid) also argues that the use of closed and WH-type questions can result in pupils' short responses, less participation and misunderstanding. The second type is more open-ended and has more 'cognitively challenging quality' than the first, those are questions with a finite set of right answers; while the third type, questions with an indeterminate number of possible answers are authentic which the teacher does not know what the pupils will answer (Skidmore, 2003:50). Zhang (2008) discusses types of questions to decide which one is effective, close or two-choice questions, open-ended questions, or authentic questions. In a study of teaching and learning center at University of Nebraska - Lincoln, results a list of question types which consist of probing questions, factual questions, divergent questions, higher order questions, affective questions, and structuring questions. Naz, Khan, et al (2013) in *Teacher's Questioning Effects on Student's Communication in Classroom Performance*, address three main types of questions; they are high-order, low-order, and follow-up. McGrew (2005) in *Student Questions in an Intermediate Modern Hebrew Classroom* examines the questions students asked over several months of a low intermediate level (third semester, college) Modern Hebrew class. Some studies that were conducted by some experts categorize the same question type to observe. Besides, the answer of why they did those kinds of

researches result the same analysis. They describe the discourse patterns the questions exhibit, address who asks questions of whom, categorize the kinds of information the questions seek, indicate the languages in which the questions are encoded, and note whether or not the questions were successful in eliciting the information the asker wanted to know.

Yuksel (2008) in *Inside the Classroom: Teacher and Student Questions in a Foreign Language*, classifies teacher's questions into authentic questions, test questions, and non-classified questions, and classifies student's questions into procedural questions, hypothesis testing questions, referential questions, lexical questions, and challenge questions.. He made a publication again in 2014 entitled *Teachers' treatment of different types of student's questions*. In his study, he observed how the teacher responded to each different student's question.

Based on the background and findings explained above, related to the importance of questioning in classroom interaction and to the emergence to classify teacher's and student's questions, this study will focus on those areas.

Hence, due to the facts above, the researcher needs to study: (1) how is the classroom questioning occurred in Public Speaking Class of the State University of Surabaya? (2) How are teacher's questions in Public Speaking Class of the State University of Surabaya? (3) How are students' questions in Public Speaking Class of the State University of Surabaya?

RESEARCH METHODS

The researcher applied descriptive qualitative approach. Conducting descriptive research means that all situations and conditions happened during the observation needs describing, explaining, and interpreting. Boardman and Taylor (2000:3) emphasize that qualitative research is done by processing the descriptive data from the observed phenomena. It contains no treatment for the subjects as what happens in experimental research.

Brown (1998:48) claims subject as every participant involved in a research. Without subject, the researcher will not be able to conduct a research that is aimed to find out some data based on the observed phenomena. The subjects of this research are the lecturer and the students in Public Speaking Class of the State University of Surabaya..

The researcher used two instruments in having this research done: audio video recording and interview guidelines. The researcher used descriptive style of observation to obtain data from the field. The data were in the form of information obtained through the occurrence of teacher's and students' questions in classroom questioning. Since this study needs accurate result of how the classroom interaction occurs, transcription during the course is necessarily used. Thus, the researcher used audio video recording. Besides, it is also to help the researcher to do rechecking the type of questions appeared and their frequency and to analyze each of them.

The second instrument is a list of guided questions for interview. Interview was conducted in the form of face-to-face interaction. Among four types of interview, the researcher decided to apply the unstructured one. Therefore, the researcher who acted out as the interviewer, could freely modify the sequence of questions, change the wording, and sometimes explain them or add to them during the interaction. The researcher interviewed both the teacher and the students as the research questions involve teacher's and student's questions. As stated before, the questions gained were not only be classified but also analyzed as well, the interview result was used to analyze the classroom questioning and each type of questions. The interview was conducted for both the lecturer and the students and it was used to answer all three research questions.

The data of this research were obtained through the direct observation. During the observation, the researcher took part in the classroom as an observer. Before going further to the following observations, the researcher firstly had a kind of introductory observation toward all participants and delivered what importance would this observation be meant to. During observation, the researcher recorded the whole classroom activities occurred. On the last day of observation, the researcher conducted an interview process toward the teacher and some students. The researcher used some guided questions to interview both of them. The interview result was used to answer all three research questions.

Data analysis is a process of reducing the large amount of collected data to make a meaningful description about them as soon as possible after the data collected (LeCompte and Schensul, 1999). The first thing that comes as an importance for the researcher to analyze the data is that all data gained are not all quality data. Sometimes, information provided does not make any sense or add meaning and value or it may have been collected in a biased way. Therefore, the researcher needs to be careful to determine whether the data are in line to answer the research questions or not. The researcher applied the 3 steps analysis of Miles and Hubberman (1994). Coding and reducing the data applied here was to select only questions uttered and code each of them. Displaying the data is the next step where the researcher used matrices in the form of tables of questions uttered. The last is drawing conclusion and verifying for generating meaning and confirming findings (Miles and Huberman, 1994). In this study, the researcher applied those tactics to reach relevant conclusions as what it really is. After getting all data needed and applying some tactics, the researcher suited and related them to the theories in Chapter Two in order to reach the implication of what already occurred in the process of classroom interaction, especially for the questioning process.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The researcher peels out the result of the observation that was already conducted in Public Speaking Class of

the State University of Surabaya related to classroom questioning. The observation had been already done four times; they are Wednesdays on the 8th, 15th, 22nd, and 29th of April 2015 at 07.30 up to 09.00 A.M.

The Classroom Questioning

Questioning is the initial part of classroom interaction, if there is no one asking, there will be no one responding. As stated before in Chapter Two, there are so many experts and previous studies proving that the teacher is the one who dominates both the talk and in asking questions.

Expert Lamie, J.M. (2005) says, "The teacher plays multiple roles in communicative activities-as controller, as assessor, as organizer, as participant and resource" (225- 228). Second language teaching classroom should be regarded as a speech community in which teacher language plays a very important role in developing learners' communicative ability. Effective teachers' language contributes effective learners' output. In addition, teachers' language embodies some teaching methodology. Good teacher's talk is beneficial. If teachers know how to talk to students, the students can hear language above their own productive level.

During the observation, the researcher found sixty six teacher's questions and twenty five students' questions. The lecturer already gave chances to his students to ask as in TQA2M, TQB20M, TQC7M, and TQD4M to the whole class. However, the number of the students' questions is still less than the lecturer's. It breaks Meng and Wang's (2011) saying that even if teachers give students opportunities to ask, they address to only a few students in the class lying within their action. From interview result, they did not ask any questions because they thought that there was nothing needed to ask. In this class, all students have the same portion to ask and to interact.

Channels of interaction are based on what activities conducted in the classroom. In the first and the second observation, which the scheduled activities were to conduct the mid-term test and to deliver the new material, the teacher-learners interaction is the channel of interaction that happened mostly. The lecturer interacted classically to explain what to do in the mid-term test and what informative presentation is like as the new lesson material. Thus, the lecturer asked his students classically. In the third observation, which the scheduled activity was to conduct a group discussion, the teacher – a group of learners interaction was the channel happened dominating that day. The lecturer's questions addressed group by group. The lecturer walked around the class and came to group by group checking his students' preparation and concepts related to the next presentation. The students in the group also delivered some questions. In the fourth observation which the scheduled activity was to conduct group presentations, the learner – a group of learners interaction mostly happened. The students who take role as the audiences must ask some questions to the group of students that perform. The learner asked

the group of the learners questions related to the topic presented.

The Teacher's Questions

To develop variety in questioning, it is important to know what kind of questions that the teachers commonly ask (Gall, Dunning, and Weathersby, 1971). During the observation, the researcher found sixty six questions. There were forty three managerial questions, fourteen open questions, five rhetorical questions, and four close questions.

The lecturer asked questions under some circumstances, related to the students' prior knowledge, materials discussed, and for summarizing materials discussed.

The managerial questions were mostly uttered in the beginning of the class. This is in line with the Blosser's theory (2000) saying that teachers often use questions to control the classroom. The managerial types are helpful for the lecturer to manage the movement from one activity to others, as in TQA4M, TQB1M, TQC2M, and others. Besides, they are also helpful to the importance of checking classroom attendance as in TQB1M and TQB2M. This type takes the dominant position because of its necessity, but it is not the most important question to ask based on the lecturer's opinion. He said that in the higher level of education, asking about classroom routines and activities is less important. TQA2M, TQB20M, TQC7M, and TQD4M are the dominative questions uttered for seventeen times. The lecturer asked students for checking their understanding related to a certain material on the particular meaning, but the students still did not deliver any questions. The lecturer believed that it is because the students had not read the materials yet, meaning that his students had less preparation for the upcoming material even though he already asked them to read before. That case happened in almost all of his classes. It was proved, when he asked his students whether they already read the material or not, the students answered "*Not yet, Sir*".

The second position is open questions which are fourteen. Open questions allow students to think in a high level and require multiple interpretations and responses. This question was used by the lecturer to ask about the students' opinion and experience of a certain topic, as in TQB130, TQB140, TQB150, TQB160, and TQB170. Besides, it is also helpful to stimulate the students' deep understanding, such as by asking them to summarize or retell what the material is about as in TQB180. It already worked to stimulate students to speak and interact in the classroom. This question also signs that the teachers are willing to give students chance to speak and to promote learning. Open questions can help negotiate meaning in the communication between teachers and learners, in which learners are given more opportunities to communicate and interact with each other, share ideas among themselves, get inspirations from each other and combine wisdom in problem solving tasks so as to make themselves understood. Thus the language classroom is

made to be a speech community in which teachers are equal participants as well as advisors, helpers and organizers. As methodologist (Allwright, 1991) expresses, "One of the major objectives of language teaching programs is to prepare the students for meaningful interaction, make them able to understand natural speaking form" (p.119-151).

Open questions will not only arouse students' interests but also help to develop their output and improve their communicative ability. According to Lewis (2005), this type of question must dominate classroom questioning rather than questions that primarily asking specific information. The lecturer deals with this theory, because for him asking open questions must be dominantly appeared in the classroom.

The third position is rhetorical questions. This type is used by the teacher to emphasize a certain thing that has been discussed before as in TQB8R, TQB7R, TQB10R, and TQC5R. The lecturer used these questions to get his students' responses, although it is in the form of very simple phrase like "Yes Sir". It is to avoid getting asleep classroom atmosphere. For the lecturer, this type of question is on the third rank related to what question is the most important, thus it takes the third position.

The last is close questions. This question only allows one possible answer that is probably known by the asker, in this case, the lecturer. The lecturer uttered these questions to discuss about a certain topic based on the reading passage as in TQB12C, TQB24C, TQB25C and others. It was very useful to assist his students to get the important point in the reading passage. By questioning some points, the lecturer directly stimulated his students to get involved in the classroom discussion. For the lecturer, this type of question should have been in the second position after the open questions, but it was the least question appeared.

The Students' Questions

Nystrand et al. (2003) stated that students' questions signal engagement and affect the teacher's control of classroom discourse positively. There were twenty five questions during the observation. Seventeen of them were procedural questions and the rest were the referential questions. The researcher did not find the other three types of questions, which are lexical, hypothesis testing, and challenging questions. Based on the students' opinions, lexical questions are often asked to their friends, not their lecturer. They often ask lexical questions to those students who they think smarter than them. Since they take English Department as education major, where English must be their second and target language, asking lexical questions to their lecturer that probably known by whole class and the lecturer is such a shame. Hypothesis testing question was also not found during the observation, it is related to their less preparation of learning that they had not read the materials first before the lecture started. Challenging question which is commonly rare was also not found. The

students hardly or even never ask this type of questions because when they came up with the disagreement to the lecturer's explanation, they chose to keep silent and have it by themselves. Furthermore, asking challenging questions seem like impolite to ask for them.

The procedural questions were often asked by the students related to the classroom management (Boyd and Rubin, 2002) as in SQA1P, SQA2P, SQA3P, SQC1P, SQC3P, SQD1P, and others. Furthermore, when the lecturer conducted a new task for them like discussion, there were so many questions related to the technical needs for the activity. Students ask these questions to take part in classroom procedures and suggestions for classroom activities. Actually, this type of question is not categorized as question that signal students' engagements related to their inquiries about the texts they read and their advancements of understanding based on Yuksel's previous study (2008).

The referential questions were asked mostly when the learner – group of learners interaction happened. The students asked after their friends in group presenting an informative presentation. Referring to Long and Sato (1983), Brock (1986) defined referential questions as ones that "request information that are not known by the asker" (p. 48). However, almost all student questions, by their nature, may belong to this category as they are usually asking for new information. For this study, referential questions referred to those that focused on unclear issues in the target readings. In this sense they are authentic questions (Nystrand et al., 2003), asking for clarification and understanding of the readings. By asking these questions, students voluntarily joined the meaningful discussion of the readings. They also revealed students' efforts to understand the issues in the texts. As in SQD2R, SQD3R, SQD4R, SQD5R, SQD6R, SQD7R and SQD8R, the students delivered their questions to their friends who presented related to the topics under the discussion.

The students did not utter any lexical questions during the observation. From the interview result, the students are very seldom to ask any lexical question with aloud voice to their lecturer because it is such a shame for students majoring English to ask translation, grammatical needs, or others which are related to English Language components.

Hypothesis-testing questions are asked when the students already knew about something but they just want to emphasize again by asking to their lecturer. During the observation, there were no hypothesis-testing questions asked. As stated above, the students often did not read the materials first though they were already asked by the lecturer. Surely, hypothesis-testing questions will be appeared when the students already reconciled a topic. Because they did not, this type of questions were not exist.

Challenging questions are asked to state the students' disagreement towards the lecturer's explanation. The students in this observation did not utter any challenging questions because they thought that the lecturer's explanation was good, clear, and understandable.

Based on the interview result, students would like to ask more questions when it is in the learner – learner /learners channel form of interaction. Furthermore, asking questions for group is obligated that time and it is related to the importance of daily participation scoring. In this case, there is no certain way how to motivate and stimulate the students to ask questions besides relating their questions to the scoring. This has also been believed by the lecturer, even though, the lecturer has already found it very useful to get his students ask in various classroom settings.

CONCLUSION

Similar to many previous studies both in first language (Nystrand et al., 2003; Pearson & West, 1991) and second language learning settings (Markee, 1995; Ohta & Nakaone, 2004; Kilton & Meyer, 1993; White & Lightbown, 1984), students' questions are fewer compared to the teacher's. There were sixty seven teacher's questions and twenty five students' questions.

For the teacher's questions, there were forty four managerial, five procedural, fourteen open, and four close questions uttered by the lecturer. This indicates that classroom management which is considered as the less important one by the lecturer takes the major position during the teaching learning process. The open questions which were the most important one considered by the lecturer were in the second position. Questioning here was very influenced by the channel of the interaction happened.

For students' questions, there were seventeen procedural and eight referential questions. Procedural questions mostly uttered when it was in the form of group discussion (teacher – group of learners channel) because students felt more comfortable to ask when it is in smaller channel of interaction. Referential questions mostly uttered when it was in the form of group presentation where asking questions is a must for the audiences and it influenced their daily participation scoring. Scoring becomes the first priority reason for the students to ask questions. Since there is no scoring in daily life interaction, the students must not ask because of getting scored. Students still have less awareness regarding to the questioning although they stated that questioning is very important for them to avoid being passive students in classroom interaction.

REFERENCES

Allwright, D. (1991). *Focus on the Language Classroom*. Cambridge University Press.
 Allwright, R.L. (1984a). The Importance of Interaction in Classroom Language Learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 5/2.
 Brock, C. A. (1986). The effects of referential questions on ESL classroom discourse. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20, 47-59.
 Cazden, Courtney B. 2001. *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and*

learning, 2nd edn. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Cotton, K. (2000). *Classroom Questioning*. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.
 Dagarin, M. (2004). *Studies in the English Language and Literature in Slovenia*. Ljubljana: Birografika Bori.
 Galassi, J. P., Gall, M. D., Dunning, B., & Banks, H. (1974). The use of written versus videotape instruction to train teachers in questioning skills. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 43, 16–23.
 Good, T.L. & Brophy, J.E. (2003). *Looking in Classroom* (2nd Ed). Michigan: Allyn and Bacon.
 Griffin, Peg & Hugh Mehan. 1981. Sense and ritual in classroom discourse. In Florian Coulmas (ed.), *Conversational routine: Explorations in standardized communication situations and prepatterned speech* 187-213. The Hague: Mouton De Gruyter.
 Harmer, J. (2000). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Harlow: Longman.
 Lamie, J.M. (2005). *Evaluating Change in English Language Teaching*. Palgrave Macmillan.
 Long, M. 1996: The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In Ritchie, W.C. and Bathia, T.K., editors, *Handbook of second language acquisition*. Academic Press, 413–68.
 Markee, N. (1995). Teachers' answers to students' questions: Problematizing the issue of meaning making. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6(2), 63-92.
 McCormick, D. E. (1997). *Using teacher questions to scaffold language learning in an ESL Classroom: A sociocultural case study*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
 McCormick, D. E., & Donato, R. (2000). Teacher questions as scaffolded assistance in an ESL classroom. In J. K. Hall & L. S. Verplaetse (Eds.), *The development of second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction* (pp.183-202). Hillsdale, NJ: LEA.
 McGrew, S. (2005). Student's Questions in an Intermediate Modern Hebrew Classroom. *Working Papers in*

TEACHER'S AND STUDENTS' QUESTIONS IN PUBLIC SPEAKING CLASS OF THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF SURABAYA

- Educational Linguistics*, 21(1), 61-78.
- Meng and Wang. (2011). *Action Study of Teacher's Language on EFL Classroom Interaction*. Finland: Academy Publisher.
- Miles and Hubberman. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis: Second Edition*. California: SAGE publications, Inc .
- Nystrand, M., & Gamoran, A. (1997). The big picture: The language of learning in dozens of English lessons. In M. Nystrand (Ed.), *Opening dialogue: Understanding the dynamics of language and learning in the English classroom* (pp. 30-74). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Nystrand, M., Wu, L. L., Gamoran, A., Zeiser, S., & Long, D. A. (2003). Questions intime: Investigating the structure and dynamics of unfolding classroom discourse. *Discourse Processes*, 35(2), 135-198.
- Ohta, A. S., & Nakaone, T. (2004). When students ask questions: Teacher and peeranswers in the foreign language classroom. *International Review of AppliedLinguistics*, 42, 217-237.
- Oord, E. J., & Rossem, V. (2002). *Differences in first graders' school adjustment: The role of classroom characteristics and social structure of the group*. *Journal of School Psychology*, 40(5). 371-394.
- Renandya. (2001). *Methodology in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Skidmore, D., Perez-Parent, M., & Arnfiel, S. (2003). Teacher-pupil dialogue in the guided reading session. *Reading: Literacy and Language*, 37(2), pp47-53
- Skilton, E., & Meyer, T. (1993). "So what are you talking about?": The importance of student questions in the ESL classroom. *Working Papers in EducationalLinguistics*, 9(2), 81-99.
- Smith, P. (2001) *Talking classrooms: Shaping children's learning through oral language instruction*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- White, L., Spada, N., Lightbown, P. M., & Ranta, L. (1991). Input enhancement and L2 question formation. *Applied Linguistics*, 12, 416-432.
- Zhang, Y. (2008). Classroom Discourse and Student Learning. *Asian Social Science Journal*, 4(9), 80-82.