

An Investigation of Question Types Used in an EFL Pre-Intermediate Classroom

Michael Ruddick*

Abstract

In Japan, outside of junior high and high schools, the emphasis on communicative language teaching is still the dominant paradigm for language teachers. The idea behind the communicative method is that students focus on authentic, meaningful interactions rather than the traditional grammar focused methods taught in school. However, just because a language lesson is communicative rather than grammar focused, does not mean that the language produced by the students or the teacher is always real life communication. Much has been written about foreign language classroom discourse and the activities that promote discourse with regards to teacher/student talk and student/student talk. Many researchers have developed ways of investigating classroom discourse that can be used as analytical tools for language teachers to better understand the language used during teacher/student interaction. This article is a study of teacher questions and the effect of those questions on a class of pre-intermediate English Language learners.

Key words : Scrivener's ARC, restricted language, authentic language, procedural, convergent & divergent questions, display Vs referential questions

Introduction

Nunan (1991, 194) tells us that during a study of teacher questions “the use of referential questions by the teacher resulted in more complex language by the students” and that “Student interaction was also more like natural discourse”. As production by the student of “complex language” and more “natural discourse” is one of the many goals of an English language teacher, it became apparent, after reading the above, that certain language classes, which I have taught recently, maybe somewhat lacking in referential questions. As Brown (1994, 166) states “Usually the higher the proficiency level you teach the more you can venture into the upper, referential end of the continuum.” This last assertion stimulates the following questions: in the higher ability classes that I teach are there sufficient “upper, referential” questions to stimulate the students? Am I creating the correct conditions for “complex language” and “natural discourse?”

In this paper I will attempt to answer the above questions and ascertain the truth of Nunan's statement. Here, I will show the findings of an *Action Research* project focused on answering these questions. I will begin with a commentary on classroom discourse, covering Scrivener's *ARC* (1996, 79) and question types (including referential and display questions)

*Michael Ruddick [情報文化学科]

before reporting on the method and findings of this research.

1. Classroom Discourse

Much has been written about foreign language classroom discourse and the activities that promote discourse with regards to teacher/student talk and student/student talk. Many researchers have developed ways of investigating classroom discourse that can be used as analytical tools for L2 teachers to better understand the dynamics with regards to teacher/student interaction. In this section, a focus will be placed on two analytical modes available to teachers for use in the L2 classroom. Both of which will be drawn upon later during the analysis of the above language class.

1.1. ARC

Scrivener, (1996, 79) proposes a three tier model with which teacher trainers can better describe classroom discourse dynamics to trainee teachers. The first element in Scriveners analytical model is *restricted*. This refers to language relating to “oral drills, many written exercises, copying from the board, eliciting dialogues, reading course book texts and so on”. *Restricted* activities, according to Scrivener, “offer opportunities for language practice, for improving accuracy, for testing, for display” (Scrivener 1996, 85) The second heading, *authentic*, refers to activities that produce unrestricted language. *Authentic* to Scrivener is for “communication, fluency, real life, pleasure”, where “meaning is more important than correctness of form” (ibid). Finally, Scriveners third element, *clarification* focuses on a more analytical view of classroom language so that “teacher explanation’, ‘reference to grammar’, elicitation of target sentences’ and so on fit into this category” (ibid). With these three components Scrivener believes it is possible to observe, break down and successfully analyse discourse interaction in an L2 classroom. Scrivener suggests that a lesson can be broken down into “components, like building bricks, together in different orders” (Scrivener 1996, 82) Once the components are identified it is then possible to describe what happens in each segment. Using the ARC model we can then analyse the type of language produced in each segment.

1.2. Questions: Procedural, Convergent & Divergent

Brown (1994, 165) explains, “In second language classrooms...your questions provide necessary stepping stones to communication”. This suggests that it may be beneficial for language teachers to focus on the types of questions generated in the second language classroom and to decide which type of question best facilitates the “negotiation of meaning in interaction”. Researchers in the field have created many ways to classify questions used in the classroom. Richards and Lockhart (1995, 186) call attention to the terms *procedural*, *convergent* and *divergent*. The tendency is to categorise questions into those that produce *authentic* and those that produce constrained language. As Richards and Lockhart explain *procedural* alludes to the management of the classroom and lesson rather than the actual

learning involved. *Convergent* questions encourage short answers or short statements that often “focus on the recall of previously presented information” and not on the generation of ideas and natural communication, whereas *divergent* questions “require students to engage in higher-level thinking” (1995, 187). Answers initiated by *divergent* questions would most probably require students to express their own opinions on a subject rather than to recall language targets. This is where we find *authentic* language. Here it is hoped that Scrivener’s “real life” discourse will take place.

Here, then, it can be seen that classroom discourse is far from simple. Both researchers make the point that, in the classroom, there exist many kinds of language. The language of the concepts *procedural*, *convergent*, *restricted*, and *clarification* seem to imply a constraint on the freedom of discourse for the language student, where as the *divergent* and the *authentic* describe a place where “normal” or “natural” discourse can prevail. More freedom and a stress on natural discourse implies that more language will be generated by the student. More language being generated, in turn, implies more communicative complexity. If in this assignment I am to discover the worth of Nunan’s statement it is toward the *divergent* and the *authentic* I must look.

1.3. Display Vs Referential Questions

Generally, classroom questions can be broken down into two headings: *display* and *referential* questions. Under the heading of *display*, we can list those questions that correlate to constrained language. These types of questions, generally believed to promote artificial discourse, will undoubtedly be found in the *restricted* and *clarification* language mentioned above. *Referential* questions, on the other hand, promote the opposite. Here we find the *divergent* questions advocated by Richards and Lockhart. These types of question will be aimed at measuring the knowledge of the student rather than testing knowledge and should prompt “students to provide significantly longer and syntactically more complex responses” (Nunan 1991, 194). To simplify the two concepts: *display* questions will promote answers of which the teacher has knowledge of, whereas *referential* questions will promote answers that the teacher may not have knowledge of. As Richards and Lockhart (1995, 187) state: “in naturalistic discourse referential questions are more frequent than display questions, whereas display questions are more frequent in whole class teaching in ESL classrooms.” Here, then, we find a further clue as to where we must look to find “negotiation of meaning” and a move toward a higher level of student speech. *Referential* questions point to a sector of classroom discourse that operates without constraint upon the student, where authentic language exists and should, therefore, increase the amount and complexity of language produced.

2. Research Methods

Nunan (1992, 3) states that “Traditionally, writers on research traditions have made a binary distinction between qualitative and quantitative research, although more recently it

has been argued that the distinction is simplistic and naïve.” According to this binary distinction quantitative research aims at a more objective view of the world. Facts and controlled measurement, verification of data and multiple case studies are cultivated in order to bring about results that can be reproduced again and again. The outcome of quantitative research should, in theory, have the virtue of producing the same effect for any teacher in any classroom. Qualitative research, on the other hand, is more concerned with the subjective. Nunan (1992, 4) describes qualitative research as “concerned with understanding human behavior from the actors own frame of reference.” It is a tool for analysis best used for “single case” studies.

As the objective here is to analyse one specific class, I have decided in favour of a qualitative method for research known as *Action Research*. Nevertheless many researchers have found the use of elements of both qualitative and quantitative methods to be useful. This *ad hoc* approach as endorsed by Wallace (1998, 113) seems to make use of both.

“The term *ad hoc* is used to describe something that has been devised for a particular purpose, with no claims to generality. What we have called the system-based approaches start with a set of general categories which are applied to specific situations. The *ad hoc* approach is also a structured approach, but the problems arise from a particular problem or research topic.”

3. Action Research

Action research has, in the past, been seen as a collaborative tool or a group activity. There are various reasons for this. For example, Cohen and Manion in Nunan (1992, 18) believe collaboration is important as “the aim of action research is to improve the current state of affairs within the educational context in which the research is being carried out.” This may be so but, as I have mentioned above, the context with which I am interested is specifically a single class of students and their discourse. Here, then, as this is a “single case” study, I intend to take an individual approach to research.

According to Hadley (1997) *action research* is :

“...a process designed to improve teaching and facilitate learning through identifying a specific classroom problem, targeting causes through systematic data collection (surveys, observation, interviews etc.) and applying an effective solution to the problem as a result of the data being collected and interpreted.”

Below I have paraphrased Hadley’s description into the five different headings, which I intend to use in my research.

- 1) Collection of data related to the question/problem.
- 2) Analysis of data.
- 3) Implementation of change related to analysis.
- 4) Further collection and analysis of data.
- 5) Conclusion and/or continual implementation of change.

4. The Class

The class involved is a group of four housewives who meet fortnightly on a Friday at a local community centre. The class length is 90 minutes. The group are middle aged with grown families who wish, now they have time on their hands, to return to English studies. The students are highly motivated and, when I began teaching the class, the students specifically asked that the class not be “just” a conversation class. We decided together that there would be a strict emphasis on learning grammar structures and vocabulary. The overall level of the class is low pre-intermediate. The textbook used by the class is *World View Three* (Rost, 2002). As agreed with the class, past lessons have focused on grammar and vocabulary. While the students seemed happy, it became obvious that they were not being given the chance to use what they learned in meaningful exchanges. At the pre-intermediate level, I believe, language exchanges in the classroom should be showing evidence of complexity or “higher ability”. By this I mean less “central teacher control” with students negotiating “roles and control of turn taking and topic among themselves” (Willis 1987, 19). A progression toward Scrivener’s “real life” or *authentic* language should be seen. At the time of this analysis very few *authentic* exchanges were taking place. Students were heavily dependent on the teacher and the textbook. It became obvious that a change was needed. The ability of the students to partake in higher-level language was not being addressed.

5. Lesson 1

The lesson took place on November 11th 2005. The lesson chosen was unit 11 of *World View Three*. The grammar target for this unit is the present perfect for the indefinite past with vocabulary related to furniture. The theme of the lesson is redecorating and television decorating shows. The title of the unit is *Trading Spaces*.

5.2. Collection of Data

Before deciding on a method of data collection for research many aspects of the classroom were taken into consideration. The main aspect was that the method used be as unobtrusive as possible. The intent was that the normal routine not be interrupted by the data collection method and that the mood of the class be as natural as possible. After consideration it was decided that an audio recording of the class would be taken. A small hand held tape recorder was placed in the centre of the table around which the students regularly sit. The small size of the tape recorder made it easy for students to ignore and act as unselfconsciously as the language class allows (Wallace 1998, 107) With regards to the

teacher, switching the machine on, turning the tape over and switching it off, were the only responsibilities. This meant that a minimum of teacher time was taken up, which in turn meant that this form of data collection was best suited for this research. As Anne Burns (1999, 96) states: “Recordings are invaluable in furnishing researchers with objective first hand data for analysing individual teacher behaviour.”

5.3. Analysis of Data

An analysis of the recorded data was done by, first, writing a transcript of the lesson (See appendix 1 and 2). It was decided, due to the time consuming effect of transcribing, that only a portion of the lesson should be transcribed (Burns 1999, 98). The section decided upon was an approximately fifteen minute long sample taken from the presentation of the lesson theme. This section can be broken down into two portions. In the first the students are asked to partake in a competition. Under a time constraint of five minutes they are asked to make a list of furniture items while working in pairs, before reporting back to the class. In the second the students are asked to match a list of words to items of furniture in their textbooks before, again, reporting back to class.

5.4. Teacher Question Count and Coding

A method of coding was chosen that would highlight teacher referential questions from display questions. For this, questions were broken down into the *procedural*, *convergent* and *divergent* concepts mentioned above by Richards and Lockhart. Here *procedural* and *divergent* categorise all *display* questions, while *divergent* represents *referential*. Teacher questions for this fifteen minute segment were then counted/tallied using an ad hoc approach (Wallace 1998, 115) and categorised as shown below.

Table 1

Total Number of Questions	18
Procedural	13
Convergent	4
Divergent	0

As we can see *display* questions take up the whole of the segment. Of the *procedural* questions ten take the form of “O.K.?” Two ask students for confirmation — “Hiro?” and “Kimiko?” — and only one “Can you please read your list out?” has any kind of complexity. *Convergent* questions consist of two elicitations, “What does it mean?” and “Where’s D?”, two clarification questions — “Kotatsu?” and “Big clock?” — and finally a clarification check, “How many?” (See appendix 1). The poverty of complexity with regards to the above display questions is matched by the lack of even one *divergent* question.

In order to discover the effect of the above teacher questions on student L2 language it was decided to use an *ad-hoc* approach as endorsed by Wallace (1998, 113). The aim of this paper is to discern the correlation between teacher questions and the amount and complexity of student L2 language. As this is so, a way was needed, first, to categorise and count the amount of student speech produced, and also to define the idea of complexity in this paper.

5.6. Student Speech Count and Coding

Rather than count sentences produced or focus on grammatical complexity, a concentration on actual utterances in the L2 and communicative complexity — where communicative means interactive — seemed to be more appropriate for the purposes of this study. The reason for this is simple: an analysis of grammatical or syntactical complexity would take more time than is allowed for in this paper and also, unlike written speech, spoken language does not always adhere to the established rules of grammar and the use of correct sentences. Given these problems it was decided to code student speech in the following manner:

- 1) Utterances of one word. For example “Table.”
- 2) Utterances of two words. For example “Side table”.
- 3) Utterances of three words. For example “Wow! Its colour”.
- 4) Utterances of four words. For example “A long neck person”.
- 5) Utterances of five words or more.

(For examples see appendix 1 and 2)

An utterance in this context can be seen as L2 used by any one student from the moment that student begins speaking until the moment they stop. Obviously, in the above, an utterance of one word will be seen as not as complex as an utterance of five or more words, but whether an utterance can be classed as communicatively complex remains to be seen. Where an utterance can be viewed as lacking in communicative complexity/interaction it will be pointed out by the researcher. When counted, using the above method, the results were as follows for the fifteen minute section.

Table 2

Utterances of :				
1 Word	2 Words	Three Words	Four Words	Five Words or More
35	16	6	1	3

It must be pointed out at this stage that, although the utterances of five words or more tally at 3, the communicative complexity of each is weak. Below we can see that these three articulations relate only to cataloguing words related to the theme of the lesson and, apart

from clarifying knowledge of vocabulary/pronunciation to the teacher, have no real communicative use.

(34) S1 : Chair, stool, cupboard, sofa, couch, wardrobe. Kotatsu ?

(41) S1 : Bathtub, washing machine, shelves, draw . . . drawer.

(49) S3 : Desk, chair, table, bed, dresser, mirror, couch, stool, chest, floor stand, drawer.

It must also be said that due to the two task types and instructions given to the students at this point in the lesson, most of the language generated was of this kind, as the sample below shows.

(20) T : O.K. Can you please read your list out, group number one ?

(21) S1 : Table.

(Pause)

(22) T : Everything.

(23) S1 : Oh ! Everything ?

(24) T : Yeah.

(25) S1 : Side table.

(26) T : Hmmm.

(27) S1 : Chest.

(28) T : Yeah.

(29) S1 : Desk.

(30) T : Uhh.

(31) S1 : Bed.

(32) T : Uhh.

(33) S1 : Dresser . . . dresser.

So, we see very little communicative interaction in the student language generated as the students read out a list, in turn, and the teacher gives feedback. The length of student turns are short and complexity is low. This is Scriveners *restricted* language, used for “testing” and “practice”. It is language “restricted to initiation only by the teacher” (Brown 1994, 173). Obviously, unless the students work in a furniture warehouse, this is not natural or *authentic*.

The result of the analysis so far, then, is presented below.

Table 3

Zero	1 Word	2 Words	3 Words	4 Words	5 Words or More
Referential Questions Equals	35	16	6	1	3

Obviously, if the amount of language and complexity is to rise, a shift has to be made from a majority of one word utterances to that of five words or more, but, to be more precise, five words or more wherein there is communicative interaction rather than mindlessly reading out a list of vocabulary.

6. Implementation of Change Related to Analysis

If Nunan is correct in his statement that teacher to student referential questions will result in “an increase in the length and complexity of student turns” (Nunan 1999, 195) then it is apparent that a move in this direction is the next step. Also a “task” change or a change of instructions needs to be introduced. In the above two exercises practiced by the students there was very little substance to generate language or, indeed to motivate the students into wanting to interact communicatively. Although the students were asked to work in pairs, an endeavour that usually leads to a higher “quantity of output” (Brown 1994, 173) the fact that the first part of the section was competitive, and because of the students close proximity to each other, the voices of the students dropped so as to be unintelligible on the taped record of the lesson (See appendix 2). Nevertheless, had the students voices been heard, I’m sure the language used to make a list of furniture would not be that different from the language used to repeat a list of furniture to the teacher.

With this in mind, for the follow up class, a change of textbook was decided. Although World View 3 can, at times, be an excellent language generator, the presentation section of its units can be somewhat textbook focused. This draws the student inwards, toward the book, rather than outwards toward their class members. The New Headway English Course at pre-intermediate level, on the other hand, tends to introduce its units with a series of, occasionally divergent, questions aimed at generating L2 speech. An example of this can be found in unit nine (Soars 2004, 70) where the students are asked :

“What will you do if the weather is nice this weekend?”

and

“What will you do when you get home tonight?”

Together with this textbook change, as mentioned above, the implementation of referential questions related to the theme of the unit chosen was to be undertaken.

7. Lesson 2

The second lesson took place on the 16th of December 2005. Unit 10 of the New Headway English Course Pre-Intermediate Students Book (Soars 2004, 78) was selected for the follow up class. The unit is entitled *Scared to Death* and is based on verb patterns and infinitives. The theme of the unit is fear and what scares us. The unit opens with four drawings of characters in various states of fear. A *convergent* question is asked about these characters: "What are these people afraid of?" Then, a further more personal *divergent* question is asked: "What are you afraid of?" It was also determined that several more divergent questions would be asked at the opening of the class as part of the presentation to the unit, and wherever possible throughout the beginning period of the lesson. These questions would be asked first to the students in general and to individual students. Afterwards a pair work task would be given in which the students would ask their partner "What are you afraid of?" before reporting back to the class. The reason for this was to examine which produced the more complex language: questions directed at individuals or the task of finding out.

7.1. Further Collection and Analysis of Data

The data was collected using the same method as above. A fifteen minute segment was again taken from the presentation portion and a transcription was made and analysed. A change from the earlier recording is that, during this session the recorder was unable to tape the whole class succinctly and ensued in recording mostly the efforts of two students. Using the same method as above the amount and type of teacher questions were counted with the following result.

Table 4

Total Number of Questions	27
Procedural	3
Convergent	10
Divergent	14

From this count of 14 *divergent* questions we see a dramatic change in the amount and type of language generated, as shown below.

Table 5

Utterances of :				
1 Word	2 Words	Three Words	Four Words	Five Words or More
25	13	5	7	15

The overall results relating to the analysis of the second lesson can be seen in the following table.

Table 6

15 Referential Questions Equals	1 Word	2 Words	3 Words	4 Words	5 Words or More
	25	13	5	7	15

Here we find a much more complex kind of language being produced by the students. Whereas in the analysis of the first lesson all utterances of five words or more produced only lists of vocabulary, in this second class real communicative complexity is emerging. When asked about their families and what scared their children when they were young, the following exchange occurred between the teacher and a student (See appendix 3).

(62) T : Thunder and lightning? What did they do?

(63) S2 : Hmmm. They're erm frightened to hear that and erm go to mothers lap and maybe mother says take it easy. Maybe.

This extract shows a complexity beyond any language produced during the first class. It was during the pair work task, though, that it became obvious that referential questions, combined with the correct task, can increase the amount of interactive language. Here we find the students taking control of “turn taking and topic among themselves” (Willis 1987, 19). The following exchange shows the kind of meaningful interaction expected of higher ability students.

(75) S2 : What are you afraid of? (5)

(76) T : Speak English please.

(77) S1 : I'm afraid of getting old. (5)

(78) S2 : Hmmm.

(79) S1 : I'm afraid of. . . What are you afraid of? (8)

(80) S2 : I'm afraid of snowing. (4)

(81) S1 : What? (1)

(82) S2: It's been a winter of much snow these days. . . .so I'm afraid of. . . (13)

(83) S1: Hmmm. Your house will be broken. (5)

(84) S2: No. (1)

8. Conclusion

Overall, in this particular class, it seems that Nunan's statement that referential questions should result in "more complex language" and more "natural" like language has some worth. Although zero referential questions resulted in three student utterances of five words or more, those articulations were very weak in interactive complexity. A rise from zero to fifteen, on the other hand, produced a count of fifteen utterances of five words or more. More importantly the introduction of *referential* questions created a more complex level of interaction in the classroom. Rather than produce a list of previously learned vocabulary or focusing on a textbook exercise, once *divergent* questions were introduced, the students began exchanging information about themselves in a meaningful, *authentic* way. Teacher to student referential questions, without a doubt, increased the amount and complexity of student replies. But it was student interaction during the given task that became more fruitful. Although the task was a simple pair work exercise devised of a simple personal question, it produced the most natural interactions between the students. With regards to the method of research, the *ad hoc* method proved valuable for this "single case" study. However there were some problems. The tally method used, while achieving effective results was maybe too simple for its intended purpose. The main problem arose from attempting to correctly categorise student utterances. An utterance of five words or more should show a certain level of complexity but, as was shown above, if an utterance consists of nothing more than a list of vocabulary, this needs to be categorised differently. In this instance, when the problem arose the solution found was that these articulations be highlighted by the researcher. For a more thorough analysis of the type of student language produced by referential/display questions though, undoubtedly, this method needs to be expanded upon.

9. Relevance to Other Teachers

Although this has been a "single case" study it may still have relevance to certain teachers of language. Those teachers working in English-language conversation schools or who teach small classes privately might benefit from the results of this analysis. It is apparent that in the above class a change should be made away from display and toward referential questions if the students are to interact to the height of their communicative abilities. Also more thought must go toward the classroom tasks the students are involved in. From the above research it is clear that pair work, combined with the right type of question, is a simple way to begin. Teachers working in the type of environment mentioned above, worried perhaps that their higher ability students are not interacting naturally, may well try to implement these changes themselves.

References

- Brown, D. (1994) *Teaching by Principles : An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. New Jersey : Prentice Hall Regents.
- Burns, A. (1999) *Collaborative Action Research for English Language Teachers*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Hadley, G. (1997) *Action Research : Something for Everyone*. In D. Griffee and D. Nunan (Eds.) *Classroom Teachers and Classroom Research*. Tokyo : JALT. (<http://www.nuis.ac.jp/~hadley/publication/jaltar/JALTAR.htm>)
- Nunan, D. (1991) *Language Teaching Methodology*. London : Prentice Hall International.
- Nunan, D. (1992) *Research Methods in Language Learning*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J and Lockhart, C. (1995) *Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classrooms*. Cambridge. Cambridge Language Education.
- Rost, M. (2002) *World View Three Student Book* Longman. NewYork.
- Scrivener, J. (1996) *ARC : a descriptive model for classroom work on language*. In Willis, J and Willis, D (Eds) *Challenge and Change in Language Teaching*. Heinemann English Language Teaching.
- Soars, J and Soars L. *New Headway English Course : Pre-Intermediate*. Oxford. Oxford University Press.
- Wallace, MJ. (1998) *Action Research for Language Teachers*. Cambridge Teacher Training and Development.
- Willis, J. (1987) *Inner and Outer : Spoken Discourse in the Language Classroom*. In *Discussing discourse : Studies presented to David Brazil on his retirement/edited by Malcolm Coulthard*, pp. 1-19. English Language Research, University of Birmingham.

Appendix 1

Transcript of lesson extract November 11th 2005

Key to Symbols

Teacher : T

Student 1 : S1

Student 2 : S2

Student 3 : S3

Student 4 : S4

Divergent (D) = 0

Convergent (C) = 6

Procedural (P) = 10

Student Utterances : 1 = 32, 2 = 15, 3 = 7, 4 = 2, 5+ = 3

Presentation of Lesson Theme

(Teacher writes the word furniture on the board.)

- (1) S1 : Furniture? (1)
- (2) T : Yeah. What does it mean? (C)
- (3) S3 : Furniture? (1)
- (4) S1 : Tables (1)
- (5) S3 : Desk, chair. (2)
- (6) T : O.K. No problems. So, quick. . . .competition. So (teacher points to students in pairs)
team one, team two. I want you to make a list of furniture.
- (7) S1 : Furniture. O.K. (2)
- (8) T : O.K. Every kind of furniture. Make a list. Work together O.K? (P) Work together.
And speak English.

Due to the nature of the activity — a competition — the students here lower their voices so that the other team can't hear. On the tape their voices are too low to be heard.

- (9) S4 : Wardrobe? (1)
- (10) S1 : (Laughter)
- (11) S4 : Wardrobe. Wardrobe. Wardrobe. (3)
- (12) T : One minute left.

Again the students lower their voices.

- (13) T : Fifteen seconds left.
- (14) S4 : Sideboard. (1)
- (15) T : O.K. Let's go. Please count how many items of furniture you have.
(pause while student count)
- (16) T : (To team one) How many? (C)
- (17) S1 : Twenty three. (2)
- (18) T : Twenty three.
(Laughter)
- (19) S3 : We not sure. (3)
(Laughter)
- (20) T : O.K. Can you please read your list out group number one? (P)
- (21) S1 : Table. (1)
(Pause)
- (22) T : Everything.
- (23) S1 : Oh! Everything? (1)
- (24) T : Yeah.
- (25) S1 : Side table. (2)

- (26) T : Hmmm.
(27) S1 : Chest. (1)
(28) T : Yeah.
(29) S1 : Desk. (1)
(30) T : Uhh.
(31) S1 : Bed. (1)
(32) T : Uhh.
(33) S1 : Dresser . . . dresser. (2)
(34) S1 : Chair, stool, cupboard, sofa, couch, wardrobe, kotatsu ? (7)
(Laughter)
(35) T : Kotatsu ? (C) Yeah, yeah, yeah. That's O.K.
(Laughter)
(36) S1 : Dressing table, carpet, curtain. (4)
(37) S2 : Big clock. (2)
(38) T : Big clock ? (C)
(Laughter)
(39) S2 : Grandfather clock. (2)
(40) T : Yeah, grandfather clock.
(41) S1 : Bathtub, washing machine, shelves, draw . . . drawer. (6)
(42) T : Drawers
(43) S1 & S2 : Drawers. (1)
(44) T : Yeah.

Students practice pronunciation of word “drawers” together.

- (45) S2 : Big mirror. (2)
(46) S1 : Ah ! Big mirror. (3)

Laughter

- (47) T : O.K. ? (P)

Team two nodd O.K. finished

- (48) T : O.K. Hiro ? (P)
(49) S3 : Desk, chair, table, bed, dresser, mirror, couch, stool, chest, floor stand, drawer . . .
(50) S1 : Ah ! Floorstand. (1)
(51) S3 : . . . wardrobe, shoed box, (3)
(52) S1 : Ah !
(53) T : Aha. Shoebox.

All students repeat “shoebox”.

- (54) T : Shoebox.

Students repeat again.

- (55) T : Good. Excellent. Now remember “furniture” isn't countable . . .
(56) S1 & S2 : Yes. (1)
(57) T : . . . so we use, we say, we can say “items of”.

(58) S3 : Items of. (2)

Students make surprised sounds

(59) T : Items of. . . .or sometimes you can say “pieces of”.

(60) S4 : Pieces of. (2)

(61) T : Pieces of furniture O.K ? (C) Items of. O.K. Oops sorry Keiko.

Teacher gives out photocopied sheets from textbook for today’s lesson.

(62) T : Today we’re in colour.

(Laughter)

(63) S3 : Wow ! Its colour. (2)

(64) T : Yeah, we’re in colour today.

Teacher points to place in text book

(65) T : So, if you can look at Getting Started there is a list of words O.K ? (P) And there’s a picture of a room at the bottom. So, it’s very easy, just write the letter next to the word O.K ? (P) If there are any new words please ask me.

Exercise is done individually. Silence.

(66) S4 : Drapu, drap, drapu ? (3)

Silence

(67) T : O.K ? (P)

(68) S1 : I don’t know drapus. (4)

(69) T : Drapes

All students “Drapes, drapes”

(70) S2 : Drapsu (1)

(71) T : Drapes. . . .drapes.

(72) S1 : Drapes (1)

(73) T : Curtains.

(74) S2 : Hmmm.

(75) S1 : What ? (1)

(76) T : Americans say curtains, the British say. . . .Oh, sorry the British say curtains
Americans say drapes.

(77) S2 : Hmmmm

(78) S1 : Oh, oh.

(79) T : O.K ? (P)

(80) S3 : Throw pillow ? (2)

(81) S2 : Throw pillow ? (2)

(82) T : Throw pillow.

(Laughter)

(83) T : I think that’s another American thing.

(84) S1 : Not cushion ? (2)

(85) T : I think the British would say cushion Americans would say throw pillow.

Students make sounds of surprise.

(86) T : Yeah, maybe.

(87) S1 : Maybe. (1)

(88) S3 : So desu neh.

(89) T : Yeah, to me that's just a cushion.

(90) S3 & S4 : Cushion. (1)

Silence. Students repeat some words from exercise : "cabinet", "bookcase". Some Japanese.

(91) T : O.K ? (P)

(92) S1 : O.K. (1)

(93) T : So, armchair is M. Lets go round O.K ? (P) So, Kimiko.

(94) S2 : Basket — B (1)

(95) T : Yeah.

(pause)

(Laughter)

(96) T : Yeah.

(97) S1 : Bookcase. (1)

Some Japanese discussion as to correct answer.

(98) S1 : K desu sho ?

(99) T : Yeah, I think K. . . .

(100) S1 : K. K.

(101) T : Looks like a bookcase, but it looks like he has a stereo on his bookcase. Maybe,
I don't know. O.K. next.

(102) S3 : Cabinet. (1)

(103) T : Hmm, hmm.

(104) S3 : E

(105) T : Yeah.

(106) S4 : Carpet. (1)

(107) T : Hmm, hmm.

(108) S4 : O

(109) S1 : Hmm, hmm.

(110) T : Yeah.

(111) S4 : O

(112) T : Kimiko ? (P)

(113) S2 : Mmm. Drapes. H. (1)

(114) T : Yes.

(115) S1 : Fireplace. C. (1)

(116) T : Aha.

(117) S3 : Lamp. D. (1)

- (118) S4 : Mmm.
(119) T : D,D,D,D. Wheres D? (P) Yeah, lamp. . . .
(120) S3 : D. D.
(121) T : Its really thin.
(122) S4 : Sofa, sofa. (2)
(123) S3 : Magazine.
(124) S4 : Ah, magazine rack. N. (3)
(125) T : Yeah, maybe.
(126) S2 : Plants. F. (1)
(127) T : F.
(128) S1 : Picture. G. (1)
(129) T : Aha.
(130) S3 : Rug. P. (1)
(131) T : Yes.
(132) S4 : Sofa wa ja A. (1)
(133) T : Yep.
(134) S2 : Stereo speakers. J. (1)
(135) T : Yes. J.
(136) S1 : Throw pillow. L. (1)
(137) T : Aha.
(138) S3 : Window. I. (1)
(139) T : Yeah, no problems. O.K. So, next.

Appendix 2

Transcript of lesson extract Dec 16th 2005

Key to Symbols

Teacher : T

Student 1 : S1

Student 2 : S2

Student 3 : S3

Student 4 : S4

Procedural (P) = 3

Convergent (C) = 10

Divergent (D) = 14

Student Utterances : 1 = 25, 2 = 13, 3 = 5, 4 = 7, 5+ = 15

Presentation of Lesson Theme

(1) T : So, lets begin.

Teacher writes on board

(2) T : Afraid...scared...frightened...terrified. Ermm...scary...dangerous...
terrifying...Frightening. Can you tell me the difference? (P)

(3) S2 : Verb. Adjective. (2)

(4) T : Yeah, that's right. Yeah, yeah, yeah. Verb. Adjective. So, these we usually use to
talk about feelings. How we feel. We use these to describe places or events.

(5) S1 : Mmmm.

(6) T : So the earthquake was terrifying and dangerous and frightening and scary. During
the earthquake I was afraid, frightened, scared, terrified. O.K? (C) So...we're going
to use these later. O.K? (C) So...first question, What are children afraid of? (C)

(7) S1 : Ahhh...children are afraid of ghosts. (5)

Laughter

(8) S4 : Dogs. (1)

(9) S1 : Eh? Dogs? (1)

(10) T : Dogs.

(11) T : Ghosts, dogs...

(12) S1 : Dark (1)

(13) S2 : Ah, dark. (1)

(14) S1 : Darkness. (1)

(15) T : Aha. Darkness.

(16) S3 : Big sound. (2)

(17) S1 : Eh?

(18) T : Ah?

(19) S3 : Like a firework. (3)

(20) S1 : Ahhh. So neh.

(21) **Pause**

T : Loud noise. Loud noise.

(22) S2 : Odd people. Odd men. (4)

(23) T : Strange men.

Laughter

(24) T : Yeah. Strange men or strange people.

(25) S1 : Homework. (1)

Laughter

(26) T : What kind of ghosts? (D) In Japan...(Muffled)

(27) S2 : Hmmm. In Japan. (2)

(28) T : What kind of ghosts are children scared of in Japan? (D)

Pause

Laughter

(29) T : Is there a ghost called Kapa? (C)

(30) S1: Hmmm. Kapa no.

(31) S4: Kapa?

(32) S2: Ahhh. Kapa.

Muffled

(33) T : Kapa isn't a ghost? (C)

(34) S1 & 2: Hmmm.

(35) T : What is a Kapa? (D)

(36) S4: Long neck. (2)

(37) S3: Kapa is a ghost. (4)

Students speak Japanese

(38) T : English please.

Laughter

(39) S4: Long neck person. (3)

(40) S2: Ahhhhhh.

(41) T : A long necked person.

(42) S2: Woman. (1)

(43) T : Woman? (C) Ahhh. O.K. What other ghosts or monsters are there? (D) Like the long necked woman.

Pause

(44) S2: Spirit. (1)

(45) S1: Hmmm.

(46) S2: Spirit. (1)

(47) T : Hmmm.

(48) S2: But we don't see it. (5)

(49) T : Ah, but we don't see it.

(50) S2: We don't see it. (4)

(51) T : Hmmm. O.K. we call those ghosts. Spirits and ghosts.

All students — Ohhhhh !

(52) T : Some ghosts you can see, some ghosts you cant.

(53) S2: Aha.

(54) T : O.K. So, children are afraid of ghosts, dogs, darkness. How about strange people?
(D) Laughter

(55) T : What kind of strange people? (D)

Muffled/Pause

(56) T : So in...in Britain, when we are children...erm in school we watch...on
T.V...like advertisements. They tell us don't go with strange people. Or erm...if
you, if a stranger talks to you run away.

All students Mmmmm

(57) T : In Japan is it the same? (C)

(58) S2: Hmmm. Recently. (1)

(59) T : Yeah. So children learn in school. When your children were young, what were they afraid of? (D) Do you remember? (C)

Pause

(60) S2 : Lightning and thunder. (3)

Laughter

(61) S2 : (To student 1) You are. (2)

More laughter

(62) T : Thunder and lightning? (C) What did they do? (D)

(63) S2 : Hmmm. They're erm frightened to hear that and erm go to mothers lap, and maybe mother says take it easy. Maybe. (18)

Laughter

(64) T : Yeah, yeah, yeah. (To student 3) Your children were afraid of dogs. What did they do? (D)

(65) S3 : I, I, I say don't. . . .away from. (7)

(66) T : Run away.

(67) S1 : Ahhhh. Run away. (2)

(68) T : Good advice. O.K. So. . . .O.K. . . .Now I want you to work with your partner. I want you to answer the question. Ask your partner, What are you afraid of? (D)

(69) S1 : Hmmm.

(70) S3 : What are you afraid of. (5)

(71) T : What are you afraid of? (D)

(72) S1 : Now? (1)

(73) S2 : Now? (1)

(74) T : Yes. And why? (D)

All students : Hmmm

(75) S2 : What are you afraid of? (5)

(76) T : Speak English please.

(77) S1 : I'm afraid of getting old. (5)

(78) S2 : Hmmm.

(79) S1 : I'm afraid of. . . .What are you afraid of? (8)

(80) S2 : I'm afraid of snowing. (4)

(81) S1 : What? (1)

(82) S2 : It's been a winter of much snow these days. . . .so I'm afraid of. . . .(13)

(83) S1 : Hmmm. Your house will be broken. (5)

(84) S2 : No. (1)

Japanese

(85) S2 : Worry. Worry about that. (4)

(86) S1 : (To Teacher) Afraid it call dislike? (4)

(87) S2 : No. (1)

(88) T : Dislike is different.

Laughter/Muffled.

- (89) S2 : I'm afraid of bad news. (5)
(90) S1 : What ? These days ? (3)
(91) S2 : Yeah. (1)
(92) S1 : Why ? (1)
(93) S2 : Why ? There are much liar, ahh, many liars, in Japan, I thought. (11)
(94) S1 : Many liar ? (2)
(95) S2 : Liars. (1)
(96) S1 : (Unintelligible) construction work. There, there, there are many liars. . . . (8)
(97) S2 : Liars (1)
(98) S1 : Nowadays. (1)
(99) S2 : These days. (2)
(100) S1 : Ahh. These days (2)
(101) S2 : I've noticed. I've noticed. (4)
(102) S1 : I know. (1)
(103) S2 : Noticed. (1)
(104) S1 : I noticed ? (2)
(105) S2 : Noticed. (1)

Japanese

- (106) S2 : I know. (2)
(107) S1 : I noticed. (2)

Pause

- (108) S1 : I note. (2)
(109) S2 : Noticed. (1)
(110) S1 : Ahhh. Noticed. O.K. You note, noticed. Look at she, erm, she noticed to there many liars these days. (16)
(111) T : O.K ? (P)
(112) S2 : Hmmm. Construction work. (2)
(113) T : Lets go. So, Kimiko, tell me what Kauru is afraid of ? (D)
(114) S2 : No. Not yet. (3)
(115) T : Ahhh. You haven't finished yet ? (P)
(116) S2 : She isn't afraid. . . . ah ja. She is afraid of nothing. (8)
(117) T : Nothing ? (C)

Laughter

- (118) T : She's super woman.
(119) S1 & 2 : Yes. (1)

Laughter

- (120) S1 : Strong. (1)
(121) T : O.K. Kauru, What is Kimiko afraid of ? (D)
(122) S1 : She's afraid of bad news. For example, erm, she noticed there are many liar in Japan these days. So, she's afraid of that. (22)