

Language Moves in Classroom Discussion: A Discourse Analysis

Arjay B. Arcena¹, Benedict V. Omblero²

¹Researcher, Graduate School Program, University of Mindanao, Philippines

²Faculty, Graduate School Program, University of Mindanao, Philippines

Abstract

In any classroom discourse, teachers are challenged as to how they elicit responses from their students and make them realize the importance of participation to attain learning. This paper aimed to know the language moves in classroom discourse and focuses on how language move shapes students' participation. It used Flanders' (1970) theory on language moves categorized as structuring, soliciting, responding, and reacting. Using qualitative-descriptive design utilizing discourse analysis, the researcher found out that all patterns of Flanders' moves are present with the following types for soliciting – checking students' day, encouraging to ask questions, asking questions, giving hints, and checking if students learn; for responding – giving commendations, answering questions and queries, and discussing the answers; for structuring – directing/requesting someone to pray, leading the prayer, reviewing the past lesson, introducing topic, interacting through question and answer, explaining the lesson, encouraging students, encouraging students to participate/ to answer questions, asking someone to answer, giving quiz/oral activity, giving directions for quiz/oral activities, giving activity, and asking students to continue the activity; and for reacting – shushing the students, giving announcements/bidding goodbye, greeting, discussing, connecting talks to today's lesson, giving commendations, warning/advising, correcting students' statements/answers, and giving information. Moreover, students voluntarily participate when they are commended by their teachers.

Keywords: Classroom Discourse, Descriptive-Qualitative, Discourse Analysis, Language Moves

1. Introduction

Teachers talk more; students talk less. This still happens until to date. Every time that there is a class discussion, most teachers are always doing the talking leaving the students to seldom talk and only talk a few which resulted to not having elicited enough responses to know whether a student knows something from the lesson or not. It is very important in every classroom for the teacher to give more time to students to express their thoughts in different situations so that the teacher would know what exactly is learned by these students and what, as well, these teachers need to provide in order to scaffold these learnings.

Hattie (2012) said that teachers talk between 70 and 80 percent of class time and teachers' talking increases as the year level rises and as the class size decreases. He further stated that teachers talk far too much and that the proportion of talk to listening needs to change to far less talk and much more listening. This further means that to combat classrooms dominated by teacher talk, giving more focus on listening is very

necessary. In this case, students are given a chance to speak, and more importantly, impose their own prior achievement, understanding, sequencing, and questioning.

Szendroi (2010) also showed in his study a similar result that on average, 71 percent of the talk was done by the teachers whereas 29 percent of the classroom talk was filled by students talk. This further tells us an indication that a lot of teachers in different classroom discussions give more time to what they are giving to students rather than assessing what the students have learned from them. In addition, Behtash, E. and Azarnia, T. (2015) reported their research findings on a teacher talk time that teacher talk dominated a large proportion of class time that is 75 percent, while student talk time comprised less than 20 percent of the class time. Moreover, Gharbavi, A. and Iravani, H. (2014) revealed from their study that the teacher was not successful to create authentic communication.

Thus, this study may give a better understanding as to how our education works here in the Philippines in terms of teaching move using language.

2. Research Questions

This paper sought to answer the following questions:

1. What are the language moves in classroom discourse?
2. How do language moves shape students' participation in classroom discourse?

3. Literature Review

Theoretical Lens

To better understand language use in this study, it refers to the moves done by any teacher during classroom discourse. It further refers to Flanders' (1970) categorized patterns of interaction or talk in different ways, particularly on teacher talk and its consequences for students' achievements, using terms such as *Asking Questions*, *Giving Directions*, *Accepting Feeling*, among others. The move, though not described in linguistic terms, nonetheless has features a little like those eventually adopted by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975), whose work was linguistic. A move could be one of four types: *Soliciting*, in which responses (verbal or non-verbal) were actively sought by the person doing the soliciting; *Responding*, involving some reciprocal relation to the Soliciting move; *Structuring*, in which pedagogical activity was set in train, either by initiating some course of action or by excluding others; and finally *Reacting*, where this was a move undertaken in reaction to any of the others (Christie, 2002). These moves will be identified in this research and be described as to how these moves are used to effectively elicit students' responses which may be used for any assessments, particularly to know whether a student, at present, understands the discussed lesson.

On Language Moves

In recent years, there has been considerable work on genre-based language studies. Particularly in the field of English for Specific Purposes, genre analysis has become an important approach for text analysis (Dudley-Evans, 1994). The term 'genre analysis' was initially used in the ESP context in Swales' (1981, 1990) pioneering work on the Introduction to an academic article (Connor, Upton and Kanoksilapatham, 2007; Dudley-Evans and St John, 1998).

Genre analysis is the analysis of language use in a broader sense in order to account for not only the way text is constructed but also for the way it is likely to be interpreted, used and exploited in specific contexts

to achieve specific goals (Bhatia, 2002). In the field of applied linguistics, such analysis is used to research and describe structure and stylistic features of texts (Coffin, 2001). One of the genre-based approaches used to identify the structure of research articles (RAs) is ‘move analysis’, which has recently become an important area of research. Some influential research on this particular form of analysis has been conducted in Swales’ (1981, 1990) studies. Swales’ Create a Research Space (CARS) model has been used to analyze research articles in different disciplines.

A ‘move’ means a discursual segment that performs a particular communicative function (Swales, 2004). It represents semantic and functional units of texts that have specific purposes (Connor, Upton and Kanoksilapatham, 2007). The focus of move-based analysis is on the hierarchical schematic structures of texts (Nwogu, 1997). With this in mind, it can be said that a move is a semantic unit that associates with the writer’s purpose. Research articles are one genre which has been extensively investigated using the move-based approach. The different conventional sections, Introduction, Methods, Results and Discussions (IMRD), of research articles have been investigated by several researchers. Some studies focus on specific research sections such as the Introduction (e.g. Jogthong, 2001; Samraj, 2002; Swales, 1990), Methods (Lim, 2006, Peacock, 2011), Results (e.g. Brett, 1994; Williams et al, 1999), and Discussion (e.g. Holmes, 1997; Peacock, 2002; Yang and Allison, 2003), whereas other studies analyze all four sections or “IMRD” patterns (e.g. Kanoksilapatham, 2007; Nwogu, 1997; Posteguillo, 1999).

Also, studies on move-based analyses have been extended to compare the rhetorical moves used in English RAs with those of RAs written in other languages such as Chinese (Loi and Evans, 2010), and Slavic (Yakhontova, 2006). It can be seen that analyzing RA sections using the move-based approach has attracted many researchers.

Previous research studies have shown that there are some significant variations in the structural organization in corpora of RA Discussions. For example, Holmes (1997) revealed that the rhetorical structure of social science Discussion sections displayed some distinctive features, such as the result that there is no obligatory move. Also, in a study carried out by Peacock (2002), it was found that there was no compulsory move in 252 Discussions from seven disciplines.

In addition, there were some differences in terms of move employment and cyclicity in the Discussions written by native and non-native writers. In three different corpora (Persian, English, and English as L2), Amirian, Kassaian, and Tavakoli (2008) found that although there was a kind of universality in moves across English and Persian texts, there were some discrepancies in the frequency and sequence of moves, such as the lack of a logical sequence of different moves in the English Discussions written by Persian writers. The marked difference was the pervasive use of ‘Reference to previously mentioned statement’ and ‘Expressing wish for further research’ moves in the Persian corpus that was not found in the English corpus. Results showed that Persian writers tended to make strong claims when explaining and justifying their findings and tried to validate their findings by repetitively referring to past literature.

Although some studies have identified the schematic structure of research articles written by Thai writers, their focus was on other sections, such as the Abstract (e.g. Phanthama, 2000; Promsin, 2006) or Introduction (e.g. Im-O-Cha, Kittidhaworn, Broughton, and Panproegsa, 2019; Jogthong, 2001). To the best of our knowledge, there has been no research published comparing the structural organization of RA Discussions published in local Thai journals with those in international journals.

On Initiation-Response-Feedback

Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) in Atkins (2001) Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) model aims to know as to how these teachers use the language in eliciting responses and participation from their students. IRF was developed from classroom discourse in general secondary classrooms which may give us an idea that it can really be a helpful tool when applied to the language of the classroom. The language of the classroom differs from many forms of spoken discourse and that it is formally structured and controlled by one dominant party, for example, the teacher.

Sinclair and Coulthard began performing research in 1970 to investigate the structure of verbal interaction (Coulthard, 1985, p. 120). Based on their original discourse analysis model year 1975, they found that in traditional, teacher led native-speaker school classrooms, where teacher and student roles were defined, interactions were highly structured (McCarthy, 1991, p. 12). For teachers especially, the Sinclair and Coulthard discourse analysis model has implications because the discourse type it chose to analyze was school lessons (Cook, 1989, p. 46). Initiation-response-feedback, or IRF, is a pattern of discussion between the teacher and learner. The teacher initiates, the learner responds, the teacher gives feedback. This approach to the exchange of information in the classroom has been criticized as being more about the learner saying what the teacher wants to hear than really communicating (teachingenglish.org.uk).

Additionally, this study will use Victoria Fromkin, Robert Rodman, and Nina Hyams' (2017) theory on linguistic features focusing on syntactical features, morphological features, and lexical relationships. Syntactical features, in this research, give focus on the types of statements of the teachers that elicit answers, like interrogatives: WH-questions and yes-no questions, as well as statements under declarative and imperative categories.

Sinclair and Coulthard's spoken discourse model was developed in 1975. The model was based on a rank scale drawn from Halliday's (1961) rank scale on the description of grammar. The model proposed to show how interaction in the classroom takes place by taking a linguistic and functional look at discourse. The structure for the Sinclair and Coulthard model was originally developed through the application of transcripts taken from primary school classroom settings in the 1970's.

However, these settings were primarily teacher centered which has led to criticisms of the model as most modern classrooms do not reflect the structure of the data out of which the model arose. Nevertheless, it remains a relatively powerful model that allows us to objectively evaluate communication that occurs in the classroom.

Moves and Acts

Moves are composed of acts, the minor units in the Sinclair and Coulthard model, and define the function of utterances made by the teacher and students. Sinclair and Coulthard (1992) listed twenty-two acts. These acts combine to make the five classes of move. Each participant can perform separate acts, and it can take more than one such act to accomplish the purpose that the initiator of the exchange has in mind. The three most common acts in the opening move of an exchange are 'elicitation,' 'directive,' and 'informative,' whose functions are, respectively, to request a linguistic response, to request a non-linguistic reaction such as writing or listening, and to convey facts or ideas (Brown, 2001).

Modifications

A modification to the original 1975 model proposed by Willis has been adopted in the analysis to allow the act acknowledged to be accepted as Head of a follow-up move in an eliciting exchange (Willis, 1992).

This modification proved helpful in fitting the data to the model and distinguishing between the display and referential questions in eliciting exchanges, which is evident in the analyzed data.

All these literature reviews will be vital in looking for answers regarding the different language moves that exist in classroom discussions. Moreover, these reviews provide supports to the results that are found in this study about how language moves shape the participation of the students when doing classroom discussions.

4. Methodology

The descriptive-qualitative research design was used in this study, wherein the collected language data from the recorded classroom discussion were analyzed descriptively using the theory on moves of Flanders (1970) focusing on *soliciting*, *responding*, *structuring*, and *reacting*.

Also, Initiation Response Feedback theory of Sinclair and Coulthard (1985) was used to describe qualitatively what is happening in the observed classroom discourses. Descriptive research is designed to describe the characteristics or behaviors of a particular population in a systematic and accurate fashion. McMillan and Schumacher (1993) defined qualitative as primarily an inductive process of organizing data into categories and identifying patterns (relationships) among categories.

The researcher chose this type of study because of its major strengths that could be beneficial in answering the problems found. Tudy and Tudy (2016) enumerated these strengths as: enabling the researcher a view of homogeneous explorations; raise more issues through broad and open-ended inquiry; and allows them to understand behaviors of values, beliefs, and assumptions.

On the other hand, qualitative research design was used to gain a deep understanding of a specific organization or event, rather than a surface description of a large sample of population. Furthermore, a qualitative type of research could help the researcher draw out wealth of knowledge, information, and valuable insights which a quantitative design cannot give. The design of this study aimed to provide an explicit rendering of the structure, order, and broad patterns found among a group of participants. This design was intended to expound the complexities of the utterances in a classroom discussion.

5. Research Participants

This study had 10 participants who were all teachers in one of the higher educational institutions in Davao City. Dukes (1984) stated that in a qualitative research, three (3) to ten (10) participants may be used; they were chosen purposively and accordingly, for they would be coming from the different subject-fields in the academe: Entrepreneurship, General Mathematics, General Biology, English for Academic and Professional Purposes, and Multimedia and Information Literacy. All these teachers were teaching during the data gathering in the Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) strand in the academic track. Thus, teachers who were not teaching the stipulated subjects nor teaching in the STEM strand should never be used as participants in this study. Moreover, those teachers who were teaching in the school not similar to the school where the participants were coming from should not also be included to participate in this study.

More so, these teachers were observed during their actual classroom discussions from November to December of the school year 2018-2019. Voice recorder and cellphone were used to record all classroom discourses so that corpora would be made available for analysis and interpretation. Additionally, qualitative corpus analysis was utilized in this study; it is a methodology for pursuing in-depth

investigations of linguistic phenomena, as grounded in the context of authentic, communicative situations that are digitally stored as language corpora and made available for access, retrieval, and analysis via computer (Hasko, 2012). Corpus design entails the application of selection and sampling criteria according to the purpose of the analysis, as well as issues of size, balance, and representativeness.

6. Instrument of the Study

This paper utilized the transcripts from the recorded class observations of ten (10) teacher-participants from various fields of expertise. Teachers were coded as T₁O₁ for Teacher 1 Observation 1, T₁O₂ for Teacher 1 Observation 2, T₂O₁ for Teacher 2 Observation 1, T₃O₂ for Teacher 3 Observation 2, and so on until T₁₀O₂ for Teacher 10 Observation 2. This means that each teacher was observed twice to be able to find consistency and/or nuances in their classroom discussion with students.

7. Procedure

After the proposal defense and doing all the necessary revisions, the researcher wrote a letter addressed to the program head of the Senior High School department of one higher educational institution in Davao City. It was also made sure that the letter was signed by the researcher's adviser and the dean of the Professional School where the researcher was currently enrolled at to add credibility to the conduct of the study.

With the program head's approval, the researcher wrote a letter addressed to the teacher-participants. These participants were all teaching in the Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics strand of the academic track. These participants were asked to sign the letter indicating their full participation in the conduct of the research including the risk and benefits they might get in accordance to their participation. Much more, these participants were also oriented on what the study is all about. Yet, they would also be oriented to have the usual discussion that they had been doing inside the classroom, so that the data would not be affected.

During the collection of data, the whole duration of each classroom discussion was recorded. This means that from the beginning of class until it ended, class was observed and was made sure to be on record using voice recorder and cellular phones.

All recorded data from the observed classroom discussions were transcribed including the fillers and even the inaudible utterances. This was to make sure that everything that happened in the classroom discourse had been given importance which sometimes might be part of the analysis.

Using the theories from which this study was anchored, the collected data were analyzed and interpreted. It was also made sure that the analysis and interpretation would answer all the questions stipulated in the research question section of the first chapter. After this step would be the presentation of the results.

8. Ethical Considerations

Voluntary Participation

The researcher wrote a letter to the program head seeking approval for the conduct of the study. After the approval, the researcher wrote another letter, addressed to the teacher-participants, this time requesting them to be the participants of the present research. All information needed for the participants to know about the nature of the study, such as objectives, were included in the letter. Yet, if these participants would not agree to participate, the researcher would look for other possible participants whose

qualifications fit to the need of the research which were presented in the inclusion and exclusion criteria in the previous part of this study.

Privacy and Confidentiality

When the researcher had already found the participants for the study, the researcher underwent an in-depth orientation about the study to these participants. The researcher used an open coding to put anonymity with regards to the identity of the participants and to their students especially that the study was done inside the classroom. Open coding involved giving *codes* or *alias* to these participants and their respective students as well as the information like name of their school, addresses, sections, and other information which may lead to identifying them. During the class observation, the researcher video-recorded and voice recorded the entire class discussion. The reason of doing the video recording was to know who was speaking in the recording of the class discussion for proper coding in the transcription. Recorded videos were deleted right after finishing the transcription, but recorded voices were kept as proof for conducting the research. It would be kept inside a folder and be placed in a cabinet where no one would reach it for five years before the researcher would totally delete the recording. More so, only the researcher, the research adviser, and the panelists would be allowed to check the recordings.

Informed Consent Process

Since all the teacher-participants were over 18 years old, then only a letter of consent was sent to them with all the details needed for them to understand better the study. The consent letter had the following information: objectives of the study, their roles as participants, and the observation schedule (their actual class schedule so as not to affect the authenticity of the results), and information about where to contact the researcher (so that the participants could ask their questions prior to the actual class observation). Additionally, these teacher-participants should have finished signing the letter of voluntary participation before the actual day of the conduct of the study.

Recruitment

The researcher sought help from the program head of the school where the study would be conducted. With the letter of approval signed by the program head and with the names of the teacher-participants, the researcher would not be having a problem now on identifying who these teacher-participants are. There would also be a research assistant to help the researcher in doing the class observation, since there were video and voice recorders used during the entire observation.

Risks

Before the data collection, the researcher oriented the participants about their role as data sources of the study. Since this study was only dealing on the different moves of the language use of the participants, then the only risk that this study might encounter was on their possible way of using non-friendly terms during the entire discussion, such as swearing and degrading expressions. Yet, it was promised to these teachers that their identity would not be disclosed to whosoever in their institution and even outside apart from them. If these participants would feel discomfort on unconsciously using these terms, then these terms would not be included or especially coded during the transcription, if these terms were still part of a certain statement that answers the need of the study. After the observation, the participants asked if there were parts of their discussion that they wanted not to be included in the analysis of the data. In addition, if the participants would not be around during the set schedule of observation or if there were unexpected circumstances that happened, the participants were given their full right to withdraw their participation in the said study.

Benefits

The researcher discussed to the participants the different benefits they could get from participating in the study. One of these was knowing their strengths as persons in the academe as well as the other things which they might work more. After having the results, the researcher met again the participants and told the participants about it. Second, the study might also give an idea to these participants about the other good things that the other participants were doing inside their classroom and might use these as well in their respective classes so as to have variations in their methods of teaching which might benefit more their students. The participants received tokens and snacks from the researcher after the observation; no other thing, like cash, was given to these participants.

Plagiarism

To avoid plagiarism, the researcher paraphrased the parts that needed to be paraphrased in the study and provided sources also to those information that needed to be given sources. More so, the researcher made use of a tool to check the paper and made sure that it passed the plagiarism test. This was done again before the final submission of the paper – the researcher should give a soft copy to the designated office within the university that is responsible of doing the said checking on plagiarism.

Fabrication

This research is an original study and no part of the results was copied from previous studies. There were some parts of the literature review which were gotten from different sources, yet they were only used as part of the review of related literature which were used as basis and support to whatever results found in this present study. More so, it was properly observed that these literature reviews were paraphrased correctly so that no part would be misinterpreted by the researcher all throughout the making of the said study. Proper citations are also observed so that credits must be given to whom the credits are due.

Falsification

All results are original and are based only on the data gathered that are analyzed using the theories stipulated. No portion of this study's results are copied or purposely changed, added, or modified just to put the researcher's own personal bias or whosoever. It is rest assured that what is included in the study are only those results found during the analysis of the data gathered. These results are also supported only by the appropriate literature reviews in the discussion section of the study.

Conflict of Interest (COI)

This study is an academic paper personally authored by the researcher, and no other agencies nor individuals are funding the paper for whatever purpose there is. It is written by the author as a partial requirement in the respective program he is under at present. Thus, by finishing this paper, the entire entitlement of the authorship of this paper is only given to the author himself and no other else.

Deceit

Before the beginning of this study, all participants were individually oriented as to what were the objectives of the study and how was it done. All of them were also given a copy of the letter asking their consent and willingness to participate in the study for them to review before signifying their signatures and before the scheduled dates for the observations. No part of the letter was falsified and that may trace any form of deceit. The letter specifies religiously everything that these participants should know about the entirety of the study.

Permission from Organization/Location

A certificate signed by the dean of Professional School of the university allowing the researcher to conduct the study was given to the program head of the institution where the researcher had the data gathering of his study. This certificate was attached with the letter to the program head of the Senior High School department to get the approval for the data gathering from some of the faculty members' class discussions. The researcher even wrote a letter to each participant, and attached to the letter were those papers signed by the program of the senior high school department head and the dean of the professional school where the researcher is currently enrolled at.

Authorship

The researcher, a graduate of Master of English in Applied Linguistics, was working with his adviser who is a graduate of Doctor of Philosophy in Applied Linguistics. It is believed that the adviser of the researcher is capable of guiding the researcher on the different parts and the actual making of the study from conceptualization, data gathering and analysis, and presentation of results since it is his field of expertise. The researcher, on the other hand, is also a discourse analyst for he has also been doing different linguistic studies prior to the making of this present study. Furthermore, the researcher is a grammarian and a translator which may help him to analyze critically all data he has. Yet, in spite of that, the researcher still believes that nothing compares to the expertise of those who took the field of linguistic first. With this, the researcher asked two more linguistic experts to check all data and analysis of the study; the researcher underwent a peer review before the final presentation of the paper.

9. Results and Discussion

In any classroom discourses, teachers are responsible to make students learn the lessons they are giving during their class meetings, and to do that, they need to have their strategies that answer the need of the students. These strategies can be in any form like asking questions, posing a situation, giving rewards, requesting the students, commending them, among others. Asking questions, especially higher-order questions, enable the students to think in-depth which makes their participation increase. This is supported by Vygotsky (1934) who argued that higher mental processes are required through the internalization of the structures of social discourse. Yet, there is still a need for these detailed linguistic and ethnographic analyses of classroom discourse to include independent evidence of how students' knowledge and beliefs are changed by their participation in the discourse.

Nuthall (1973) added that asking higher-order questions, providing structuring information, and praising student answers have been correlated with student achievement – in this case, students' participation in any form of classroom discourse. With this, teachers really need to know how to make these students participate in the different tasks they are doing inside their classroom.

Thus, from the perspective of what students need to know in order to participate, management on class and different activities and instruction on how to do different tasks cannot be separated (Graesser and Person, n.d.). Additionally, this higher-order questions help the students to think critically which would empower them to really learn.

Critical thinking or to produce graduate who are critical thinkers is one of the objectives of the country when they designed the K-12 program. To note, Republic Act No. 10533 or also known as Act Enhancing the Philippine Basic Education System by Strengthening its curriculum and increasing the number of years

for Basic Education, Section 2 or the Declaration of Policy, hereby declared the policy of the state that every graduate of basic education shall be an empowered individual who has learned, through a program that is rooted on sound educational principles and geared towards excellence, the foundations for learning throughout life, the competence to engage in work and be productive, the ability to coexist in fruitful harmony with local and global communities, the capability to engage in autonomous, creative, and *critical thinking*, and the capacity and willingness to transform others and one's self (DepEd, 2012).

Language Moves

In Classroom Discourse

It can be observed in any classroom discourse that teachers solicit ideas about the students' daily experience by checking how the students' day going. Some transcripts are provided below.

T: Okay. Now everyone, how was the long weekend? T₁O₁

T: What did you do last time? Natulog? You needed some rest as well. T₄O₁
(*What did you do last time? Did you sleep? You needed some rest as well.*)

T: Okay, be seated. Kamusta ang inyong performance ganiha? T₅O₂
(*Okay, be seated. How was your performance?*)

Solicitation happened in the above-given samples since students will provide responses regarding what their teachers were asking about. In this way, teachers would know the status of their students that could be used as supplemental details during their discussion on that day. In addition, teachers may also provide advice, or additional inputs, or clarity regarding students' experiences and previous topics before they start their scheduled lesson-discussion. This part of their conversation may lead students to feel at ease talking to their teachers and may result to having good conversation about the possible topics in the entire duration of the lesson-discussion.

Another language move that is apparent in the transcripts is encouraging students to ask questions. It is common for the teachers to encourage students to ask questions regarding what happened last meeting as a form of assessment on what the students understood about their previous lesson before starting a new one. This is also to connect the answers of their students to the lesson that would be discussed on that day. Not only that, teachers also do the same strategy every after doing certain step of a larger process. See the sample transcripts below.

T: Sige daw, sige daw. Isulat daw what's your concern, ano yong tinatanong nya? T₄O₁
(*Let's try. Please write your concern, what was he asking about?*)

T: Pangutana jud ug wala nakasabot. T₄O₁
(*You really need to ask if you didn't understand.*)

T: Pero katong wala jud naka-answer? Walay question? Wala? T₁O₁

(How about those who did not answer, don't you have questions?)

Notice in the samples that teachers were asking their students whether they have questions or none about the lesson, and even encouraged them to ask if they did not understand or if there was a portion that they did not get [T₄O₁]. Notice also that a teacher [T₁O₁] even repeated their question to make sure that everything is cleared and that everyone understood. If there were no questions, at all, teachers would then structuralize their statements to continue the discussion or introduce new topics.

After introducing a certain topic, teachers solicited again ideas from the students through asking questions. These questions were all related to the day's topic which gave the teachers an idea as to how far these students knew and understood about the topic to be discussed and for the other students to know some more ideas from their classmates. Consider the sample transcripts below.

T: What is the first step to become a successful entrepreneur? T₁O₁

T: Okay for the first rule, for the first law what is the operation used in this law? T₃O₁

There were three moves that teachers had after this part of soliciting: (1) reacting due to receiving answers from the students, be it correct or not; (2) giving hints by producing first few sounds of the answer, giving examples, and defining the answer; and (3) repeating keywords. With these moves, the teachers were able to know if the students really learned from the discussion and from their classmates' personal thoughts on the matter.

After getting ideas from the students and after answering the students' queries, teachers went back to structuring through discussing properly the lesson and clarifying the issues found during the soliciting of answers with the students. After all issues had been answered and clarified, teachers solicited again to the students by providing hints from them. Consider the sample transcripts below.

T: Are you talking in behalf of the seller or in behalf of the buyer? T₁O₁

T: You don't need to transform this one into exponential, you can solve this one using logarithmic. T₃O₂

Observe that in the first transcript [T₁O₁], the teacher provided the hints through the choices given whether *seller* or *buyer*. On the other hand, the second sample [T₃O₂] provided the possible technique to be used in solving the problem. However, the students need to know where, in particular, this technique could be used among the given problems.

Finally for this move, solicitation, teachers check if the students learn the topic discussed on that day. The samples below are provided.

T: Okay. So, for today's oral recitation umm our objective is to assess if you really have learned something about the discussion and the four P's of marketing...okay? So, let's start. T₁O₁

T: Okay, naintindihan? T₅O₁
(Okay, so you understand?)

The first sample [T₁O₁] was more of an assessment through oral recitation, which is one way of really evaluating the understanding of the students. Unlike the first sample, the second [T₅O₁] is simply asking

the students if they understood or not the lesson, which can only be answered with a yes and a no. This kind of assessment could not provide a definite data whether, truly, they learned or not.

Responding appropriately to students' thoughts and ideas about anything that is discussed or presented could make these students feel better; hence would provide more elicitations. Commending these students would be one best way of eliciting responses from them. Sample of commendations are as follows:

T: Okay, alright Thank you. Okay T₁O₁

T: Exactly, di ba? T₁O₁
(*Exactly, right?*)

T: Oy kabalo jud siya. T₁O₁
(*He really knows.*)

T: Yes culture very good... T₂O₂

T: Very good. So kana nga part... T₄O₁
(*Very good. That's the part...*)

A simple 'okay', 'very good', or 'thank you' will really make a difference to students. This could make them feel appreciated and proud. This is also a confirmation that teachers value the efforts of the students and their willingness to learn. These tokens, as affirmation of teachers' appreciation to students who show gusto toward learning, create an avenue for students to participate more and even to respond positively to teachers' activities and questions.

Another move under responding is answering questions and queries of students. Primarily, the purpose of teaching is to make students learn, and one way of making them learn is through clarifying their questions on a certain matter. This is why, as teachers, we need to be ready always about students' questions. Sometimes, they ask questions that are more advanced than we thought. See how the teachers responded to their students queries below.

S: Ma'am, nonetheless na mataas ang price o mababa, if 'yong customer niya is nakita na valuable 'yong isang product, bilhin nya talaga? Parang ganon lang talaga?
(*Ma'am, neither the price is high or low, if the customer saw the product's value, will he really buy it? Is it really like that?*)

T: Well, depende sa customer kung naa siyay 'kwarta. T₁O₁
(*Well, it depends if the customer has money or none.*)

S: so flowery?

T: flowers

S: Hala perfect, naa poy imperfect?
(*Oh, It's perfect. Is there also imperfect flower?*)

T: Meron, isang male and female reproductive organs. T₅O₂
(*There is, with one male and one female reproductive organs*)

The first sample [T₁O₁] was about a student clarifying to their teacher the idea they understood from the teacher's presentation. This was, eventually, responded by the teacher with an answer that depended on an existing situation. Meanwhile, the second sample [T₅O₂] was about a student who was innocently asking about a detail that had not been presented yet. Gladly, the teacher addressed the matter with an explanation. One may have an idea here that the conversation continued with further explanation to clarify questions among these students.

The last move under responding is discussing the answers. When the teachers already got the information or not, they tended to react to get some more information through students' explanation or elaboration of their answers which led to discussing things out. If the teachers were not satisfied still with the students' answers, they solicited some more ideas from the students through asking questions related to what was presently discussed. The teachers reacted, thereafter, and gave commendations to those students who had given correct answers. See the sample transcripts below.

T: Alright. That's actually right. Well, now marketing is not just all about the umm ordinary buying and selling. It's actually, we have misconceptions about marketing. We always uhh think about promotion, 'di ba? When we say marketing...where in fact, marketing is all about the ummm ehhe it's all about putting the product at the right price, right place. T₁O₁

T: Very good. Life was put on earth by divine forces. This belief is common to many of the world's religious especially to our ah yong individual religion natin even ang even ang mga Muslim may ibang paniniwala sila kung saan galing... T₅O₁
(Very good. Life was put on earth by divine forces. This belief is common to many of the world's religious especially to our individual religion. Even Muslims have their belief where it came from.)

If there were times that students did not have ideas about the questions given by the teachers, the latter gave hints which were in a form of solicitation or simply explaining it like the above-given samples. This part clarifies the information not clear to the students and gives the teachers a chance to assess what the students understood in the process of learning the lesson.

After all these, the teachers did the structuring again, but this time, they encouraged students to ask questions for more clarity of the lesson. There might be some information not clear still to some of the learners, thus, this was done. This might result also to having two moves: one was another structuring through posing a question, and two was through soliciting by asking students to repeat what has been explained using own words.

T: Hello lead the prayer. T₅O₁

T: Prayer! prayer! who will lead the prayer?T₅O₁

T: Lead the closing prayer Mr.____T₇O₁

T: Okay so let's stand now...please lead the prayer ok let's pray now. T₇O₂

It is evident in some teachers of this research that they value the importance of starting any activity with a prayer to be guided in the entire session of their classes. This is not only true when starting a class, but this is also practiced after ending the session [T₇O₁] before getting out from the classroom. Sometimes, teachers do not ask their students to lead the prayer, but there are also times that they lead the prayer, themselves.

In addition and before starting their class, teachers do reviewing their past lessons by asking students to briefly discuss what they had last meeting.

T: Let's have a review of what we already discussed last time.

So who can discuss or give examples? T₂O₁

This is done by the teachers to assess if their students are ready to connect past lessons to what they would be discussing at present. This is a sort of solicitation, yet since it is done before beginning the main lesson of the current meeting, it falls under structuring.

After assessing the students, the teachers would now start introducing the topic. Understand the connection of the following sample transcripts to reviewing the past lessons.

T: Okay. Very good. Now let's proceed directly to our main lesson. The main topic given... T₁O₂

T: ...because out topic for today is... T₅O₁

T: Okay this time I hope you're ready we will talk about media information courses. T₇O₁

Teachers may confirm the correctness of the students' answer regarding the past topic and commend them for presenting such. Then the teachers may continue now to the main lesson for that day [T₁O₂], or directly connect both past and present topics [T₅O₁], or making sure that students would discover it themselves the connection of the past and present lessons through readying them with the review activity [T₇O₁].

There could also be times that teachers will ask few questions before engaging to the main lesson. This would provide them an avenue to know the prior knowledge of students.

T: I have one question. Ano ang nasa flower aside from being colorful?

(I have a question. What's in the flower why is it colorful?)

S1: seed

S2: petals

S3: stem; life

Then, actual explanation of the lesson would follow. While explaining the lesson, teachers would also encourage students to ask their questions or to participate in the discussion.

T:...so any questions or clarification about that? T₂O₁

T: ...clarification? None so far? Sigang next. T₂O₁

(Clarification? None so far? Okay, next.)

T: Wala?...participate mo last discussion na nako ni sa lecture. T₅O₂

(Is there really nothing? Please participate for this is my last lecture.)

There could also be times that teachers called students' names just to answer teachers' questions. This is commonly done when there were no single student who would like to participate, or if not, to make sure that a student has participated for everyone already had.

T: ...where is (student's name)? Same question, 1.5 million
na pick-up then akong ihatag sa imoha is tseki. Question:
Do you have the right not to accept my payment? Yes or no? T₁O₁
*(Where is (student's name)? The same question, the vehicle is worth
1.5 million. Then I'll pay you with a check. Question: Do you have the
right not to accept my payment? Yes or no?)*

T: oh different taste, what else? What do you need, ahh what do you
consider when going ahhh yes Pink? T₂O₂

Additionally, teachers structure their lessons through giving directions for quiz or any oral activities, actual giving of activity, and asking students to continue doing their activity. Samples for these are the following:

T: Input this one in your calculator, then, we will come
up with an answer of 450 dollars okay? T₁O₂

T: Overall, the perfect score is 12. Lowest score is 3. 4
ang highest rating per criterion and 1 is the lowest. Okay
reporters take the stage. T₄O₁

T: Isulat na lang ninyo kung nay mali sa hand-outs. T₄O₁
(Please write if there is something wrong found in the handouts.)

T: ...interview current owner listed in the disclosure
document...investigate the franchisor's history and profitability... T₂O₁

T: siges ipadayon na ang example para Makita nila. T₄O₁
(Let's continue doing the sample, so that they can see it.)

T: O, siges daw i-expand daw na using your definition a while ago. T₄O₁
(Expand that using your definition a while ago.)

The first two sample transcripts show the teachers giving directions to their students [T₁O₂ and T₄O₁]. Additionally, the third and fourth samples show teachers giving actual activity to students [T₄O₁ and T₂O₁] while fifth and sixth sample transcripts show teachers asking students to continue doing their activity [T₄O₁].

Reacting was also evident in the transcripts, as one language move. In the table presented above, teachers had commonality in terms of shushing their students when having their classes. Teachers shushed students because of some reasons: they cannot hear what was being presented by other students; they are irritated

by these students' noise; or they would simply like to get the attention of these students especially if they are discussing.

T: What is marketing? shhhh everyone...what is marketing? T₁O₁

T: Yes? Everyone, please. Shhhh...no coaching. T₁O₁

T: Shhh! Huh? Class, listen! T₁O₂

It can also be noticed that under reacting, giving announcements/bidding goodbye and greeting are found under it. These are all casual and usual reactions towards actions and behaviors between teachers and students inside the classroom. Samples are provided below.

T: Okay so that's all for this afternoon, please all stand. T₃O₁

T: So that's all for this afternoon. Goodbye class. T₃O₂

T: May announcement ako next meeting intramurals nyo na. ang attendance niyo like for Tuesday yesterday, Thursday... ganon talaga class days pa rin yon dapat maibigay and attendance saakin. T₅O₂
(I have an announcement. Next week will be your intramurals. Your attendance will still be checked and be submitted to me.)

T: Merry Christmas and a Happy New year one month na lang... T₂O₂
(Merry Christmas and a happy new year. There's only one month left.)

T: good afternoon. T₅O₁

Participants T₃O₁ and T₃O₂ are both bidding goodbye while T₅O₂ is giving announcement. On the other hand, T₂O₂ and T₅O₁ are both greetings. All these moves are most likely to acquire responses from students.

To add more, it is evident that giving commendations, warning/advising, and correcting students' statements or answers elicit responses also from students.

T: Very good, it would form into cell... T₅O₁

T: Hoy...mabagsak jud ka sa quiz. Okay I'll give you a chance, remember your quiz last time, do you think it's a good number? T₂O₁
(You will really fail the quiz. Okay I'll give you a chance, remember your quiz last time, do you think you passed?)

S: Franchise...

T: No, it's not franchise. Subsidiary are some of sub-division of the business kunyare San Miguel Corporation is the mother company... T₂O₁
(No, it's not franchise. Subsidiary means some of sub-division

of the business. Like San Miguel Corporation, as the mother company.)

Meanwhile, giving information has been found out also to elicit responses, maybe because it created unclear pictures to students' minds. Hence, the need to be clarified arose that enabled the students to question their teacher as a form of response to the teachers' presentation.

T: Ang ginawa ng San Miguel Corp, they decided to merge all the subsidiaries and other conglomerates because they also have an international business, they operate in Macau, Taiwan, Vietnam and some of South-East Asian countries, ganun. So ang ginawa... T₂O₁
(What San Miguel Cord did, they decided to merge all the subsidiaries and other conglomerates because they also have an international business, they operate in Macau, Taiwan, Vietnam and some of South-East Asian countries.)

After asking the students, teachers explained to students the lesson of the day. This part of the discussion lets the teachers confer everything they wanted to share and give to their learners. After the teachers' discussion, the teachers solicited information from the students as to what were the things they understood from the teachers' discussion of the lesson. This lets the teachers recognize students' learning that might convince them to reiterate information, to clarify meanings, or to end their discussion.

After everything had been given and cleared, teachers did the structuring again through giving direction for a quiz or any activity. When the quiz or any activity was done, the teachers responded to the need of the students to know what really the correct answer in each quiz item was or how the activity should be properly done; with this, teachers needed to have a discussion of the answers and of the activity-process. Then teachers ended the meeting by reacting through bidding a simple goodbye.

This study found out that teachers tend to do the following for structuring: requesting/asking/commanding someone to do something; giving directions, asking someone to answer, introducing topic, discussing, encouraging someone to ask questions, giving quiz or activity, and asking students to continue doing the activity. These are all true from Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories (1970). There, he classified teacher talk to seven moves in all four categories.

Requesting/Asking/Commanding someone to do something

Students: Hi, ma'am.

Teacher: Hello, lead the prayer.

Student: In the name of the Father, the Son, the Holy Spirit,

Amen. Lord, thank you for all the blessings

–T₅

The transcript above shows a sample of requesting wherein the teacher started with a greeting "hello" before the indirect request itself, "lead the prayer", which made the student do the request. Flanders believed that a teacher needs to accept the students' feelings in any conversation. Greeting may give the students a positive implication that helps them respond positively and participate in classroom discourses. It is the desire of any teachers to get a quick intervention from their students that effectively manage student behavior. One of these interventions is greeting students (Carnine, 1997). This was what Allday and Pakurar (2007) did in their study when they used a multiple baseline design across participants and settings to measure the effects of teacher greetings on students' on-task behavior. Their intervention

included greeting the target student at the door using the student's name, followed by a brief, positive interaction that communicated expectations.

Allday and Pakurar (2007) further supported this study's claim through their study by saying that the produced teacher greetings increases students' on-task behavior from a mean of 45% in baseline to a mean of 72% during the intervention phase. They added that teacher greetings represent an antecedent manipulation that can easily be implemented in classrooms to improve students' on-task behavior. This further means that as the main leaders inside the classroom, teachers need to have a positive way to start and end their classes; one of which is to give greeting to their students for these students to feel that they are cared for and recognized.

Giving directions

Teacher: What did you do last lime? *Natulog*? You need some rest as well. Okay, so we will continue with the reporting with a new topic. However, I would want to collect the exercise that was assigned to the reporters last time. Nacheckannaba?

(Had we checked it?)

Student: Wala pa, ma'am.

-T₄

Instruction-giving has a direct effect on learning; a lesson or activity becomes chaotic and fails when students do not understand what they are supposed to do (Sowell, 2017). It is observed in the transcript that the teacher was giving the students an instruction to continue their reporting on that day of their class meeting, but since the teacher asked the previous reporters to give an activity to those non-reporters, then the teacher added another direction in a declarative manner to give to her the output. This is for the students not to be confused which task they are going to do first. This further means that teachers' way of giving direction should be specific, simple, and clear (Hannaford, 1995).

Though, Jensen (1998) added that teachers should avoid giving multiple directions at one time. Giving directions one at a time allows the students to process the information. When multistep directions are necessary, tell the students the directions and then guide them through the directions as needed. Flanders (1970) also believes that teachers need to give directions to the students in order for the teachers to assess the learning of the students with regards to the outputs about the tasks given to them. This giving of directions by the teachers to students was also included by Flanders in his seven moves of teacher talk.

Asking someone to answer

Teacher: Unsay number 2 question?

Student: Number 2, what is the internet?

-T₈

Cotton (1988) provided reasons as to why teachers need to ask students questions; these are as follow: to develop interest and motivate students to become actively involved in lessons; to evaluate students' preparation and check on homework or seatwork completion; to develop critical thinking skills and inquiring attitudes; to review and summarize previous lessons; to nurture insights by exposing new relationships; to assess achievement of instructional goals and objectives, and to stimulate students to pursue knowledge on their own.

The transcript is actually an example of reviewing previous lesson – in this example, reviewing the previous question. The teacher wanted to know if the students listened carefully to what he was telling them about, especially that they were having a quiz that time. It is very important for teachers to always check their students, so that they would also know if the students are still with them while having their classes or not. Paul and Elder (2000) stated that ‘thinking is not driven by answers but by questions. Had no questions been asked by those who laid the foundation for a field...the field would never have developed in the first place’. In order to keep a field of thought or a concept or a topic alive, teachers have to constantly ask questions of it, rather than simply allowing that field to close down. Teachers are then able to challenge existing or established answers through questioning to challenge students’ thinking.

Introducing topic

Teacher: Are you guys ready? Okay, each group will be given three minutes to guess the word...and these words are related to the topic that we will discuss this afternoon.

Student: Yes, ma’am.

Student: Wow!

-T₆

Another way of structuring is introducing topic. Flanders (1970) included this in his seven types of teacher talk, included in lectures. In this manner, students would know what lesson they are going to discuss in a certain meeting as per opened and described by their teachers. The transcript above shows an interactive way of introducing a new topic – that is through a game.

Kevin Yee (2019) said that interactive way of introducing topics may have multiple benefits. It can give the instructor an easy and quick assessment if students have really mastered the material or plan to dedicate more time to it, if necessary. Also, the process of measuring student understanding in many cases is also practice for the material. Finally, Yee added that the very nature of these assessments drives interactivity and brings several benefits: students are revived from their passivity of merely listening to a lecture and instead become attentive and engaged; second, these could be prerequisites for effective learning. These techniques are often perceived as “fun”, yet they are frequently more effective than lectures at enabling student learning.

This opening of new topic leads to discussing the lesson. Corcoran (2015) stated in her study that discussion in classrooms makes students’ learning more interactive, and it helps the students develop their skills that cannot be taught in any traditional formats of lecture. She further stated that discussion whether in a large group or small group is not perfect, but she believes that teachers can do a lot to improve their use of discussion inside their respective classrooms.

Discussing

Teacher: And the last one for this session is the hasty generalization, class, or the sweeping generalization. Sweeping *siya*...a sample is not significant or enough to support a generalization about a population...

Students: Ahhhhh.

-T₉

Discussing something to students will benefit them a lot. It was found in the in the study of Costa, et. al, (2007) that discussion sessions were enjoyed by undergraduate students, and even results show that this

practice increases knowledge retention compared to a usual teacher-centered lectures. More so, discussions help students develop and strengthen interpersonal communication skills as well as analytical and critical thinking skills. Research shows a positive correlation between the quality of classroom discussion and how well students understand what they have learned (Murphy et al., 2009). It also suggests that improved discussion in the classroom will help students build better problem solving skills (Murphy, et al., 2009). Corcoran (2015) added that discussion is a tool to be used inside the classroom, for when it is used properly, it increases students' enjoyment of the class and strengthens students' understanding of concepts.

Encouraging someone to ask questions

Teacher: Okay, guys. Do you have any questions?

Students: Wala, ma'am.

(None, ma'am.)

-T₁

By saying, "do you have any questions", the teacher encourages the students to ask their queries if they would like to clarify things up or if ever there are other things related to their topic that they would like to know. Teaching students to ask questions involves changing student behaviors. Yet, the only way to change student behaviors is to first change our teaching behaviors (Jones-Carey, 2017). This means that there should be a constant encouragement of teachers for the students to ask questions, for it may be one of the avenues for teachers to know student learning that teachers may use for assessment. Moreover, it is believed that students' questions can serve different functions such as confirmation of an expectation (Chin, 2002), resolution of an unexpected puzzle, and filling a recognized knowledge gap (Biddulph and Osborne, 1982). Student questioning, particularly at the higher cognitive levels, is also an essential aspect of problem-solving (Pizzini & Shepardson, 1991; Zoller, 1987).

Giving quiz or activity

Teacher: One fourth sheet of paper, write your name, section and then the date today.

Student: ...wala na koy ballpen.

(I don't have ballpen anymore.)

-T₇

After having the discussion, teachers are now ready to give their assessments. This is what the above given sample is showing us. The teacher was asking the students to get a piece of paper to prepare them for an activity through a quiz. In this way, students participate for they know what consequences they may possibly get by not following the teachers' command. Giving activities after a certain discussion gives an idea to the teacher about students' learning. According to Hanna and Dettmer (2004), assessment is the process of gathering data; more specifically, it is a way instructors gather data about their teaching and their students' learning. Moreover, Hanna and Dettmer (2004) suggested that teachers should strive to develop a range of assessments strategies that match all aspects of their instructional plans. This is because assessments measure if and how students are learning and if the teaching methods used by the teachers are effectively relaying the intended messages to student-learners.

There are also times that teachers end their classes by just asking their students to continue the activities they are doing in order for them to finish it. This is true like what is shown in the sample below.

Asking students to continue the activity

Teacher: That's all for today. Continue doing your activity and submit it next meeting.

Students: Yes, ma'am. Thanks, ma'am.

-T₁₀

It is always believed that teachers would like their students to finish every task they are giving to them. There may be times that students do not finish on the time given the activities that their teachers gave them; teachers need to do something about it. When students enter school, their level of interest and desire to engage in learning are also heavily influenced by teachers, administrators, the school environment, and their classmates (Lumsden, 1994). This is one reason why they tended not to do on the prescribed schedule their activities. Although it may sometimes seem that teachers have no control over students' attitudes about learning, researchers confirm that they do (Anderman and Midgley, 1998). To a very large degree, students expect to learn if their teachers expect them to learn (Lumsden, 1994, p. 2); this is the why the teacher needed sometimes to give consideration to students given that the students will be reprimanded, somehow, of their passive actions.

Another category of Flanders (1970) move is soliciting. Soliciting is said to be a move where responses, in this case is only verbal, were actively sought by the person doing the soliciting. Soliciting has different types that are found in this study; these are the following: checking students' day, asking questions/questioning, checking students' activities, giving hints/checking students' learning, and asking someone to do something.

Checking students' day

Teacher: How is your day? Okay lang ba mo?

(Are you okay?)

Students: Okay lang, ma'am.

(We're okay, ma'am.)

Students: Yes, ma'am.

Teachers: Maayo. So, may I request everyone to stand and pray.

(Good to hear that.)

-T₁₀

Everyone wants to be cared for – and one way of showing care is through checking one's day. This is all true to some teachers; they check their students for they want to know if their students are still doing fine or the other way around. Teachers' behavior as cited by Khalid, Yasmin, and Azeem (2011) has received significant attention in studies of the work place. This is due to the general recognition that this variable can be major determination of students' performance. Much more, the transcript shows us that the teacher is concerned about the students' wellness. By responding, *Maayo*, there is a feeling of happiness on the teacher's side towards the students' status. This further means that the teacher is encouraged by the answer of the students to have class on that day and would like to give back the encouragement to the students through asking them to stand and pray before starting their lesson that day. Murphy (2005) quoted that teachers are those who influence the students and adults in the school setting. Teachers are identified who reached out to others with encouragement technical knowledge to solve classroom problems and enthusiasm for learning new things. The definition of teacher and those they are contributing to school

reform for students' learning. Teachers are characterized as individuals who are actively involved in promoting change and effectively communicate with students (Haris and Muijs, 2002).

Asking questions/Questioning

Teacher: ...Okay, so this time, I hope you're ready. We will talk about media information sources. So first I would like to ask you, where did you get information?

Students: Internet

Teacher: Internet, saan pa?

(Where else?)

Students: (in chorus) TV, radio, book, magazines

Teacher: Bakit internet ang pinakauna niyong sinabi?

(Why is internet your first answer?)

Student: Dali lang, sir.

-T₇

Most likely, classroom discussions are dominated by question and answer activities with teachers, the ones asking most of the questions to students, leaving the students to talk less. In this way, teachers control the discourse between them. As stated by Chaudron (1988) in Walsh (2006), most of the studies on teachers' questioning behavior have examined the ways in which questions facilitate the production of target language forms or correct content-related responses. Many of the question-types selected and used by language teachers are of the closed variety and produce only short responses from students. This can be noticed in the transcript provided above. Students only answered directly the questions of the teacher with a word or words and not with elaborations. This is because the teacher posed a question that needed also a single-word answer.

Yet it is noted that students answered the second question of the teacher with similar short answer even though it needed to have an elaboration. Moreover, the students' answer was a very obvious reply due to the extensive availability of internet in today's generation. Students may answer differently like "since almost all information are available there already" or "because almost all depend on it at present", yet no one did that. When this happen, teachers should probe their questions. Kyrene (2016) shared that there are times that the initial response of students may be superficial. The instructor needs to use a questioning strategy called probing to make students explore initial comments. These probing questions are useful in getting students more involved in critical analysis of their own and other students' ideas.

Moreover, Cotton (2001) stated that questioning may result in the following amongst high school students: on-task behavior, speculative thinking on the part of the students, and relevant questions posed by the students. However, he also stated that 'simply asking higher cognitive questions does not necessarily lead students to produce higher cognitive responses'. This claim is supported by Lemov (2015) who stated that 'without sufficient factual knowledge this questioning will lead to unfounded speculation'. As teachers, it is important that we plan the use of open questions carefully and attempt to foresee the potential pitfalls of our questions.

Checking students' activities

Teacher: Take your seats.

Students: Thank you sir.

Teacher: Okay, did you start the survey?

Students: Yes, sir.

Teacher: Okay na today?

Students: Ay, wala pa mi nagpaprint.

Teacher: ...start the survey to—next week Monday.

Students: Okay sir.

-T₂

To check students' activities is very essential in any classroom discourses since it enables the teachers to know about the achievement of the student-learners. More so, it gives the teachers a chance to know what to do when the activity is done or not – teachers may do scaffolding as a sign of support to students or may continue with another lesson, depending on the outputs that these students produced from the previous given activity. Students' sense of relatedness is most often studied with a focus on emotionally supportive dyadic teacher-student interactions. Klem and Connell (2004) used a threshold method for demonstrating the effects of perceived teacher support on student engagement and achievement. Their analyses then focused on how students' engagement predicted their achievement threshold, and found out that students who exerted more effort on their school work, paid attention in class and valued school were more likely to do well on the index. On the other hand, those who exerted less effort had the opposite results.

Giving hints/Checking students' learning

Teacher: Over ten raise to four point four. Now transform this one into exponential, pero ang inyong naandan man gud, na-una ang log diri...Over ten raise to four point four, 'di ba mao inyong na-andan? 'Di ba? Nakasanayan ninyo? So base?
*(...but you are used to having log here first.
... this is what you are used to, right?)*

Student: Ten.

Teacher: Transform into?

Students: Exponential.

Teacher: Exponential. Kaya ten raise to... pila tong fifty-four point... over five? Ten point?
(So, ten raise to...what was that fifty-four point... over five again? Ten point?)

Students: Eight.

Teacher: Fifty-four over five is equal to EB over ten, raise to four point four, tama? Pila gani ni? Ten point?

(...raise to four point four, right? What's the answer again?)

Students: Eight.

-T₃

It is noted in the transcript given that the teacher was actually giving hints to the students as to what was the next step to be done. The teacher's hints was also an indicator whether the students know the steps or not through their answers. This method of the teacher is called scaffolding through giving hints. Alibali (2006) suggests that as students progress through a task, faculty can use a variety of scaffolds to accommodate students' different levels of knowledge. More complex content might require a number of

scaffolds given at different times to help students master the content. One of his scaffolding methods is explanations which could be written instructions for a task; verbal explanation of how a process works. The teacher's way of giving hints falls under this scaffolding method where the teacher tried to explain how the process worked in the problem they were solving through verbal explanation. Additionally, when planning to use scaffolding to students, consider Hogan and Pressley's (1997) suggestion – practice scaffold topics and strategies that the students in a teacher's class know well.

Asking someone to do something

Teacher: A round of applause to everyone...okay class

This time, I'm going to announce your performance task number one.

Students: Yehey!

Teacher: Ang performance task number one ninyo...

(Your first performance task is...)

Student: Yes, ma'am.

Teacher: The performance task that you are going to do is to make an advertisement out of fallacies... you can choose two to three fallacies...3 minutes minimum, 5 minutes maximum...November 9 and then you send it to me, g-mail account

Student: video?

Teacher: Yes.

-T₇

One way to assess students' learning about the discussed lesson is through letting the students work something out from what they have learned in the lesson. That is why teachers, most commonly, are doing this assessment after having their classes. In this case, students tend to participate and like it which makes them to participate even more the next time around. Costa (2007) stated that increasing how much students actively participate in the classroom increases also the students' enjoyment of the class and their retention of factual knowledge.

The transcript above shows that the students were excited upon hearing that they would be having their first performance task through doing a videoed advertisement. It is believed that if students like the activity that they are going to do, they tend to do it with much enthusiasm and perfection. Yet, it is expected that not always teachers would have similar activities for their different lessons. Sometimes teachers would like only to have an incorporation of activity to the lesson they are discussing. With this, teachers need to plan something, modifying the usual discussion to smaller group discussion which enables still the students to have fun since they are in a group and they can still get a lot of information from the other members. Jing (2010) said that in smaller groups, student participation tends to be spread out more equally among group members than it is in a large group. In a full class discussion, only one person can speak at a time, but when a class is broken up into smaller groups, a student from each group can be speaking at any given time. In that way, more students get the opportunity to speak in the same amount of time.

The third move of Flanders (1970) is responding which involves some reciprocal relation to the soliciting. Responding involves the following in this study: giving commendations and answering questions.

Giving commendations

Teacher: Now, what are the three categories of archaea bacteria? Yes? Shhhh! What are the three charac...categories?

Student: Methanogen, halophiles, thermophiles.

Teacher: Very good! Now, what do you mean by...methanogens?

-T₅

It is believed by many that teachers' words are powerful that they may create or break a student. This is one of teachers' roles to play within any classroom discourse - one who hones students. Brown (2007) develops the claim that "teachers can play many roles in the course of teaching and this might facilitate learning. Their ability to carry these out effectively will depend to a large extent on the rapport they establish with their students, and of course, on their own level of knowledge and skills". The study of Podobinska (2017) found out that most of the students believe that teacher's talk helps to boost students' behavior, helps establish positive relationship between students and the teacher, and helps maintain discipline, while some of them said that it boosts students' confidence. This further implies that teachers should continue giving constructive words to their students in order for their students to love more going to school, study, and succeed. In order to succeed at school, students need to believe that they are capable of doing so (Brown, 2001).

Answering questions

Student: Sir, naa koy question, sir.

(Sir, I have a question.)

Student: Wala na tong every week na blog, sir?

(Are we not going to have anymore the every week blog, sir?)

Teacher: Yeah, wala na after that week because I will be announcing the combination, like project for the blog. Okay, so yun na nga. It's good to see people na they're still preserving the value or yung... Recently, we talked about like indigenous knowledge. We talked about that and in that video, we saw some good deeds for what Filipino people are somehow known to be, like we are known to be honest like that. So I hope we will still continue to be honest, okay?

(Yes, no blog at all after that week because I will integrate your project in a blog. So that's it. It's good to see people that they're still preserving our value. Recently, we talked about indigenous knowledge. And in that video, we saw some good deeds that Filipinos are known for; we are known to be honest. So, I hope we will still continue to be honest, okay?)

-T₇

Teachers who are answering students' questions in a thoughtful manner are said to influence more the students to learn than those who do not answer their students' queries or those who answer but in an unlikely way. For teachers, these questions can be used as indicators of students' learning problems, and provide diagnostic information about what students are thinking. Students' questions can also be harnessed for lessons that involve class discussion, argumentations, investigations, problem-based learning, and project work (Chin and Osborne, 2008).

What was good about the teacher in the provided transcript was that the teacher was very thoughtful in answering as to why there was no weekly blog to be submitted by the students, rather the teacher made it easier for the students to do the task since it was already planned by the teacher to incorporate it with another task which was easier now for the students to do. Further, the teacher emphasized their lesson to the answer he had given to his students and even gave importance to the value – honesty. Ariyante's (2016) study found out that by transferring good moral attitudes to learners, students become sensitive and responsible individuals.

The last type of move of Flanders (1970) is reacting. He explained that reacting is a move undertaken in reaction to any of the other moves. In this paper, reacting comes in the following categories: doing segues to open the topic/connecting talks to today's lesson, shushing the students, discussing/giving information, warning, correcting students' statement/repairing, and giving announcements/bidding goodbye.

Connecting talks to today's lesson/doing segues

Teacher: So ma proud na ko?

(Will I be proud now?)

Student: In the morning, pagka-buntag baya dayon to gihimo

(we did it a day after [you instructed us])

Student: Sure!

Teacher: 'Di ba flower-flower 'yan?

(Was that formed like a flower?)

Teacher: Because our topic for today is...

Student: Is flower pollination.

Teacher: Pwede, malapit pero let's start with the...

(it could be. Almost there, but we need to start with...)

Student: Parts of the flower Ma'am noh?

Teacher: Life Science.

-T₅

There are times that teachers when entering the classroom tend to do personal talks with their students, but because they need to present lessons to their students, they do segues that just to connect what they are talking to what their actual lessons are that day. Schulten (2017) stated that there will be times that we need to start with the world and connect it to the curriculum; in the sample transcript given, the teacher started talking about the project that her students submitted a day before and was asking the students if she should be proud about it since the students did it a day after the teacher instructed them to do it. The teacher identified the shape of the project like a flower – this part was certainly the part that Schulten identified as “world”. Then, the teacher connected it to their lesson that day, life science, since flowers

have life primarily. This part was referred by Schulten as the curriculum or the lesson that they, the teacher and students, will be discussing on that day.

Discussing/giving information

Teacher: Alright. That's actually right. Well, now, marketing is not just all about the ordinary buying and selling. It's actually we have misconceptions about marketing. Think about the promotion. When we say marketing, where in fact, marketing is all about the umm.. It's all about. It's all about putting the product at the right price, right place.

-T₁

McCrorie (2006) presented that teachers in many group situations are having their roles, such as facilitator of learning, leading discussions, asking open-ended questions, guiding process and task, and enabling active participation of learners and engagement with ideas. The transcript shows that the teacher commended first a certain student before proceeding to her main topic that meeting, explaining a specific topic that they were discussing that day. Discussion can play a valuable role in any lecture (Huesch, 2019). This is the reason why teachers really need to go to their respective classes every time they have schedule and give their discussions because it helps much the students to learn lessons from the teachers themselves inside their respective classrooms.

Moreover, facultyfocus (2015) presented some benefits that students can get through their teachers' discussion inside the classroom. First is that discussion increases students' interests and engagement – this can help maintain students' focus, especially when students and teachers are discussing their answers and be able to get different perspectives from others about the topic. Good questions and answers are also very helpful during discussion to help these students think deeply and make connections. Second, it provides the teachers with feedback – during the time that students answer the posed question every after lecture, teachers may gauge whether the students answer the question incorrectly; with this, teachers can help students correct their answers. Lastly, it gives teachers the power to control the classroom environment – if there are students who are not paying attention in class, teachers can call upon them so students can focus in class better. As a result of this, students are more attentive to what's happening during the entire discussion. Classroom discussion can really make students be more engaged, prepared, and motivated.

Giving Advice

Teacher: Kung maglisod pa jud mo ug tan-aw, dili na na niya sala. Kung magkopyahanay pa jud mo, sala na jud na ninyo masakpan ta mo. Grabe na jud.
(If you have difficulty of looking, it's not his fault. If you are going to cheat, that's now your fault. Disgusting.)

-T₈

The transcript above shows the teacher giving advice about what the students' action are. Cheating has been one of the many problems of teachers regarding their students inside the classroom, thus a warning has been made by the teacher. Linsin (2010) stated that a warning is just a warning and nothing more. He explained further that when giving a warning, do not add a lecture about it or do not reprimand the students, and never shows your displeasure. This implies that if teachers go beyond the giving of warning, then the

tendency may result to shaming the students or simply making a story about the students who possibly do not violate any rule the teachers impose in their classes. Linsin added that a warning only works when its purpose is to allow the students fix their mistakes on their own. The teacher in the sample transcript went beyond to just giving warning here when he added, “*grabe na jud*” which is a side comment about what students were doing that time when based to Linsin’s.

Correcting students’ statements/repairing

Student: O, ‘diba ‘pag makakita na ka’g log lang siya, it means ang base niya kay ten na na daan kay ginault na man siya. Common. Kwaon ni sila kay parehas naman ang e ug In.

(If you happen to see log, it means that the base is already 10, for it has been repeated. You need to get this out since e andlnaresimilar.)

Teacher: Dili na In. LN na.

(That’s not In. It should be LN.)

Student:*(inaudible)* Ln ni, ma’am? Nganong... *(inaudible)*

(Is it Ln, ma’am? Why...)

Teacher: L nana small l.

(That should be a capital L.)

-T₄

Statement corrections are a great way to help students address their misconceptions. It is a good activity to allow students to check their understanding of key class concepts at the end of a unit (ablconnect, 2019). In the given transcript, a student was saying while writing “ln” in board. The teacher repaired the term by saying that it should be written in capital letter since it is a logarithmic abbreviation which proper way of writing should be followed. With that, the student changed it to LN. The teacher’s action here tells us that she just wants her students to learn even the basin naming of the terms used for them not to commit the mistake again next time since they are STEM students, and they might encounter the term again in their next level of academic pursuit. Repairing students’ learning of lessons must be done by teachers, and it is better to be done every after class meeting, so that students will be clarified about different things. Repair can be initiated by the speaker of the repairable or may it be initiated by its recipient which is presented in this transcript (Canonio, Nonato, & Manuel, 2017). Repair is defined as a strategy for resolving miscommunication problems involving speaking, hearing, and understanding (Schegloff, Sack, & Jefferson, (1977).

Giving announcements/bidding goodbye

Student: ...as it was in the beginning is now and ever shall be world without end.Amen.

Teacher: Goodbye, class.

Student: Goodbye and thank you, sir

-T₂

Teacher: Because we have our examination on nine, uhm I think *(inaudible)* twenty-six and five , twenty-nine *(inaudible)* exam, too. We’ll not meet because it’s holiday; five,

Monday and then Friday we will have our exam.

Student: Monday

Teacher: Five. November 5 and definitely we will meet again.

okay lang?

(*Is it okay?*)

Teacher: Twenty items *lang* for skeletal muscles. So, there will be additional written work for the midterms.

-T₆

Most commonly, the teachers end their classes with a prayer and announcements than of having an activity to assess students' learning that day. This is because most of the time, teachers do not have any more time after their discussion. The lack of class-ending activities is due to a number of factors including time constraints, attempts to complete as much course material as possible (Pescosolido and Aminzade, 1999 in Eggleston and Smith, 2002). More so, it could be because of being unaware of useful techniques, or feeling uncomfortable saying goodbye (Wagenheim and Gemmill, 1994 in Eggleston and Smith, 2002), yet this did not happen in this transcript since the teacher, participant 2 was comfortable saying goodbye to his students. On the other hand, participant 6 was doing another thing to end her class – that is, to give announcements as to what will happen the next day they are going to meet. Both these class-ending are the teachers' reactions on their students' responses with regards to the discussion they had prior to bidding goodbye and giving of announcements as shown.

More so, this study aimed to unravel how language use shapes students' participation in a classroom discourse. Thus, the following are the results to satisfy the second research question of this study using Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975), in Atkins (2001), Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) model to know how these teachers use the language to get elicitation through students' responses and participation. IRF could really be a helpful tool when applied to the language of the classroom since it was developed from classroom discourse in general secondary classrooms.

How Language Move shapes Students' Participation in a Classroom Discourse

Language use of teachers inside the classroom elicits individual voluntary participation through performance tasks, like oral recitation and board activities. Moreover, the same language use of teachers makes students participate in different group activities as performance tasks. The following are some of the examples found in the transcripts of the recorded class discussions of the participants of this study.

Soliciting

For Soliciting, *checking if the students learn* has been found out to have shaped students' participation during classroom discourse. This means that teachers need to be creative in their way of discussing things, which includes various strategies, so that they could be able to elicit responses from their students that would enable to give them idea how far students learn the lessons being discussed.

Checking if the students learn. One way for the teachers to assess students' learning is through solicitation. This is done in various ways, and one of which is to repeat some details that are previously provided by the teachers themselves. Giving hints by letting the students to finish what the teacher has stated is another way of assessing background knowledge or the current information presented. Below is an example of the teacher checking the students' learning.

T: Very good, 10. Remember, just like what I have said last time and if ever walang nakalagay na number for the base, the base is automatically?

(Very good, 10. Remember, just like what I have said last time and if ever there's no number for the base, the base is automatically?)

Ss: (in chorus) 10

T: Good. Now ma-simplify pa ba? Ma-expand pa?

(Good. Now, can we still simplify it? Can we still expand it?)

S1: Yes.

T: Yes, you can expand this one tama? So ito you cannot expand...

copy...plus magiging?

(Yes, you can expand this one, right? But you cannot expand the other one... just copy to make it?)

Ss: (in chorus) log...

T: B and this is now your answer.

S2: expand

S3: expand

T: Expand now for letter B. T₃

The sample transcript above shows that the teacher was trying to solicit responses from students by having an ascending voice in a question form like, "...the base is automatically?" This serves as a queue for students to provide answers, which they did in chorus. The teacher was also into asking an affirmation whether or not the problem can be expanded. This provides an idea for the students to give their answer between a yes and a no. The teacher even asked the students whether what she did in the solution is correct or not by stating, "Yes, you can expand this one, right?"

The teacher even have at the last part of the transcript the giving of directives by commanding the students to expand the letter B problem. All these teacher's statements indicate solicitation that primarily want elicitations from the students, and obviously, with the presented transcript from the gathered data, teachers successfully elicited responses from their students. This is clearly an indication that teachers just need to initiate conversation to be able to have responses from learners, as well as a way to assess them.

Responding

For Responding, *answering questions and queries* and *discussing the answer* with students are two language moves that have been found out to have shaped students' participation during classroom discussion. These two language moves would help students feel comfortable as they approach their teacher, especially during discussion that would greatly benefit their learning of the lessons.

Answering questions and queries. To make sure that students will feel comfortable in one's classroom discussion, teachers need to be approachable and open to possibilities that there will be queries that students would like to be clarified about. Students' comfortability towards teacher's openness will make

students be engaged in any discussion that will make them to continue in providing responses to whatever teachers are going to ask them. Consider the following for teachers being responsive.

S: Sir, bakit man lage si Burger King sa Buhangin?

(Sir, why do we have Burger King [near Jollibee] in Buhangin?)

T: Ano yung question ulit? Ngano man jud magtapad sila? Hindi naman sila directly competing with each other. T₂

(What was the question again? Why are they located near to each other?)

Because they are not directly competing with each other.) T₂O₂

S: Sir ang mga products ang nagabayad ana sir ang franchisee sir?

(Sir, does the franchisee pay for the products?)

T: Sige, for the products, some of the franchisors included in the contract, let's say for example in 3 years time, I will provide all your bonds and patty...

(Okay, for the products, some of the franchisors included in the contract that they will be the one to provide all the bonds and the patty.)

S: Ikaw gihapon magbayad sa iya sir?

(Will you still be the one to pay the franchisor for that, sir?)

T: Yes, sila na lang magpadala nito. Sige, next.

(Yes, they will just deliver these to them. Okay, next.)

S: So, magbayad ka sa imong tax pag magfranchise ka?

(So, you will pay for your tax if you franchise?)

T: Again you go to the value of your business. T₂O₂

As noticed in the above presented sample, the teacher politely and openly answers the students' queries. Yet, to provide a clear answer about the students' question, teacher may ask students to repeat what has been asked to them, just like what the first set of transcript shows. Moreover, answers of teachers regarding students' questions may vary. The second pair of transcript presents a teacher that gives an example to give clarity to what the students need to know, the phrase, "...let's say, for example..." is an indicator that the teacher tries to provide a picture of a certain scenario that will help the teacher to be understood and will assist eventually the understanding of the students leading to their learning.

It can also be observed that there are series of questions, one after the other, asked by students to their teacher as seen in the provided transcript. This language move gives light to what confuses the students that results to a clear understanding on the students' end.

Discussing the answer. Another way of responding is through discussing an answer with students. Through this, students and teachers create a certain connection that make them comfortable with each other, which helps students to learn better the lessons. Consider the provided sample below for this result.

T: Sige in connection sa question ni Kit kailangan mong mag-innovate.

If you're the franchisee will you allow to innovate the menu?

(Okay. In connection to Kit's question, you need to innovate.

If you're the franchisee, will you allow the menu to be innovated?)

S: No.

T: No.

S: Ngano man?

(Why?)

T: Hindi ganito yan ok 1 by 1 for example 'di ba sige.

7/11 ay one example...go back to McDonalds...

(No. I'll give you an example. Let's go back to the previous example, McDonalds... [starts discussing])

From what has been presented above, especially the last part of the transcript, the teacher provided an explanation regarding what the students would like to know about the topic. This indicates that the teacher really knows what they are teaching to their students; hence putting clarity to what they have already discussed. Note that the teacher makes use of the statement, "...let's go back to the previous example...". This is an indicator that the teacher would like to put emphasis by not only repeating, but by having an in-depth discussion regarding the details previously given and by adding some more information to add clarity to it.

Structuring

For Structuring, two language moves are found to have been helpful in shaping students' participation when doing classroom discourse. These are *interacting through question and answer* and *encouraging students to participate or to answer questions*. Moreover, these language moves need teachers to show positive approach and present themselves in a nice way to students to make students feel that they and their ideas are welcome to the discussion provided. Consider the following transcripts as samples for this language move.

Interacting through question and answer. Teachers need not only to stand in front of the class and speak about the lessons for the entire duration. Rather, they need also to make sure that students are not only listening but also understand what they are speaking about. Interacting through question and answer is one way to assess students' learning of the matter. Consider the following transcript below under this language move.

S: Nganong gibaligya man nila Sir? Wala silay ipangbayad?

(Why did they sell it, sir? Didn't they have money to pay?)

T: Wala silay pambayad, so ayon binenta nila para hindi na makulong.

(They didn't have money to pay, so they sold it to avoid being sued.)

S: Kung magloan diay sila Sir?

(How about file a loan, sir?)

T: Definitely hindi na. Number 1, they already have bad reputation. T₂O₁

(Definitely not. Number 1, they already have a bad reputation.)

Sometimes explanation is not what the students need; rather only simple answers to their confused minds. The transcript above is an example of simple relative questions of students regarding the topic on that day. Yet, these questions are necessary to be addressed since these may be sources of possible bigger questions in the future. More so, engaging in simple question and answer during classroom discussions provide an avenue for students to learn and relearn the basics and even the complexities of the subject.

Encouraging students to participate or to answer questions. It is not appalling to everyone that classroom discourses are for all, both teachers and students, to contribute in the development of the discussion. Hence, encouraging students to participate by answering questions is not new at all. This is one of the best

strategies used by teachers to elicit responses from their students and one best way to make sure that everyone understands the discussion. The sample transcript below is provided under this language move.

T: ...so any questions or clarification about that? T₂O₁

T: ...clarification? None so far? Sige next. T₂O₁

(Clarification? None so far? Okay, next.)

T: Sige, wala ng questions or any question from the group, okay na, Tarzan? T₂O₁

(No more questions from the group? Is it okay now, Tarzan?)

T: this is the last topic, do you have any questions before we proceed ? T₂O₁

It can be observed in the above-given transcript that the teacher tries to engage the students in the discussion by encouraging them to ask questions. “Any question?”, “clarification?”, “no more questions from the group?”, and “do you have any question before we proceed?” are just some of the obvious statements and markers from the gathered data during classroom discussion-observations. This is making sure that everyone understands the lesson before jumping to a new lesson, especially that lessons are interconnected. This further means that previous lessons are necessary in understanding the next lessons to be discussed. This is apparent from the recorded transcript.

Reacting

For Reacting, *discussing* and *giving commendations* are the language moves found that shaped participation of students whenever there is a discussion inside the classroom. Moreover, discussing lessons or providing additional information to what has been discussed provides better understanding to students and another way for them how to attack a lesson. Meanwhile, giving commendations create a positive impact to students that they appreciated, which may make them participate more in classroom discussions and activities next time.

Discussing. Consider the sample transcript below and see how the teacher elicited responses from the students by using this language move. Discussing a particular lesson to students is the prime reason as to why there are teachers. Discussion is necessary to be able to make sure that there is learning that students can get from their sources of information – the teachers.

T: Alright everyone we're going to start now our discussion.

Sige uhhhm last meeting we had already discussed about...

(Okay, last meeting, we had already discussed about...)

S: Types of claims

T: ...and the first, we had unsa to > five noh?

(...and the first one, we had how many [fallacies] again? We have five, right?)

S: 5 ma'am

S: 5 fallacies

S: oo, fallacies

(Yes, fallacies)

S: yes, ma'am

T: okay. *[starts discussing]* T₁₀

The sample above started with the teacher's initiation through asking the students about what they had last time. This indicated that the teacher would like to review first the students about what they discussed previously before going to another part of the lesson or a total new lesson. It could be observed that

students knew exactly what they had last meeting by answering what exactly the teacher expected them to respond. More so, affirming the students' answer gave the students the feeling of inclusivity in the discussion. Thus, it made them to respond the next time they were asked. This would tell us more that affirmative feedback elicited relative answers from the students themselves.

Giving commendations. Commendations are necessary for the students to boost their confidence and feel that they appreciated. Commendations like “very good”, “good job”, “that is creative”, and the likes will help students to provide responses every time they will take part in any discourse. Check the provided samples below as to how teachers commend their students' efforts during their classroom discussion.

T: Now class, how about from decimal to percent? Kanina percent to decimal divided by 100. Ngayon decimal to percent, multiply it by 100.

Let's have this one 0.9, 0.098. deci...ahhh percent form.

(Now class, how about transposing from decimal to percent? A while ago, we had percent to decimal divided by 100. Let's try the other way around, and multiply it by 100. Let's have this one, 0.9, 0.098.)

S: 9.8%

T: 9.8

S: percent

T: percent...very good...and this one?

S: 45.5

T: okay...very good. Now let's proceed directly to our main lesson. T₁

It can be shown in the sample transcript above that the teacher initiated the oral recitation, which was open to all students, by asking to solve the problem. The use of 'us' in “Let's” indicates that there is an inclusivity of teacher and students in doing the said activity – answering the problem. The students felt this inclusivity that made them respond to what was tasked to them. The commending feedback of the teacher after getting the answer from the students helped also the students to respond again the next problem they were asked to calculate.

T: Anong base by the way?

(What base, by the way?)

S: 10

Ss: 10

T: Very good...10. Remember just like what I have said last time,

and if ever walang nakalagay na number for the base, the base is automatically?

(...if ever there is no number base, the base is automatically?)

S: (in chorus): 10..T₃

The teacher started the initiation of getting answer through the use of questioning which was responded by the students right away. The teacher gave feedback by saying “very good” which had been positively perceived by students for them to continue participating during the discussion.

Since Initiation-Response-Feedback of Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) focuses on knowing how these teachers use the language in eliciting responses and participation from their students, this present paper tried to find out which among the language moves most likely to have been very successful in doing the said elicitations. Eliciting responses from students is very necessary in any classroom discourse because it gives the teachers the idea as to how far these students understand about the lessons discussed.

Checking if the students learn. There are various ways as to how students' learning can be assessed, and it can be done directly and indirectly (Cornell University (2024)). Some of these are through giving homeworks, quizzes, essays, reports, case study analysis, research projects and a lot more. Moreover, oral recitation can be done inside the classroom during discussion, which can also be a form of assessment. This is evident in some of the processes used by the teachers during their classroom discussion. Teachers let students to provide their answers and explain what they understood about this by explaining it before them. Aside from this, teachers let them discuss among themselves regarding posed questions. Researches provided results that students learn better when they give explanations rather than when they receive explanations (Webb, 1989; Chi et al, 1994; Sparks, 2013 in Kent State University 2024). This means that students should really be given time to speak their minds and what they believe is true regarding matters, especially about the lesson-discussion.

Moreover, when teachers are having their discussion with the students, they tend to guide students to knowing the answer. This is through giving hints if students are not able to clearly provide correct answers. A study of Choi, H. et al. (2023) found out that using hints paired with reflection prompts increased learner performance in delayed knowledge transfer tasks. More so, it increases learners' perceptions of learning. This can be beneficial to students to believe that their idea about a certain question is correct since the hints provided by their teacher lead to what they thought really is true.

Checking if the students learn is believed to be one great way of making sure that there is understanding amongst students regarding the current lesson and readying them to what will be discussed next – that is the continued topic. This further means that there will be better understanding of the connection between the present and the future lessons.

Answering questions and queries/Interacting through question and answer. It is not new that to answer questions and queries of students will make them provide their responses. Questioning, according to Tofade et al. (2013) stated that concepts about questioning can be applied in the classroom and in experiential learning environments as these promote comprehension and critical thinking. Tofade's statement is supported by Cuccio-Schirripa and Steiner (2000) when they said that questioning is one of the thinking processing skills which is structurally embedded in the thinking operation of critical thinking, creative thinking, and problem solving.

True enough, learning of students is made stronger and clearer when teachers, as sources of information and providers of clarity, provide explanation that supports what students know. The Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning (2012) suggested that teachers need to ask students challenging and thought-provoking questions to encourage them to tap their existing mental models which may build their previous knowledge.

Shanmugavelu et al. (2020) mentioned that Questioning is important to enhance student motivation and to promote positive, critical, and creative thinking among students; in addition, it is also needed to improve the teaching and learning process inside the classroom. They suggested that some may use distribution of questions to students. This may create a great opportunity to students to provide and to receive ideas from their classmates, which, in turn, benefit all of them.

Another move that shapes students' participation under is *discussing the answer* with them. The Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning (2024) stated that discussion is important to learning in all disciplines because it helps students to process information rather than to receive it simply. Clarity in all

fields that one deserves to know should be through open discussion. This furthers the information known by the learners as well as generates an idea for the teachers how far their students know about the matter. Additionally, discussion is not only limited between a teacher and their students, but it could also be amongst students themselves. Abdulkaki et al. (2018) found that discussion provides students with a platform to contribute to their own learning and would offer the teacher an opportunity to check students' understanding of the material provided (Craven and Hogan, 2001) – a lesson, perhaps. Though, there are instances, as critics argued, that some issues and concerns may show up during students' discussion like some participants may dominate the discussion sessions (Howard, 2015) and some may just be passive the whole time (Brookfield and Perskill, 2005). This was the same with what Applegate (1969) found that in most instances, discussion becomes a limited dialogue between the teachers and students with some sitting mute and inactive; though he, too, found out that discussion implies open and active participation. If this happened, students need to be of help by being a facilitator and including in their orientation that everyone should be given a chance to speak and be heard.

Gall, M.D. and Gillett, M. (2010) stated that discussion method has great potential for classroom teaching. They also added that it is remarkably versatile and is demonstrated as effective method to produce elicitation in all year levels – that includes senior high school and college students. At the end of the day, one feature of discussion is that learners have considerable agency in the construction of knowledge, interpretation, and understanding. This further means that students have a considerable “interpretive authority” to evaluate the plausibility or validity of the responses of each within the discussion (Wilkinson, 2009). This is why discussion is one excellent tool to elicit response, for it delivers positive impact on students since it encourages listening, speaking, and critical thinking among them leading to better performance (Dorgu, T.B. and Hamilton-Ekeke, J.T., 2018).

Encouraging students to participate or to answer questions. Participation is seen by everyone, especially of teachers, as an extremely crucial element for learning; this is the same sentiment of Cieniewicz (2023), and even motivating the students can be a daunting task, as he recognized. However, he mentioned that various actions may motivate the students to really participate; some of which that he enumerated would be giving grade-related incentives, redeemable certificates, or other simple rewards. Meanwhile, Lathrop (2023) suggested that teachers may provide a participation evaluation to make sure that students will really participate actively during various activities designed for them. This is the same with what Chapnick (2023) did in his classes; he said that rubric is accompanied by a preface explaining his philosophies of the roles and values of participation. With this, it encourages the students to actively participate and play their roles in discussions; they even volunteer their opinions, ask questions, and listen carefully.

Similar to Cieniewicz (2023), Weimer (2023) found out in her study how students would like their teachers encourage them to participate; these are required or graded participation, incorporating ideas and experience into discussion, active facilitation. Additionally, Weimer stated, after her survey with faculty members, that faculty warn their students they would call them and oriented them regarding the importance of participation in class. Also, teachers provide opportunities for students to reflect before responding. Aside from these, teachers use questions appropriately through open-ended questions and by getting the attention of those who have relevant experience regarding the topic, or those with background knowledge of it.

All these created an impression that teachers can find various ways – strategies – on how to make their learners participate, and not only limited to just always using words and ending it with the same words.

Rather, evaluations, and simple rewards can be presented to them. Yet, participation of these students should not only from the beginning, or mid-part, or latter; it should be all-round. Participation norms need to be established early in the course. If a teacher is able to hold fast to hearing from their students, right from the beginning, that certain norm will be established and can be maintained until the end of the course (Weimer, 2023).

Giving commendations. It was found out that commending the students about their answers made the students to participate more in the classroom discourse and even did it voluntarily. Praise is one of the simplest yet most powerful tools to let students be motivated and engage in activities Morin (2021).

Some of the teachers provide activities or something that students will work on before giving commendation. One of which is providing steps as to how something will be done. Giving steps should be clear and teachers should verify that the students understand these steps Black and William (1998), and by offering praises to these students' work and efforts can alter their negative thoughts about themselves, say, cannot easily follow instruction (Dwyer and Dweck, 2024).

Affirmation regarding students' response is one way also of commending students. A teacher may give feedback to a student's answer in a form of another initiation, affirming the students' answer. Affirmation is a good way to do in any discourse since it gives the interlocutor the idea of being accepted in a communication process (Hattie, 1999). With this, a student would create a thought in their mind that it is okay to participate since there is someone who commends and/or affirms their idea – much more if this comes from their teacher. Teacher-provided affirmation prompted students to do more (Smith, Rozek, and Manke, 2021).

In addition, Hattie (1999) continued that feedback is an important part of the assessment process. It has a significant effect on student learning and has been described as the most powerful single moderator that enhances achievement. The same is believed by Al-Bashir, Kabir, and Rahman (2016) when they said that there is a great importance of feedback in improving learning experience for the students aside from the significant effect of it in professionalizing teaching in higher levels of education. Additionally, Nicol (2010) stated that feedbacks guide students on what steps to take to improve, motivate them to act on their assessment, and develop their capability to monitor, evaluate, and regulate their own learning. Moreover, giving feedback, especially positive ones, sends message to the students that the teacher cares about the learning taking place (Brookhart, 2008). It also allows the students to become more engaged and involved in the classroom.

Commending students like saying “very good” or “excellent” can truly create changes regarding the behavior of students to participate. Although, Burnett and Mandel (2010) mentioned that there are several factors needed to be considered when using praise and feedback for students may need more as they grow older, these praises and feedbacks are best tools to reinforce both behavior and learning (Benson-Goldberg and Erickson (2021). Compliments that complement students can create an intrinsic desire to learn more and the classroom is the perfect place to foster that learning (Rhett, 2011), while Morin (2014) said that praise can have a powerful effect on students with learning and attention issues. She added that acknowledging the students' efforts can boost students' self-confidence and help motivate them to keep trying hard. This, too, is similar with what Kizlik (2014) believes in one of his guidelines on effective praise – that is specifying the praiseworthy aspects of the students' accomplishment that may help students to better appreciate their thinking, problem-solving and performance.

10. Implications

This study is found to have a great potential to be used as basis for educational practice for some reasons. First, this study focuses on language moves inside a classroom discourse, which provides us an idea how language will be properly presented to students so that they could be able to elicit responses from them. At the end of the day, it is the prime purpose why teachers teach – for them to share to their students what they know about their field of expertise and for students to understand what is being taught to them; hence, elicitation is necessary to make sure that one learns. This can be added and applied as strategies to the learning materials of the teachers during planning period. In this manner, teachers will be guided and will always have an opportunity to check and review their materials, in case of the possibility of forgetting these. This could also be shared to the rest of the faculty who wish to improve their teaching styles aided with language use.

Second, with the results of this study, it is implied that teachers have vast choices as to how they can be able to maintain students' participation during classroom discussion. This means also that, if teachers would just be creative in presenting their lessons with the aid of language, they could be able to help students to better liken learning and learn better the subject. It has been found out that all indicators of Flanders' language moves were able to shape students' participation; hence, there is no reason to say that it is too impossible for students to participate. Teachers just need to discover how to make it happen – that is through trainings on how to appropriately use language in classroom discourse.

Lastly, the entirety of this research implies that if one tries, one may achieve something good. It has been an issue in some researches that asking students regarding or related to the current lesson makes them threatened or anxious. However, this study proves otherwise. It creates an avenue to know various purposes of questioning and how these questions would help teachers in acquiring learning from their students. Its implication boils down to knowing how to use language properly – easily understood by the students, not threatening, not intimidating; rather welcoming.

There are few limitations of this study that call for future research; one of which is its context, senior high school classrooms. With the results found, it is only right to have studies that are similar to this focusing on language moves but targets another context like club and organization meetings, panel discussions, or classrooms in tertiary and graduate levels. By doing this, we could be able to find more relevant answers that may provide more details for a better understanding as to how we would be using language in lesson-discussions with another set of participants – this time older and more mature, which is somehow intriguing.

However, if future researchers would like to focus on senior high school classes, it is encouraged for them to use another lens/es to fill details to other areas in classroom discourses that need to be studied; hence, they may use this study's limitation to do action through conducting their researches. This is also to help fulfill the vision of every educator to provide clear data that may assist them in understanding various phenomena within the corners of their classrooms; that could only be realized if there will be many of educators to brave themselves in pursuing finding light in response to this concern, and that through conducting research.

Moreover, this study is limited only to ten classroom discussions with two observations per participant. With this limitation, it is implied that there could be other data sources that future researchers may focus on and utilize for other possible language moves that could shape students' participation. Much more, this

could also be one good study that may provide other purposes of asking questions, not found in this current study.

11. References

1. Abdulbaki, K., Suhaimi, M., Alsaqqa, A., & Jawad, W. (2018). *The use of the discussion method at university: Enhancement of teaching and learning*. Retrieved from: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1200403.pdf>
2. ablconnect (2019). *Statement correction*. Harvard University. Retrieved from: <https://ablconnect.harvard.edu/statement-correction>
3. Adler, R., Rodman, G., & du Pre, A. (2024). *Understanding human communication*. Twelfth Ed. Oxford University Press. Retrieved from: <https://global.oup.com/us/companion.websites/9780199334322/book/>
4. Al-Bashir, M., Kabir, R., & Rahman, I. (2016). *The value and effectiveness of feedback in improving students' learning and professionalizing teaching in higher education*. Journal of Education and Practice. Vol. 7, No. 16. Retrieved from: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1105282.pdf>
5. Alibali, M (2006). *Does visual scaffolding facilitate students' mathematics learning? Evidence from early algebra*. <http://ies.ed.gov/funding/grantsearch/details.asp?ID=54>
6. Allday, R. A., & Pakurar, K. (2007). *Effects of teacher greetings on student on-task behavior*. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 40, 317–320. Retrieved from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1885415>
7. Amirian, Z., Kassaian, Z., & Tavakoli, M. (2008). *Genre analysis: an investigation of the discussion sections of applied linguistics research articles*. The Asian ESP Journal, 4(1), 39-63.
8. Anderman, L.H. & Midgley, C. (1998). *Motivation and middle school students [ERIC digest]*. Champaign, IL: ERIC Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education.
9. Applegate, J.R. (1969). "Why don't pupil talk in class discussions?". Clearing House, 44: 78-81.
10. Ariyante (2016). *Moral values in education: teaching English classroom at Ma'had Tahfizul Qur'an Rahmatullaah Samarinda*. Retrieved from:
11. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/318556988_MORAL_VALUES_IN_EDUCATION_TEACHING_ENGLISH_CLASSROOM_AT_MA'HAD_TAHFIZUL_QUR'AN_RAHMATULLAH_SAMARINDA
12. Atkins, A. (2001). *Sinclair and Coulthard's IRF model in a one-to-one classroom: an analysis*. Retrieved on July 7, 2018 from: <https://www.birmingham.ac.uk/documents/collegeartslaw/cels/essays/csdp/atkins4.pdf>
13. Banbrook, L. & Skehan, P. (1990). *Classrooms and display questions*.
14. Basturkmen, H. (2012). *A genre-based investigation of discussion sections of research articles in dentistry and disciplinary variation*. Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 11, 134-144. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2011.10.004>
15. Behtash, E.; Azarnia, T. (2015). *A case study of teacher talk time and student talk time in an Iranian language school*. International journal of English language. Volume 2, pp 274-285.

16. Benson-Goldberg, S., & Erickson, K. (2021). *Praise in education*. DOI: 10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.1645 Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/352039675_Praise_in_Education
17. Bhatia, V. K. (2002). *Applied genre analysis: A multi-perspective model*. IBERICA, 4, 3-19.
18. Biddulph, F., & Osborne, R. (1982). "Some issues relating to children's questions and explanations". LISP(P) Working Paper No. 106, University of Waikato, New Zealand.
19. Black, P. & William, D. (1998). *Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom assessment*. Granada Learning.
20. Brett, P. (1994). *A genre analysis of the results section of sociology articles*. English for Specific Purposes. Vol. 13, Issue 1, pp. 47-59.
21. Brookfield, S.D. & Perskill, S. (2005). *Discussion as a way of teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
22. Brookhart, S.M. (2008). *How to give effective feedback to your students*. ASCD.
23. Brown, H. (2007). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. 2nd ed. Pearson Education.
24. Brown, H. (2001). *Teaching by principles*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
25. Burnett, P. & Mandel, V. (2010). *Praise and feedback in the primary classroom: Teachers' and students' perspectives*. Vol. 10, 2010, pp. 145-154. Retrieved from: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ906941.pdf>
26. Cambridge Dictionary (2020). *Commanding*. Retrieved from: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/commanding>
27. Cambridge Dictionary (2024). *Questions: yes-no questions*. Retrieved from: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/grammar/british-grammar/questions-yes-no-questions-are-you-feeling-cold>
28. Canonio, J., Nonato, R., & Manuel, J. (2017). *Repair strategies on spoken discourse*. International Journal of Scientific and Research Publication, Volume 7, Issue 11. Retrieved from: <http://www.ijsrp.org/research-paper-1117/ijsrp-p7181.pdf>
29. Carnine, D. (1997). *Bridging the research-to-practice gap*. Exceptional Children, 63, 513–52
30. Cazden, C. (2001). *Classroom discourse. The language of teaching and learning*. Heinemann. Portsmouth, NH
31. Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning (2013). *Questioning strategies to engage students*. Northern Illinois University. Retrieved from: <https://www.niu.edu/citl/resources/guides/instructional-guide/questioning-strategies-to-engage-students.shtml>
32. Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning (2024). *Discussions*. Indiana University Bloomington. Retrieved from: <https://citl.indiana.edu/teaching-resources/teaching-strategies/discussions/index.html>
33. Chai, Z.F., Swanto, S., Akmam Din, W., & Othman, I.W. (2022). *Using wh-questions strategy and poetry to improve writing skills among esl Malaysian Primary School learners during post-pandemic*. DOI: 10.35631/IJEPC.748027 Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/366412795_Using_WH-Questions_Strategy_And_Poetry_To_Improve_Writing_Skills_Among_Esl_Malaysian_Primary_School_Learners_During_Post-Pandemic

34. Chapnick, A. (2023). *Creating a class participation rubric*. Tips for encouraging student participation in classroom discussions. The Teaching Professor. A Magna Publication. Retrieved from: <https://cft.vanderbilt.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/59/tipsclassparticipation-tp.pdf>
35. Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classroom: Research on teaching and learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524469>
36. Chi, M.T.H., de Leeuw, N., Chiu, M.H., & LaVancher, C. (1994). *Eliciting self-explanations improves understanding*. Cogn. Sci. 18, 439-477.
37. Chin, C. (2002). *Student-generated questions: Encouraging inquisitive minds in learning science*. Institute of Singapore. Retrieved from: <https://repository.nie.edu.sg/bitstream/10497/292/1/TL-23-1-59.pdf>
38. Chin, C. & Osborne, J. (2008). *Students' questions: A potential resource for teaching and learning science*. Journal in science education. Retrieved from: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/03057260701828101>
39. Choi, H., Jovanovic, J., Poquet, O., Brooks, C., Joksimovic, S., & Williams, J.J. (2023). *The benefit of reflection prompts for encouraging learning with hints in an online programming course*. The Internet and Higher Education. Elsevier. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2023.10090>
40. Christie, F. (2002). *Classroom discourse analysis: A functional perspective*. New York, NY: Lexington Avenue.
41. Cieniewicz, J. (2023). *Participation blues from the student perspective*. Tips for encouraging student participation in classroom discussions. The Teaching Professor. A Magna Publication. Retrieved from: <https://cft.vanderbilt.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/59/tipsclassparticipation-tp.pdf>
42. Coffin, C. (2001). *Theoretical approach to written English-a TESOL perspective*. In A. Burns, & C. Coffin (Eds.), *Analysing English in a global context: A reader*. New York: Macquarie University Press.
43. Collins (2020). *Warning*. Retrieved from: <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/warning>
44. Connor, U., Upton, T. A., & Kanoksilpatham, B. (2007). *Introduction to move analysis*. In D. Biber, U. Connor, & T. A. Upton (Eds.), *Discourse on the move: Using corpus analysis to describe discourse structure*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company
45. Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
46. Corcoran, S. (2015). *Discussion in the classroom: Why to do it, How to do it, and How to assess it*. Retrieved from: <http://teachingonpurpose.org/journal/discussion-in-the-classroom-why-to-do-it-how-to-do-it-and-how-to-assess-it/>
47. Cornell University (2024). *Center for teaching innovation. Measuring Student Learning*. Retrieved from: <https://teaching.cornell.edu/teachingresources/assessment-evaluation/measuring-student-learning>
48. Costa, M., Van Rensburg, L., & Rushton, N. (2007). *Does teaching style matter?* Medical Education, 41(2), 214-217. Retrieved September 2015.
49. Cotton, K. (2001). *School improvement research series research you can use*. Retrieved from: <https://educationnorthwest.org/sites/default/files/ClassroomQuestioning.pdf>
50. Coulthard, M. (1985). *An introduction to discourse analysis*. Harlow: Longman.

51. Craven, III, J. and Hogan, T. (2001). *Assessing student's participation in the classroom*. Science Scope, 25(1), 36-40.
52. Cuccio-Schirripa, S. & Steiner, H.E. (2000). *Enhancement and analysis of science question level for middle school students*. Journal of Research in Science teaching, 37:210-224.
53. Cullen, R. (1998). *Teacher talk and the classroom context*. ELT Journal, 52/3, 179-187. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/elt/152.3.179>
54. DepEd (2012). *Republic act no. 10533. An act enhancing the Philippine basic education system by strengthening its curriculum and increasing the number of years for basic education, appropriating funds therefor and for other purposes*. Retrieved from: <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/2013/05/15/republic-act-no-10533/>
55. de Ruiter, J.P. (2012). *Questions: formal, functional, and interactional perspective*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
56. DeVault, M., Taylor, S.J., & Bogdan, R. (2016). *Introduction to qualitative research methods: A guidebook and resource* (4th ed). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
57. Dictionary.com (2020). *Request*. Retrieved from: <https://www.dictionary.com/browse/requesting>
58. Dictionary.com (2020). *Warning*. Retrieved from: https://www.google.com/search?sxsrf=ALeKk004cxAhXWLLKcMtUOl-mLN5FKStQ%3A1583639737848&ei=uWxkXqS0M4q6mAWXmqzYCA&q=warning+meaning&oq=warning+meaning&gs_l=psy-
59. Dorgu, T.B. & Hamilton-Ekeke, J.T. (2018). *Effectiveness of discussion method of teaching in curriculum delivery in secondary schools in Bayelsa State of Nigeria*. DOI: 10.21276/sjhss.2018.3.9.9 Retrieved from: <https://saudijournals.com/media/articles/SJHSS-39-1096-1102-c.pdf>
60. Dudley-Evans, T. (1994). *Genre analysis: An approach to text analysis for ESP*. In M. Coulthard (Ed.), *Advances in Written Text Analysis*. London: Routledge.
61. Dudley-Evans, T. & St John, M. (1998). *Developments in ESP: A multi-disciplinary approach*. Cambridge University Press.
62. Dukes, S. (1984). *Phenomenological methodology in the human sciences*. Journal of Religion and Health, 23(3), 197-203. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00990785>
63. Dwyer, C. & Dweck, C. (2024). *Using praise to enhance student resilience and learning outcomes*. Applications of Psychological Science to Teaching and Learning modules. Retrieved from: <https://www.apa.org/education-career/k12/using-praise>
64. Eggleston, T. & Smith, G. (2002). *Parting ways: Ending your course*. Retrieved from: <https://www.psychologicalscience.org/observer/parting-ways-ending-your-course>
65. Everyday Speech (2024). *Understanding IEP goals: The importance of yes/no question*. Retrieved from: <https://everydayspeech.com/sel-implementation/understanding-iep-goals-the-importance-of-yes-no-questions/#:~:text=Yes%2FNo%20questions%20provide%20an%20opportunity%20to%20encourage%20self%2Dadvocacy,when%20answering%20Yes%2FNo%20questions.>
66. facultyfocus (2015). *Benefits of getting students to participate in classroom discussions*. Retrieved from: <https://www.facultyfocus.com/articles/teaching-and-learning/10-benefits-of-getting-students-to-participate-in-classroom-discussions/>

67. Fitriati, S.W., Vica, G.A., Trisanti, N. (2017). *Teachers' questioning strategies to elicit students' verbal responses in EFL classes at a secondary school*. DOI: 10.25134/erjee.v5i2.537. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/317364401_TEACHERS%27_QUESTIONING_STRATEGIES_TO_ELICIT_STUDENTS%27_VERBAL_RESPONSES_IN_EFL_CLASSES_AT_A_SECONDARY_SCHOOL
68. Flanders, N. A. (1970). *Analyzing teaching behavior*. Addison-Wesley.
69. Flowerdew, J. (1999). *Writing for scholarly publication in English: The case of Hong Kong*. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(2), 123-145. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(99\)80125-8](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(99)80125-8)
70. Flowerdew, J. (2001). *Attitudes of journal editors to nonnative speaker contributions*. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35, 121-150. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3587862>
71. Flowerdew, J., & Wan, A. (2010). *The linguistic and the contextual in applied genre analysis: The case of the company audit report*. *English for Specific Purposes*, 29(2), 78-93. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2009.07.001>
72. Fox, B. & Thompson, S. (2010). *Response to wh-questions in English conversation*. DOI: 10.1080/08351811003751680. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/233196777_Responses_to_Wh-Questions_in_English_Conversation
73. Free English Lessons (2011). *Elliptical sentences*. <http://thewindlike.blogspot.com/2012/12/ellipticalsentence.html#.XQBsmcgzBIU>
74. Fromkin, V., Rodman, R., & Hyams, N. (2011). *An introduction to language*. 9th edition. Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
75. Fromkin, V., Rodman, R., & Hyams, N. (2017). *An introduction to language*. 10th edition. Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
76. Gall, M.D. & Gillett, M. (2010). *The discussion method in classroom teaching*. *Theory Into Practice*. Vol. 19, Issue 2: Teaching Methods: Learning Applications. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405848009542881> Retrieved from: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/00405848009542881>
77. Gharbavi, A. & Irvani, H. (2014). *Is teacher talk pernicious to students? A discourse analysis of teacher talk*. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*. Volume 98, pp 552-561. DOI: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.451
78. global.indiana (2013). *Deliberation for global perspectives in teaching and learning*. Indiana university. <https://global.indiana.edu/documents/global-perspectives/clarifying-and-probing-questions-handout-step-2-define.pdf>
79. Graesser, A. & Person, N. (n.d). *Discourse – classroom discourse – cognitive perspective*. Retrieved June 20, 2018, from <http://education.stateuniversity.com/pages/1916/Discourse.html>
80. Green, J. & Dixon, N. (1994). *The social construction of classroom life*. *International encyclopedia of English and the Language Arts*, Vol. 2, pp. 1075-1078. A. Purves (Editor), New York. Retrieved August 7, 2018, from <http://www.skeptron.uu.se/broadly/sec/p-greendixon.htm>
81. Guba, E.G. (1981). *Criteria for assessing the trustworthiness of naturalistic inquiries*. *ECTJ*. 29(2):75
82. Guba, E.G. & Lincoln, Y.S. (1986). *But is it rigorous? Trustworthiness and authenticity in naturalistic evaluation*. *N Dir Eval*. 1986(30):73-84.

83. Guthrie, G. (2023). *16 types of questions you need to know*. Retrieved from: <https://nulab.com/learn/collaboration/the-8-essential-questioning-techniques-you-need-to-know/>
84. Halliday, M.A. (1961). *Categories of the theory of grammar*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00437956.1961.11659756>
85. Hanna, G. S., & Dettmer, P. A. (2004). *Assessment for effective teaching: Using context-adaptive planning*. Boston, MA: Pearson A&B.
86. Hannaford, C. (1995). *Smart moves: Why learning is not all in your head*. Alexander, NC: Great Ocean Publishers.
87. Haris, A. & Muijs, D. (2002). *Teacher leadership, a review of research*. Nottingham: National college for school leadership
88. Hasko, V. (2012). *Qualitative corpus analysis*. Research Gate. DOI: [10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0974](https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0974)
89. Hattie, J. (2012). *Visible learning for teachers: Maximizing impact on learning*. New York, NY: Routledge.
90. Hattie, J. (1999). *Influence on students learning*. Auckland: University of Auckland.
91. Heath, S.B. (1983). *Dimensions of language development: Lessons from older children*. Stanford University. Retrieved from: <https://www.shirleybriceheath.net/pdfs/SBH-DimensionsLanguageDevelopmentLessonsFromOlderChildren.pdf>
92. Hogan, K., & Pressley, M. (1997). *Scaffolding student learning: Instructional approaches and issues*. Cambridge, MA: Brookline Books
93. Holmes, R. (1997). *Genre analysis, and the social sciences: An investigation of the structure of research article discussion sections in three disciplines*. *English for Specific Purposes*, 16(4), 321-337. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906\(96\)00038-5](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(96)00038-5)
94. Howard, J. (2015). *Discussion in the college classroom: Getting your students engaged and participating in person and online*. Scholarship and Professional Work – LAS. Butler University.
95. Huebsch, J.D. (2019). *Teacher talk: Discussing equity in the classroom*. Department of English. University of Washington. Retrieved from: <https://english.washington.edu/news/2019/02/14/teacher-talk-discussing-equity-classroom>
96. Im-O-Cha, P., Kittidhaworn, P., Broughton, M.M., & Panproegsa, S. (2019). *A comparative study of the structures of language and linguistics journal research article introductions written in Thai and in English*. *Language and Linguistics*, 22(2), 46-57. Retrieved from <https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/joling/article/view/180500>
97. Jensen, E. (1998). *Teaching with the brain in mind*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
98. Jiang, Y. (2020). *Teacher classroom questioning practice and assessment literacy: Case studies of four English language teachers in Chinese universities*. Vol. 5, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2020.00023>. Retrieved from: <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/educ.2020.00023/full>
99. Jing, M. (2010). *Cooperative learning method in the practice of English reading and speaking*. *Journal of Language Teaching & Research*, 1(5), 701-703.
100. Jogthong, C. (2001). *Research article Introduction in Thai: Genre analysis of academic writing*. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, West Virginia

101. Jones-Carey, M. (2017). *Teaching students to ask question for 21st century success*. Retrieved from: <https://www.gettingsmart.com/2017/08/teaching-students-to-ask-questions-for-21st-century-success/>
102. Kanoksilpatham, B. (2007). *Rhetorical moves in biochemistry research articles*. Research Gate. DOI: 10.1075/scl.28.06kan.
103. Kent State University (2024). *Oral communication as a learning tool*. Center for Teaching and Learning. Retrieved from: <https://www.kent.edu/ctl/oral-communication-learning-tool>
104. Khalid, A., Yasmin, S., & Azeem, M. (2011). *Impact of teacher's background and behavior on students learning*. International Journal of Human Resource Studies. Macrothink Institute. Pakistan.
105. Kizlik, R. (2014). *Effective classroom management and managing student conduct*. [online] Adprima.com. Available at: <http://www.adprima.com/managing.htm> [Accessed 23 Feb. 2016].
106. Klem, A.M., & Connell, J.P. (2004). *Relationships matter: Linking teacher support to student engagement and achievement*. Journal of School Health 2004; 74: 262-73.
107. Koshik, I. (2003). *Wh-questions used as challenges*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614456030050010301>. Vol. 5, Issue 1. Retrieved from: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/14614456030050010301>
108. Kyrene (2016). *"Questioning strategies."* Center for Innovation in Teaching & Learning, University of Illinois. Retrieved from: https://www.kyrene.org/cms/lib/AZ01001083/Centricity/Domain/42/Art%20and%20Science/41_Handling%20student%20responses%20to%20questions.pdf
109. Kvale, S. (2006). *Dominance through interviews and dialogues*. Vol. 2, Issue 3. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800406286235>
110. Lathrop, A. (2023). *Teaching how to question: Participation rubrics*. Tips for encouraging student participation in classroom discussions. The Teaching Professor. A Magna Publication. Retrieved from: <https://cft.vanderbilt.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/59/tipsclassparticipation-tp.pdf>
111. Lee, J. (2012). *Teaching Hong Kong L2 learners wh-questions-using a learning study approach*.
112. Lemov (2015). *The importance of questioning*. Retrieved from: <https://classteaching.wordpress.com/2017/01/19/the-importance-of-questioning/>
113. Lim, J. M. H. (2006). *Method sections of management research article: A pedagogically motivated qualitative study*. English for Specific Purposes, 25, 282-309. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2005.07.001>
114. Lim, J. M. H. (2010). *Commenting on research results in applied linguistics and education: A comparative genre-based investigation*. Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 9, 280-294. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2010.10.001>
115. Lincon, Y.S. & Guba, E.G. (1998). *Lincoln and Guba's evaluative criteria*. Retrieved from: <http://www.qualres.org/HomeLinc-3684.html>
116. Linsin (2010). *How to give a warning that improves behavior*. Smart classroom management. Retrieved from: <https://smartclassroommanagement.com/2010/05/22/how-to-give-a-warning-that-improves-behavior/>
117. Liu, M., & Zhu, L. (2012). *An investigation and analysis of teacher talk in college English class*. Volume 2. International Journal of English Linguistics 2012, pp 117-121

118. Loi, C.K., & Evan, M.S. (2010). *Cultural differences in the organization of research article introductions from the field of educational psychology: English and Chinese*. Journal of Pragmatics, 42(10), 2814-2825.
119. Long, M. & Sato, C. (1983). *Classroom foreigner talk discourse: Forms and functions of teachers' questions*.
120. Longman (2019). *Commend*. Retrieved from: <https://www.ldoceonline.com/dictionary/commend>
121. Lumsden, L. (1994). *Student motivation to learn*. ERIC Digest, 92, 4358. Retrieved from: http://www.kidsource.com/kidsource/content2/Student_Motivation.html#credits
122. Macmillan Education Limited (2020). *Giving advice*. <https://www.macmillandictionary.com/us/thesaurus-category/american/to-give-advice>
123. Mahmud, M. (2015). *Questioning powers of the students in the class*. Journal of Language Teaching and Research. Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 111-116. Retrieved from: <https://www.academypublication.com/issues2/jltr/vol06/01/13.pdf>
124. Malinowski, B. (1936). *The problem of meaning in primitive languages*. In C. K. Ogden & I. A. Richards (Eds.), *The meaning of meaning* (pp. 296-336). London: Kegan Paul.
125. Marangell, S. (2021). *Asking questions to support student learning in class: strategies and tips for small-group teaching*. Melbourne CSHE Teaching and Learning Short Guide Series. The University of Melbourne. Retrieved from: https://melbourne-cshe.unimelb.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0006/3637923/asking-questions-to-support-student-learning_final.pdf
126. Marton, F. & Tsui, A. (2004). *Classroom discourse and the space of learning*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers. Mahwah, New Jersey London
127. Merriam, S.B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
128. McCarthy, M. (1991). *Discourse analysis for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
129. McCrorie (2006). *The role of the teacher*. Retrieved from: <https://faculty.londondeanery.ac.uk/e-learning/small-group-teaching/the-role-of-the-teacher>.
130. McGroarty, M. (1996). *Language attitudes, motivation, and standards*. In S. McKay & N. Hornberger (eds), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching*, New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 3-46.
131. McMillan, J.H. & Schumacher, S. (1993). *Research in education: A conceptual understanding*. New York: HarperCollins.
132. Morin, A. (2014). *The power of praise*. Retrieved from: <https://www.understood.org/ways-praise-can-empower-kids-learning-issues>
133. Morin, A. (2021). *The power of effective praise: A guide for teachers*. Retrieved from: <https://www.understood.org/en/articles/the-power-of-effective-praise-a-guide-for-teachers>
134. Murphy, J. F. (2005). *Connecting teacher leadership and school and school improvement*; London: Crawin Press Inc.
135. Murphy, K., Soter, A., Wilkinson, I., Hennessey, M., & Alexander, J. (2009). *Determining the effects of classroom discussion on students' comprehension of text: A meta-analysis*. Journal of Educational Psychology, 101(3), 740-764. Retrieved September 2015.

136. Musumeci, D. (1996). *Teacher-learner negotiation in content-based instruction: Communication at cross-purpose?* Applied Linguistics. Vol. 17, Issue 3, September 1996, pp 286-325. Retrieved from: <https://academic.oup.com/applij/article-abstract/17/3/286/159089?redirectedFrom=fulltext&login=false>
137. Natto, C.V. (2023). *Why is it important to ask “why?”*. Business strategy. Retrieved from: <https://www.mentorworks.ca/blog/business-strategy/importance-of-asking-why/#:~:text=The%20simple%20answer%20is%20that,digging%20deeper%20into%20the%20det>
138. ails.
139. Nicholson, S.J. (2014). *An Impetus for change: Classroom analysis using Sinclair and Coulthard’s model of spoken discourse*. International Journal of Linguistics ISSN 1948-5425 2014, Vol. 6, No. 2. Macrothink Institute.
140. Nicol, D. (2010). *From monologue to dialogue: Improving written feedback processes in mass higher education*. *Assessment and evaluation in higher education* 35(5), 505-517.
141. Nordquist, R. (2021). *The yes-no question in English grammar*. An Interrogative Query that seeks a Positive or Negative Answer. Retrieved from: <https://www.thoughtco.com/yes-no-question-grammar-1692617>
142. Nuthall, G. (1973). *Discourse – classroom discourse – cognitive perspective*. Retrieved August 7, 2018, from <http://education.stateuniversity.com/pages/1916/Discourse.html>
143. Nunn, R. (1999). *‘The purpose of language teachers’ questions’*. International Review of Applied Linguistics, 37: 23-42.
144. Nwogu, K. N. (1997). *The medical research paper: structure and functions*. English for Specific Purposes, 16(2), 119-138. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906\(97\)85388-4](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(97)85388-4)
145. Paul, R. & Elder, L. (2000). *Critical thinking: Nine strategies for everyday life, Part I*. Research Gate. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/234584955_Critical_Thinking_Nine_Strategies_for_Everyday_Life_Part_I
146. Peacock, M. (2002). *Communicative moves in the discussion section of research articles*. System, 30, 479-497. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(02\)00050-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(02)00050-7)
147. Peacock, M. (2011). *The structure of the methods section in research articles across eight disciplines*. Asian ESP Journal, 7(2), 97-124.
148. Permata Sari, F.D.I. (2017). *The effect of wh-question strategy to the students’ writing skill*. Retrieved from: <http://repository.unmuhjember.ac.id/1756/1/Article.pdf>
149. Pescosolido, B. & Aminzade, R. (1999). *The social worlds of higher education: Handbook for teaching in a new century*. Corpus ID: 142441190. Retrieved from: <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/The-social-worlds-of-higher-education-%3A-handbook-in-Pescosolido-Aminzade/cc33806cb6fa3568f8e1cd855fffc9cda2321b2b>
150. Phanthama, P. (2000). *The organization and the linguistic features of the abstracts of medical journals*. Unpublished master’s thesis, Mahidol University, Thailand.
151. Pizzini, E.L. & Shepardson, D.P. (1991). *“Student questioning in the presence of the teacher during problem solving in science.”* School Science and Mathematics, 91(8), 348-352.

152. Podobinska, M. (2017). *Power of teachers' words - the influence on pupils' grades and behaviour*. University of Rzeszow, Poland. Retrieved from: <http://www.worldscientificnews.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/WSN-771-2017-1-106-1.pdf>
153. Pojanapunya, P., & Todd, R. W. (2011). *Relevance of findings in results to discussion sections in applied linguistics research*. Proceedings of the International Conference: Doing research in applied linguistics. King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi and Macquarie University.
154. Postiguillo, S. (1999). *The schematic structure of computer science research articles*. English for Specific Purposes. Vol. 18, Issue 2, 1999. ISSN 0889 4906.
155. Probe & Elder (2017). *The Importance of questioning*. Retrieved from: <https://classteaching.wordpress.com/2017/01/19/the-importance-of-questioning/>
156. Promsin, P. (2006). *An analysis of moves and modality in English engineering abstracts*. NIDA Language and Communication Journal. 43-61.
157. PurlandTraining.com (2023). *Wh-questions*. Retrieved from: <https://purlandtraining.com/free-lessons/elementary-english-course/unit-4-0-family/lesson-4-1-wh-questions/>
158. Raine, P. (2010). *An application of the Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) method of discourse analysis*. Retrieved from: <https://www.birmingham.ac.uk/documents/college-artslaw/cels/essays/csdp/rainesinc-coul.pdf>
159. Rachmawaty, N., & Ariani, S. (2018). *Investigating the types of teacher questions in ELF secondary classroom*. Advance in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, Vol. 276.
160. Rhett (2011). *The benefits of praise: Compliments for your students*.
161. Rosenshine, B. & Furst, N. (1973). "The use of direct observation to study teaching." In Second Handbook of Research on Teaching, ed. Robert M.W. Travers. Chicago: Rand McNally.
162. Rymes, B. (in press, 2008). *Classroom discourse analysis: A tool for critical reflection*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
163. Samraj, B. (2002). *Disciplinary variation in abstracts: The case of wildlife behavior and conservation biology*. In J. Flowerdew (Ed.), Academic Discourse. Pp. 40-56. London: Pearson.
164. sagepub.com (2020). *The selection of a research design*. Retrieved on August 15, 2018 from: https://www.sagepub.com/sites/default/files/upm-binaries/27395_Pages5_11.pdf
165. Salinger, J.D. (1951). *The catcher in the rye*. The Big Books of Spring. Retrieved from: https://www.goodreads.com/book/show/5107.The_Catcher_in_the_Rye
166. Schegloff, Sack, & Jefferson (1977). *The preference of self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation*. Language, 53(ii), 361-382.
167. Schulten, K. (2017). *Making it relevant: Helping students connect their studies to the world today*. Retrieved from: <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/07/learning/lesson-plans/making-it-relevant-helping-students-connect-their-studies-to-the-world-today.amp.html>
168. Seedhouse, P. (1996). *Classroom interaction: Possibilities and impossibilities*. ELT Journal, 50, 16-24. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/elt/50.1.16>
169. SEL Implementation (2024). *Understanding IEP Goals: The importance of yes/no questions*. Retrieved from: <https://everydayspeech.com/sel-implementation/understanding-iep-goals-the-importance-of-yes-no-questions/#:~:text=Firstly%2C%20Yes%2FNo%20questions%20provide,promote%20active%20paticipation%20and%20engagement>

170. Shanmugavelu, G., Ariffin, K., Vadivelu, M., Mahayudin, Z., & Sundaram, M.A. (2020). *Questioning techniques and teachers' role in the classroom*. International Journal of Education. Vol. 8, Issue 4. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.34293/education.v8i4.3260>. Retrieved from: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1268029.pdf>
171. Shenton, A. (2004). *Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects*. Research Gate: DOI: 10.3233/EFI-2004-22201.
172. Silverman, D. (2001). *Interpreting qualitative data: Methods for analyzing talk, text, and interaction*. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/31718316_Interpreting_Qualitative_Data_Methods_for_Analyzing_Talk_Text_and_Interaction_D_Silverman
173. Sinclair, J. & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
174. Smith, E., Rozek, C., & Manke, K. (2021). *Teacher-versus researcher-provided affirmation effects on students' task engagement and positive perceptions of teachers*. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/348810537_Teacher-versus_researcher-provided_affirmation_effects_on_students'_task_engagement_and_positive_perceptions_of_teachers
175. Sowell, J. (2017). *Good instruction-giving in the second-language classroom*. Retrieved from: https://americanenglish.state.gov/files/ae/resource_files/etf_55_3_pg10-19.pdf
176. Sparks, S. (2013). *Students can learn by explaining, studies say*. Education Week. May 31st 2013. Retrieved from: <https://www.edweek.org/leadership/students-can-learn-by-explaining-studies-say/2013/05>
177. Swales, J. M. (1981). *Aspects of article introductions*. Birmingham, UK: University of Aston, Language Studies Unit.
178. Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
179. Swales, J. M. (2004). *Research genres: Explorations and applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524827>
180. Szendroi, I. (2010). *Teacher talk in the ESP classroom: The results of a pilot observation study conducted in the tourism context, WoPaLP*. Volume 4, pp 39-58.
181. teachingenglish.org.uk (n.d.). *Initiation-response-feedback (IRF)*. Retrieved on August 3 2018 from: <https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/article/initiation-response-feedback-irf>
182. Thompson, L. (1997). *Children talking: The development of pragmatic competence*. London: Multilingual Matters Publisher.
183. Tofade, T., Elsner, J., & Haines, S. (2013). *Best practice strategies for effective use of questions as a teaching tool*. American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education. Am J Pharm Educ. 2013 Sep 12; 77(7): 155. Doi: 10.5688/ajpe777155. Retrieved from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3776909/>
184. Tudy, I. & Tudy, R. (2016). *Doing qualitative research: A practical guide for student researchers*. Diocesan Printing Press and Publishing, Inc. Tagum, Davao del Norte, Philippines.
185. Vajda, E. (2019). *Syntax*. <http://pandora.cii.wvu.edu/vajda/ling201/test1materials/syntax.htm>

186. Vygotsky, L.S. (1934). *Simply psychology*. Retrieved August 7, 2018, from https://www.google.com.ph/?gfe_rd=cr&ei=6aQ1U8eVOO6OiAeQxoDQDg#q=vygotsky
187. Wagenheim, G. & Gemmill, G. (1994). *Feedback exchange: Managing group closure*. Sage Journals. Retrieved from: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/105256299401800213?icid=int.sj-abstract.similar-articles>.
188. Walsh, S. (2006). *Classroom discourse: "Towards an analysis of discourse" revisited*, unpublished thesis, University of Leeds.
189. Washington.edu (2019). *Discussion*. Retrieved from: <https://www.washington.edu/teaching/teaching-resources/engaging-students-in-learning/leading-dynamec-disussio/>
190. Webb, N.M. (1989). *Peer interaction and learning in small groups*. Int. J. Educ. Res. 13, 21-39.
191. Weimer, M. (2023). *Those students who participate too much*. Tips for encouraging student participation in classroom discussions. The Teaching Professor. A Magna Publication. Retrieved from: <https://cft.vanderbilt.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/59/tipsclassparticipation-tp.pdf>
192. Weimer, M. (2023). *Student recommendations for encouraging participation*. Tips for encouraging student participation in classroom discussions. The Teaching Professor. A Magna Publication. Retrieved from: <https://cft.vanderbilt.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/59/tipsclassparticipation-tp.pdf>
193. Weimer, M. (2023). *To call on or not to call on: that continues to be the questions*. Tips for encouraging student participation in classroom discussions. The Teaching Professor. A Magna Publication. Retrieved from: <https://cft.vanderbilt.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/59/tipsclassparticipation-tp.pdf>
194. Weissberg, R., & Buker, S. (1990). *Writing up research: Experimental research report writing for students of English*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.
195. Wilkinson, I. (2009). *Discussion method*. Psychology of Classroom Learning: An encyclopedia, pp. 330-336. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/301290144_Discussion_methods
196. Williams, V., Jones, L., & Turkey, J. (1999). *Controlling error in multiple comparisons, with examples from state-to-state differences in educational achievement*. Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics, Vol. 24, No. 1, pp 42-69. American Educational Research Association and American Statistical Association.
197. Willis, D. (1992). *"Caught in the act: Using the rank scale to address problems of delicacy."* In Coulthard, M. *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis*. London and New York: Routledge. Pp. 111-122.
198. Yakhontova, T. (2006). *Cultural and disciplinary variation in academic discourse: The issue of influencing factors*. Journal of English for Academic Purposes. Vol. 5, Issue 2, pp. 153-167.
199. Yanfen, L. & Yuqin, Z. (2010). *A study of teacher talk in interactions in English classes*. Chinese journal of Applied Linguistics. Volume 33, Issue 2, pp 76-86.
200. Yang, R. & Allison, D. (2003). *Research articles in applied linguistic: Moving from results to conclusions*. English for Specific Purposes, 22, 365-385.
201. Yee, K. (2019). *Interactive techniques*. Retrieved from: <https://www.usf.edu/atle/documents/handout-interactive-techniques.pdf>

202. Your Dictionary (2020). *Recognizing*. Retrieved from: <https://www.yourdictionary.com/recognizing>
203. Zhang, S., Du, X., & Deng, J. (2021). *A mixed-study on the effectiveness of verbal praise in primary school class*. DOI: 10.15354/sief.21.or060. Retrieved from: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1322561.pdf>
204. Zoller, U. (1987). "The fostering of question-asking capability: A meaningful aspect of problem-solving in chemistry." *Journal of Chemical Education*, 64,510-51.