International Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Sciences
ISSN: 2278-6236
Impact Factor: 6.284

TEACHING FUNCTIONS OF TEACHERS IN A LANGUAGE CLASS

Samuel S. Poliden, PhD, Benguet State University, La Trinidad – 2601 Benguet, Philippines

Abstract: *Teaching functions in a language class was the focus of this study. Classroom proceedings were observed, recorded and videotaped to determine the teaching patterns/functions of the English teachers. Bowers' model (1980) was used to determine which teaching functions enhance communication opportunities for students. Data gathered were summarized, analyzed and cross-tabulated. Summary statistics like weighted means, frequency counts, percentages, ranks and Cochran Q-test were used to analyze the teaching patterns of the English teachers. Finding of the study shows that eliciting was commonly used by the English teachers in engaging the students in classroom activities/discussion followed by sociating and responding the least. In connection with the findings of this study, it is concluded that teaching functions of teachers follow certain patterns which engage the students in classroom activities/discussion. Based on the findings and conclusions of the study, the researcher recommends that since responding was the least of teachers' functions, activities/tasks given to the students should be more challenging to encourage students to ask questions that develop their critical thinking and to enhance interaction with the teacher.*

Keywords: *Teaching pattern, teacher talk, classroom proceeding, language class, communication,*

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Teaching functions in language classrooms vary as influenced by educational norms and methodology used by the teacher. The level and age of the class also make a difference. The purpose of the activity is another influence on interaction patterns.

Questioning patterns have been studied by a number of classroom researchers and have been shown to be a means by which teachers exert control over the interaction, and not simply a means of eliciting information. The term display question has been coined to refer to a question to which the teacher knows the answer in advance. Questions that seek new information are called referential or real questions.

Guttierrez (1994) has described this pattern of social action and discourse as a "recitation script" that limits opportunities for students to produce elaborated talk, interact with other students, construct their own questions, and participate in the types of discourse they are expected to produce. This pattern supports a transmission approach to teaching, where teachers tell students what is important and students passively listen to receive the teacher's wisdom. In addition, Cazden (2001) has described the IRE pattern as a "default setting," implying that without deliberate attention to one's language and patterns of interacting with students, teachers will default back to this way of talking due to its strong tradition, many years of apprenticeship in this way of interacting, and how this way of talking with students has been idealized as the most effective way of discussing and delivering the curriculum.

There are numerous reasons why this type of classroom interaction has appealed to classroom teachers. Traditionally, classroom management has been a primary focus in teacher preparation programs, and is a large part of the evaluation systems used to assess the quality of teacher candidates (Darling-Hammond, 2007). The IRE interaction pattern is appealing because it can be used by teachers to control which topics are important, the amount of participation by individual students, the pacing of the lesson, and which responses will be sanctioned as useful or correct. One may conclude that it may be the pressures of trying to "cover the curriculum" that leads teachers to this way of interacting with students and asking questions.

There are other tensions that affect classroom interaction patterns, including the tensions between: (1) the pacing of a lesson and time allowed for students to ponder or explore new interpretations, (2) the search for a single main idea and the possibilities each new interpretation offers, (3) privileging one interpretation to the exclusion of other students' voices, (4) and the difference between questions with a predetermined answer and open-ended questions that allow for a range of acceptable answers.

Unfortunately, monologic or IRE interaction patterns focus on the transmission of predetermined facts and concepts, not intellectual complexity and expanding readers' interpretive repertoires. In contrast, interactive discussions create a space in the discussion for students to generate interpretations, articulate their ideas and negotiate meanings with other readers, not simply strive for consensus.

In contrast to the IRE interaction pattern, numerous literacy educators have described an alternative way of interacting around a piece of literature. Sometimes referred to as dialogic teaching (Alexander, 2006), inter-thinking (Mercer, 2000), shared contemplation (Chambers, 1996), exploratory talk (Barnes & Todd, 1995), scaffolded talk (Nystrand, 1997) or co-elaboration (Serafini&Youngs, 2008), educators and theorists have tried to offer teachers a preferred vision for the types of classroom discussions and interactions they would like to see enacted to support students' thinking and literate abilities.

During an interactive discussion, students play an integral role in determining the direction and focus of the discussion. Each student is responsible for articulating their interpretations and ideas to the community of readers to be considered by other students. They assume an active role, listening intently to other students' ideas and interpretations, negotiating meanings through the discussion and opening lines of communication among students rather than always going through the teacher.

The role of the teacher in the discussion is more facilitative than directive, allowing students a greater share of the conversational turns than a traditional IRE interaction pattern, and is concerned with the interpretations students are offering, rather than searching for predetermined, literal-level answers. Here, students produce a "chain of utterances" (Nystrand, 2006) where they are able to talk without interruption or re-direction from the teacher. Students listen and respond to one another as well as the teacher. In addition, the teacher responds to the students' ideas rather than the students simply answering a series of questions asked by the teacher. These two transcripts demonstrate the differences between monologic and dialogic interaction patterns, allowing students' voices to be heard and positioning the teacher as *one* voice in the conversation, not *the* authoritative voice.

The expectations that are established to support classroom discussions should be transparent, clear and obtainable. In other words, students should know why they are being asked to discuss a certain topic the way the teacher is asking them to, there should be open discussions and numerous demonstrations of this type of dialogic interaction, and the teacher should not expect the students to discuss texts in ways that are not shown to them or they have not previously experienced. Expectations that support a shift from monologic, teacher-directed discussions to dialogic, interactive discussions include the following; (a) students responses are honorably reportable, (b) listening well is as important as talking

well, (c) address other students, as well as the teacher, when sharing ideas, (d) consider what has been previously offered by other students, and (e) “half-baked” ideas are accepted and encouraged.

This study shed light on the kind of teaching patternsteachers utilize that promote communication opportunities for students. In this context, teachers would be able to devise language activities for the students. Moreover, language teachers take into account that learners learn in many ways and that the use of different teaching practices/strategies should be considered thus deviating from the traditional lecture method where the classroom setting is dominated by the teacher talk thereby depriving their students to use the second language.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Interactive discussions depend on students being able to listen attentively to one another in order to respond and react to the various comments offered. This requires students to directly address one another, rather than using the teacher as a conduit for all comments and ideas. This leads to the proposition that each student in the discussion needs to consider what has been offered by other students before articulating their own interpretations. Interactive discussions build upon each interpretation or comment offered, they are not simply a collection of unrelated ideas. A primary goal of interactive discussions is to share the possibilities concerning a particular piece of subject matter, not to reach consensus or come to agreement about what a book means. Interactive discussions create a space for students to articulate their interpretations, consider the ideas of other students and negotiate the possibilities a particular text offers.

One of the most important strategies for changing the interaction patterns during discussions is to stop requiring students to raise their hands to offer ideas or enter the conversation. Instead, teachers need to teach students how to listen for openings in the discussion, and how to politely “get the floor.” When students raise their hands and wait for the teacher to call on them during discussions, the only thing they have to listen for is their names being called. They can simply shut out all the conversation until they hear their name, and then simply respond to the teacher. In addition, having teachers determine who will speak next and for how long may give them undue influence in the direction and pacing of the conversation. It takes time to make this shift to allowing students to determine when

to speak, and caution must be taken to avoid the domination of the discussion by individual students. However, the benefits by far outweigh the challenges (Chambers, 1996).

Second, when teachers speak in first-person plural, the language is more invitational, suggesting that both teachers and students are working together to comprehend what is being discussed. The objectives are "reciprocal" (Chambers, 1996), in that both teacher and students (we) are working towards richer, more sophisticated understandings.

A third suggestion is having students "code texts" using sticky notes to mark passages and events they feel are important for discussing before the class gathers to discuss the text. Developing richer, more sophisticated interpretations requires time and attention to the written text and visual images. Allowing students to refer to their codes in a text encourages students to return to the text to support their interpretations and initial responses during discussions.

Brown (1994), on the other hand, gave descriptions of teacher-talk but suggests that teacher-talk undergoes through a continuum of directive to non-directive methods: controlling, directing, managing, facilitating and resourcing.

According to Brown, controlling is focused on simply organizing the class hours. e.g. "You have 15 minutes to discuss the problems reflected in the story. After which, five minutes will be given in presenting your output.

Directing is also keeping the process of interaction flowing smoothly and efficiently to bring uniqueness in communicative skills. e.g. In her essay "Three Days to See", Helen Keller enumerated the things she will do in three days while she can see. If you are put in the same situation, where the optometrist tells you that you will only have three days left to use your sight, how will you spend these days?

Managing is simply planning the lessons, modules, activities but allowing each learner to be creative within the parameters set. e.g. Before you defend your propositions in front, submit to me first your written arguments.

In facilitating, the teacher capitalizes on intrinsic motivation allowing students to discover language, by using it pragmatically rather than telling about the language while resourcing implies the students to take initiative to go to the teacher (for advice or counsel) allowing them to proceed with their own linguistic development.

Brown (1994) claims that the key to interactive teaching is to play toward the non-directive end of the continuum, gradually enabling students to move from their roles of total dependence (upon the teacher, the textbook, etc.) to relatively total independence. The proficiency level of the class will determine to some extent, which roles will dominate. But when at the lowest levels, some interaction can take place and the teacher's role must be one that releases the students to try things for themselves.

Another discussion strategy has been described as "handing off" the conversational turn to other students by focusing one's gaze on someone other than the speaker (Myhill et al., 2006). In this technique, rather than looking solely at the student offering an interpretation, the teacher would look at back and forth to other students, inviting them to participate through their gaze. Using one's gaze and proximity to a particular student can signal that they are expected to offer something to the discussion without having to ask directly for participation.

Nystrand and his colleagues have discussed the concept of "uptake" in several publications (Nystrand, 1997, 2006; Nystrand, Gamoran, & Heck, 1993). This technique involves "taking up" from what has been offered previously and using students' input and interpretations as a foundation for the subsequent questions and comments made by the teacher. In order to be successful, this strategy requires teachers to listen sensitively and attentively to what students are saying in order to utilize their comments in subsequent turns.

Another successful strategy for helping students to attend to what other students have said previously, is a strategy called "He said, She said, and I think" (Serafini&Youngs, 2008). In this strategy, individual students are required to describe what two other students have said previously before offering their comments and interpretations. This technique requires students to listen to at least two other students before offering their ideas. In addition, students generally use what has been said by other students in their own comments, building upon and adding to what has been offered. Alexander (2006) has stated that quality classroom interactions are cumulative, suggesting that discussions should build upon the ideas and interpretations that have been offered, and chain them into coherent lines of thinking and enquiry.

Each of the strategies described requires a change in the expectations set for students and the role of the classroom teacher in classroom discussions. These techniques are not

magical cures that will alone change the dynamics of the classroom, but are suggestions for reconsidering the types of interactions that occur in classroom discussions.

Bowers (1980) distinguished the different definitions of the teaching functions: Eliciting is an act designed to produce a verbal response from another person while sociating is an act not contributing directly to the teaching/learning task, but rather to the establishment or maintenance of interpersonal relationships. Directing encourages nonverbal activity as an integral part of the teaching/learning process while evaluating rates another verbal act positively or negatively. Presenting, on the other hand, gives information of direct relevance to the learning task while organizing serves to structure the learning task or environment without contributing to the teaching/learning task itself. Responding directly seeks the utterance of another speaker, such as answering a question.

As used in this study, teaching functions refer to teacher acts in urging the learners to participate in class discussion. The figure below describes the different acts a teacher does in the process of teaching (Bowers, 1980).

Category	Description
Responding	Any act directly sought by the utterance of another speaker, such as answering a question
Sociating	Any act not contributing directly to the teaching/learning task, but rather to the establishment or maintenance of interpersonal relationships.
Organizing	Any act that serves to structure the learning task or environment without contributing to the teaching/learning task itself.
Directing	Any act encouraging nonverbal activity as an integral part of the teaching/learning process.
Presenting	Any act presenting information of direct relevance to the learning task.
Evaluating	Any act that rates another verbal act positively or negatively.
Eliciting	Any act designed to produce a verbal response from another person.

Figure 1. Bowers' (1980) categories for analyzing classroom interaction

According to Johnson (1985), there are three major aspects of teacher behavior in the classroom namely: physiological, interpersonal and pedagogical.

The physiological aspect of teacher-talk includes elocution, phonology, syntax, discourse structure, and semantics. The teacher's voice remains a major educational resource. In noisy environment, to be understood by learners, necessarily, a teacher has to speak loud and clear. The teacher's voice ideally, should be as rich and as varied as that of an actor.

The interpersonal aspect includes classroom management and socialization as well as establishments of an atmosphere where learning to be effective is stimulated and encouraged. The teacher defines the behavior he considers appropriate between teacher and learner as well as among the learners under a variety of circumstances. After all, everyone agrees that a favorable classroom atmosphere is prerequisite for effective learning. It seems highly probable that the learner's perception of the teacher's intention, which determines the outcome of learning, could be at variance with the teacher's actual words.

The most important aspect of teacher-talk is the pedagogical aspect where the relationship between intention and linguistic realization is most transparent. Within this aspect are three functional modes: interactive, operative, and informative.

a. An interactive transaction is marked by an elicitation which is the teacher's attempt to elicit information from one or more learners and this usually takes the form of a question. The elicitation and reply, if any, divide the transaction into three phases: (1) the framing phase where the teacher prepares the learners for the elicitation or instruction. The teacher functions included are marking boundaries between transaction and phase (ok, well, etc.); focusing (directing learner's intention to a topic area and establishing communicative intentions); structuring (organizing the interaction); and nominating (calling a learner to answer).

After elicitation, if there is no reply, the teacher may enter (2) the mediating phase, which ensures understanding. The teacher's functions are: checking (checking if the elicitation is understood); promoting (urging a reply by saying "come on", "continue", etc); clueing (providing additional information to help learners give a reply); repeating or rephrasing the elicitation and nominating if the learners do not volunteer to answer, elicitation are normally followed by a nomination.

When a reply is given, the teacher enters (3) the evaluation phase which determines whether or not the required task (activity has been carried out satisfactorily. The teacher in this phase deals with the reply given with the following functions: checking (establishing whether the reply is intended by the learner or understood by the other learners); repeating (reiterating the reply); assessing (evaluating the accuracy or adequacy of the reply); commenting (expanding the reply); and establishing continuity (establishing the relationship with the next transaction).

The teaching functions within a phase are not ordered and are potentially recurring; that is, the teacher may prompt repeatedly or having rephrased a question, promptly again or provide further clues.

b. An operative transaction is marked by a directive, which usually takes the form of an order or an instruction. It is also divided into three phases: (1) framing phase which prepares the learners for instruction; (2) the mediating phase which ensures understanding; and (3) the evaluating phase which determines whether or not the required activity has been carried out successfully. The teaching functions are the same as those in the interactive mode.

c. The phases identified in the informative mode include: (1) the framing phase which prepares the learners for a reasonably complex information structure; (2) the informing phase which notes the main points and answers questions; and (3) the consolidating phase which ensures that the presentation of new information has been effective.

An interaction transaction is marked by an elicitation, which is the teachers' attempt to elicit information from one or more students and which usually takes the form of a question. The elicitation and reply (eliciting and responding to Bowers' terms) divide the transaction into three phases: First, the framing phase where the teacher prepares the students for the elicitation.

The illustrative teaching functions include marking boundaries between transactions and phrases, focusing or directing students' attention to a topic area and establishing communicative intentions, structuring or organizing the interaction and nominating or calling upon a student or students to answer.

After the elicitation, if there is no reply, the teacher enters the mediating phase. The teaching functions here are checking, that is if the elicitation is understood, prompting or by

urging, clueing or providing additional information to help students give a reply, repeating or rephrasing, elicitation and nominating.

If students do not volunteer and answer, elicitations are normally followed by a nomination. When a reply is obtained, the teacher enters the evaluating phase where the teacher deals with the reply obtained. Performing one or more teaching acts such as checking establishes whether the reply is intended by the student or understood by other students, repeating to stress the reply, assessing to evaluate the accuracy or adequacy of the reply, commenting to expand upon the repetitions and establishing continuity that is to establish the relationship with the next transaction.

The teaching functions within a phase are unordered and potentially recursive like the teacher may prompt repeatedly or have rephrased a question, prompt again or provide further clues. A transaction terminates when the teacher switches to another mode or to an elicitation on a new topic.

Hughes (1959) described seven categories of teacher-talk: Controlling, imposing, facilitating, developing content, responding, positive affectivity, and negative affectivity.

Controlling empowers the teacher to structure, regulate, set standards, judge, or otherwise control learner behavior.

In imposing, the teacher moralizes, giveshelp withoutasking, appraises, and imposes himself into the situation rather than employing a routine.A teacher also checks for information, clarifies procedures and demonstrates procedures when he does facilitating.

Developing content gives authority to the teacher to stimulate, clarify, summarize, evaluate, answer questions, agree or otherwise develop content for learning while responding makes the teacher to clarify learner problems, interpret situations or feelings, and/or respond to learners in terms of content and learner's effort to learn.

In positive affectivity, the teacher encourages, praises, gives recognition, offers solace, or shows positive regard for learners while in negative affectivity, the teacher admonishes, reprimands, accuses, threatens, ignores or shows negative regard for learners.

Brown (1994), on the other hand, gave similar descriptions of teacher-talk but suggests that teacher-talk undergoes through a continuum of directive to non-directive methods: controlling, directing, managing, facilitating and resourcing.

According to Brown, controlling is focused on simply organizing the class hours. e.g. "You have 15 minutes to discuss the problems reflected in the story. After which, five minutes will be given in presenting your output.

Directing is also keeping the process of interaction flowing smoothly and efficiently to bring uniqueness in communicative skills. e.g. In her essay "Three Days to See", Helen Keller enumerated the things she will do in three days while she can see. If you are put in the same situation, where the optometrist tells you that you will only have three days left to use your sight, how will you spend these days?

Managing is simply planning the lessons, modules, activities but allowing each learner to be creative within the parameters set. e.g. Before you defend your propositions in front, submit to me first your written arguments.

In facilitating, the teacher capitalizes on intrinsic motivation allowing students to discover language, by using it pragmatically rather than telling about the language while resourcing implies the students to take initiative to go to the teacher (for advice or counsel) allowing them to proceed with their own linguistic development.

Equally, student-talk includes the different responses of the students: specific, initiated and confusion. Specific response is within a specific and limited range of available or previously practiced answers; initiated response is a response to the teacher with the student's own ideas, opinions, reactions, and feelings while confusion happens when more than one student at a time talk, students calling out excitedly, and eager to participate or respond.

With the theories on teaching functions discussed, this study aimed to determine the teaching functions of the teachers in the language class. Specifically, it sought to determine the teaching functions used by English teachers to enrich communication in the language class.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study used classroom observation to record and videotape classroom proceedings to determine the teaching patterns of the English teachers.

Bowers' model (1980) was used to determine which teaching functions enhance communication opportunities for students.

Locale and Time of the Study

There were at least 10 English 11 classes observed, recorded and videotaped at the Department of Humanities, SY 2014 representing the eight (8) colleges and two (2) institutes.

Data Collection Procedure

Collections of data were both electronic and manual in nature (Bailey 2006). Manual data collection was in the form of classroom observation. Electronic data collection, on the other hand, was done with videotape recorder. Results of the classroom observation both manual and electronic were analyzed.

Data Collection Instruments

Classroom proceedings of the English teachers were observed and recorded to analyze their teaching patterns/functions. The model of Bowers was employed to determine the teaching functions of teachers.

Treatment of Data

Data gathered were summarized, analyzed and cross-tabulated. Summary statistics like weighted means, frequency counts, percentages, ranks and Cochran Q-test were used to analyze the teaching patterns of the English teachers.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Teaching Functions of Teachers

This study presents the analysis of the teaching functions of the English teachers using Bowers' categories which points out or identifies the functions of teacher behavior in the process of teaching. It also determines which of the teaching functions promote communication. Bowers' (1980) teaching categories consist of responding, sociating, organizing, directing, presenting, evaluating, and eliciting.

Generally, the dominant teaching function used is eliciting followed by evaluating, directing, sociating, presenting, and organizing. Here, the teacher starts her lesson with eliciting before presenting the lesson to the class. She ends her lesson by evaluating and sociating.

Aside from eliciting and evaluating, according to Johnson (1985), directing is considered as controlling. It empowers the teacher to structure, regulate, set standards, or to control learner behavior.

This shows that classroom interaction is dominated by eliciting followed by evaluating and sociating. That is, asking question inside the classroom has the bulk of initiating communication between and among the learners and the teachers. In a class where most students are passive, eliciting is undisputably an effective tool to engage them in class discussion. This reflects the relatively high priority of teachers in conducting more language activities and establishing good rapport with the students.

Consequently, responding was not used by the teacher since there was no question that students asked their teacher.

The findings indicate that as teachers evaluate students' performances, they tend to make a move to socialize by praising their performance. This may be considered important in a language classroom to create an environment conducive for learning.

The findings also corroborate with Hughes (1959) who described seven categories of teacher-talk: Controlling, imposing, facilitating, developing content, responding, positive affectivity, and negative affectivity.

Controlling empowers the teacher to structure, regulate, set standards, judge, or otherwise control learner behavior.

In imposing, the teacher moralizes, gives help without asking, appraises, and imposes himself into the situation rather than employing a routine. A teacher also checks for information, clarifies procedures and demonstrates procedures when he does facilitating.

Developing content gives authority to the teacher to stimulate, clarify, summarize, evaluate, answer questions, agree or otherwise develop content for learning while responding makes the teacher to clarify learner problems, interpret situations or feelings, and/or respond to learners in terms of content and learner's effort to learn.

In positive affectivity, the teacher encourages, praises, gives recognition, offers solace, or shows positive regard for learners while in negative affectivity, the teacher admonishes, reprimands, accuses, threatens, ignores or shows negative regard for learners.

While these teaching functions used in the classroom are intertwined with each other, eliciting is predominantly the first teaching function employed by the teachers in the classroom to initiate communication between and among students and the teachers as means of presenting the lesson. On the other hand, evaluating and sociating are also the teaching functions used by the teachers to end their classes. The rest of the teaching

functions are interchangeably used in the classroom depending on the classroom lesson and class activities.

Responding was not initiated by the teachers because there was no question from the students for the teachers. This may be associated to the behavior of the students where they do not generally have the courage to ask questions even they did not understand the lesson.

When presenting the lesson, the teacher uses series of questions. Initially, after presenting the lesson, the teacher directs and organizes the class activities. In general, the last function of the teacher is always evaluating students' activities which are usually followed by sociaiting.

According to Hughes (1959), one of the functions of teacher talk is positive affectivity which means that the teacher praises, gives recognition or shows positive regards for learners' performance.

In summary, there is a pattern the teacher uses in the classroom. The teacher presents the lesson in a series of questions or putting the class in a conducive mood. Then the teacher organizes and directs class activities. In the process of interaction, the teacher evaluates students' activities using positive affectivity. This pattern is in contrary to the traditional classroom interactions of Initiate – Respond – Evaluate (IRE) discourse pattern. (Mehan, 1979 and Sinclair and Coulthard (1975).

Mehan (1979) and Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) have described traditional classroom interactions as an Initiate – Respond – Evaluate (IRE) discourse pattern. In this pattern, teachers Initiate a discussion topic, most frequently by posing a question, to which students are expected to Respond, and teachers then Evaluate students' responses. Cazden (2001) and others (Alexander, 2006; Myhill et al., 2006; Nystrand, 1997; Westgate & Hughes, 1997) have documented the ubiquity of this interaction pattern and have offered a variety of approaches for changing the way teachers and students interact in classrooms.

The IRE pattern has been labeled as "monologic discourse pattern" (Alexander, 2006), in which teachers take turns at will, decide on what topics are important to discuss, decide who will talk and for how long, and interject their responses and interpretations controlling the pace and direction of the discussion. Teachers in traditional discourse patterns dominate classroom discussions, speaking more than fifty percent of the time, control the

direction of the discussion by asking particular types of questions, and endorse the responses of particular students that align with what has been predetermined to be important or correct.

The teacher also assumes the role of arbiter of what is meaningful or correct, focuses exclusively on the literal text, and directs the discussion towards particular meanings and answers. The answers she is looking for are often found directly in the written text, not in what the readers brought to the text. A primary goal of this type of interaction is the transfer of knowledge and information from teacher to students, where the discussion goes around in a centripetal direction until the group reaches consensus (Scholes, 1985). In an IRE interaction, teachers directly control the discussions and lead students to the answers they predetermined or prefer.

Summary

Eliciting was proven to be commonly used by the English teachers in engaging the students in classroom activities/discussion followed by sociating and responding the least.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

In connection with the findings of this study, it is concluded that teaching functions of teachers follow certain patterns which engage the students in classroom activities/discussion.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions of the study, the researcher recommends that since responding was the least of teachers' functions, activities/tasks given to the students should be more challenging to encourage students to ask questions that develop their critical thinking and to enhance interaction with the teacher.

REFERENCES

1. ALEXANDER, R. 2006. Towards dialogic teaching: Rethinking classroom talk (3rd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Dialogos.
2. BARNES, D., and F. TODD. 1995. Communication and learning revisited: Making meaning through talk. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton-Cook.
3. BOWERS, R. 1980, Verbal behavior in the language teaching classroom. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Reading.

4. BROWN, H. D. 1994. Teaching by Principle. London: Prentice – Hall Regents.
5. CAZDEN, C. B. 2001. Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
6. CHAMBERS, A. 1996.Tell me: Children, reading, and talk. York, ME: Stenhouse.
7. DARLING-HAMMOND, L. 2007.Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
8. GUTIERREZ, K. 1994. How talk, context, and script, shape contexts for learning: A cross-case comparison of journal sharing. Linguistics and Education.
9. HUGHES, M. M. 1959. Assessment of the quality of teaching in elementary schools. Utah University Press, Utah.
10. JOHNSON, R. K. 1985. Language in learning. Singapore: SEAMEO.
11. MEHAN, H. 1979. Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
12. MERCER, N. 2000. Words and minds: How we use language to think together. London: Routledge.
13. MYHILL, D., S. JONES and R. HOPPER. 2006. Talking, listening, learning: Effective talk in the primary classroom. Berkshire, England: Open University Press.
14. NYSTRAND, M. 1997. Opening dialogue: Understanding the dynamics of language and learning in the English classroom. New York: Teachers College Press.
15. NYSTRAND, M. 2006. Research on the role of classroom discourse as it affects reading comprehension. Research in the Teaching of English, 40(4).
16. NYSTRAND, M., A. GAMORAN and M. J. HECK. 1993. Using small groups for response to and thinking about literature. English Journal.
17. SINCLAIR, J. and COULTHARD, R.M. 1975.Towards an analysis of classroom discourse. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
18. SCHOLES, R. 1985. Textual power: Literary theory and the teaching of English. New Haven: Yale University Press.
19. SERAFINI, F., & YOUNGS, S. 2008. More (advanced) lessons in comprehension: Expanding students' understandings of all types of texts. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
20. WESTGATE, D., and M. HUGHES. (1997). Identifying 'quality' in classroom talk: An enduring research task. *Language and Education.*