An Analysis of Questioning and Feedback Strategies Using the IRF Framework

Classroom Research and Research Methods
Paper submitted July 2010
to the School of Humanities of the University of Birmingham, UK
in part fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
in
Teaching English as a Foreign or Second Language (TEFL/TESL)

LT/10/08

For an EL class to which you have access, investigate *both* of the following questions.

(a) What are the teacher's questioning strategies, and how effective do these appear to be?

(b) What are the teacher's feedback strategies, and how effective do these appear to be?

Write a report of your findings.

Centre for English Language Studies

Postgraduate programmes, Open Distance Learning
ESSAY COVER SHEET AND DECLARATION

Student ID number	1119155
Module Number (1-6)	1
Title of Degree Programme:	MA TEFL / TESL
Title of Module:	Language Teaching and Classroom Research Methods
Assessment Task No.	LT/10/08
Submission	First Submission
Date Submitted	10th July 2010
Name of tutor	Gregory Hadley
Word Count	4,245

1. Introduction

Asking questions and giving feedback are activities which are central to the role of teaching. There is an abundance of research in both areas, grouping questions into distinct categories; as well as analyzing feedback in order to ascertain both its purpose and its effectiveness (Chauldron, 1977; Ellis, et al., 2001; Guan Eng Ho, 2005; Havranek, 2002; Lyster and Ranta, 1997; Seedhouse, 1996). It is commonly accepted that teachers should become aware of the types of questions and feedback they use if they are to excel as teachers.

In this paper I will explore the types of questions I ask and analyze feedback types in my classroom. I will also examine my strategies and determine how effective they are according to our current understanding of questions and feedback.

2. Literature Review

In this section, I will outline the IRF cycle, and explain how questions and feedback are intertwined in this cycle. I will also discuss where key players in ELT stand on the issues of questions and feedback.

2.1 The IRF Cycle

In language teaching, the IRF exchange (sometimes referred to as IRE) is the familiar sequence of teacher-student-teacher turn-taking in the classroom. In the "initiation" (I) phase the teacher usually asks a question, to which the student responds (R). This is then followed by some sort of feedback or evaluation (F/E) by the teacher.

According to Van Lier, depending which questions are asked, the initiation stage may '…require students merely to recite previously learned items.' (2001: 94) On the other hand, he goes on to say:

> 'At the most demanding end of IRF, students must be articulate and precise; they are pushed by successive probing questions, to clarify, substantiate, or illustrate a point that they made previously.' (Van Lier, 2001: 94)

While the IRF format may not be inherently ineffective, it could be considered restrictive, in that students aren't able to initiate themselves. (Van Lier, 95) It might be possible to conclude, however, that this form of interaction could be viewed as more pedagogically sound if the teacher were to ask more referential questions vs. display questions, which would give IRF the purpose of scaffolding, as Van Lier (2001: 96) suggests:

> 'The initiation-response-feedback exchange, at least when it moves beyond mere recitation and display, can be regarded as a way of scaffolding instruction, a way of developing cognitive structures in the zone of proximal development, or a way of assisting learners to express themselves with maximum clarity.'

Perhaps he is advocating that we design our questions with consideration to Vygotsky's (1978: cited in Van Lier, 2001: 96) "zone of proximal development."

2.2 Questions

We can now focus on the first phase of this interaction pattern. Questions, broadly speaking, can be classified into two categories: display (or closed) questions, in which the teacher already knows the answer, and referential (or open) questions, or those to which the teacher does not know the answer (Barnes, 1975; Long and Sato, 1983; Guan Eng Ho, 2005). It is generally recognized that teachers ask predominantly display questions in the classroom (Nunan, 1987).

Nunan (1987) said that referential questions should be used more often than display questions if we are to have more genuine communication in the language classroom. His stance is not in line with the traditional IRF sequence: '…in genuine communication, decisions about who says what to whom and when are up for grabs.'(Nunan, 137) This would imply that display questions are not compatible with the aim of communicative competence.

Seedhouse (1996: 21), in contrast, states that 'In the classroom…the core goal is learning or education, and both the IRF cycle and display questions are interactions well suited to this course goal.' He also says (19) that the IRF cycle '…is very noticeably present in a particular discourse setting outside the classroom, namely, in the home in parent-child-interaction.' It would appear Nunan and Seedhouse do not see eye-to-eye on the definition of "genuine communication." Seedhouse also cites Van Lier's take on Nunan's idea that more referential questions in the classroom equals more genuine communication: 'Van Lier (1988, cited in Seedhouse, 1996: 20) …argues that there is little difference, in interactional terms, between a display question and a referential question.' One may conclude that Seedhouse and Nunan also disagree on whether display questions are pedagogically sound.

Guan Eng Ho has suggested that questions cannot so easily be dichotomized into categories of "display / closed" or "referential / open:" 'There are frequent instances…where questions asked and initiated by teachers are neither closed nor open.' (2005: 301) She has proposed a third category of questions, which falls between the traditional two categories previously mentioned. Included in this new grouping are 'general knowledge, vocabulary, and language proficiency questions.' (2005: 303) Presumably, she is trying to tell us that it is not so easy to classify a question based simply on whether or not the teacher already knows the answer. She goes on to say (305):

> '…if we are to consider the intentions behind the question, we would think twice about labeling it as a closed type and therefore of inferior quality. And yet, it is the observer's perspective that is made known rather than those of the participants in the interaction.'

It follows, therefore, that while Nunan tells us that display / closed questions are without purpose in the CLT classroom, and Seedhouse says that *any* classroom interaction with the goal of learning is purposeful, Guan Eng Ho seems to be suggesting that effective questions are those which accomplish what the teacher hopes to achieve in the first place, regardless of any taxonomy a particular observer has assigned them.

2.3 Feedback

Feedback is the final phase of the IRF interaction. The Longman Dictionary of Teaching and Applied Linguistics defines feedback in the context of language teaching as '… comments or other information that learners receive concerning their success on learning tasks or tests, either from the teacher or other persons.' (Richards and Schmidt, 2002: 199)

One common practice is to vary one's stress and intonation when giving corrective feedback, and Zamel (1981: 145) takes issue with this:

> '…repeating part of the student's answer with exaggerated stress of rising intonation (a practice I have observed in many ESL classes) does not provide explicit information.'

Feedback has further been subdivided into several "feedback types," such as those listed by Panova and Lyster (2002), including back channeling, repetition, and recasts.

Back channeling, according to the Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics, is 'feedback given while someone is speaking' and includes 'comments such as *uh*, *yeah¸ really*,…and grunts that indicate success or failure in communication.' (Richards and Schmidt, 2002: 199)

Repetition, according to Zamel (1981: 144), would be more effective if the teacher were to incorporate new information into feedback:

> 'The use of analogy and contrast is more effective than frequent repetition:
>
> Teacher: What are you holding?
>
> Student: I am holding some paper.
>
> Teacher: Good. Some paper. Just like some sugar, some coffee. (Emphasis on *some*)

Among these three types of feedback, recasts are the most common (Donato, 1994; Doughty, 1994; Ellis et al., 2001; Loewen, 2002, 2004; Lyster and Ranta, 1997; Oliver, 2000; Panova and Lyster, 2002; Seedhouse, 1997; cited in Loewen and Philp, 2006: 537) Recasts are, according to the Longman Dictionary of Teaching and Applied Linguistics (446):

> 'a type of negative feedback in which a more competent interlocutor rephrases an incorrect or incomplete learner utterance by changing one or more sentence components while still referring to its central meaning.'

According to Mackey (2006: 405), recasts are one type of 'helpful interactional (process)…which can supply corrective feedback letting learners know their utterances were problematic.' Havranek (2002: 268) seems to agree with Mackey, and adds: 'Corrective feedback is most likely to be successful if the learner is able to provide the correct form when he is alerted to the error.'

In order to measure the effectiveness of feedback, researchers generally use the learner's response to the feedback ("uptake") as a gauge (Chauldron, 1977; Loewen, 2004; Lyster, 1998; Lyster and Ranta, 1997; cited in Loewen and Philp, 2006: 539).

Mackey and Gass (2005: 199) have devised a framework for determining both frequency and type of feedback uptake. Their categories indicate how soon a correction was incorporated into the learner's next utterance, as well as whether or not an opportunity was given for uptake or if the learner completely ignored the instructor's feedback.

While Mackey and Gass gain insight by examining the student's uptake and are more explicit in what makes feedback effective or ineffective, Zamel (1981) puts the focus on the teacher:

> 'There are many…instances in which the feedback is inexplicit, unrelated to the ambiguity the student may be experiencing, and therefore ineffective.' (145)

On a final note, it is prudent to acknowledge Havranek's warning (2002: 256) that:

> 'Establishing that a correction succeeded…would require long-term observation of the learner's production of the corrected structure while at the same time making sure that there is no further input of the same structure, ruling out any other source of learning.'

In other words, while using uptake is useful in analyzing one's own feedback strategies at a particular place and time, observation over a longer period would be more telling.

3. Method

This section gives a background of the participants and the institution. It also describes the methods of data collection used in this research. Finally, the procedure for analyzing data is presented.

3.1 Participants

This study consisted of six adult Korean males, ages 42 to 50, studying in a ten-week intensive English program in South Korea. The recording was made of a "Communication" class, using Interchange 3rd Edition, Book 2. The students were all at the same level, "Intermediate Low," according to their incoming Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI). All students had previously studied English grammar in high school as well as university. Therefore, they already had a rudimentary understanding of the grammar being practiced. At the time of the recording, they had been involved in the program for nine weeks, so a rapport between the instructor and students had been established.

The instructor (myself) has more than seven years' teaching experience, primarily with adults. I had been at the institution for one year at the time this recording was made.

3.2 Procedures

The research presented here is based on the first half of a two-hour class, which was digitally recorded and later transcribed. The data was then coded, and tally sheets were used in order to both investigate the amount of questions and feedback (quantitative), and to classify them with intent to reveal their efficacy (qualitative).

 I strive to employ the communicative approach, in which 'students are expected to interact primarily with each other rather than with the teacher, and correction of errors may be…infrequent.' (Richards and Rodgers, 2001: 66) This approach necessitated several omissions from the transcript due to a large percentage of class time being allotted to pair or group work, in which I did not interfere unless deemed appropriate.

The data analyzed consisted of any teacher-student interaction related to questioning or correcting. The IRF framework was particularly helpful in determining which data would be useful in my investigation.

It should be noted that this research is restricted to my own classroom, a prime example of what is known as "convenience," or "opportunity" sampling, a sampling strategy which is non-probabilistic (Dornyei, 2007: 98). Therefore, the implications discussed here are extremely limited in scope and should not be taken to be true for all teachers and students in a similar situation. Or, as Dornyei points out, 'No matter how principled a non-probability sample strives to be, the extent of generalizability in this type of sample is often negligible.' (2007: 99)

3.3 Analysis

The categories used to code the first set of data were taken from the question types discussed by Nunan (1987), Seedhouse (1996), and Guan Eng Ho (2005). I first categorized all pedagogical questions as "display," or "referential." I then ascertained the purpose of the other questions I asked, and assigned them the following categories:

- Other
- Seeking clarification
- Checking comprehension
- Procedural

Using Guan Eng Ho's criterion for effectiveness, I classified my questions as "effective" if I was able to get the answer I wanted during the "response" stage of the IRF cycle. If I had to probe further with another question, I classified the first question as "ineffective."

My corrective feedback classifications were adapted from the observation scheme designed by Mackey and Gass (2005: 199). I assigned each third move in the IRF cycle one of the following categories:

- Recast
- Metalinguistic explanation
- Clarification request
- Repetition
- Nonverbal cue
- Praise
- Criticism
- Back Channeling

Again, using the Mackey and Gass framework, and the notion of learner uptake presented by Loewen and Philp, I concluded my feedback was effective if the student incorporated my correction either into their next utterance or at some point later in the class. I decided my feedback was ineffective if the student had no opportunity for feedback incorporation or if he ignored my correction.

4. Discussion

In this section I will discuss my questioning strategies and their degree of effectiveness. Subsequently, I will examine the feedback strategies used in my class and assess their efficacy.

4.1 Types of questions in my classroom

Table One shows the types and frequency of questions asked in my class:

Display	/////// 8
Referential	////// 6
Other	// 2
Seeking clarification	/// 3
Checking comprehension	/// 3
Procedural	/ 1
Total	23

Table 1

As is typical in second language classrooms, display questions were prevalent. Surprisingly, the quantity of referential questions asked was only slightly less than that of display questions. If we take "display questions" to be strictly those to which the teacher already knows the answer, then the following two questions would certainly fall into that category:

1. *Can you give me a synonym or another way of saying this word?*

2. *What kind of situation?*

However, if we use the third category proposed by Guan Eng Ho, we can label these questions as "Other."

The remaining questions were largely procedural, asking students to repeat themselves if I didn't understand; checking their understanding of my instructions; and giving one instruction in the form of a question.

4.2 Effectiveness of questions

Of sixteen pedagogical questions asked, nine were deemed "effective" and seven were "ineffective." I will now address several examples of these. I will put my expected response in parentheses.

The first question was asked at the beginning of the class in order to introduce the lesson topic:

T: Predicament. Can you give me a synonym or another way of saying this word? ("situation.")

S4: Situation.

The first turn, *I* was successful if we use my getting the answer I wanted as a measure of effectiveness. In the third turn, *F,* I repeated the student's response and started the cycle again with a new question:

T: Situation? What kind of situation? ("troublesome" or "difficult.")

S: Trouble? Trouble situation.

I took that to be an acceptable answer since I was not eliciting a grammatically correct response. Focus on form vs. focus on forms is a valid argument to consider with regard to instructional effectiveness; however it goes beyond the scope of this research.

In the next phase I tested the students' ability to use the new word, "predicament" in context:

T: What was the predicament? ("He spilled juice on the couch.")

S3: Spilled the juice on the couch.

Perhaps Nunan would say that this stage of the lesson was a misuse of class time, since I wasn't engaging the students in genuine communication. Seedhouse may argue that I was using scaffolding to prepare the students to talk about predicaments. Guan Eng Ho might agree that my questions were effective in that I was able to get the answers I was looking for.

It should be noted that most questions discussed here are display questions. Referential questions were generally less effective than display questions:

T: What would you have done in the first situation? (grammatical focus: "would have")

S3: ...I should have cleaned...it immediately.

Another example of an ineffective use of a referential question:

T: Would you have sent an email to apologize?

S1: Yeah, he invite...his friend...out for dinner

If we look at some display questions that were labeled "ineffective," we can catch a glimpse of how questions can shape the discourse of the classroom, in an attempt to steer students toward learning objectives.

T: How did he try to solve the problem? (He turned the cushions over.)

S4: He would clean it.

The student's response was incorrect both grammatically and semantically. I followed up his response with another display question:

T: Did he clean it?

S4: Clean? Oh. I don't know.

In this case I would side with Seedhouse and say that, while the question itself was ineffective at eliciting the "proper" response, the interaction was not entirely unproductive, since the students were sending me messages about what they had and hadn't understood— in this case, that I was looking for a meaning-based response, and not a grammatical one, as can be seen in the next interaction:

T: Ok. He turned…

S2: Cushion?

This time, the third turn was not a question, but an example of corrective feedback, which will be discussed now.

4.3 Types of feedback in my classroom

Table Two shows the types and frequency of feedback given in my class:

Recast	/////////////////////// 24
Back Channeling	////////////////// 17
Repetition	////////////// 14
Praise	//// 4
Clarification request	// 2
Nonverbal cue	/ 1
Criticism	/ 1
Metalinguistic explanation	/ 1

Table 2

The quantitative results here fit current research in ELT, in that recasts were the most common feedback type, as can be seen in the following extract:

S3: Trouble situation.

T: You can say troublesome situation.

Back channeling was the second most common type, and this included comments such as 'OK,' 'mhm,' and 'Alright.' Repetition was by and large used in the accuracy stage of the lesson. When a student gave a correct answer, I simply repeated his answer before moving on to the next student. A typical interaction during this stage of the lesson is as follows:

T: Tony? (sentence with "should have")

S1: You should have studied very hard.

T: Alright. Should have studied very hard.

Here, the third turn begins with back channeling and finishes with repetition of the student's correct answer. Another example of IRF, with repetition as the key component of *F* can be seen here:

T: Wouldn't have.

S3: I wouldn't have gone alone.

T: OK. Wouldn't have gone alone. Good.

I did manage to add a bit of praise with the comment, "Good." Of the four instances of overt praise, I used "Good" twice. Other expressions were "That's a very good question," and "I think you guys have got it."

The lesser-used feedback strategies included a nonverbal cue, in which I mimed in order to elicit the phrasal verb "turn over;"and criticism, where I gave general feedback to the class:

T: I think you're having a bit of trouble producing original sentences with this grammar.

At the beginning of class, I drew the students' attention to the pronunciation of "couch," which I labeled as "metalinguistic" feedback.

4.4 Effectiveness of feedback

Table Three shows the students' response (or lack thereof) to corrective feedback given in my class:

Feedback Uptake

FB incorporated into next utterance	////////// 10
FB incorporated later utterance	/ 1
No opportunity for FB incorporation	////// 6
Ignored feedback	/// 3

Table 3

I would not include back channeling in this analysis since this feedback type was used strictly to indicate successful communication, as in this extract:

> *S3: You should have been more careful.*

> *T: Mhm. Mhm.*

I would also contend that repetition is not in itself corrective, and serves the same purpose of back-channeling in that it lets the student know that his response was understood and acceptable. Zamel would most likely disapprove of my use of repetition, as in the following example:

> *S4: I would have called the hotel lobby.*

> *T: I would have called the hotel lobby.*

In order to make this third turn more effective, I should have incorporated new information into this feedback, for example,

> *"I would have called the hotel lobby, or, would have talked to the front desk, or, would have called the police."*

Of the twenty instances of correction, slightly more than half were considered "effective," if we use the learner's uptake as defined and discussed by Havranek, Mackey, and Loewen and Philp. There was one example of feedback being incorporated into a later utterance, with regard to the pronunciation of "couch."

The following two examples show feedback incorporated into the learner's next utterance, (immediate uptake):

S5: You shouldn't have been more careful.

T: Do you mean I should have been more careful? Should have?

S5: You should have been more careful.

Here, I offered a recast, focusing on the positive form of the modal "should." This form of correction is more explicit than other instances of correction, though:

S5: You should have gone…gone there. Huh? You shouldn't have…uh,…

T: Shouldn't?

S5: You should have gone there with sun block.

In this case, intonation and stress alerted the student to his misuse of "shouldn't." However, I believe Zamel would disagree with my method here, as I ran the risk of being too vague in my correction. Following is an instance of feedback which would likely be considered ineffective by Zamel, Mackey and Gass:

S5: I wouldn't have made a reservation like this hotel.

T: Or, at this hotel.

S5: Yes.

In this case, I used a recast to offer syntactical correction, and the student merely ignored my feedback. Thus, the third turn of the IRF cycle was essentially useless. This confirms what Havranek said about learner contribution and recasts.

In the above example, the student was given an opportunity to self-correct. However, in many cases, the students were not given such an opportunity:

S3: …I should have cleaned it immediately.

*T: So you can say I **would** have cleaned it immediately. Maybe, he **should** have cleaned it…Jerome, what would you have done?*

S1: Yeah,…

While Mackey put recasts in a positive light, the effectiveness of my feedback in this instance is questionable at best.

5. Reflections

I was not surprised that the types of questions in my class are mostly display questions. This matches the current research in ELT. It appears that I use display questions for checking concepts and eliciting correct answers to homework. Before embarking on this research I was not aware of the difference between display and referential questions. After looking at my own question types, I have deduced that the purpose of my referential questions was to give the students a chance to create using the language paradigms presented in class.

My feedback strategies are also indicative of current research in that I relied primarily on the use of recasts. Perhaps this is an instinctive method of correction, which would explain its prevalence in the field of ELT. I was also unaware of my frequent use of repetition as a form of feedback. In addition, the lack of chances given to the students to self correct was surprising.

In the future I plan to use not necessarily more or less of a particular question type, but to make the questioning stage more communicative by giving other students a chance to give feedback to their fellow classmates. I will also strive to give more correction in order to promote learner uptake. Finally, I will do my best to examine the questioning and feedback strategies I employed after each lesson, and to determine the effectiveness of those strategies.

5.1 Limitations of the study

I would like to stress again that opportunity sampling is a less-than-ideal environment for research. The research population in this study is of negligible size and the external validity of this study would be minimal at best. We should also remember Havranek's warning that analysis of this nature would be much more valuable if research were conducted over a longer period of time.

6. Conclusion

The goal of this paper was to examine my own questioning and feedback strategies and to determine their effectiveness. I found that I used primarily display questions, the purpose being to concept check and to check answers to homework. I used fewer referential questions, and their purpose was generally to give the students a chance to use the new language creatively. The effectiveness of these questions depends on the yardstick used—Seedhouse and Nunan have conflicting views.

I am largely unsatisfied with my feedback strategies, since I relied heavily on recasts, which are, according to many, an ineffective form of feedback. I also found that I utilize repetition with no clear aims other than to show my understanding, which is also a form of back channeling. I found that my students' uptake could have been much higher had I given them the chance to incorporate feedback into their next utterance.

It may be useful to delve further into the purposes of display and referential questions, and to use what was gleaned here to determine their effectiveness. It may also be interesting to explore other categorizations of questions and determine to which end of the IRF spectrum they belong, picking up where Van Lier left off. Additionally, the IRF cycle is a fascinating concept and one which, in my opinion, deserves further study— particularly ways in which the third turn can best influence the subsequent initiation phase.

7. References

- Barnes, D. (1975) **Language, The Learner, and the School**. Aylsebury: Hazell Watson and Viney.

- Chauldron, C. (1977) A Descriptive Model of Discourse in the Corrective Treatment of Learners' Errors. **Language Learning**, *27*, 29-46.

- Donato, R. (1994) "Collective scaffolding in second language learning." In J.P. Lantolf & G. Appel (ed.) **Vygotskian Approaches to Second Language Research**, Norwood, NJ: Ablex. pp. 33-56.

- Dornyei, Z. (2007) **Research Methods in Applied Linguistics**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Doughty, C. (1994) "Fine-tuning of feedback by competent speakers to language learners." In J.E. Alatis (ed.) **Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics.** Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press. pp. 96-108.

- Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., and Loewen, S. (2001) Learner Uptake in Communicative ESL Lessons. **Language Learning**, *51*, 281-318.

- Guan Eng Ho, D. (2005) Why Do Teachers Ask the Questions They Ask?. **RELC Journal**, *36/3*, 297-310

- Havranek, G. (2002) When is corrective feedback most likely to succeed?. **International Journal of Educational Research**, *37,* 255-70.

- Loewen, S. (2002). The Occurrence and Effectiveness of Incidental Focus on Form in Meaning-Focused ESL Lessons. **Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation**, The University of Auckland, New Zealand.

- Loewen, S. (2004) Uptake and Incidental Focus on Form in Meaning-Focused ESL Lessons. **Language Learning**, *54*, 153-87.

- Loewen, S. and Philp, J. (2006) Recasts in the Adult English L2 Classroom: Characteristics, Explicitness, and Effectiveness. **The Modern Language Journal**, *90/4,* 536-56.

- Long, M. and Sato, C. (1983) "Classroom Foreigner Talk Discourse: Forms and Functions of Teachers." In H.W. Seliger and M. H. Long, **Classroom-Oriented Research in Second Language Acquisition.** Rowley: Newbury. pp. 268-86.

- Lyster, R. (1998) Recasts, Repetition, and Ambiguity in L2 Classroom Discourse. **Studies in Second Language Acquisition**, *20*, 399-432.

- Lyster, R. and Ranta, L. (1997) Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake: Negotiation of Form in Communicative Classrooms. **Studies in Second Language Acquisition**, *19*, 37-66.

- Mackey, A. (2006) Feedback, Noticing, and Instructed Second Language Learning. **Applied Linguistics**, *27/3*, 405-30.

- Mackey, A. and Gass, S. (2005) **Second Language Research: Methodology and Design.** London and New York: Routledge.

- Nunan, D. (1987) Communicative language teaching: Making it work. **ELT Journal**, *41/2*, 136-45.

- Oliver, R. (2000) Age Differences in Negotiation and Feedback in Classroom and Pair Work. **Language Learning**, *50*, 119-51.

- Panova, I. and Lyster, R. (2002) Patterns of Corrective Feedback and Uptake in an Adult ESL Classroom. **TESOL Quarterly**, *36/4*, 573-95.

- Richards, J.C. and Rodgers, T.S. (2001) **Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching.** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Seedhouse, P. (1996) Classroom interaction: possibilities and impossibilities. **ELT Journal**, *50/1*, 16-24.

- Seedhouse, P. (1997) The Case of the Missing "No": The Relationship Between Pedagogy and Interaction. **Language Learning**, *47*, 547-83.

- Van Lier, L. (1988) **The Classroom and the Language Learner**. New York: Longman.

- Van Lier, L. (2001) "Constraints and Resources in Classroom Talk: Issues of Equality and Symmetry." In Candlin, C. and Mercer, N. (ed.) **English Language Teaching in its Social Context: A Reader.** London and New York: Routledge. pp. 90-107.

- Vygotsky, Lev, S. (1978) **Mind in Society.** Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- Zamel, V. (1981) Cybernetics: A Model for Feedback in the ESL Classroom. **TESOL Quarterly**, *15/2*, 139-50.

8. Appendix: Lesson Transcript

Transcript notes

T = Teacher

Ss = Students

S1 = Student #1, etc.

… = brief pause

/ = Pause

// = Longer pause

[…] = Omission, students talking in pairs

{ = overlapping speech

T: Ok, we're coming down to the wire.

Ss: huh?

T: Down to the wire, this means, near the end. We've only got two more days after today, and today we're going to finish Unit 15. OK, yesterday remember we talked about the 2nd conditional, the unreal conditional, for impossible or unlikely situations. For example, what would you do if you were married to a famous actress? right? How would you feel about that? These kinds of situations. Unreal or unlikely. Today we're going to look at regrets, or something that should be different something that if you could go back in time and change what you did. So language to talk about that, um past modals. We'll get to that in a minute um but first let me give you a quick overview of today's lesson. Perspectives, you'll see the grammar in use. Grammar focus, and then uh after the break we're going to review the listening. Speaking section, where you can practice all the grammar together. Also the writing, last night I asked you to write a letter asking for advice, to think of a problem. Today you're going to discuss this problem with your group members then you'll give advice as well. There's also a reading section with other letters asking for advice. And finally I have the question bank and the language summary for unit 15 so you can review that this weekend. OK let's get started by taking a look at the perspectives section page 102. I feel, or sorry, I felt terrible is the name of it. I felt terrible. So you were to read these predicaments. Let's take a look at this word here.

T: Predicament. Can you give me a synonym or another way of saying this word?

S4: Situation.

T: Situation? / /What kind of situation?

S4: Trouble? Trouble situation.

T: Trouble? OK. You can say a troublesome situation…serious situation. / OK?

So in this case um he says "What a disaster!" Disaster is a little bit stronger than predicament, actually.

So let's do this in pairs, together. Check your answers. What should he have done? Uh compare, do you agree or disagree? Let's take about 2 minutes to do that, so when you're ready you can start.

[…]

T: OK guys, so please close your books. Close your books. Predicament. Predicament number one, first predicament, first troublesome situation. Uh, what was the predicament? In other words, what happened?

S3: Spilled the juice the couch.

T: Spilled juice on the couch. This word, pronunciation is couch. Couch. It's more common than sofa in the US. Spilled juice on the couch. What went wrong? / / Actually this is the answer here, isn't it? Let's do that. (erases whiteboard) What went wrong would be the predicament.

 So what did he do about it? What did he do about it? / How did he try to solve the problem?

S4: He would clean it. Uh, Couch. Clean it immediately. No?

T: Did he clean it? Did he, did he clean? / (mimes turning cushions over)

 (laughter)

S4: Clean? Oh. I don't know.

T: OK. He, he turned…

S2: Cushion?

T: Yes.

S3: Cushions. Turned cushions.

T: The cushions / Over. So instead of cleaning he just turned them over.

Ss: (laughter)

T: Really smart, yeah? It's like cleaning your room and putting everything in the closet. Right? You don't really clean you just move the mess. Um, ok so what went wrong in the second situation here?

S1: forgot{ my best friend's birthday.

       {S3: birthday.

T: Was that a he?

S2: He {forgot   his friend's

      {S6: forgot

         {S4: Friend's birthday

T: OK. He forgot his best friend's birthday, b-day. What did he do about it? / / Did he send a gift? A card? Phone call?

S1: Phone {call to his friend.

        {S2: E-mail

T: OK. He sent an email{…

             {S3: apologize.

T: Good. To apologize.

S2: Apologize.

T: Charlie, what would you have done in the first situation? Would you have turned the cushions over?

S3: No. Uh, in my case, uh, I I should have cleaned, cleaned it immediately. Because of leather couch. (laughs)

T: Yeah. Absolutely. Uh, yeah, so you can say I would have cleaned it immediately. Maybe, he should have cleaned it, he should have cleaned it immediately. Or I would have cleaned it immediately. Jerome, what would you have done in the second situation? If you had forgotten your best friend's birthday, would you have sent an email to apologize?

S1: Yeah, He invite uh, his friend uh / out for dinner.

T: OK. So you would have invited your friend out to dinner if you were in that situation? (S nods) Alright. Nice.

Let's take a look at the grammar. Uh This is where we're going with this. The grammar focus on page 103. Take a second to read that. / / So, this is language that is used to give opinions

or suggestions about actions in the past. What should I have done? This is a kind of regret. / Do you know what I mean?

If you could change something in the past, you would use this language. Oh you should have told him about it. You shouldn't have hidden it. He should have cleaned the sofa immediately. OK? or he should have called his friend right away. But, yeah?

S4: Would have, should have, same?

T: No. Not the same. Because, that's a very good question, should have, again is a kind of regret. Would have is, if you were in that situation, what would you have done? So, you're talking to your friend here, in the perspectives section. You should have cleaned the sofa, right? If I were you, I would have cleaned the sofa. You can't say I should have cleaned the sofa because, you're not him. So you're using the second conditional, unreal situation. I would have done something else. OK? Let me think of another example. / At karaoke, Kerry sang, uh, what was it? Uh, Starship? Do you know? We built this City.

Ss: Yeah, uh huh.

T: I would have sung a different song. I wouldn't have sung Starship, my voice is too low. Ok? So I would have sung a different song. That's if I were Kerry I would have done that. So that's the difference there. In one situation you're giving advice You shouldn't have done that, you should have done something differently; or regrets I ate some bad tofu kimchi last night. I shouldn't have eaten that because today my stomach is painful. Regret, should. Um, imaginary situation, imaginary, imagination, not real / would. OK?

So let's take a look. Complete these conversations, and practice with a partner. Now I know this grammar is a little difficult because it requires you to really think, is it a regret or is it imaginary? Is it a real situation or, or, what is it? So, you can think about that when you read through part A with a partner. One person is A one person is B. Read that together.

Then when you finish move on to section B. Read the situations. What would have been the best thing to do? For example, situation 1, (stands on right side of podium) The teacher borrowed my favorite book and spilled coffee all over it. / What do you think?(stands on left side of podium) I would have told her that I prefer something else. (moves back to right side of podium) I disagree. I think you should have spoken to him about it. (left side of podium again) Oh, yeah. Ok. I agree. So check your answers there. And finally, on letter C, use your own ideas for situation B. For example, the teacher borrowed my favorite book and spilled coffee all over it. Oh, you should have told the teacher's boss, maybe. So you're thinking of your own ideas in section C. So three things, first, role play situation A. Second, check your answers to part B and finally use your own ideas for part B, this is letter C. With a partner, we'll take about 10 minutes. Whenever you're ready, you can start.

[…]

S4: I would have given her a present and should have given her a present. Both ok?

22

T: Should have, I really regret not getting her a present and would have, you're making a suggestion, maybe to a friend. Is that clear?

[…]

Alright guys let's get a little more practice with this. I think you're having a little bit of trouble producing original sentences with this grammar so let's take a closer look at the grammar then I'm going to give you a chance to make some more sentences with it. So, imagine, I had a really tough vacation. My wife and I went to Thailand. I got lost, um, got separated from my wife. I ate some bad food, and I went to the wrong part of Bangkok and someone stole my wallet. So it was a really bad vacation, yeah?

T: What should I have done? Can you give me some advice? / Or, what would you have done?

S5: You shouldn't have gone to Thailand. (laughs)

T: Haha, perfect. You shouldn't have gone to Thailand. You should have stayed in Korea.

S5: You shouldn't have been careful.

T: Do you mean I should have been careful? Should have?

S5: You should have been careful.

T: You should have been careful or should have been more careful. Both are ok. Jerome, what would you have done?

S1: I would have gone.

T: You wouldn't have? Wouldn't have?

S1: Wouldn't have gone.

T: I wouldn't have gone to Thailand. I wouldn't have gone to Bangkok. I wouldn't have eaten street food, for example.

So in this context, a bad situation, a bad vacation. Many things went wrong. So I've got a handout for you guys here. / /OK, the first side is A, on this side student A. The other side student B. OK? So talk about your vacation. I went sightseeing and got lost. So your partner, think of one thing that is positive and one thing that is negative. For example, I went sightseeing and got lost. I'm A. I went sightseeing and got lost. B: You should have taken a map, / I would have taken a map. You shouldn't have run away from the tour group. So, positive, negative. In other words, check and "x" OK, and then change roles. Student B, I got sunburned. Oh, well you should have … I wouldn't have stayed in the sun for so long. Anything is ok. Alright? So, you're practicing this grammar here. Uh, Just read the ques-read the situation I went sightseeing and got lost. What should I have done ?um, I got bored on the beach. What would you have done? I got sunburned what should I have done? Oh you

23

should have / I would have / Shouldn't have, wouldn't have. Like that. Alright? Let's do this. Take about 10 minutes to do that before we go to break. Whenever you guys are ready, choose who is A who is B and you can choose who will start.

[…]

T: What was that John?

S5: He shouldn't have had a lot of money.

T: Oh I see.

[…]

S3: I wouldn't have gone hotel.

T: OK… I wouldn't have gone…

S3: I wouldn't have gone that hotel.

T: I wouldn't have gone to that hotel.

S3: I wouldn't have gone to that hotel.

T: Right. Go to the hotel.

[…]

T: (writes "should have;" "shouldn't have;" "would have;" "wouldn't have" on Whiteboard)

Alright guys let me stop you there. We're going to do a little bit of practice before going to break. Russell, could you choose any situation? Just say a situation, predicament. / So, I…

S6: I say all?
T: No, no. Just choose one.

S6: I didn't understand the language.

T: OK. Thank you very much. I didn't understand the language. Tony? (points to "should have" on Whiteboard)

S1: You should have studied very hard.

T: Alright. Should have studied very hard. (points to "shouldn't have")

S2: You shouldn't have met her.

(laughter)

T: OK. I see. Maybe he met a woman somewhere. He shouldn't have met her. OK, another situation? Any situation?

S1: I got bored on the beach.

T: OK. Billy? (points to "would have")

S2: I would have gone with my new (inaudible)

T: Sorry?

S2: I would have gone with a new girlfriend.

T: Oh I see. Good. Next, I wouldn't have.

S3: I would have…

T: Wouldn't have.

S3: I wouldn't have gone alone.

T: OK. Wouldn't have gone alone. Good. Next situation.

S2: I had money stolen.

T: OK. Charlie?

S3: You should have, you should have been careful.

T: Mhm. Mhm.

S4: You shouldn't have brought a lot of money.

T: Alright. You shouldn't have brought a lot of money. You should have been careful. OK. Two more.

S3: The hotel room was too noisy.

T: The hotel room was too noisy. Jerome?

S4: I would have called the hotel lobby.

T: I would have called the hotel lobby.

S5: I wouldn't have made a reservation like this hotel.

T: Or, at this hotel.

S5: Yes.

T: Right good. Next situation.

S4: I got sunburned.

T: Alright. And John?

S5: You should have gone…gone there. Huh? You shouldn't have…uh

T: Shouldn't?

S5: You should have gone there with sun block.

T: Alright. You should have gone there with sun block or you should have taken sun block. Both are ok. Russell?

S6: You shouldn't have gone without sun block. (laughs)

T: Very smart. Great. And John, how about one more situation? Final situation?

S5: I lost my passport.

T: Alright. Lost my passport. Russell?

S6: I wouldn't

T: I would…

S6: I would have gone to police office.

T: To the police office.

S6: To the police office.

T: OK, I would've gone to the police office or you could just say I would have gone to the police. OK, wouldn't have?

S1: I wouldn't have gone abroad.

T: I wouldn't have gone abroad. I would have stayed home. You should have stayed home in bed. You should have never gone on vacation.

Alright so I think you guys have got it.

So remember this here, should, is a bit stronger than uh, would have. You should have stayed at home. You should have listened to your mother. I would have done something differently. Alright? So this is uh a little weaker, a little weaker but you're still giving a suggestion. This (pointing to "should") is pretty strong, it's more like advice, something you should do. Not have to, but should. So stronger, a stronger feeling. OK?

Alright I think we can take a break there. When we come back, we'll look at pronunciation as well as the rest of the chapter. The first half of class, the focus has mainly been this grammar, past modals. Remember yesterday we looked at the unreal conditional, the 2nd conditional uh, If I were in Thailand I would go shopping at many food markets. But today we've been looking at the past with similar grammar, alright? Would have or should have. Ok, let's take a break and come back in 15 minutes. Thank you.