

An Ethnographic Approach to Exploring Degree of Involvement in Oral Interactions: The case of L2 classrooms

Sousan Sattar Boroujeni, Department of English, Najafabad Branch, Islamic Azad University, Najafabad, Iran

susansattar@yahoo.com

Reza Biria, Department of Foreign Languages, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan (Khorasgan) Branch, Isfahan, Iran

Biria_reza@yahoo.com

Sara Mansouri, Department of English, Najafabad Branch, Islamic Azad University, Najafabad, Iran

sara-mansoori@iaun.ac.ir

Abstract

One of the main concerns in educational settings has been the degree of the learners' involvement in learning and the extent to which they actively participate in classroom talks and interactions. The present study is an emic-based ethnographic study aimed at providing insights about patterns of talk and different degrees of interaction in EFL university classes with a specific focus on teacher's role. To this end, three different classes were observed for twelve consecutive sessions. Students were both male and female senior EFL students at Najafabad Azad University. The age of the participants ranged between 22 and 28. These classes were taught by the same instructor so that the researcher was directly involved in observing participants' interactions in the targeted classrooms and in the data collection procedures. The participants' oral behavior was carefully observed and recorded. To guarantee higher validity, some participants were also interviewed. The results of data analysis revealed that male and female students showed different degrees of contribution to classroom interactions. However, the students' degree of involvement in the classroom discussions were linked to the related schemata, type of activity, and learners' interest in the conversation topic rather than interactants' gender. In addition, most of the involvements were teacher-initiated and directed. Notably, the findings can be of considerable value to teachers' professional development and can highlight the importance and the value of using specific strategies that can be introduced and employed by the teacher to increase the degree of the students' involvement in classroom interactions as well as motivate them to take responsibility of their own learning.

Keywords: Classroom interactions, Emic-based, Ethnographic approach, Learner involvement, Oral interactions

Introduction

Considering a group's behavior as being greatly influenced by the cultural patterns of that group is an important principle in ethnography. Ethnography is a holistic, emic study of the behavior in the target communities to investigate their social organization and the role of culture in shaping the interactional patterns and the flow of knowledge among the members of that community (Watson, 1988). It is kind of longitudinal study that demands a relatively long period of detecting the behavior of the members of a certain community while collecting data using different data collection methods as observation, interviewing, and audio or video tape recording. In second language research such studies aim at describing and interpreting the cultural as well as

communicative behavior of a group of participants (Johnson, 1992). As Tsui (2001) stated teacher-student interaction as well as student-student interaction is what is meant by classroom interaction.

It is also important to place emphasis on the role of interactional patterns in the classroom either teacher- student interaction (Hamre & Pianta, 2007) or the student- student interaction. Classroom interaction and the related studies using different approaches as DA & CA can make a great contribution to develop teachers' awareness of their own teaching and help them in improving the quality and efficiency of their teaching, also to collect data on the students' behavior, measure and then analyze the data to present a description of the learners' behavior in the class. Such research studies can be conducted both qualitatively and quantitatively. The former type of research study helps us in determining how the students interact in the classroom, to what extent they participate in the classroom activities and whether or not their participation is spontaneous. The latter method, on the other hand, let us account for the degree of interaction in the classroom as a whole or between the teacher and students or students and students in time and volume. The primary focus of discourse analysis is on the linguistic features of interaction while in conversation analysis social actions and the important role of the interlocutors are also focused on (Antaki 2002). However, in both conversation analysis and discourse analysis the interlocutors' interactions are studied in terms of their turn taking patterns, yet interactions are more dynamic in terms of speech acts created in conversation analysis compared to discourse analysis.

In the analysis of interactions in a second language classroom it seems necessary to create a link between conversation analysis and discourse analysis at the pedagogical level to study the interlocutors' interactional patterns in terms of sequences, turn-taking, repair, and topic development and provide a condition for discourse analysis to function in a broader sociolinguistic context (Seedhouse, 2004). He also stated that talk in interaction was methodical, organized and systematic rather than disordered. Teacher may play different roles in a class including exposing the students to the instructional material, controlling and monitoring the learners' interactional patterns and turns, sequencing and organizing the activities, and correcting errors. In addition the teacher is the one who initiates and closes turns or directs students themselves to do so.

Early studies on classroom discourse analysis focused on the nature of sequences and turn-taking in teacher- fronted traditional classes in which teacher was the authority. Studying the organization of sequences of turns specifically in traditional classrooms shows a three- part sequencing of the question and answer adjacency pairs including a question asked by the teacher, following by the student's answer as a second turn and finally the third turn is usually the teacher's feedback.

Sharrock and Anderson (1982) believe that students can learn a subject simply by talking through it in a classroom community. Classroom talk and interaction of the students via getting involved in such discussions is similar to other activities like role playing, question and answers, or even reading aloud in class in which the main objective is to get the students involved. As an instance in a question and answer interaction students and the teacher shift roles to ask and answer questions in order to exchange information. This way the teacher controls the students' learning behavior and provides them with the necessary feedback while the students learn about a certain topic. To create an interactive atmosphere in their classes, teachers can conduct such activities in small groups or in form of a whole-class discussion.

It appears from the aforementioned investigations that numerous investigation have been conducted on issues relevant to classroom research, including teacher talk, turn-taking, types of

teacher questions, teacher and learner feedback, and error correction. Although the question of gender bias in teaching has also prompted much research, more systematic studies on the role of teacher and the students' gender in the amount and direction of the classroom interactions are still needed in the area of EFL. This study mainly focused on the role of teacher in students' degree of involvement in classroom interactions considering the students' gender in both teacher-student and student-student interaction in the classroom. The current study contributes to our knowledge by addressing the following questions:

1. Which factors influence the patterns of interaction in the classroom?
2. What types of activities are employed by the teacher?
3. Does the students' mother tongue play any significant role in the types of activities used in the classroom?
4. To what extent do female/male students volunteer to talk, pose a question, or answer the questions?
5. What is the frequency of the teacher's questions answered by the students selected by the teacher vs. volunteer students?
6. Does the teacher address one of the two sexes more than the other?

Literature review

Classroom discourse analysis does not have an old history. It dates back to 1960s (Christie 2002). Then in the mid-1970s to the 1980s there was a new focus on the studies related to classroom interactions. Classroom interaction has been studied and the individuals' talk in classroom has been recorded and analyzed by some conversation analysis researchers as Seedhouse (2004, 2005), and Hester and Francis (2001). According to Martin-Jones et al. (2008) classroom discourse not only refers to classroom talk and talk-in-interaction but also to how the social world is understood and constituted. As Kumaravadivelu (1999) has stated any educational institution aims at systematically observe, understand and analyze classroom objectives and events. Classroom discourse analysis is mainly related to the analysis of the talk in the classroom or the texts in the classroom context. It can make a great contribution to the understanding of how knowledge is constructed in the classroom, who is participating, who initiates the talk in class, what turn-taking patterns are at work, as well as the way learning occurs. This also sheds light on the way interpersonal relations are shaped and act in the class (Cazden 1988). Douglas (2009) suggested that in order to understand teaching in classroom, there is a need to clearly express the related theoretical frameworks.

Many research studies in second language teaching have employed ethnographic approaches for different purposes; we can refer to Duff, (2002) and Pavlenko & Lantolf, (2000) as some examples. As a good source of access to conversational models, how students participate in oral interactions, and to what extent they know the language, classroom discourse can be studied and analyzed (Drew & Heritage, 1992).

Brophy and Good (1970) observed that 'male' students had more interactions with the teacher than female students and were generally more remarkable in the teacher's perceptual field. Jariah Mohd. Jan and Khatijah Shamsuddin (2000) claimed that teachers paid more attention to their male students and the female students received fewer opportunities in the classroom and thus there was an unequal distribution of turns. Female students tend to please the teacher and take shorter turns, take more notes in class and use less humor than male students (Chavez, 2000). Chavez also argues that gender of the students play an important role in determining or changing the patterns of student-teacher talk while Tannen (1996) asserted that gender cannot be the only variable affecting the interactional patterns in class. She says students'

and teachers' age, classroom context itself, teachers' experiences and many other factors may have noticeable influences. The study by Francis (2004) suggests that male students participate more in classroom interaction than females. It supports the claim that in Iranian context, boys are more likely to interact with their teachers (Rashidi and Rafiee Rad, 2010). They volunteered to answer the questions and usually took longer turns. In a different study Shomoosi, et.al. (2008) stated that the students' interactions in class can be influenced by their gender or the gender of the teacher. Rashidi and Rafiee Rad (2010) also observed in Iranian contexts that males were more likely to interact in classroom especially with their teachers. For the female students interactions were more likely for meeting the teacher's expectations or pleasing the teacher. Studies of classroom talk have also shown that male students tend to gain dominance over the physical space and also dominate the amount of talk in the classroom. However, as there are controversies among the results obtained in related studies, one cannot confidently claim to what extent gender affects classroom interactions.

Although for long educational settings, especially CA in classroom settings, have been studied within Ethnomethodology (McHoul, 1990; MacBeth, 1990), significant number of research studies in this area dates back to the late 1990s. Brock, et al., (2009) claimed that in classes where teachers manage time and monitor students' behavior, students learn better. Comparing the traditional classrooms with more modern ones, and considering changes in the language teaching pedagogy, one realizes that there is a shift of focus so that in the more recent classes students are more actively participated, classes are mostly learner-centered and task-oriented. As Seed house (2004) claims, such a change in teaching pedagogy has changed the interactional patterns in the classroom including turn-taking patterns and sequencing and organization of repair. Duffy, et. al. (2002) have suggested that classroom environment is also affected by the teacher's gender. Male and female teachers have classes with different characteristics and interactional patterns. According to Rashidi and Rafiee Rad (2010) in relation to the patterns of discourse, male and female teachers did rather the same proving the fact that context plays a more important role than interaction or the other factors in choosing the features of discourse.

Method

Research design

The present study has an ethnographic perspective to classroom interaction. That is, the classroom interactional patterns and also the meanings of communication patterns were studied. This means that the investigators have directly involved and observed the participants' behaviors in a natural environment rather than in an experimental setting. So the "WHYS" and the "HOWS" of interaction have been explained from the perspective of the instructor, or from the emic (the insider) point of view. Such a perspective can greatly contribute to the understanding of what actually happens in the classroom environment, i.e. the approach being used in the present study. It also aimed at revealing the inconsistencies and stress in classroom discourse due to linguistic and sociocultural differences in a heterogeneous discourse community and the role of teacher in fostering students' interactions in such a setting. By looking at how the teacher reacts to the students' responses, it will be possible to study the classroom dynamics and the ways students participate, the degree of their involvement, and how spontaneously they do so.

Using qualitative data on interpersonal communication of the EFL University students from observations of three EFL classrooms in Najafabad Azad University, Iran, the relationship between teacher-student and also student- student exchanges were addressed in this research.

Some other variables as gender and the degree of the teacher's involvement/control over interactions have also been considered as important.

Participants

Seventy five male and female EFL students in three different classes participated in the present study. Their ages ranged from 21 to 26. Students were the last year EFL students at Najafabad Azad University. They were taught and observed by the same instructor to avoid the possible negative impacts of having an unknown person or an observer in the classroom. The main criterion of subject selection was availability.

Material

Classroom talk and specifically interaction not just between teacher and students but also among students was the investigators' concern in the present study so that the interactions in the classroom were classified into teacher-student talk and student-student talk. The program continued for a whole semester and the students' interactions with the teacher and other students were observed for 12 succeeding sessions. To judge the meaning and function of the teacher and students' particular behaviors in the class, frequency count and percentage devices were employed. The investigators consulted TALOS, Target Language Observation Scheme, Ullmann & Geva (1985) and COTS, Classroom Observation Tally Sheet, Nunan's (1989).

Procedures

In order to enhance long-term academic success, it is required to maintain efficient interactions in the classroom both between the teacher and student and among the students. So in order to make students listen attentively and participate actively in class interactions the teacher asked them questions while randomly addressing each of them, even when another student was speaking so that they feel they need to be listening and be ready to respond. Students were allowed to ask their own questions, provide responses and state their opinions about the subject matter discussed to demonstrate their creativity and reflect their knowledge and the extent to which they are progressing. Teachers tried to control and monitor the students' interactions; however, when students were interacting with each other in pairs or small groups they managed to take turns without the interference of the teacher. The data collection process consisted of two steps. The first step comprised classroom observation while taking notes and tape-recording the classroom conversations. The objective was to study both the teacher and the students' behaviors in class and the relative frequency of such behavior.

In the second step that was an interview phase, the students were interviewed about their personal perspectives regarding the interactions in class and their related experiences. Some female teachers who teach the same students in other courses were also interviewed to learn about their perception of class interactions and the role of students' gender as a determining factor in directing and motivating such interactions among the students or between the teacher and the students.

Data analysis

The data collected were analyzed to provide answers to the already stated research questions. The investigators also estimated the reliability of the data collection instrument used in this study by employing a second coder. Class interactions were recorded during all class periods. The recordings were then carefully analyzed by some colleagues immediately after each session to double check the accuracy of the data collected. The frequency of different interactional

activities in the classroom was computed. The degree of teacher's involvement and the students' responses, the type of language used, the most frequent type of utterances, and the degree of students' initiation were also observed.

Results

The analysis of the data showed the following results:

Table 1. *Interactional features of male and female students*

<i>Male Students</i>	<i>Female Students</i>
1. Initiate more exchanges	1. Prefer to be asked or called by the teacher
2. Take longer turns	2. Take shorter turns
3. Ask fewer questions	3. Ask more questions
4. Are more confident	4. Need feedback and confirmation
5. Prefer to use the target language	5. Tend to shift to their mother tongue
6. Respond to referential questions	6. Volunteer to answer the display questions
7. Quickly give feedback to the teacher	7. Present more accurate and related responses

The results of the present study suggest that according to table 1 both male and female students participated in the classroom interactions, but especially when it was related to asking and answering questions, female students asked more questions and mostly expected to receive immediate feedback on their performance from the teacher. It seemed that even good female students were not confident enough and needed confirmation to ensure they were doing the job the right way. Female students also tended to shift to their mother tongue, Persian, more than male students. Also, based on the information represented in table 1, male students asked fewer numbers of questions that could be interpreted in different ways. Some of the teachers being interviewed attributed this to the higher level of confidence in male students and some others believed that male students did not usually follow the classroom activities as carefully as female students did. Teachers who were interviewed noted that in their mixed classes female students seemed to be more shy, quiet and unwilling to be active participants, although they tended to pay more attention and concentrated more.

Results of the study also revealed that mostly female students volunteered to respond to the display questions that were posed by the teacher. Yet when the teacher addressed the students to answer the inferential questions, male students proved to be more serious and alert.

Table 2. *Classroom Observation Tally Sheet from Nunan (1989)*

	Tallies	Total
1. Teacher asks a display question (i.e. a question to Which she knows the answer)		143
2. Teacher asks a referential question (i.e. a question to Which she does not know the answer)		72

3. Teacher explains a grammatical point	108
4. Teacher explains meaning of a vocabulary item	342
5. Teacher explains functional point	72
6. Teacher explains point relating to the content (theme/ topic) of the lesson	72
7. Teacher gives instructions or directions	108
8. Teacher praises	36
9. Teacher criticizes	18
10. Learner asks a question	108
11. Learner answers questions	180
12. Learner talks to another learner	108
13. Period of silence or confusion	36

The High Inference TALOS					
<i>Teacher</i>					
Use of L ₁	0	1	2	3	4
Use of L ₂	0	1	2	3	4
teacher talk time	0	1	2	3	4
explicit lesson structure	0	1	2	3	4
task orientation	0	1	2	3	4
Clarity	0	1	2	3	4
initiate problem solving	0	1	2	3	4
personalized questions & comments	0	1	2	3	4
positive reinforcement	0	1	2	3	4
negative reinforcement	0	1	2	3	4
Corrections	0	1	2	3	4
Pacing	0	1	2	3	4
use of audio-visual aids	0	1	2	3	4
Gestures	0	1	2	3	4
Humour	0	1	2	3	4
Enthusiasm	0	1	2	3	4
<i>Students</i>					
Use of L ₁ on task	0	1	2	3	4
Use of L ₂ on task	0	1	2	3	4
student talk time on task	0	1	2	3	4
initiate problem solving	0	1	2	3	4
Comprehension	0	1	2	3	4
Attention	0	1	2	3	4
Participation	0	1	2	3	4
personalized questions & comments	0	1	2	3	4
positive effect	0	1	2	3	4
negative effect	0	1	2	3	4

S to S interaction on task	0	1	2	3	4
<i>Program</i>					
linguistic appropriateness	0	1	2	3	4
content appropriateness	0	1	2	3	4
Depth	0	1	2	3	4
Variety	0	1	2	3	4
listening skill focus	0	1	2	3	4
speaking skill focus	0	1	2	3	4
reading skill focus	0	1	2	3	4
writing skill focus	0	1	2	3	4
formal properties	0	1	2	3	4
functional properties	0	1	2	3	4
Integration with general curriculum	0	1	2	3	4

Source: Nunan, David, *Understanding language classrooms: A guide for instructor initiated action*, 1st Edition © 1989. Reprinted by permission of Pearson Education, Inc., Upper Saddle River, NJ.

Teacher responded to the students' utterances (either questions or answers); however, table 2 reveals that teacher praised the students for their correct responses or related questions twice more than criticizing them for doing something wrong. The teacher tried to correct the errors committed by the learners both explicitly by interrupting to focus attention on a certain structure or language related point or by implicitly giving direction, instruction, or elaboration on that erroneous form. Such a finding confirms the claim that teacher correction and feedback is an influential factor in enhancing students' activities in class. The interesting point to be considered was that not all the students participated and each session there were a few students who kept quiet and remained passive to the end of the session. Significant numbers of interactional activities were initiated by the teacher and students rarely seemed to volunteer to initiate talk or problem solving.

It has been supposed that in language classes the students' mother tongue should not be used and only the target language should be employed as both the medium of instruction and the language used in class. However, findings provide evidence that both L1 and L2 were employed in the class. L2 was used both by the students and the teacher; hence, when they had problem doing the tasks, students, especially female ones, shifted to their L1 and asked their questions in their mother tongue.

The students' mother tongue was used by the teacher just to clarify the problematic points or represent examples in mother tongue for further and easier understanding of the learners. Hence, she encouraged students to avoid using their L1 and try to state their problems in the target language.

According to the analysis of data 61% of the questions posed by the teacher were answered by the students selected by the teacher, 27% were answered by the students who volunteered and 12% were not answered at all. All in all students rarely initiated problem solving activities. The teacher addressed both male and female students to answer the questions and there was a focus on speaking skill in order to involve students in oral activities; nevertheless, when the students were called out and had to contribute to the classroom discussions their talk time on the tasks was on the average rate. Female students presented more accurate and related responses showing that they had been more attentively listening even though their attempt might have taken

a longer time. It was also learnt that female students showed more interest to get involved in the reading activities and were better in their pronunciation compared to male students, a finding that was not the focus of the present study.

Another unpredicted and notable finding of the study was that when the teacher had a sense of humor, both male and female students showed more willingness to interact and the frequency of their participation in class interactions increased considerably. This could be attributed to the fact that humor benefited students' relationships. It also contributed to reducing tension and helped the students to deal with stress.

Discussion

Although according to the teachers who were interviewed and also the teacher observer, there were some gender differences between the female and the male students in the classroom considering the overall patterns of oral interactions in the class, generally speaking, the students' degree of involvement in the classroom discussions was proved to be a matter of having related schemata and being interested in the topic rather than a gender related issue. Hence, when they got involved male students usually dominated conversations and discussions and talked longer turns. Another interesting point was that female students tended to compete with the male students especially when trying to answer the questions posed by the teacher. Our teaching experiences suggest that the students' oral production chances will be doubled and facilitated when they receive feedback from the teacher. However, male and female students participate in different forms and varying degrees in class interactions.

One way to involve students in learning process is to find ways to encourage students and motivate them in a way to actively participate in classroom activities specifically in classroom oral interactions either interacting with the other peers or with the teacher. This way students directly experience what is going on in the class, what is the main topic or subject matter discussed, as well as learning to be in relation with other students who are experiencing the same situation so that they can understand how to interact with others and learn from each other that leads to the development of their team work skills and collaborative learning. In modern approaches teachers mostly play the role of a facilitator in the classroom. As students mostly feel shy or stressed to perform in front of the other students, they do not usually get involved in class interactions spontaneously and need encouragement. One way to help students be more active in class interactions is to put them in small groups. The excitement of being a member of the group and responsible for accomplishing part of the group project can greatly motivate them to participate actively.

Chaudron (1988), cited in Nurmasitah, (2010) posited that interaction is significant because it is via interaction that we can analyze the target language structures and get insight into the meaning of classroom events. It gives learners opportunities to use the structures they have encountered in classroom events into their own speech. The interactional patterns between the teacher and learners and the way learners construct such communication structures determine the extent to which learners understand the classroom events. This way students develop their competencies and learn to think critically, they also gain opportunities to experience comprehensive and thorough, structured interaction with the other students in class. It is important to note that the interaction between the students and the teacher in class is the necessary and valuable part of teaching and learning process.

A recent research study by Rashidi and Naderi (2012) states some discriminations or the existing biases may influence the teaching quality in a positive or negative way. Moreover, gender is a culture related variable and has different impacts in different contexts so that the

results of a study done in a certain context or culture cannot be generalized to other cultures and contexts, specifically in Islamic context more studies need to be done to come into a clearer picture of the issue.

Language learners have limited set of linguistic resources for constructing their turns, so they bring with them variety of interactional resources that they can transfer from their mother tongue. Such factors along with the existing biases can positively or negatively influence the quality of teaching and learning. Moreover, gender difference is a culture-bound issue so that it has been considered differently in different countries and naturally people coming from different cultures have different viewpoints about its role in the classroom. Obviously the results of the studies in different cultures cannot be generalized to other contexts especially to an Islamic context like Iran where the gender has an essential role in social issues.

Conclusion

Considering the fact that teachers play a very important role in encouraging, directing, and managing interactions in the class, the following are suggested to promote gender equality and encourage both male and female students' interaction and participation in the class activities:

Teachers should be careful enough in providing equal opportunities for both male and female students in their classes to participate in discussions, activities, and other oral interactions. The key elements for effective language class practice are creating a stress-free atmosphere and encouraging both teacher-student and student-student patterns of interaction in the classroom. This way teacher can foster and support students' social and emotional functioning in the classroom. Classroom discussions should be interesting and related to the objectives of the course, they should be simple, guided and comprehensible for all the students either brighter ones or the weaker ones. Teachers should manage the chances given to the learners to respond to the questions asked or ask their own questions. Individuals are not the same in their cognitive development and if teachers consider the fact that interaction and communication in class is a cognitive act, they can eliminate or remove the role of gender in classroom practice. Actually teachers can explore ways to manage and change the classroom practice in a positive or more efficient way. Teachers can also manage and change their own turns in order to pose more accessible questions in class and develop their teaching strategies. Even weak students can be contributed to participate in class interactions by both the teacher and their peers in classroom using all the linguistic and nonlinguistic resources available to them.

Such studies may encourage more student-centered teaching particularly in language classes. They can also reflect modifications in pedagogical practices. This research study has thrown up many questions in need for further investigation. The role of the learners' gender in classroom interactions, the role of teacher's gender, amount and type of feedback provided by the teacher, the type of language used, the length of utterances, and other similar issues could lead to thoughtful discernment into the process of language learning and teaching particularly in EFL classes and each can be the topic of future research studies. As the teacher in the present study has been a female teacher, it is recommended that further research be undertaken to explore the role of teacher's gender in the nature of classroom interactions. There is also some disagreement among the findings of the studies. On the other hand, as in reality we do not usually have equal number of male and female students in our classes, and considering the fact that in our EFL classes female students are considerably more than the males in number, it might seem to be natural that we cannot make a definite judgment about the role of gender in directing or influencing patterns of interaction in EFL classes in Iran. Interested researchers can conduct

focused research studies to shed light on the extent to which such factors can foster student-teacher or student-student interactions.

References

- Antaki, C., 2002. What is 'Conversation Analysis'? [online] Available from: <http://www-staff.iboro.ac.uk/~ssca1/sitemenu.htm> [Accessed 8 March 2005].
- Bogdan, R. & Biklen, S. (1998). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Brock, et al., (2009). *Language Education in Africa. A comparative and transdisciplinary analysis*. Bristol Papers in Education: comparative and international studies. United Kingdom
- Brophy, J., & Good, T. (1970). Teachers' communication of differential expectations for children's classroom performance: Some behavioral data. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 61, 365–374.
- Cazden, Courtney, B. (1988). *Classroom Discourse: The Language of Teaching and Learning*. Heinemann, Portsmouth, NH.
- Chaudron, C (1988). *Second Language Classrooms: Research on Teaching and Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chavez, M. (2000). Teacher and student gender and peer group gender composition in German foreign language classroom discourse: An exploratory study. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32, 1019-1058.
- Christie, F. (2002), *Classroom Discourse Analysis: A Functional Perspective*. London: Continuum.
- Douglas, K. (2009). Sharpening Our Focus in Measuring Classroom Instruction. *Educational Research*, 38:518-521
- Drew, P. and Heritage, J., 1992. Analyzing talk at work: an introduction. In: P. Drew and J. Heritage, eds. *Talk at work: interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge University Press.
- Duff, P. (2002). The discursive co-construction of knowledge, identity and difference. An ethnography of communication in the high school mainstream. *Applied Linguistics*, 23,289-322.
- Duffy, J., Warren, K. and Walsh, M.(2002). Classroom interactions: gender of teacher, gender of student, and classroom subject. *Sex roles*, 45 (9/10), 579 – 593
- Fairclough, N. 1989. Discourse representation in media discourse *Sociolinguistics*,17: 125: 39.
- Francis, B. (2004). Classroom interaction and access: Whose space is it? In *Gender in Education 3-19: A Fresh Approach*, ed. H. Claire, 42-49. London: Association of Teachers and Lecturers.
- Hamre, B. K., & Pianta, R. C. (2007). Learning opportunities in preschool and early elementary classrooms. In R. C. Pianta, M. J. Cox, & K. L. Snow (Eds.), *School readiness and the transition to kindergarten in the era of accountability* (pp. 49–84). Baltimore: Brookes.
- Hester, S. and Francis, D., 2001. Is institutional talk a phenomenon? reflections on methodology and applied conversation analysis. In: A. McHoul and M. Rapley, eds. *How to analyse talk in institutional settings: a casebook of methods*. London: Continuum.
- Johnson, D.M. (1992). *Approaches to research in second language learning*. New York: London
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (1999), 'Critical classroom discourse analysis', *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(3), 453–84.
- MacBeth, D., (1990). Classroom Order as Practical Action: the making and un-making of a quiet reproach *British Journal of Sociology of Education* Volume 11, Issue 2

Martin-Jones, M., De Mejia, A. M. and Hornberger, N. (eds) (2008), *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*, vol. 3: Discourse and Education (2nd edn). New York: Springer Science + Business Media LLC.

McHoul A. W. (1990). The organization of repair in classroom talk. *Language in Society* / Volume 19 / Issue 03 , pp 349-37

Mohd. Jan, J. and Shamsuddin, K. (2000). Gender Imbalance in Classroom Discourse Practices. Paper presented at International Conference Year 2000, Language and Cognition, 14-16 July 2000, Faculty of Languages and Linguistics, University of Malaya.

Nunan, D. (1989). *Understanding language classrooms: A Guide for instructor initiated action*. New York: Prentice- Hall.

Nurmasitah, S. (2010). A study of classroom interaction characteristics in a geography class conducted in English: The case at year ten of an immersion class in SMA N2 Semarang (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Oiponegoro).

Pavlenko, A., & Lantolf, J.P. (2000). Second language learning as participation and the (re)construction of selves. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp.155-178). New York: Oxford University Press.

Rashidi, N. and Naderi, S. (2012). The Effect of Gender on the Patterns of Classroom Interaction. *Education*, 2(3): 30-36

Rashidi and Rafiee Rad (2010). Analyzing Patterns of Classroom Interaction in EFL Classrooms in Iran. *Asia TEFL*. Volume 7 Number 3, Pages 1-187

Seedhouse, P., 2004. *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: a conversation analysis perspective*. UK: Blackwell Publishing.

Seedhouse, P., 2005. Conversation analysis as research methodology. In: K. Richards and P. Seedhouse, eds. *Applying conversation analysis*. England: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sharrock, W. W. & Anderson, R. J. (1982). On the demise of the native: some observations on and a proposal for ethnography *Human Studies* 5 (1):119 - 135

Shomoossi,N; Amouzadeh,M and Ketabi, S. (2008). Class- room Interaction Mediated by Gender and technology: the Language Laboratory Course. *Novitas-ROYAL*, 2 (2), 176-184

Tannen, D. (1996b). Researching gender-related patterns in classroom discourse. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30, 341-343

Tsui, A.B.M. (2001). "Classroom Interaction Research". In R. Carter & D. Nunan (eds.), *TESOL Guide*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ullmann, R., & Geva, E. (1985). Expanding our evaluation perspective: What can classroom observation tell us about Core French Programs? *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 42(2), 307-323.

Watson- Gegeo, K. (1988). Ethnography in ESL: Defining the essentials. *TESOL Quarterly*, 22, 575-592