

Differences in Questioning Behavior Between Native Teachers and Nonnative Teachers

Kilryoung Lee
(Youngnam University)

Lee, Kilryoung. (1999). Differences in questioning behavior between native teachers and nonnative teachers. *English Teaching*, 54(3), 157-175.

Previous research has established that modified input is beneficial to students' learning a second language, and nonnative teachers as well as native teachers modify their speech through interaction to their nonnative students. A comparison is conducted in this study to explore the difference between 'native teachers and nonnative students' on one hand and 'nonnative teachers and nonnative students' on the other, in terms of interactive features represented in the teachers' questioning behavior. The study also questions any cultural influence of Asian students and non-Asian students on the interactive complex in multi-ethnic classrooms. It was found in this study that the nonnative teachers spent more time getting information from the students than the native teachers. The native teachers' spontaneous and fast-paced ways of teaching were not effective for helping the students, specifically the reticent Asian students, to learn a language. The Asian students received more modified input from the nonnative teachers who are more strict when managing classes.

I. INTRODUCTION

It has been widely accepted that, for a language teacher, a native speaker of the target language is better than a nonnative. This might be due to our perception that a native speaker is more authentic. It is certainly true in many features like pronunciation and native cultural intuition. However, it may not be obvious whether such a native teacher (NT) is more effective in helping students to learn

the target language, compared with a nonnative teacher (NNT).

There are even more NNTs of English than NTs throughout the world. In fact, the number of English teachers in China alone, who are mostly nonnative, is larger than native ESL teachers in the U.S. and Canada combined in secondary schools. It may be interesting to focus on NTs and NNTs to find out not only their teaching characteristics, but also their influence on language learning in the classroom. There has been little research empirically comparing NTs and NNTs in terms of their teaching effectiveness.

In addition, this study is centered on classes in which the students are from various cultural backgrounds. When students are providing culturally diverse colors, their cultural differences assuredly influence the canvas of the class. The present research is concerned with interactive complex vulnerable to culturally different students' participation.

II. PURPOSES OF THE STUDY

It has been established that the language used by teachers and students in the classroom may contribute to helping students to learn a second language. Many previous studies (Ely, 1986; Long, 1981; Naiman, Fröhlich, Stern, & Todesco, 1978; Pica, Young, & Doughty, 1987; Seliger, 1977) have reported a positive relationship between second language acquisition and the amount and nature of interaction. Interaction between students and teachers in the classroom is a very influential factor in making focused input, and therefore helping students to acquire a language. These interactional features include ways of negotiating comprehensibility and meaning.

According to Long (1980, 1981, 1983), NTs' speech to nonnative students is most effective for acquisition when it contains 'modified interaction.' He proposed the importance of modified input in helping learners to acquire a language. However, this argument rests only on the context of native speakers and nonnative speakers. What about an interaction with modified input between NNTs and nonnative students? Are NNTs as capable as NTs in conducting interaction and helping students to obtain modified input?

The focus of this study is to compare NNTs' and NTs' questioning behavior. This is because a teacher's questioning, as one of the most commonly employed

techniques in the teachers' repertoire (Richards, 1997), helps make greater quantities of linguistic input comprehensible (Long & Sato, 1983), and so can be an indicator of teaching effectiveness of creating modified input. To be concrete, the present study explores distinctive interactive features represented in the teachers' questioning types such as personal-solicit, self-selection, general-solicit, display and referential questions, yes/no and wh-questions, interactional structures of questions, and wait-time.

In addition, many researchers like Pica, Young and Doughty (1987), Tomizawa (1990), and Tsui (1996) said that cultural differences among students in the ESL classroom may influence the extent to which particular learners engage in classroom interaction. Then, it is interesting to find out how students' participation in multi-cultural classrooms is affected by whether teachers are native speakers or not. Thus, the present study questions the cultural influences of Asian students and non-Asian students on their interaction with NTs and NNTs.

There has been much research of conversation between native speakers and nonnative speakers outside or inside the classroom, whether it is an ESL (English as a Second Language) or content classrooms. However, there have been few previous studies involving NNTs, even though there are a considerable number of NNTs of English, even in the U.S., and many more NNTs throughout the world.

III. PREVIOUS STUDIES

When does language learning take place? As Wong-Fillmore (1985) said, this happens when learners are in frequent enough contact with speakers of the language to develop sets of shared experiences and meanings which help them communicate, despite the lack of a common language. Speakers and learners need to interact for a certain period of time and try to exchange information. In this process, speakers usually make considerable modifications to help the learners to ascertain what is said. Learners also try to decipher what speakers say and how to interact with them, with the help of the modification provided.

Hatch (1983) has illustrated the modifications speakers make when they talk to learners, whether in the first or second language contexts: they speak more slowly, enunciate more clearly, make greater use of concrete reference than of abstract, use shorter and less complex sentences than they might otherwise, and make

greater use of repetition and rephrasing than usual. In addition, they use non-verbal cues to help learners understand what is being discussed. The procedure to make conversation comprehensible is called 'negotiation'.

Influenced by all of these arguments, Chaudron (1988) has attributed an important role to interactive features of classroom behaviors such as turn-taking, questioning and answering, negotiation of meanings and feedback. These features are in contrast to a more traditional view of learning from knowledgeable teacher to passive or empty students.

Of those interactive features, 'teachers' classroom questioning' had not been the focus of research until Long and Sato (1983) studied 'classroom foreigner talk discourse: a form and function of teachers' questions'. Teachers' questions serve to signal speaking turns for students, and make conversational topics salient and compel students to participate. More importantly, teachers' questions in classrooms help teachers negotiate meaning and make modified input, facilitating and sustaining students' participation.

There is much evidence that native ESL teachers and native speakers addressing nonnatives outside the classroom modify some features of their speech (Gaies, 1977). Building upon research investigating the nature of conversational interactions between a native speaker and a nonnative speaker, Varonis and Gass (1985) further examined the nature of conversational interactions between a nonnative speaker and a nonnative speaker in contexts outside the classroom. They revealed that a greater amount of negotiation work to create the comprehensible input takes place in 'nonnative speaker and nonnative speaker' discourse than in either 'native speaker-native speaker' or 'nonnative speaker-native speaker' discourse.

About the case of NNTs, however, there has been little research in the language classroom context. Milk (1982) is one of the few researchers who studied NNTs' language use in the classroom. He conducted a study of whether NNTs of EFL in Peru modify their speech when addressing less proficient learners. He compared the levels of syntactic complexity in classroom and interview contexts. Using Minimal Terminable Units (T-units) to measure syntactic complexity, he found that the speech directed to the students in the classroom was significantly less complex than what the teachers were capable of producing in another setting. Thus, his study indicated that even NNTs accommodate their speech to students' level of syntactic complexity.

IV. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The subjects of this study are two NTs, two NNTs and their seventy international students enrolled at an intensive English language institute at a northeastern university in the U.S. The four teachers and their students were observed in the classes and the teachers and some selected students were interviewed.

The two NTs taught 'Reading & Writing' (level 3B) and 'Lab' (level 6), respectively. Likewise, the two NNTs taught 'Reading & Writing' (level 3A) and 'Lab' (level 5), respectively. There were only two NNTs in the institute and both of them participated in this study. The two NTs were selected, since they were teaching the same subjects as the NNTs were teaching, at a similar level of proficiency. The two NTs, who were male, had considerable experience teaching English in an ESL context, while the two NNTs were female and taught in an EFL context. The students, mainly in their twenties, were from eighteen different countries. For this study, the students were categorized into two groups, Asian and non-Asian, due to the two groups' significantly different responses to the teachers and a different amount of participation shown in many studies (Hwang, 1993; Sato, 1982). They were 52 Asians and 17 non-Asians (6 South Americans, 5 Middle Easterners, 5 Africans and 2 Europeans), as shown in Table 1 below.

TABLE 1
Subjects by the Classes and Teachers

	NNTs	NTs
Reading & Writing	Level 3A	Level 3B
	<i>Asians - 7</i>	<i>Asians - 4</i>
	<i>Non-Asians - 1</i>	<i>Non-Asians - 3</i>
Lab	Level 5	Level 6
	<i>Asians - 18</i>	<i>Asians - 23</i>
	<i>Non-Asians - 7</i>	<i>Non-Asians - 7</i>

Each teacher was observed two times in a non-participant way. The purpose of this non-participant observation was to quantitatively identify clear patterns unique to native or nonnative teachers and Asian or non-Asian students. To diminish disruptive effects that might be caused by a strange observer to the students, a dummy observation was conducted for each class, prior to the real

observation. All class-observation was done with a tape-recorder, from which detailed verbal interactions were transcribed. To obtain a high sound quality, three tape-recorders with ultra-high-quality for language classrooms were used at each observation. Various questioning types found in the transcript of class-interaction were coded, and quantified. Statistical treatment involved the application of the chi-square test to some of the frequency data.

Some questions or hypothesis developed from the quantitative analysis were asked at the interview to teachers and selected students. The purpose of the interview was to get information helpful for the analysis of the quantified results obtained from the non-participant observation. Interviews with Korean subjects were conducted in Korean. All other interviews were in English.

V. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Personal-Solicit

A personal-solicit is a teacher question or an invitation to respond, directed at a particular individual (Sato, 1982). Seliger (1977) interprets it as 'directed input,' which requires that the addressee attend to the interlocutor's utterance closely, because a response of some kind will be expected. He argues that the solicited learner personalizes the exchange by changing the input into intake. Thus, personal-solicit may lead to an effective source from which the learner can form or modify internal hypotheses about the target language.

Table 2 shows the frequency of personal-solicit by the NT/NNT and students' ethnicity. On the whole, the numbers of speaking turns allocated by the NNTs (1.33 turns per person) and the NTs (1.16 turns per person) are close. However, in more detail, the frequency distribution in the NTs' and the NNTs' is so different as to be statistically significant. Asians in NTs' received 0.74 turn per person in comparison to non-Asians' 2.3 turns, whereas the NNTs allocated rather more speaking turns to Asians (1.36 turns) than to non-Asians (1.25 turns).

TABLE 2
Frequency of Personal-Solicit

	NNTs	NTs
Asian	34 (1.36)	20 (0.74)
Non-Asian	10 (1.25)	23 (2.30)
Total	44 (1.33)	43 (1.16)

$$\chi^2 = 10.048, df = 1, p < .005$$

*The number inside the parenthesis is the rate per person.

The fact that non-Asians in the NTs' received a lot more personal-solicit than Asians may indicate that the NTs behave differently in allocating questions toward Asians and non-Asians. Laosa (1979) argues that the teachers in academically, socially, or ethnically heterogeneous classrooms behave differently in addressing, reacting, and so on, toward students who are perceived either as low-achieving, of low socioeconomic status, or belonging to a minority ethnic group. Sato (1982), discussing this matter in the viewpoint of ethnicity, found out that Asian students were significantly reticent, and fewer personal-solicits were allocated to them. Her result matches the data here in the NTs' classes rather than in the NNTs'. The NTs in this study might call upon the reticent Asian students less often, since the teachers did not want to force the reticent students to respond to questions. Some researchers have suggested that language-related variables influence teacher behavior. For example, Schikne-Llano (1983) presented language proficiency as a factor which influences teachers' choice of learner interlocutor.

The NTs' behavior is considered a kind of 'cushioning.' Bailey and Galvan (1979) has labeled an unequal treatment of certain minority group students as the 'cushioning effect,' whereby teachers attempt to protect academically poor students by not forcing them to respond to questions that they may not be prepared to answer. It is supposed, as Chaurron (1988) said, that the NTs seem to be more influenced than the NNTs by the perception that non-Asians are more ready to participate and by the similarity between the teachers' expectation and the non-Asians' norms of interaction.¹⁾

1) Many researchers such as Lee (1998) and Lutz (1990) maintained that the classroom behavior expected of U.S. teachers and Asian students is very different from each other. Asian students are accustomed to teacher centered-formal classroom atmosphere. However, there is relatively no such mismatch between non-Asian students and U.S. teachers.

This assumption is partly corroborated by interviews with the teachers, as shown in Appendix. The NTs said that they might be impartial in allocating questions. Specifically, one NT introduced his own philosophy of allocation, 'natural atmosphere' where active students take more turns and the teachers keep the class going on without regulating it. However, the NNTs were revealed to be more rigid in spreading out the questions to each student.

2. Self-Selection

Self-selection is a turn taken by a student in the absence of a solicit from the teacher (Sato, 1982). For this study, students' bidding is not involved, since the observation was conducted with only tape-recorders and it is hard to recognize the bidding in class.

A self-selection is assumed to have the most distinguishing nature to judge the degree of voluntary participation. A speaker who does self-selection, as an initiator of interaction, must attend carefully to not only his or her own output in order to make the intent of the utterance clear but also the response of the interlocutor. Therefore, Self-selection is as important as personal-solicit for developing interlanguage in that it can have the learner form or modify internal hypothesis about the target language.

As shown in Table 3, non-Asians are significantly more lively in NTs' classes (4.4 turns per person) rather than in NNTs' classes (0.75 turn per person), while Asians made a few more initial turns in NNTs' classes (0.88 turn per person). This phenomenon is true of the frequency trend of personal-solicit. It is remarkable that the degree to which non-Asians are active in NTs' classes is much greater in comparison with the other cases. This may be because the talkative non-Asian students are fully active in the NTs' classrooms where the teachers respect 'natural atmosphere.'

TABLE 3
Frequency of Self-Selection

	NNT	NT
Asian	22 (0.88)	21 (0.78)
Non-Asian	6 (0.75)	44 (4.40)

$$\chi^2 = 16.850, df = 1, p < .001$$

3. General-Solicit

A general-solicit is a request made by the teacher for a response from anyone in the class. Overall, non-Asians responded more often to the teachers than Asians did, as shown in Table 4. In more detail, the non-Asians responded significantly more often to a general-solicit in the NTs' classes (5.9 turns per person), while the Asians did in the NNTs' classes (1.64 turns per person).

The trend of frequency distribution in response to a general-solicit is similar to one of both personal-solicit and self-selection. The similarity seems to be partly caused by a combination of such a common attribute as students' voluntary speech in Self-selection and their response to general-solicit on one hand, and as teachers' different philosophy of allocation between the NNTs and the NTs in personal-solicit and Self-selection on the other.

TABLE 4
Frequency of General-Solicit

	NNTs	NTs
Asian	41 (1.64)	30 (1.11)
Non-Asian	30 (3.75)	59 (5.90)

$$\chi^2 = 9.246, df = 1, p < .005$$

4. Display and Referential Questions

Long and Sato (1983) hypothesized that questions in and outside the classroom tend to serve two different interactional functions: referential and display. They said referential questions are those to which the speaker does not know the answer. Display questions are those to which he or she knows the answer. Display questions are frequently used by teachers as a means of checking students' knowledge, as opposed to a way of obtaining information unknown to the questioner.

In the classroom talk, it was assumed that the teachers would use more display questions than referential ones, since teachers as the powerful party, basically, deliver knowledge and check whether learners understand it. Early (1985) and Dinsmore (1985) also supported this. Long and Sato (1983) found significantly higher frequency of display questions than referential questions in ESL teachers' speech. Pica and Long (1986) also obtained the same results, when they compared

experienced with inexperienced teachers of ESL.

Table 5 shows the significant difference in the NTs' and the NNTs' classes regarding the frequency of different functions in questions. The assumption is sustained in the NTs' case, whereas it does not fit exactly in the NNTs' case. This implies the NNTs' classes had a larger portion of getting information from learners, while the NTs', as assumed, had a more dominant one-way flow of information. Two possible reasons were found in the transcript of the classes observed. First, many of the NNTs' referential questions were 'clarification requests' while NTs rarely asked referential questions for clarification. The NNTs used 19 referential questions for clarification request, for example, 'What was that?', 'What did you say?' and so on. This means that there are frequent miscommunications between the NNTs and the students. This is supported in the interview as shown in the Appendix. Secondly, there was a different feature of class behavior between the NTs and NNTs. The NNTs had a relatively strong tendency to emphasize homework. The NNTs spent more time talking about homework than the NTs. For example, one of the two NNTs checked the homework answers by having all of the learners write down the answers on the blackboard and evaluate them by asking the learners questions one by one like 'Who got all of them?' or 'How many did you get?', which are all referential. The NNTs' emphasis on homework is verified through the interviews with the teachers and the students, as shown in the Appendix.

Those two reasons above might cause the NNTs to ask more referential questions, which are likely to bring about negotiation. This partly matches the study of Varonis and Gass (1985), who argued that a greater amount of negotiation takes place in nonnative speaker-nonnative speaker discourse.

TABLE 5
Frequency of Display and Referential Questions

	NNTs	NTs
Display	102	126
Referential	104	44

$$\chi^2 = 23.620, df = 1, p < .001$$

5. Yes/No and WH-questions

Pica and Long (1986) supposed that teachers employ more wh-questions

because of their apparent value as devices for management functions, for eliciting specific information, and for checking learner's understanding and knowledge of the target language.

As supposed, the teachers, either NTs or NNTs, used more *wh*-questions than *yes/no* questions, as shown in Table 6. The distribution frequency did not show a significant difference of the questions between NT and NNT. However it is clear that the proportion of *wh*-questions to *yes/no* ones in NNTs' is much more than in NTs'. The NNTs might well have more *wh*-questions than NTs, considering that the NNTs had more referential questions for obtaining unknown information, as shown in Table 5.

TABLE 6
Frequency of WH and Yes/No Questions

	NNTs	NTs
WH	132	94
Yes/No	74	76

$$\chi^2 = 2.997, df = 1, p < .10$$

6. Three Interactional Structures of Questions

Long and Sato (1983), in their study of ESL teachers' questions, made use of the Kearsely's (1976) taxonomy of question types based on conversational data. They categorized some questions of interactional features into the 'echoic' type, which is concerned with the repetition of an utterance or confirmation that it has been properly understood. These are confirmation checks,²⁾ comprehension checks³⁾ and clarification requests,⁴⁾ all of which have the specific function of maintaining interaction by ensuring that the interlocutors share same assumptions and identification of referents (Chaudron, 1988).

As discussed in Long and Sato (1983), the three interactional structures indicate

- 2) They are designed to elicit confirmation that the utterance has been correctly heard and understood.
- 3) Attempts by the teacher to establish that the learner is following what he is saying. Typical realizations are "Right?", "OK?," "Do you follow?"
- 4) These differ from confirmation checks in that there is no presupposition that the teacher has understood or heard the learners' previous utterance.

"the direction of information-flow in preceding utterances (p. 275)." In the present study, it was assumed that the NTs' talk would contain fewer confirmation checks and clarification requests than the NNTs', since the NTs had more display questions and yes/no questions which would be linked with one-way flow of information. As shown in Table 7, the NNTs were a little bit more active in interacting with their students in all the three structures, and the NNTs, as assumed, had more confirmation checks and clarification requests which should contribute to interaction or negotiation in the classroom.

TABLE 7
Frequency of Three Interactional Structures of Questions

	Confirmation check	Comprehension check	Clarification request
NTs	44	94	35
NNTs	51	116	37

7. Wait-Time

Many researchers have exhibited considerable interest in the function of pause in speech. As a kind of pause in classroom interaction, wait-time is the amount of time the teacher pauses after a question and before pursuing the answer with further questions or nomination of another learner (Chaudron, 1988). As a means of modifying questions, wait-time is considered to be important in language classrooms (Rowe, 1974).

There are some researchers who believe that the chunk or automatic response like routines and habits serve as input for language acquisition in the sense that the language learner eventually analyzes the rote-learned sentences or phrases and comes to generalize their structure to new content in new contexts (Fillmore, 1976). However, according to Krashen's (1981) view of SLA, 'comprehensible input' is the important factor in developing the interlanguage. The emphasis on wait-time is derived from the theoretical background of the latter.

Many researchers said increased wait-time would be desirable, especially in an ESL classroom. White and Lightbown (1984) said they found in their study the average wait-time was only 2.1 seconds and argued that learners should be given several seconds to begin to answer questions, and several more to finish answering them. Holley and King (1985) argued that teachers have to wait for five to ten

seconds. The increased wait-time should obtain an increase in learners' response following initial hesitation (Holley & King, 1971) and allow the second language learners a better opportunity to construct their response (Rowe, 1971).

The average wait-time⁵⁾ revealed in the observation for this study was 1.53 seconds for the NNTs and 1.09 seconds for the NTs. The NNTs waited a little longer, even though both of them waited for less than two seconds.⁶⁾

In more detail, the wait-time measured was specified as shown in Table 8 where two following facts are indicated: (1) wait-time after a referential question (1.28 sec.) is longer than the one after a display question (1.13 sec.) and wait-time after a personal-solicit (2.46 sec.) is longer than the one after a general-solicit (1.26 sec.). (2) The NNTs' wait-times after each type of the questions are longer than the NTs'.

The reason for the different wait-time between display and referential questions is evident in that a teacher should wait a bit longer for responses of learners in the questions to which the teacher does not already know the answers (referential question), than in the questions to which the teacher already knows the answers (display question). In the case of display questions, the teachers were in a hurry to ask the next question, and so they did not wait long for the answers, neither did they want long answers, as White and Lightbown (1984) argued. On the contrary, the existence of an 'information gap' in referential questions might lead quite naturally to a slower pace with a longer wait-time as the teachers wanted unknown information, which was a genuine communication. For 'personal-solicit', a teacher chooses a student as an interlocutor as if they were in a dyad, to have more attention on the learner. Therefore, the teacher waits a little longer for a response to the question asked to a specific person (personal-solicit) rather than a whole class itself (general-solicit).

The NTs and the NNTs waited mostly for less than two seconds, pacing fast in running the class. The NNTs waited a little more than the NTs. It was found from the interview, as shown in the Appendix, that this difference may be derived from the NTs' culture. That is, the NTs were culturally more or less inclined to keep the class going and avoiding pauses. This may cause the NNTs' longer

5) Each of any wait-time in this study is average wait-time based on total wait-time divided by total number of the questions considered.

6) For this study, timing was done by a chronograph which is precise to two places after the decimal point. It is acknowledged that the wait-time obtained here in this study is a bit higher than real wait-time, since this timing was done manually.

wait-time in all of the four question types.

TABLE 8
Average Wait-Time of Four Question Types by NTs and NNTs

	NTs	NNTs	Total
Display question	0.95	1.28	1.13
Referential question	0.95	1.37	1.28
General solicit	1.14	1.45	1.26
Personal solicit	1.37	2.56	2.46

(unit: sec.)

VI. CONCLUSIONS

It was found in this study that the proportion of referential questions and wh-questions to display questions and yes/no questions, respectively, in the NNTs' was larger than in the NTs'. This implies that the NNTs spent more time getting information from the students than the NTs. This led naturally to the NNTs' larger proportion of confirmation checks and clarification requests, which should contribute to negotiation. Also, such NNTs' interactive characteristics naturally needed more wait-time. These findings were supported in the interview by the NNTs' teaching characteristics which included many clarification requests caused by miscommunications, and emphasizing homework, as well as the NTs' cultural impatience with silence.

When the students' culturally different conversational styles are considered, the Asian students were found to obtain more help from the NNTs rather than from the NTs. This is the case in personal-solicit, self-selection and general-solicit. The NTs' tendency to respect natural atmosphere might influence the talkative non-Asian students to participate much more actively, and the NNTs' relatively strict philosophy of allocation seems to have compensated for the Asian students' lack of voluntary speech.

It is acknowledged that there are some limitations to this research. The research is only for the purpose of exploratory investigation involving a small number of subjects, with a mixture of quantitative and qualitative methodology. Different results might be obtained if a larger number of NTs and NNTs were involved.

Thus, caution is required when trying to make generalizations of the findings of the study. 'Lab' class is not the optimal environment for observing the interaction, since most of the class activity is listening and there are carrels. Also, since all the NTs observed in this study were male and all NNTs were female, the result of the study might be affected by some features unique to gender. If a video camera had been used, clearer turn-taking behavior including gestures could have been investigated and compared between the NTs and the NNTs. Since the wait-time was counted with a manual chronograph, the measured wait-time might be a little longer than the actual time. This problem could be partially solved by delivering the sound from tape-recordings into a servochart plotter (Rowe, 1974).

This study makes an attempt to investigate the differences between NTs and NNTs. There are diverse variables shaping teacher characteristics and many criteria by which teacher effectiveness is measured. This study suggests that interactive features represented in questioning behavior could be a criterion for comparing teachers, in terms of helping students to learn a second language. In addition, unlike our widely-accepted perception, this study implies that spontaneous and fast-paced ways of teaching, as the NTs did, were not found effective for helping students, specifically the reticent Asian students, to learn a language. Rather, the Asian students received more modified input from the NNTs who are more strict in managing classes.

REFERENCES

- Bailey, K., & Galvan, J. (1979). Accentedness in the classroom. *Aztlan*, 8, 83-97.
- Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classroom: Research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dinsmore, D. (1985). Waiting for Godot in the EFL classroom. *ELT Journal*, 39, 225-234.
- Early, M. (1985). *Input and interaction in content classrooms: Foreigner talk and teacher talk in classroom discourse*. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Ely, C. (1986). An analysis of discomfort, risk-taking, sociability and motivation in the second language classroom. *Language Learning*, 36, 1-25.
- Fillmore, W. (1976). The second time around: Cognitive and social strategies in

- second language acquisition, Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University.
- Gaies, S. (1977). The nature of linguistic input in formal second language learning: Linguistic and communicative strategies in ESL teacher's classroom language. In H. Brown, A. Yorio, & R. Crymes (Eds.), *On TESOL '77* (pp. 204-212). Washington, D. C.: TESOL.
- Hatch, M. (1983). *Psycholinguistics: A second language perspective*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Holley, F., & King, J. (1971). Imitation and correction in foreign language learning. *Modern Language Journal*, 55, 494-498.
- Hwang, M. (1993). *Factors affecting Japanese, Korean, and Taiwanese students' passiveness in oral interaction in English in the intermediate ESL spoken classroom*. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation. State University of New York, Buffalo.
- Kearsely, G. (1976). Questions and question-asking in verbal discourse: A cross-disciplinary review. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 5, 355-375.
- Krashen, S. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Laosa, L. (1979). Inequality in the classroom: Observational research on teacher-student interaction. *Aztlan*, 8, 51-67.
- Lee, K. (1998). Teacher-related effects on Asian students' oral participation: The case of four teachers and four Korean students' responses. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation. State University of New York, Buffalo.
- Long, M. (1980). *Input, interaction and second language acquisition*. Ph.D. dissertation. University of California, Los Angeles.
- Long, M. (1981). Input, interaction and second language acquisition. In H. Winitz (Ed.), *Native language and foreign language acquisition*. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 379, 259-278.
- Long, M. (1983). Native speaker/non native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input. *Applied Linguistics*, 4, 126-141.
- Long, M., & Sato, C. (1983). Classroom foreigner talk discourse: Forms and functions of teachers' questions. In H. Seliger & M. Long (Eds.), *Classroom-oriented research in second language acquisition* (pp. 268-285). Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Lutz, R. (1990). Classroom shock: The role of expectations in an instructional

- setting. *Georgetown University Round Table on Language and Linguistics 1990* (pp. 144-156). Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Milk, R. (1982). Language use in bilingual classrooms: Two case studies. In M. Hinesand & W. Rutherford (Eds.), *On TESOL '81* (pp. 181-191). Washington, D. C.: TESOL.
- Naiman, N., Fröhlich, M., Stern, H., & Todesco, A. (1978). The good language teacher. *Research in Education Series No. 7*. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Pica, T., & M. Long (1986). The linguistic and conversational performance of experienced and inexperienced teachers. In R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition* (pp. 85-98). Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Pica, T., Young, R., & Doughty, C. (1987). The impact of interaction on comprehension. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21, 737-758.
- Richards, J. (1997). The dilemma of teacher education in second language teaching. In J. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Second language education* (pp. 3-15). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rowe, M. (1974). Pausing phenomena: Influence on the quality of instruction. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 3, 203-224.
- Sato, C. (1982). Ethnic styles in classroom discourse. In M. Hines & W. Rutherford (Eds.), *On TESOL '81* (pp. 11-24) Washington, D. C.: TESOL.
- Schikne-Llano, L. (1983). Foreigner talk in content classrooms. In H. Seliger & M. Long (Eds.), *Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition* (pp. 146-164). Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Seliger, H. (1977). Does practice make perfect? A study of interaction patterns and L2 competence. *Language Learning*, 27, 263-278.
- Tomizawa, S. (1990). *Psychological and socio-cultural factors affecting the Japanese adult ESL learners' inactiveness in oral interaction in English*. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, State University of New York, Buffalo.
- Tsui, A. B. M. (1996). Reticence and anxiety in second language learning. In K. Bailey & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Voices from the language classroom* (pp. 145-167). NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Varonis, E., & Gass, S. (1985). Nonnative/native conversation: A model for negotiation of meaning. *Applied Linguistics*, 6, 71-90.
- White, J., & Lightbown, P. (1984). Asking and answering in ESL classes.

Canadian Modern Language Review, 40, 228-244.

Wong-Fillmore, L. (1985) When does teacher talk work as input? In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 17-50). Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

APPENDIX

Interview Material

About the allocating questions

One NT respected the philosophy of 'natural atmosphere'. He said,

Natural atmosphere is important and I usually don't pick students who don't pay attention like the students who keep their heads down during the class.

The other NT said that allocating somebody depends on his teaching pace,

I try to spread my questions around as best as I can. But it depends on what my pace is. If I am doing something that I want to get through, then, I probably avoid students who take a long time to answer the questions.

It is probable that the attitudes of the NTs easily lead extroverted students to talk a lot more, instead of regulating their turns.

On the contrary, the NNTs were revealed in the interview to be more rigid in allocating the questions to each student. One of the NNTs said, in the interview, she was more concerned about quiet students and took more care of them by allowing longer wait-time or asking simpler questions.

It is important to give everybody the chance to speak. I pick silent people even in the beginning of the conversation.

I am kind of compassionate with students of limited linguistic ability.

The other NNT emphasized,

The point is everybody has to have a chance to participate.

About the miscommunications

Some students said that the NNTs often do not understand so clearly what we are saying

as much as the NTs do.

About homework

The students said the NNTs spent more time explaining and checking the homework. One NNT said, "*Homework is very important, especially, as a reinforcement to the learning.*"

About the wait-time

One NNT said,

Because of my culture, I feel really nervous with silence. We'd like to fill some stuff when students take a long time to answer. I really want to jump in, or if it does get to be too long, I want to move on someone else.