



Teacher-student verbal communication and student learning

Hardi Yunius bin Kasim¹, Kayame de Joseph²

¹Fakulti Pendidikan, Kolej Universiti Perguruan Ugama Seri Begawan, Brunei Darussalam

²Faculty of Education, Divine Word University in Papua New Guinea, Papua New Guinea

Article Info

Article history:

Received April 23, 2022

Revised Jun 11, 2022

Accepted Nov 26, 2022

Keywords:

Student learning success;

Teachers and students;

Verbal communication.

ABSTRACT

Teachers and students communicate through curiosity and attention. In social psychology, the instructor communicates and the pupil receives. Teaching-learning involves students getting teaching materials in various forms and teachers offering them in a dialogic style at a given time and location. Teacher-student contact is essential for effective teaching and learning. Teachers and students exchange psychological messages. Student learning achievement is multifaceted. Teachers' verbal communication skills affect student learning. Verbal communication—spoken or written—uses symbols or words. Teachers require solid language skills and a vast vocabulary to speak verbally because kids cannot understand specific words alone. This study seeks to understand how teacher verbal communication is implemented, how student learning is affected, and how. The association between verbal communication (variable X) and student learning success (variable Y) is researched using a quantitative descriptive method using a correlational study type, Product Moment (r). This strategy examines how components are connected.

This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC license.



Corresponding Author:

Hardi Yunius bin Kasim,

Fakulti Pendidikan,

Kolej Universiti Perguruan Ugama Seri Begawan,

KM 2, Jalan Raja Isteri Pengiran Anak Saleha, Bandar Seri Begawan. BA 2111, Brunei Darussalam,

Email: yunus.kasim@kupu-sb.edu.bn

1. INTRODUCTION

Everyday individuals talk to each other and the surroundings. Humans have tendencies to live in a community and help each other to improve their life system, hence communication has educational value (Wen & Clément, 2003)(Mason, 2005). At home, family members converse at the dinner table; at school, kids discuss exam results or the instructor gives lesson material; at work, the section divides tasks; and at the mosque, the preacher preaches (Landa, 2007) (Holden & Billings, 2007). Communication affects all elements of life and human quality. A survey found that humans communicate 70% of the time (Wood & Smith, 2004) (Furqon, 2003) (Wulandari, 2004).

Communicators share their thoughts and feelings with others (communicant) (Covarrubias, 2007). Thoughts are mind-generated ideas, information, opinions, and others. Heartfelt feelings include confidence, certainty, uncertainty, worry, anger, courage, excitement, and more (Brown, 2004). Communication is essential for human development and great culture (Rogoff, 2003) (Carey, 2007). Education, for instance, relies on communication (Mast, 2007). Communication creates all educational behavior (Shavelson et al., 2003). How can you educate, teach, or lecture without talking? Every region needs appropriate communication (De Jong & Harper, 2005) (Kim, 2006). Teachers and students communicate through curiosity and attention (Teixeira-Dias et al., 2005) (Chak, 2007). In a dynamic society with reciprocal interactions, communication is natural. Teachers and students'

reciprocal interaction supports educational goals and the teaching and learning process (Sutherland & Oswald, 2005) (Hunt et al., 2003). In social psychology, teachers are communicators and students are communicants (Woods & Ebersole, 2003).

Education stresses teacher-student contact. Language—spoken, written, or signaled—predominates this instructional engagement (de Mesa & de Guzman, 2006). Communication involves words. Educational connection depends on communication (Ajjawi & Higgs, 2007) (Grönroos, 2004) (Carey, 2007). Recent educational ideas consider students as learning subjects who self-direct their education based on their talents, interests, and concerns (Palmer & Wehmeyer, 2003). This new view makes religious education dialogical (Weisse, 2003). A teacher must internalize and transform religious values (faith and piety) as well as transfer knowledge (religion) (Günther, 2006), so communication between teachers and students must be based on the principles of an integralistic approach (covering all aspects of student needs) and emphasize developing individualistic, social, and moral abilities because students are individuals, social, and moral beings (Esbjörn-Hargens & Foucaultii, 2007).

Teaching-learning involves students getting teaching materials in various forms and teachers offering them in a dialogic style at a given time and location (Renshaw, 2004). Effective teaching-learning requires teacher-student communication (Chun, 2004). Teachers as learning agents must have four competencies: pedagogic, personality, professional, and social. Based on these qualities, teachers must communicate clearly and effectively (Polk, 2006) (Morais et al., 2005) (Graham, 2007). Teachers can improve their interpersonal communication skills by practicing (Duffy et al., 2004). The teacher communicates learning plans to students, organizes students from the start to the end of class, and explains teaching materials, even if students don't understand them (Clausen, 2007). Tomorrow and in the future, the teacher will describe improvements, student tasks, and learning activities (Schreiner et al., 2005). All teacher activities involve communication.

Teachers require linguistic abilities to communicate. Teachers require a wide vocabulary since kids can't understand certain words without others (Stahl, 2005) (Stahl & Nagy, 2007). If all three variables are present, a learner will succeed in learning. Qualified, well-spoken teachers with comprehensive scientific knowledge are crucial (Smith, 2004). Students must comprehend teacher communication to succeed in school. Teachers' communication improves students' learning, and vice versa. Oral and written communication aids learning (Gardner et al., 2005). However, many teachers are ignorant and apathetic to verbal communication during teaching and learning, and the reality in the field is that teachers' verbal communication is not maximized (Church, 2005) (Westwood, 2004).

2. RESEARCH METHOD

The research approach is used to identify and collect valid, accurate, and meaningful facts to solve the challenges at hand. for problem disclosure (Arikunto, 2013). This thesis uses Product Moment, a descriptive quantitative method with a correlational study type (Trumbull & Watson, 2005) (Hoskins & Mariano, 2004) (Thomas, 2003). Correlational research measures relationships and predicts the independent variable regarding the independent variable (Ercikan & Roth, 2006).

This study employs one Likert model scale to measure verbal communication. To evaluate learning using report card ratings. A 4-point Likert scale is used to determine how much the teacher's verbal communication affects student learning performance. The author created a 27-item verbal communication scale to quantify its impact. In order for each statement item from the questionnaire to contribute to the research objectives, the authors make indicators of statements about verbal communication, which is a two-way communication process between teachers and students. Interviews, documentation, and questionnaires are how the author collects data.

Analytical Methods Analysis tests instrument validity. Product moment formula determines correlation index.

$$r_{xy} = \frac{N \sum XY - (\sum X) (\sum Y)}{\sqrt{[N \sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2] [N \sum Y^2 - (\sum Y)^2]}} \dots\dots\dots(1)$$

Description: r_{xy} = Correlation index number “r” Product Moment N = Number of Cases $\sum XY$ = The sum of the multiplication results between the X score and the Y score $\sum X$ = Sum of all X scores $\sum Y$ = Sum of all Y scores.

The value obtained is then consulted in the product moment correlation table with the following criteria: rejected, if $r_{count} < r_{table}$ and accepted, if $r_{count} > r_{table}$.

Instrument Reliability Test, Test the reliability of variable X using the Cronbach Alpha formula
 (∞) The alpha formula used to find instrument reliability:

$$r_{11} = \left[\frac{K}{K-1} \right] \left[1 - \frac{\sum \sigma b^2}{\sigma^2} \right] \dots\dots\dots(2)$$

Description: r_{11} = Instrument Reliability K = Number of Question Items $\sum \sigma b^2$ = Total Item Variance σ = Total Variance.

To find the item variant, the following formula is used:

$$\sum \sigma b^2 = \frac{\sum x^2 - \left(\frac{\sum x}{n} \right)^2}{n} \dots\dots\dots(3)$$

Description: $\sum \sigma b^2$ = Total variance of item X = Total score n = Number of respondents.

The values obtained from the validity and reliability tests are then consulted in the Product Moment interpretation table. After testing the reliability and validity of the instrument, then the valid instrument is processed. Initial data processing, namely determining the effect of teacher verbal communication (variable X) on student learning success (variable Y). Before being analyzed, the author describes the results of the questionnaire with the percentage formula:

Percentage formula

$$P = \frac{N}{f} \times 10\% \dots\dots\dots(4)$$

Description: P = Percentage number F = Frequency of respondents' answers N = Number of frequencies (many individuals) 100% = Fixed number

The analysis technique used to interpret the two variables is carried out in the following steps: After analyzing separately then analyzing the relationship between variable X, namely the effect of teacher verbal communication, and variable Y, namely student learning success, the formula used in this case is the Product Moment formula. Because the respondents numbered 70 or more than 30, the Product Moment correlation formula from Karl Pearson that the author used was:

$$r_{xy} = \frac{\frac{\sum X'Y' - (CX')(CY')}{N}}{(SDx')(SDy')} \dots\dots\dots(5)$$

Description:

$\sum x'y'$ = The number of cross-multiplication results (Product of the moment) between: cell frequency (f) with x' and y' .

Cx' = Correction value on variable X, which can be found by the formula:

$$Cy' = \frac{\sum fx'}{N}$$

Cy' = Correction value on variable Y, which can be found / obtained by the formula:

$$Cy' = \frac{\sum fy'}{N}$$

SDx' = Standard Deviation of X score in the sense of each score as 1 unit (where $i = 1$)

SDy' = Standard Deviation of Y score in terms of each score as 1 unit (where $i = 1$).

N = Number of Cases

The formulation of the correlation is to test the following hypothesis: H_0 (null hypothesis), "There is no significant relationship between teacher verbal communication and student learning

success". H_a (alternative hypothesis), "There is a significant relationship between teacher verbal communication and student learning success".

Data Interpretation Technique, Providing data interpretation of "rxy", namely matching the calculation results with the correlation index number "r" Product Moment, then providing interpretation with: Rough / simple interpretation, namely consulting the rxy value in the Product Moment correlation index table.

Table 3. Correlation Index "r" (Product Moment)

Magnitude of "r" Product Moment	Data Interpretation
0,00 - 0,20	Between variables X and Y there is indeed a correlation, but the correlation is very weak or very low, so the correlation is ignored (considered no correlation between variables X and variable Y)
0,20 - 0,40	Between variable X and variable Y there is a weak or low correlation
0,40 - 0,60	Between variable X and variable Y there is a rather low correlation
0,60 - 0,80	Between variable X and variable Y there is a sufficient correlation
0,80 - 1,00	There is a high correlation between variables X and Y

Interpretation using the "r" value table by means of: $r: df = N - nr$

Description:

df = Degrees of freedom

N = Number of cases

nr = The number of variables correlated.

After that the results are matched with the table of correlation coefficient values "r" Product Moment, either at the 5% significance level or at the 1% significance level, then a conclusion is made whether there is a significant positive correlation or not. For hypothesis testing, a significant test of the product moment correlation coefficient (t test) is carried out with the formula:

$$t = r \frac{\sqrt{n - 2}}{\sqrt{1 - r^2}}$$

To find out how many percent (%) variable X contributes to variable Y, the coefficient of determination is sought by determining the degree of relationship between variable X and variable Y using the coefficient of determination formula as follows:

$$KD = r_{xy}^2 \times 100\%$$

Description:

KD: Contribution of variable X to variable Y

rxy: Correlation coefficient between variable X and variable Y

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Frequency distribution of verbal communication.

The percentage frequency of respondents' answers from the questionnaire data can be seen in the description below: The delivery of information in a language that can be understood by students shows that, most (70%) students strongly agree, a small proportion (29%) of students agree, only (1%) students disagree, and none (0%) students strongly disagree. The unclear pronunciation of words causes students difficulty in receiving information obtained the results of a small proportion of students (16%) who strongly agreed, most students (81%) disagreed, a few students (3%) disagreed, and no students (0%) strongly disagreed. The teacher's clarity in expressing words does not reduce student errors in completing tasks with the results, no (0%) students stated strongly agree, almost none or only (1%) students stated agree, most (72%) students stated disagree, and a small proportion (27%) of students stated strongly disagree the teacher's clarity in expressing words does not reduce student errors in completing tasks. It is known that only (1%) of students strongly agreed that the teacher used nonstandard words in explaining the subject matter, a few (13%) students agreed that the teacher used nonstandard words in explaining the subject matter, a small proportion (24%) of students disagreed that the teacher used nonstandard words in explaining the subject matter, and most (61%) students strongly disagreed that the teacher used nonstandard words in explaining the subject matter.

The teacher abbreviates writing in explaining the material: no (0%) students strongly agreed, a few (4%) students agreed, most (70%) students disagreed, and a small proportion (26%) of students strongly disagreed. Information is delivered in a variety of languages: a small proportion (36%) of students strongly agreed, a large proportion (57%) of students agreed, a small proportion (7%) of students disagreed, and none (0%) of students strongly disagreed. Teachers do not review (re-explain) student work that, almost no or only (1%) students strongly agreed teachers do not review (re-explain) student work, few (16%) students agreed teachers do not review (re-explain) student work, few (20%) students disagreed teachers do not review (re-explain) student work, and most (63%) students strongly disagreed teachers do not review (re-explain) student work. Reading the textbook without being given an explanation can be seen that out of 70 respondents, none (0%) students stated strongly agree, a few (3%) students stated agree, most (70%) stated disagree, and a small proportion (27%) students stated strongly disagree. Teachers write in neat writing shows that, most (60%) students strongly agree, a small proportion (36%) of students agree, a few (3%) students disagree, and almost none or only (1%) students strongly disagree. Students can read the teacher's writings From the data, it appears that a small proportion (18%) of students strongly agreed, most (77%) students agreed, a few (4%) students disagreed, and only 1% of students strongly disagreed. Teachers do not arrange sentences regularly in explaining the material, it can be seen that, no (0%) students strongly agreed that teachers do not arrange sentences regularly in explaining the material, few (4%) students agreed that teachers do not arrange sentences regularly in explaining the material, most (73%) students disagreed that teachers do not arrange sentences regularly in explaining the material, and a small proportion (23%) of students strongly disagreed that teachers do not arrange sentences regularly in explaining the material. Teachers immediately respond to every response from students showed that, most (60%) students strongly agreed, a small proportion (33%) of students agreed, a few (7%) students disagreed, and none (0%) students strongly disagreed. Students do not immediately consult the teacher when experiencing difficulties in learning, none or (0%) students strongly agreed, a few (13%) students agreed, a small proportion (23%) students disagreed, and most (64%) students strongly disagreed. Equality of views is important in communication as most (65%) students strongly agreed, a small proportion (34%) of students agreed, almost none or only (1%) students disagreed, and none (0%) students strongly disagreed. The teacher did not conduct question and answer activities after explaining the material. It can be seen that, almost no or only (1%) students strongly agreed, a few (13%) students agreed, a small proportion (26%) students disagreed, and most (60%) students strongly disagreed. The teacher uses various writing models in writing shows that, almost most (47%) students strongly agree, a small number (40%) of students agree, (10%) students disagree, and a few (3%) students strongly disagree. Teachers only talk (communicate) with some students, it was found that, none (0%) students strongly agreed, few (3%) students agreed, most (67%) students disagreed, and few (30%) students strongly disagreed. Teachers get angry when students make comments, almost none or only (1%) students stated strongly agree, a few (9%) students stated agree, a small proportion (27%) students stated disagree, and most (63%) students stated strongly disagree. Teachers give advice to students who have difficulty in learning shows that, most (63%) students strongly agree, a small proportion (31%) of students agree, a few (6%) students disagree, and no students strongly disagree (0%). Students are free to express their opinions to their teachers as seen, most (61%) students strongly agree, a small proportion (34%) of students agree, a few (4%) students disagree, and none or only (0%) students strongly disagree. Suggestions and criticisms from students were responded to with words that offended students, indicating that there were no students who strongly agreed (0%), a few students who agreed (14%), a small number of students who disagreed (25%), and most students strongly disagreed (61%). The explanation of the material accompanied by a little humor explains that the teacher needs to accompany the explanation of the material with a little humor, this is evidenced by most (60%) students stating strongly agree if the teacher accompanies the explanation of the material with a little humor, a small proportion (33%) of students stating agree if the teacher accompanies the explanation of the material with a little humor, a few (6%) students stating disagree if the teacher accompanies the explanation of the material with a little humor, and almost none or only (1%) students

stating strongly disagree if the teacher accompanies the explanation of the material with a little humor. The teacher guides students to speak in correct sentences, It shows that teachers guide students to speak in correct sentences as evidenced by a small proportion (40%) of students strongly agreeing, most (60%) students agreeing, and no students disagreeing and strongly disagreeing. Teachers listen carefully to students' conversations, most (60%) students strongly agreed, a small proportion (33%) of students agreed, a few (7%) students disagreed, and none (0%) students strongly disagreed. Teachers only accept students' opinions that are in line with their own opinions, almost none or only (1%) of students strongly agreed, a few (10%) students agreed, a small proportion (34%) of students disagreed, and most (54%) students strongly disagreed. Teacher comments on students conveyed through their writing, showed that most (63%) students strongly agreed, a small number (31%) of students agreed, a few (6%) students disagreed, and no students strongly disagreed (0%). The teacher provides detailed task completion instructions. It can be seen that, a small proportion (19%) of students agreed that the teacher provided detailed task completion instructions, most (63%) students agreed that the teacher provided detailed task completion instructions, a few (14%) students disagreed, and only (4%) students strongly disagreed. shows that, (47.99%) students stated Strongly Agree, (44%) students stated Agree, (6.77%) students stated Disagree, and (0.69%) students stated Disagree with the verbal communication carried out by the teacher. Based on the results of the researcher's interview with the Islamic religious education teacher, it is stated that the implementation of verbal communication in the teaching and learning process has been maximized even though it has not produced many learning outcomes. Likewise, the results of the questionnaire that researchers have distributed to some students who are samples in this study state that, if the frequency of students who state Strongly Agree with Agree is added, the result is 92.54% and if the frequency of students who state Disagree and Disagree is added, the result is 7.46%. This means that the verbal communication carried out by the teacher is maximized or good.

Data analysis and interpretation.

To be able to determine whether or not there is an influence of verbal communication on student learning success, Data Analysis with Product Moment Formula After obtaining the desired data, namely from variable X in the form of a questionnaire statement answer score distributed to 70 respondents and from variable Y in the form of primary data on the Final Exam results report. To analyze the data that has been collected, the author uses the product moment correlation method, which is to find out whether there is a significant positive correlation between variable X and variable Y, or even vice versa, there is no significant positive correlation between variable X and variable Y. Through the correlation map or Scatter Diagram that has been made, it can be seen: $N = 70$; $\sum fx' = -16$; $\sum fy' = 20$; $\sum fx'^2 = 1105$; $\sum fy'^2 = 1458$; $\sum x'y' = 784$. By paying attention to the magnitude of the calculation number, namely (0.624), which ranges from 0.600 - 0.800, it means that the positive correlation between variable X (Verbal Communication) and variable Y (Student Learning Success) is a sufficient positive correlation. Interpretation using the "r" Value Table To consult the rxy value against the "rtable" value, the Degrees of Freedom are sought using the formula: $df = N - nr = 70 - 2 = 68$ After checking the Product Moment "r" Value table and df 68 is not found in the table, the author uses the closest number from 68 to the value in the table, namely df 70. With a df of 70, the r table at the 5% significance level is 0, 232; while at the 1% significance level, the r table is 0.302. It turns out that rxy or ro (whose value = 0.624) is much greater than r table (whose values are 0, 232 and 0, 302). Because ro is greater than rtable, the null hypothesis is rejected. This means that there is a significant positive correlation between variable X and variable Y. Significance Test of Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (t test). The results of these calculations, if consulted against the t table at the 5% significance level = 2.00 and at the 1% significance level = 2.65, then $t_{count} > t_{table}$, significant correlation. Thus there is a positive relationship between variable X and variable Y.

Determination Coefficient Test, From the above calculation, KD is 3894%, which means that variable X (verbal communication) has a correlation with variable Y (student learning success) of 38.94%, this proves that 61.06% of learning success is influenced by other factors.

Hypothesis Test Results From the calculation results obtained r_{xy} of 0.624, this results in the conclusion that there is a positive relationship between verbal communication and student learning success, proven $t_{count} > t_{table}$. Thus the author draws a conclusion from the results of this study that student learning success is also influenced by verbal communication with a significant influence.

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of research on the Effect of Verbal Communication between Teachers and Students on Student Learning Success. Verbal communication carried out by the subject teacher is included in the good category. Student learning outcomes in the subject are very good, because the overall average score is 81.35. There is a positive relationship between teacher verbal communication and student learning success because the value of $r_{count} > r_{table}$. Teacher verbal communication influences student learning success with sufficient intensity.

REFERENCES

- Ajjawi, R., & Higgs, J. (2007). Using hermeneutic phenomenology to investigate how experienced practitioners learn to communicate clinical reasoning. *Qualitative Report*, 12(4), 612–638.
- Arikunto, S. (2013). *Prosedur penelitian suatu pendekatan praktik*.
- Brown, D. P. (2004). *The formation of the thought of a young English conservative: WH Mallock and the contest for cultural and socio-economic authority, 1849–1884*. University of Missouri-Columbia.
- Carey, J. W. (2007). A cultural approach to communication. *Theorizing Communication. Readings across Traditions, Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications*, 37–50.
- Chak, A. (2007). Teachers' and parents' conceptions of children's curiosity and exploration. *International Journal of Early Years Education*, 15(2), 141–159.
- Chun, A. H. W. (2004). The agile teaching/learning methodology and its e-learning platform. *International Conference on Web-Based Learning*, 11–18.
- Church, K. (2005). *Effective oral communication in the foreign language classroom*. University of Colorado at Boulder.
- Clausen, J. M. (2007). Beginning teachers' technology use: First-year teacher development and the institutional context's affect on new teachers' instructional technology use with students. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 39(3), 245–261.
- Covarrubias, P. (2007). (Un) biased in western theory: Generative silence in American Indian communication. *Communication Monographs*, 74(2), 265–271.
- De Jong, E. J., & Harper, C. A. (2005). Preparing mainstream teachers for English-language learners: Is being a good teacher good enough? *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 32(2), 101–124.
- de Mesa, A. P., & de Guzman, A. B. (2006). Portrait of Filipino teachers' classroom practices: traditional or constructivist? *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*, 5(3), 235–253.
- Duffy, F. D., Gordon, G. H., Whelan, G., Cole-Kelly, K., & Frankel, R. (2004). Assessing competence in communication and interpersonal skills: the Kalamazoo II report. *Academic Medicine*, 79(6), 495–507.
- Ercikan, K., & Roth, W.-M. (2006). What good is polarizing research into qualitative and quantitative? *Educational Researcher*, 35(5), 14–23.
- Esbjörn-Hargens, S., & Foucaultii, M. (2007). Integral teacher, integral students, integral classroom: Applying integral theory to education. *AQAL: Journal of Integral Theory and Practice*, 2(2), 72–103.
- Furqon, C. (2003). Hakikat komunikasi organisasi. *Hakikat Komunikasi Organisasi*, 2(15), 1–9.
- Gardner, C. T., Milne, M. J., Stringer, C. P., & Whiting, R. H. (2005). Oral and written communication apprehension in accounting students: Curriculum impacts and impacts on academic performance. *Accounting Education*, 14(3), 313–336.
- Graham, P. (2007). Improving teacher effectiveness through structured collaboration: A case study of a professional learning community. *RMLE Online*, 31(1), 1–17.
- Grönroos, C. (2004). The relationship marketing process: communication, interaction, dialogue, value. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*.
- Günther, S. (2006). Be masters in that you teach and continue to learn: Medieval Muslim thinkers on educational theory. *Comparative Education Review*, 50(3), 367–388.
- Holden, A., & Billings, A. (2007). *Interfaith interventions and cohesive communities*. Lancaster, CA: University press.
- Hoskins, C. N., & Mariano, C. (2004). *Research in nursing and health: Understanding and using quantitative and qualitative methods* (Vol. 23). Springer publishing company.

- Hunt, P., Soto, G., Maier, J., & Doering, K. (2003). Collaborative teaming to support students at risk and students with severe disabilities in general education classrooms. *Exceptional Children*, 69(3), 315–332.
- Kim, S. (2006). Academic oral communication needs of East Asian international graduate students in non-science and non-engineering fields. *English for Specific Purposes*, 25(4), 479–489.
- Landa, M. S. H. (2007). *Crossing the divide: A phenomenological study of early childhood literacy teachers who choose to work with children in high-poverty schools*. University of Maryland, College Park.
- Mason, R. (2005). *Globalising education: Trends and applications*. Routledge.
- Mast, M. S. (2007). On the importance of nonverbal communication in the physician–patient interaction. *Patient Education and Counseling*, 67(3), 315–318.
- Morais, A. M., Neves, I. P., & Afonso, M. (2005). Teacher training processes and teachers' competence—a sociological study in the primary school. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21(4), 415–437.
- Palmer, S. B., & Wehmeyer, M. L. (2003). Promoting self-determination in early elementary school: Teaching self-regulated problem-solving and goal-setting skills. *Remedial and Special Education*, 24(2), 115–126.
- Polk, J. A. (2006). Traits of effective teachers. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 107(4), 23–29.
- Renshaw, P. D. (2004). Dialogic learning teaching and instruction. In *Dialogic learning* (pp. 1–15). Springer.
- Rogoff, B. (2003). *The cultural nature of human development*. Oxford university press.
- Schreiner, C., Henriksen, E. K., & Kirkeby Hansen, P. J. (2005). *Climate education: Empowering today's youth to meet tomorrow's challenges*.
- Shavelson, R. J., Phillips, D. C., Towne, L., & Feuer, M. J. (2003). On the science of education design studies. *Educational Researcher*, 32(1), 25–28.
- Smith, H. A. (2004). *Attitudes of teacher educators in Aotearoa New Zealand towards bilingualism and language diversity*.
- Stahl, S. A. (2005). Four problems with teaching word meanings. *Teaching and Learning Vocabulary: Bringing Research to Practice*, 95.
- Stahl, S. A., & Nagy, W. E. (2007). *Teaching word meanings*. Routledge.
- Sutherland, K. S., & Oswald, D. P. (2005). The relationship between teacher and student behavior in classrooms for students with emotional and behavioral disorders: Transactional processes. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 14(1), 1.
- Teixeira-Dias, J. J. C., Pedrosa de Jesus, H., Neri de Souza, F., & Watts, M. (2005). Teaching for quality learning in chemistry. *International Journal of Science Education*, 27(9), 1123–1137.
- Thomas, R. M. (2003). *Blending qualitative and quantitative research methods in theses and dissertations*. Corwin Press.
- Trumbull, M., & Watson, K. (2005). Qualitative research methods. *Integrating Quantitative and Qualitative Methods in Research*, 101–126.
- Weisse, W. (2003). Difference without discrimination: religious education as a field of learning for social understanding? In *International perspectives on citizenship, education and religious diversity* (pp. 170–184). Routledge.
- Wen, W.-P., & Clément, R. (2003). A Chinese conceptualisation of willingness to communicate in ESL. *Language Culture and Curriculum*, 16(1), 18–38.
- Westwood, P. S. (2004). *Learning and learning difficulties: A handbook for teachers*. Aust Council for Ed Research.
- Wood, A. F., & Smith, M. J. (2004). *Online communication: Linking technology, identity, & culture*. Routledge.
- Woods, R., & Ebersole, S. (2003). Becoming a “communal architect” in the online classroom—Integrating cognitive and affective learning for maximum effect in web-based learning. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 6(1), 1–24.
- Wulandari, L. H. (2004). *Efektivitas Modifikasi Perilaku-Kognitif Untuk Mengurangi Kecemasan Komunikasi Antar Pribadi*.