Exploring the Effectiveness of Spoken English Classes of Japanese EFL Learners

Mohammad U. FAROOQ

This article explores the effectiveness of spoken English classes of Japanese EFL learners through analyzing teachers' questioning strategies, rate of speech, wait-time in interactions, feedback, and learners' language production. As a case study, a 90-minute class of approximately 40 learners was observed employing the "Flint system" and the "Ethnographic approach" common in classroom research. A careful examination of the lesson transcript and the post interview with the teacher revealed that the teacher directed more referential questions leading to the modified interaction which is regarded as successful classroom second language acquisition. However, the production from an average learner seemed to be much smaller in comparison with the teacher's efforts. The reasons seem to relate to the concept of saving face that compelled Japanese students to remain silent when responding in English. Based on the finding, suggestions for how to have students speak out during classroom interactions are made.

1. Introduction
1.1 Description of the Problem

Looking at the nature of EFL learning, one will realize that these learners, as opposed to the ones with a mixed first language and cultural background taught in an English speaking environment (ESL), have considerably few opportunities to use the language communicatively both outside and within the classroom among peers (Farooq 1993: 88-89). This implies that the teacher is the only source learners expect to communicate with, and as a result s/he is bound to correspond to the learn-

ers' expectations in terms of questioning and feedback. The need for this teacher-learner interaction is likely to be more demanding in a setting of Japanese learners that can be well understood through a heavily used phrase 'nama no eigo' (Live English), which reflects the desire of a Japanese learner to interact with foreigners.

Studies relating to ESL teaching have also pointed out the need for teachers' questioning. "In second language classrooms, where learners often do not have a great number of tools your questions provide necessary stepping stones to communication" (Brown 1994: 165, also see Nunan 1991: 192). Questioning is reported as one of the commonly used strategies, and in some classrooms teachers use more than half of the class time exchanging questions and answers. Moreover, in studies exploring the contribution of teachers' questions in second language classrooms, these questions play a crucial role in language acquisition. They can be used to allow the learners to keep participating in the discourse and even modify it so that the language used becomes more comprehensible and personally relevant (Richards and Lockhart 1996: 185). Similar remarks were made in favor of providing feedback, emphatically to EFL learners. For example, "Such responsibility means that virtually everything you say and do will be noticed" (Brown 1995: 28, also see Nunan 1991: 195).

The preceding discussions imply the necessity of exploring teacher-learner verbal behavior in an EFL context, with special emphasis on Japanese learners. The literature also expresses interests toward exploring this particular behavior (McDonough and Shaw 1995: 271-272). Furthermore, the information is extremely beneficial for large institutions with a great and increasing number of classes that prefer teachers to become more involved in verbal communication with their students. On the other hand, a careful inspection of the available literature (Holland and Shortall 1997, Chaudron 1993) shows that comparatively little attention has been given to exploring EFL classrooms, and with the exception of Ishiguro (1986, cited in Chaudron 1993), information in regards to Japanese EFL learners is not available.

1.2 Objectives of the Paper

In view of the questions (Holland and Shortall 1997: 121), the objectives of this paper are to observe an English language lesson by employing the "Flint system and the Ethnographic approach, and discuss on the effectiveness of the lesson. The specific research question addressed is that 'In an EFL class of beginning-level

Japanese students, will the use of teacher's questions combined with modification techniques and feedback produce language from students?' The report will first, discuss the concepts and definitions relevant to the topic; next, describe the steps and procedures involved in collecting and analyzing the data; and last, discuss the outcomes of the study.

2. Background of the Problem

While there are many different types of questions that make it difficult to decide on discrete and directly observable categories (Richards and Lockhart 1996: 185; Ellis, 1994: 587), prevailing studies have identified two types of questions that are broadly classified as *display* and *referential* (Holland and Shortall 1997: 65; Chaudron 1993: 127). *Display questions* are those to which the answers are known and which are designed to elicit or display particular structures, while *referential questions* are ones to which teachers, in naturalistic and classroom discourse, do not know the answers (Richards and Lockhart 1996). Other studies have looked at subtypes of display and referential questions in terms of *knowledge, comprehension, application, inference, analysis, synthesis and evaluation* (Brown 1994: 166). Three additional types associated with the concept of *negotiation* or *modification of meaning* between interlocutors (Chaudron 1993: 130-131) or *modified interaction*, are *comprehension check, clarification request,* and *confirmation check*.

> The concept refers to those instances in an interaction in which the speaker and listener work together to determine that they are talking about the same thing: in other words, when the speaker carries out comprehension checks ('Know what I mean?') to determine whether he/she has been correctly understood, and when the listener requests clarification ('What do you mean, she's silly?') or confirms that he/she has correctly understood ('You stopped because you didn't learn anything?') (Nunan 1989: 45).

Extensive literature exists on how teachers modify their speech in the classroom. The modification has been classified into several different ways (Chaudron 1993; Holland and Shortall 1997). However, the current study intends to look mainly at *phonological* and *discourse* modifications. The former category includes modification of, for instance, *rate of speech, wait-time*: the length the teacher waits after asking the question before calling on a student to answer it, rephrasing the question, directing the question to another student (Richards and Lockhart 1996: 188;

Thornbury 1996; 283; Korst 1997: 280; Chaudron 1993: 128) and *pronunciation*, where in the latter case one of the aspects involves *self-repetition*.

The aspects of feedback are classified as *affective* and *cognitive* (Brown 1994: 28), *positive* and *negative* (Chaudron 1993: 133, Nunan 1991: 197), and *content* (Thornbury 1996: 282) and *form* (Richards and Lockhart 1994: 189;). In general, simplified terms, the function of the first type of feedback relates to the teacher's encouragement, and the last refers to error correction. Another function is expressed as to providing "information which learners can use actively in modifying their behaviors" (Chaudron 1993: 134). A further distinction of error correction is defined in terms of *global* and *local errors*, where *global errors* hinder communication; they prevent the hearer from comprehending some aspect of the message; *local errors*, because they usually only affect a single element of a sentence, do not prevent a message from being heard; context provides keys to meaning (Brown 1994: 263-264).

3. Subjects

The subjects for this study were 38 students in a first-year general conversational English course at a private women's junior college in Aichi Prefecture, Japan. The class meeting, of 90 minutes per week, was the second half of one-year required course. They had been attending another required course of Business English once a week for the same duration, and had had at least 6 years of English learning experience at secondary school in Japan prior to the present college. All students were Japanese nationals, 19-20 years old, and were majoring in Administrative Secretarial Studies. No preliminary test was conducted to evaluate students' proficiency level. However, the students were relatively motivated and their English ability was lower basic, lower than survival level in that they could barely ask or respond to any question without assistance from the teacher. Moreover, the class was comprised of mixed levels and the majority was poor at spoken English.

Additionally serving as a subject for the study was a teacher, a male North American, who has been working for the college on a part-time basis. He had regular weekly access to these students. The teacher who is presently engaged in a postgraduate program in Humanities was selected on the basis of his teaching experience in Japan, willingness to allow class observation, and relevant support.

4. Data Collection

This section reporting the various procedures involved in this study is divided into two phases. The former phase describes the steps employed prior to actual collection of the data, which itself is explained in the latter phase. A detailed account of all the procedures involved is necessary for validating the results as "it is of special significance in qualitative research since there are no set procedures for conducting such research." (Seliger and Shohamy 1995: 245).

4.1 Preliminary Investigations

In order to collect reliable data, it is reasonable in the first place to become familiar with the various instruments summarized in Holland and Shortall (1997: 31-44), and form a basic idea on how they work practically, which one is best suited to the current research outcomes, and whether it requires any modification. After a thorough examination of most of the instruments both in class observations, and through recordings and transcripts, the Flint and BIAS systems were given specific attention, chiefly the former one. As both systems were based on a 3-second recording procedure system, it was obvious to test the simpler instrument (BIAS, which seemed to be the simplest among all the reported instruments with seven categories) and to apply the acquired experience to a more complex one. To this end, following the directions (Brown 1994: 164, 168), the Flint system was tested in two real-time observations paying particular attention to research questions 5 and 6 of the book, which were directly related to the objectives of this study.

However, one can imagine, if a system with limited constituents such as BIAS requires a massive number of grids along with considerable training to cover an entire classroom interaction (Holland and Shortall 1997: 42), what would probably be the case of a system (Flint) which has more contents than those of BIAS. As was assumed, in real-time observation the Flint system did not work properly, nor with the lesson recording, but showed reliability in data when coding were done using a transcript. That means the system needs modification if one desires to utilize the Flint system. The point that "Moskowitz recommends using a chart or grid to note instances of each category" (Brown 1994: 164) implies the system can also be employed to record every instance of behavior, instead of recording instances in a period of time.

4.2 Suitability of the Instruments

For the actual classroom observation, the Flint system along with the Ethnographic approach was selected. In addition to the preceding discussions, following is a rationale regarding these particular choices. Selection of a suitable observation instrument or a combination of the instruments in accordance with a particular research objective requires time-consuming efforts on the part of a researcher because of an enormous number of such instruments that have been developed thus far. Chaudron (1993: 18-19) reported and gave a detailed description of them. These instruments that were developed to describe or classify all types of verbal interaction in a classroom prevent researchers from utilizing them in their present form for specific purposes because of their complicated nature.

There are other reasons that the literature pointed out, as well. According to Nunan (1989: 81) "in many schemes, the actual language used in the interaction is lost." They can also serve to blind us to aspects of interaction and discourse which are not captured by the scheme, and which may be important to our understanding of the classroom or classrooms we are investigating (Nunan 1993: 98). Therefore, in this respect, it is essential to state that despite the diversity of instruments, any researcher or team of researchers have rarely employed the prior instrument as indicated by Chaudron (1993: 180) and Nunan (1989: 83).

For an inexperienced researcher familiarity with the instrument prior to its actual utilization seems to be another crucial factor, in that it may affect the reliability of the collected data. The familiarity would be even more demanding if the selected scheme requires a large number of categories, high-inference items and multiple coding. It can also be justified on the basis of my personal experience of testing the instruments (4.1), that all of the choices (Holland and Shortall 1997: 31-44) must require considerable training before the system can be used efficiently and effectively. For example, consider even in the case of a tally sheet which has the advantage of being easy to use especially for initial real-time observation (Holland and Shortall 1997: 33), initial appropriate training in real-time is recommended (Nunan 1989: 78).

In the current work, following the guidelines cited by Nunan (1989: 82), Moskowitz's Flint system has been chosen as an initial phase for the reasons that the scheme deals with low-inference items and the categories explicitly provide the required classroom data such as teacher's questions, feedback and student's lan-

guage production. However, the system does not provide all the required data for this study such as the types of questions, modification techniques, and the quantity of students' language production. An alternative is to get such information from the textual analysis of the transcript obtained from a recorded classroom interaction (Nunan 1989: 88). This kind of ethnographic record which may undoubtedly be a time-consuming and laborious task, however, serves several advantages: the preserved data can be utilized to validate and verify the findings, for reliability purposes, either by independent reviewer/s or by the researcher him/herself (Seliger and Shohamy 1995: 205), tested against other observational schemes, and to an unskilled researcher clarifying the unfamiliar concepts in a systematic way, help guide the process of the research.

4.3 Real-time Observation

The naturally existing 90-minute class meeting (see section 3) was observed for sixty minutes only once. The students were seated in a traditionally teacher-centered classroom setting: three large blocks of seats, each block with 14 seats. A small portable Digital Pulse Control (DPL) tape recorder, specifically designed for recording voices was placed near the teacher's desk in order to get natural data. The observer was seated by the advice of the teacher in the back to have a wide look around the classroom. In order to have students' cooperation both the introduction of the observer and the clarification of the objectives of observation were done by the teacher at the beginning of the lesson. The objectives were also clarified to the teacher two weeks earlier; however, the kinds of activities teacher planned to have before the observation began were unknown to the observer.

During the lesson, the marked pattern of interaction was that the teacher walked among the students and asked or answered questions individually. Three abnormalities were encountered during the observation that might have affected the data. Firstly, in some of the responses the voices of the students, in particular the ones far from the observer or the tape recorder, were either unclear or inaudible in spite of the teacher's repeated requests for a loud voice. Secondly, although students were aware of the objectives, the class atmosphere appeared to be unnatural, in that the students felt nervous and embarrassed to initiate in front of an unfamiliar observer. Lastly, there was a clear distinction of the teacher's action zone (Richards and Lockhart 1996: 139-140) which was later pointed out by the teacher.

4.4 Materials

The materials employed during the class were a dialogue (Appendix 2) from To-fuku and Shaikh (1997: 22), a general English textbook prescribed by the college for the first-year students of second term accompanied by the dialogue's tape recording; and four large pictures from Hadfield (1984: 37). The dialogue's calculated rate of speed which was recorded in female voices in British and North American accents was 129.59 words per minute.

4.5 Stimulated

In order to know the teacher's view about his lesson, specifically his policy on providing or not providing feedback to the students, a stimulated recall technique (Nunan 1989: 91; Nunan 1993: 94) was employed. A personal meeting was arranged at his residence three days after the observation. While being shown the results of his class observation, the recording and the transcript, the teacher was interviewed. He did not show willingness to listen to his own voice. The discussion that took place for about thirty to forty minutes was audiotaped.

5. Data Analysis

Additional information about categories (4), (8) and (9) in Appendix 1, modification techniques, and the reliability measurement were accomplished employing the lesson transcript. The data were thoroughly checked to establish that no additional alterations could be found.

5.1 Types of Questions

The prime concern was to examine the evidence of the three types (mentioned in section 2) display questions, referential questions and modified interaction in the forms of comprehension checks, clarification requests and confirmation checks, and were obtained by counting the number of occurrences of each type. The Flint system provided the number of questions used. The data were further verified through the recordings and transcript, and classified into specific types as above. The teacher's frequent use of a certain question (see Appendix 3: lines 1, 11, 17, 20), made it difficult to decide on the preponderance of a particular type. This tendency was also noticed in comprehending, confirming, and clarifying information. For this reason, the reported data included repetition of the same question.

5.2 Modification Techniques

Two types of behaviors, namely teacher's wait-time and rate of speech, were a focus of attention, and were estimated using a stop watch and the transcript. These numerical data were obtained primarily for two reasons; First, because students were very quiet during the lesson (which was assumed due to the teacher's fast speed), and because instances of long wait-time and frequent pauses were noticeable during the class observation.

The rate of speed in 'giving directions' and in 'summarizing students ideas' were obtained in 5 and 9 segments of speech respectively. These were instances where the teacher had to give longer directions and summarize ideas and were chosen intentionally, partly because of their frequent occurrence, and partly because of the facility in estimating speech rate. Attempts were also made to quantify speech rate during interaction, for the study chiefly dealt with teacher-student behavior, but these were unsuccessful due to the difficulties in measuring the 'time' factor in short questions.

5.3 Students' Language Production

After getting the total number of students' responses from the Flint system (Appendix 1), the responses were identified and the words in each response were counted from the transcript. Using this information the mean length was calculated.

5.4 Feedback

Frequencies of categories 2, 3, 3a, 5a, 6, and 7a, obtained from the Flint system (Appendix 1) were subsequently reconfirmed from the recording and the transcript.

For simplicity, categories 3 and 3a were combined to represent a single category.

6. Results
6.1 Use of Teacher's Questions

Frequencies of the five types of questions (Table 6.1) were estimated to determine the preponderance type. These were referential (preponderance) and display questions, and in modified interaction, comprehension checks (preponderance), clarification requests and confirmation checks.

Distribution of Questions Types	Frequency
Referential	64
Display	37
Comprehension checks	39
Clarification requests	23
Confirmation checks	13

Table 6.1: Distribution of Questions (frequency)

6.2 Modification Techniques

The three types of modification techniques mainly employed were: (a) louder and slow speech; (b) self repetition of questions; and (c) longer and frequent pauses. Mean wait-time (Table 6.2) of 34 pauses in the range of 1.07-15.45 seconds (sec) was 4.87 sec in A1, whereas in A2, of 30 pauses, it appeared to be of 5.93 sec in the range 1.16-12.84 sec. The total number of pauses was 64 in activity A (Appendix 3).

Distribution of Wait-time	Seconds
Mean wait-time (in activity A1)	4.87
Mean wait-time (in activity A2)	5.93
Mean wait-time (in A1 and A2)	5.4
Number of pauses	64

Table 6.2: Wait-time (in seconds)

The estimated values of the speech rate (Table 6.3) were in the range of 63.89-134.6 wpm, calculated in 5 instances of giving directions; and 102.43-181.00 wpm, when calculated in 9 instances of summarizing students' ideas.

Studies	Criteria	Rate of Speech (in wpm)
Present Study	giving directions	107.57
	summarizing students idea	128.93
	mean rate	118.25
Dahl (1981)*	description by 6 non-teachers	112
	description by 6 teachers	110
Henzl (1979)**	storytelling by 3 English teachers	107.6
Holland and Shortall* 1997: 66; Chaudron** 1993: 66-67		

Table 6.3: A comparison of rate of speech in words per minutes (wpm)

6.3 Students' Language Production

The types and amount of students' language production were specific response: 59.69 %, open-ended response: 24.49 %, and initiated questions: 15.82 %. The mean estimated length of all responses (verified) was 3.35 words (Table 6.4). Total number of responses in the above categories were 117, 48 and 31 respectively. Additionally, of 31 questions, 22 appeared to be referential and the rest 9 were display questions. The maximum length of response was 19 words.

Distribution of Language Production	%/Words Per Response
Specific	59.69 %
Open-ended	24.49 %
Initiation	15.82 %
Mean length	3.35 words

Table 6.4: Distribution of language production (in %), and the mean length (in words) per response

6.4 Feedback

The types of feedback provided were both positive and negative (Table 6.5), with positive feedback as the dominant behavior, about 85 % of all the instances. The most common way was by using 'students' ideas' and 'repeating student response verbatim'.

In providing negative feedback, 'criticizes students' response' was the dominant way.

Distribution of Feedback Provided	Frequency
Uses ideas of and repeats student response verbatim	89
Praises or encourages	74
Gives directions	29
Criticizes students' response	33
Corrects without rejection	2

Table 6.5: Distribution of feedback provided in decreasing order (frequency)

7. Discussion

The aim of this paper was to examine the research question: In an EFL class of beginning-level Japanese students, will the use of teacher's questions combined with modification techniques and feedback produce language from students? On

the basis of numerical data obtained in this study, this question can be answered in the affirmative as indicated by the distribution of students' response (Table 6.4), in particular taking into consideration the quantity of referential questions (6.3.3). The use of individual factors; questions, modification techniques and feedback, that are likely to have effects on the language production will be discussed below in the light of existing theories, numerical results, and examples from the classroom extract (Appendix 3).

7.1 Questions

The teacher's use of more referential questions as compared to display questions and negotiation of meaning (Table 6.1) can be the main factors that helped produce language from the learners. The most frequent type (referential questions) was assumed as promoting greater learner productivity (Chaudron 1993: 127) and involving efforts of both teacher and the learners (Thornbury 1996: 279-280); and it has been reported (Brock 1986 cited in Chaudron 1993: 173; Nunan 1991: 194) that learners responded to this type with significantly longer and more complex utterances. The dominance of referential questions could be associated with that of modified interaction as predicted by White (1997: 47) in terms of confirmation checks and clarification requests. The preponderance of modified interaction type specifically in activity B (Appendix 3, extract 3) in which the teacher created a two-way information gap (Nunan 1991: 50) among participants could be regarded as "successful classroom second language acquisition" (Nunan 1989: 47).

7.2 Modification Techniques

The teacher's longer wait time and frequent pauses (Table 6.2, also see Appendix 3), along with louder and slow speech (Table 6.3) and self repetitions of questions (Appendix 3: 1, 11, 24, 32, 34) appeared to be dominant techniques in modifying questions. Additionally, changing question forms and modifying vocabulary (11, 20, 24, 36, 56, 60), and stressing words (24, 63, 81) were also found as aiding production. There have been recommendations of (a) longer wait-time, (b) reports on successful increase in learners responses of more than 4-5 seconds of wait-time (Thornbury 1996: 282; Korst 1997: 280, Chaudron 1993:128), and (c) evidence of slow speech rate (Holland and Shortall 1997: 66) and self-repetition (Chaudron 1989: 128).

7.3 Feedback

The provision of feedback (Table 6.5) was found in almost every turn of the teacher both by responding to the content and correcting errors (see Appendix 3). It was grossly comprised of 'uses ideas of students' as can be seen in 22, 30, 36, 111, 119, 125, 137, and 'praises and encourages', for instance in 61, 69, 97. However, the teacher was more inclined to correct local errors specifically of the verb tense and preposition as soon as they appeared during interaction (see lines 7, 28, 48, 67, 99, 105, 141), and unconsciously neglected the global errors. For instance, in lines 1-75, the fact that 'Akiko' went to America was not entirely clear to the students as well as to the teacher (50), and during this interaction several corrections relating to the form were made.

Too much emphasis on negative feedback using words may prevent learners from responding. The teacher's comments on his policy of providing feedback also reflected this behavior (Appendix 4). As correction of errors would be a preferred style for some learners (Richards and Lockhart 1996: 189) and teachers (Chaudron 1993: 133, 135, 137), it could have the tendency of giving negative effects on learners' language production since it hinders communication (Chaudron 1993: 135). According to Krashen, "learners must be affectively positive and receptive in order for "natural" acquisitional process to function" (Krashen 1982 cited in Chaudron 1993: 134).

Conclusion

In this study, the efforts made on the parts of the teacher and the learners can be seen in view of the reported quantitative and raw data. Learners were able to generate the target language to some extent. However, the production was remarkably slow with long pauses (57, 96, 100, 120), generated largely with the aid of repetition of the teacher's questions and his frequent and extended pauses. The teacher's speaking speed, initially assumed fast, was also in the range of what was normally considered slow (Table 6.3). It appeared that the learners were generally hesitant (2, 21, 62), spoke with very low and unclear voices indicating a lack of confidence (43, 49, 53, 64), responded predominantly only when nominated (1, 34, 50, and 56). Besides, a clear distinction of the teacher's action zone (4.3) implied that more able learners were the only source of producing the language in the form above. In strict meaning, it is obvious that the production from an average learner was much

smaller in comparison with the teacher's efforts.

The reasons seem to lie in the learners' cultural and educational background, and the concept of saving face that compelled them to remain silent when responding in English (Ishii and Bruneau 1991 cited in Korst 1997: 279). Results in this report also evidenced the potential of this particular learners' behavior during the teacher-learner interaction in EFL classes of these learners. In the light of the preceding situation the pedagogical implications are that the EFL teachers during classroom interactions with the individual students should keep in view the learners' cultural and educational background, focus on minimizing their fear, and refrain from correcting their errors. This is especially essentially since a silent response to a question not only embarrasses a student it creates notable difficulties on the part of the teacher as well.

As recommendations for further classroom research it is highly desirable to look at Japanese learner silence to teacher's questions and feedback as the problem is not thoroughly investigated in classroom observation (see Korst 1997).

References

Brock, Cindy A. 1986. 'The effects of referential questions on ESL classroom discourse'. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20: 47-59.

Brown, H. 1994. *Teaching By Principles*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Chaudron, C. 1993. *Second Language Classrooms: Research on teaching and learning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, R. 1994. *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Farooq, M. 1993. 'Teaching Oral Communication in College Classes'. *Research Bulletin of Aichi Women's Junior College. General Education and Interdisciplinary Research*. No. 26: 83-92.

Hadfield, J. 1984. *Elementary Communication Games*. Surrey: Nelson.

Holland, R and Shortall, T. 1997. *Classroom Research and Research Methods*. Birmingham: The Center for English Language Studies.

Ishii, S. and Bruneau, T. 1991. 'Silence and silences in cross-cultural perceptive: Japan and the United States'. In Larry, A. and Richard, E. (eds). *Intercultural Communication*. 314-319. Belmont, CA. Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Ishiguro, T. 1986. Simplification and elaboration in foreign language teacher talk and its source. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, Stanford, Ca.

Korst, T. 1997. 'Answer, Please Answer! A Perspective on Japanese University Students' Silent Response to Questions'. In *JALT Journal*, 19, No.2: 279-291.

Krashen, Stephen D. 1982. *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford:

Pergamon Press.

McDonough, J. and Shaw, C. 1995. *Materials and Methods in ELT*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Nunan, D. 1989. *Understanding Language Classrooms*. Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall.

Nunan, D. 1991. *Language Teaching Methodology* Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall International.

Nunan, D. 1993. *Research Methods in Language Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. and Lockhart, C. 1996. *Reflective Teaching In Second Language Classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Seliger, H and Shohamy, E. 1995. *Second Language Research Methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Thornbury, S. 1996. 'Teachers research teacher talk'. *ELT Journal* 50/4: 279-287.

Tofuku, M and Shaikh, F. 1997. *Oral Communication Ib, 15 Conversations*. Nagoya: Dick Corporation.

White, M. and White, D. 1997. 'First Things First: Writing The Research Proposal'. In Griffee, T. and Nunan, D. 1997. (eds.). *Classroom Teachers and Classroom Research*. Tokyo: Japan Association for Language Teaching.

Appendix 1: Categories in the Flint System

The following categories were adopted in the study and will be referred to in the main text.

Teacher Talk

Indirect Influence

2. *Praises or encourages:*

Praising, complimenting, telling students why what they have said or done is valued.

3. *Uses ideas of students:*

Clarifying, using ideas, interpreting ideas, summarizing ideas. The idea must be re-phrased by the teacher but still recognised as being student contributions.

3a. *Repeat student response verbatim:*

Repeating the exact words of students after they participate.

4. *Asks questions:*

Asking questions to which an answer is anticipated. Rhetorical questions are not in-cluded in this category.

Direct Influence

5a. *Correct without rejection:*

Telling students who have made a mistake the correct response without using words or intonation which communicate criticism.

6. *Gives directions*

Gives directions, requests or commands which students are expected to follow.

7a. *Criticizes students' response:*

Telling the student his response is not correct or acceptable and communicating by words or intonation criticism, displeasure, annoyance. rejection.

Student Talk

8. *Student response, specific:*

Responding to the teacher within a specific and limited range of available or previ-ously shaped answers. Reading aloud. Giving a specific response.

9. *Student response, open-ended, or student-Initiated:*

Responding to the teacher with students' own ideas, opinions, reactions, feelings. Giv-ing one from among many possible answers which have been previously shaped but from which students must now make a selection. Initiating the participation.

(See Holland and Shortall 1997: 38-39; Brown 1994: 163).

Appendix 2: Textbook Dialogue

Yoko: Akiko, Akiko, over here. I'm over here.

Akiko: Wow, hi Yoko. I thought I would never find you. There are so many people here.

Yoko: I know. It's always hard to find people at the airport.

Akiko: Have you been waiting long?

Yoko: No, only about 5 minutes. I hit a traffic jam coming here and thought that you would probably have to wait for me. How was your flight?

Akiko: Oh, it was good. Very smooth. Of course, I slept much of the way over so it didn't seem to take much time at all.

Yoko: How was the airplane food? Did you like it?

Akiko: Yes, they had sushi on the plane. It was delicious. Let's go. I've got lots to tell you about my trip to America. Boy, was it fun.

Appendix 3: Transcript

Following is the transcript of the lesson's extracts along with accompanying commentaries. Key to symbols: Teacher: T; Student: S or s; Students: ss; Wait-time or pause: [ ] in seconds; Researcher comments: ( )

1. Extract of Activity A1

The first phase of the activity (A1) was a memory recall, and required students, after listening to the dialogue, to respond to the teacher's questions without consulting the text. The students had a chance of listening to the recording four times, and were allowed to take notes. During the question-response session, the teacher nominated the students in turn for responding.......................................continued.......................................

1   T: OK, so one more time. Ah, where did, where did Akiko go?.Where did Akiko go?. Anybody? Where did Akiko go? [4:10 seconds] Do you know? (asks one s)

2   S: (nods)

3   T: Give me your number, first.

4   S: She

5   T: (interferes) She

6   S: She goes

7   T: Past tense, past tense (corrects tense error). She....

8   S: She went

9   T: She went.

10 S: She went to airport.

11 T: She went to airport....Yoko went to the airport to meet Akiko....Where did Akiko go? [2:48]...Anybody? Where did Akiko go? [4:61] Where did Akiko just come from? (with slow speed)

12 S: She...

13   T: (interferes) She..
14   S: She (inaudible) airport.
15   T: Airport
16   S: Airport, I think.
17   T: OK. She went to airport....Ah, Yoko, Yoko went to the airport to meet Akiko.
     Where was Akiko?...Where was she? [7:52] Anybody? Where was she? [6:12]
     Where did Akiko go? [5:29] Nobody?.. Do you know? (points to one s)
18   S: Sushi (does not understand the question)
19   T: Yeah, she ate sushi, but..[3:06] Nobody?...Let's try once more.

....Students listen to the recording again...

20   T: OK, anybody catch that? [2:64] Where, where did, where did Akiko
     go?...Where was (stress) Akiko? (with slow and clear voice) [8:41].
21   S: (hesitates) She went to America.
22   T: Yeah, she went to America...Maybe she was on vacation...Ah..[2:24] how was
     her trip? [2:97] How was her trip? [4:66] How was her trip [3:75]
23   S: She, she took airplane (does not understand the question).
24   T: Yeah, she took airplane not how (stress) did she go (stress) to America? How
     was (stress) her trip?...How're you today? [1:28] How, how was her trip?
25   S: It
26   T: It...
27   S: is
28   T: It was (corrects tense error)
29   S: It was good.
30   T: Yeah, it was good...It was very good....Yeah..So, ah, what's your number?
31   S: Two.
32   T: Please give me your number, first....Um [8:3] How was Akiko's flight?
     (speaks slowly with pauses) [3:16] How was Akiko's flight [pause] from
     America?...What was your number again?
33   S: Two.
34   T: Sorry...How was Akiko's flight from America? [1:07] Anybody? [2:06] Do you
     know? (asks one s) Ok?..How was Akiko's flight? (with low voice, anticipating
     a response from someone) [8:22] What do you think? [2:96] Do you know?..
     How was Akiko's flight? (asks one s) [2:16]
35   S: It was good.
36   T: yeah, it was good, right? It was smooth, right? It was good....Why, why was it
     smooth?....Why? (asks the same s)
37   S: It was.
38   T: It was...
39   S: because.
40   T: because..

41 S: because, sushi, sushi was delicious.

42 T: Okay. Sushi was delicious (ss laugh)...There was one more reason why the flight was good?...Ah, the sushi was delicious. There's one more reason... There's one more reason why, why it was smooth [pause] for her. [2:02] Anybody? What do you (stress) think? (asks one s) Why was the flight smooth?

43 S: (inaudible).

44 T: She...slept (ss laugh).

45 S: She slept.

46 T: Yeah, she slept..

47 S: in the plane.

48 T: Yeah, she slept in the plane. She slept on (stress) the plane (corrects preposition error)... Give me your number.

49 S: (inaudible).

50 T: Is that ok?...So, she slept on the airplane. So, ah...how, how long did, how long did Yoko [pause] wait [pause] for Akiko? [7:88]...I'm sorry, how long did Akiko wait for Yoko? How long did Akiko wait for Yoko? (makes a mistake, fact is Yoko waits for Akiko) [1:72] You know?

51 S: Five minutes.

52 T: Five minutes, right? And, why, why was she [1:3] why was she late?

53 S: (inaudible)

54 T: What's your number again?

55 S: (inaudible)

56 T: Twelve. So, why was [pause] Yoko late? (asks ss) Anybody know? [5:48] Why are people sometimes [pause] late [pause] to get [pause] to the airport? (speaks slowly) [5:05] Do you know? Why, why was she late? (asks one s)

57 S: She [5:05]

58 T: She...

59 S: She met a traffic jam.

60 T: Yeah, she met a traffic jam, right? Or, she got in [pause] a traffic jam......

2. Extract of Activity A2

In the second phase of the activity (A2), the teacher voluntarily asked the students to reverse the process and asked him questions either from what they had listened in the previous phase or making their own questions. The question was then answered by the teacher or transferred to a nominated student. Students were not allowed to look at the text......................................Students listen to the recording again......................................

61 T: Okay, how about some questions[pause] for me [4:11] Anybody? [5.19] Do you have a question? (asks one s)

62 S: No.

63 T: Yes, please have (stress) questions. Maybe questions about [pause] this topic [pause] for me. You can use (stress) the same (stress) questions we've used be-

fore.

64 S: (inaudible)

65 T: How about? What was? Do you have a question? [9:56] Go ahead [8:14]

66 S: What did Yoko, Akiko (s is not sure of the person) eat in the airplane?

67 T: Yeah, what did Yoko eat in the airplane? What did Yoko eat on (corrects preposition error with stress) the airplane? Um, she ate sushi, right? (makes a mistake, fact is Akiko) Ah, what did she eat? (asks one s)

68 S: Sushi

69 T: Okay, good....Give me your number, first. Give me your number, first.

70 S: Twenty-two (counting error)

71 T: Twenty-two?

72 S: Three. (possibly corrects error)

73 T: Three, okay...Let's go...What else? [3:26] Do you have questions? [8:56] Do you have [pause] one? [7: 33] Go ahead..[15:11] Anybody? Please [7:18] Remember, wh-questions ok, yes/no questions ok, right? [9:92] Go ahead. [5:18]

74 S: Akiko or Yoko went to America?

75 T: Akiko went to America, and Yoko is meeting at the airport [1:10] Akiko went to America [4:26]

76 S: Why...um what Akiko do in America?

77 T: Okay, what did Akiko do in America? (corrects verb tense error) Ah, why did Akio go to America? I don't know. Okay, more questions. What's your number?

78 S: Thirty-three

79 T: More questions. [3:99] Do you have a question? (asks one s)

80 S: Where's Yoko now?

81 T: Remember, they are both at the airport now, right? They are both at the airport They are both at or maybe now (stress) today (stress) they are at...Okay, what's your number?

82 S: Fifteen.

83 T: Seven....

84 S: Fifteen

85 T: teen (does not catch correctly) More questions please [4:28] Give me your number, first

86 S: Thirty-one

87 T: OK.

88 S: Did Akiko's flight was good?

89 T: Okay (waits for self-correction).....was.....once more..was...

90 S: Was Akiko's food..

91 T: (interferes) Yes, was Akiko's fifth, does Akiko's fifth smooth? (.does not correctly catch the word and misunderstands s's question)..Yes, it was, right? This is a be-doshi (be-verb), right? (more interested in correcting local errors) Was Akiko, was Akiko's food.....Okay, someone else? [6:17] Here are many people

[pause] Do you have something? (asks one s)
92   S: Ah, yes...continued..

3. Extract of Activity B

   Students were randomly given handouts, parts of four different pictures (see 4.4). Each student was required to orally describe the part of her picture. When a description was done, other students and the teacher asked questions about the contents of the picture. The students were directed to find members holding the parts of the same picture during a question-response session. It appeared that the handouts were given one week earlier to have students work on their oral description. A part of the activity is given below...continued...

 93   T: Okay, ah, how about you? Why don't you begin? Describe your picture. [7:19]
 94   S: There is a there is a sea.
 95   T: Can you please speak more loudly because he wants to get recording.
 96   S: There is a sea. There is a sea. [5:58]
 97   T: Please continue. There is a sea. [5:56]
 98   S: Boy. Boy is. [1:18]
 99   T: A boy (corrects article error) [3:73]
100   S: A boy is [4:96]
101   T: Continue [6:23]
102   S: look like dog
103   T: OK. [9:02]
104   S: dog
105   T: a dog..(corrects article error)
106   S: a dog is
107   T: Umhun
108   S: There is a hole..
109   T: Um hun, there is a hole?
110   S: There is a foot, only a foot.
111   T: There is only a foot. OK.
112   S: Only a foot...swimming [1:11]
113   T: Someone
114   S: Ah, someone is swimming
115   T: Yeah
116   S: Someone is sitting
117   T: Someone is sitting. OK. I think, we can make many questions (talks to ss) [6:68]
118   S: There is a house on the sea [1:10]
119   T: There is a house on the sea (stress)
120   S: (silence) (s does not know how to express) [4:26]
121   T: I think that's a boardwalk, there is a house on the boardwalk, right?...There's a house on the boardwalk going out the sea, right? [2:81]

122 S: (silence)
123 T: Anything else?
124 S: No.
125 T: No? OK. ....This is [pause] at the sea. This is at the beach and there is a man
     [pause] and you think, she thinks he is playing beach volleyball and there is a
     hole [pause] and someone is swimming in the sea.....Anything else?
126 S: [pause] house
127 T: There is....[2: 93] (waits for self-correction)....Once more.
128 S: There is a house.
129 T: There is a house [pause] on the boardwalk.
130 S: Boardwa
131 T: OK. Let's ask questions. [pause] We can ask many questions....Boardwalk
     is like [pause] a sidewalk out to the sea, right?...(while writing on the
     blackboard)...Questions, please. One point for each question [pause]
132 S: (silence, ss laugh, hesitate)
133 T: I have many questions.
134 S: (ss talk in L1)
135 T: This is at the sea? There is a woman or man? (initiates and models a question)
136 S: Man
137 T: It looks like he is playing, he looks like he is playing beach volleyball. [pause]
     There is another man who is swimming in the sea. Ah, there is a hole [pause]
     in the sand. She can see some feet. [pause] And, there is a house on the
     boardwalk....Questions [pause]...Anything? [3:52] Go ahead [3:01]
138 S: How many people is on the picture?
139 T: okay, ...how many are we say in (stress) the picture. (corrects preposition error)
     Once more.
140 S: How many people in the picture?
141 T: How many people are (stress) there in the picture? (corrects verb error)..Okay,
     what's your number?
142 S: Seventy (s makes counting error)
143 T: Seventeen....How many people are there in the picture?
144 S: Four people..continued..

Appendix 4: Teacher's Self-repeated Policy Regarding Feedback

The teacher informed the researcher of three principles and beliefs on his teaching
and providing feedback.

Firstly, students' local errors that include mainly grammatical mistakes must be cor-
rected either by the student or the teacher soon after their occurrence and before pro-
ceeding any further during interaction.

Secondly, the teacher should utilize pictures, preferably with no words on them, and
that these teaching materials should be authentic in nature in order to stimulate real-life
interaction.

Thirdly, the teacher should speak at a natural speed and both the teacher and learners talk must be generated naturally and be "in the air" as opposed to speaking through reading or watching a printed text.

Lastly, the teacher must, all the time, encourage the learners to help them communicate naturally.