

Teachers' Questions and its sequential impact on students' participation. A Conversation Analysis Case Study in the EFL Classroom

Dr Asma Ebshiana

Department of Modern Languages and Linguistics,
Faculty of languages & Translation- University Of Zawia
a.ebshiana@zu.edu.ly

Abstract

Teacher questions perform a significant role in opening and maintaining interaction within the classroom. Furthermore, questions play an important part in designing and constructing the three-part sequence. Accordingly, they have a great impact on student participation. Some questions invite extended talk and students are able to produce substantial long responses, while others invite minimal responses. This article aimed to show how sequentially teachers design and construct the “known answer questions” and “unknown answer questions” in the three part sequence, also how students' responses orient to the teacher's questions. Conversation analysis (CA) methodology (Hosoda, 2016; I. Koshik, 2002b; Seedhouse, 2005b), was used to analyse and investigate sequentially these questions. The participants were 30 adult EFL learners undertaking an academic English course at higher education. The class was held by two native English language teachers, one male and one female both teachers were teaching on the Pre-Sessional English Programme (PSP). The findings show that “known answer questions” allow for brief answers and hence restrict student participation, despite the fact that the teacher constantly rearranges and reformulates his/her questions in different formats in the ongoing sequence to promote participation. On the other hand, “unknown answer questions” provide an extended discussion and substantial responses from students, allowing them to speak freely.

تم استلام الورقة بتاريخ: 2023/9/ 15 م وتم نشرها على الموقع بتاريخ: 2023/ 10 / 21 م

Such questions are non-testing and received more elaborate responses from students.

Keywords: unknown answer questions”, Conversation analysis, classroom talk. “Known answer questions.

أسئلة المعلمين وأثرها المتسلسل على مشاركة الطلاب في الحديث الصفي

دراسة تحليل المحادثة في فصل الطلاب الدارسين للغة الإنجليزية كلغة
أجنبية

أسماء اسماعيل بشينة

قسم اللغة الإنجليزية كلية اللغات والترجمة

الجامعة الزاوية

a.ebshiana@zu.edu.ly

الملخص

تلعب أسئلة المعلم دورًا مهمًا داخل الفصل الدراسي مما يفسح المجال للتفاعل والمشاركة بين الطلاب. و للأسئلة دورًا مهمًا في تصميم وبناء التسلسل المكون من ثلاثة أجزاء [سؤال المعلم وإجابة الطالب وتقييم المعلم]. تتطلب بعض الأسئلة نقاشًا مطولًا ويمكن الطلاب من تقديم إجابات طويلة متعددة، بينما يدعو البعض الآخر إلى الحد الأدنى من الإجابات. تهدف هذه المقالة إلى إظهار كيفية قيام المعلم بتصميم وبناء الأسئلة ذات الإجابة المعروفة "والغير المعروفة. في هذه الورقة تم استخدام نهج تحليل الحديث الذي يعتمد على التحليل العميق للتفاعل الكلامي المتضمن ترتيب الكلام وتتابعه وأدوار المشاركين في الحديث، حيث كان عدد المشاركين 24 مشارك من البالغين متعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية الذين يتلقون دورة اللغة الإنجليزية الأكاديمية في التعليم العالي كلغة أجنبية تم استخدام طريقة تحليل المحادثة (CA) كنهج متسلسل. أظهرت النتائج أن الأسئلة ذات الإجابات المعروفة تسمح بإجابات مختصرة وبالتالي تحد من مشاركة الطلاب، على الرغم من أن

المعلم يعيد ترتيب وصياغته باستمرار و من ناحية أخرى، توفر الأسئلة الغير معروفة الإيجابية، مناقشات موسعة وإجابات جوهريه من الطلاب، مما يسمح لهم بالتحدث بحرية ويحفز الطلاب على إجراء محادثة مطولة بتعليقات مدروسة ومثل هذه الأسئلة ليست اختبارية و تتلقى إجابات أكثر تفصيلاً من الطلاب.
الكلمات المفتاحية: الأسئلة غير المعروفة الإجابة عليها، تحليل المحادثة، الحديث الصفي. "أسئلة الإجابة المعروفة

1. Introduction

Since questions are the first turn (initiation) in the three-part sequence and are the most prevalent in my data, this article examines and focuses on two recurrent types of questions used by the teacher called "known answer questions" and "unknown answer questions." "Known answer questions" are questions, which appear to function as test questions with the teacher in a knowledgeable position (K+) (Heritage & Raymond, 2012). For illustration, examples are taken from the current data such as "*=what part of speech is ↓equal*" and "*what does an adjective ↑describe*". These questions are about grammar which match the teacher's pre-determined answers, since the classroom is constrained by the teacher. The teacher is considered being in the position of knowing the answer (K+), in order to evaluate the student's response by accepting it as correct or incorrect. In this respect, the teachers reinstate their epistemic authority through initiating "known-answer questions" (Hosoda, 2016) Such questions are designed to determine whether the students have understood certain terms or vocabulary. Alternatively, "unknown answer questions" are designed for gathering information about topics or subjects the teacher does not know about (K-) or eliciting students' views or opinions. As shown from the corpus, these questions include for instance, "*why do you disagree*" and "*can you think of an argument or an example*" "*who have brothers and sisters*" These questions make the consequences different in the 'third turns' for instance, in



“known answer questions” the teacher gives a third turn response that suggests she already knows the answer by giving an explicit evaluation as “good” or “yes “that’s” right” (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975; Mehan, 1979). However, on certain occasions, the teacher may employ responses such as “Oh Okay” or “Oh yes” marking a state of change in receiving students’ answers to “known answer questions” (Ebshiana ,2019). In “unknown answer questions”, for instance, the teacher may produce responses such as acknowledgement tokens; “right” and “okay” in the third turn, indicating continuation and prompting for further contribution. This article aimed to examine teachers’ initiations in terms of questions. Moreover, studying how teachers’ questions are designed and constructed through the three-part sequence *in suite*, provides a fine grain analysis to explore teachers’ strategies and techniques in designing their questions which influence students’ responses and thus, participation. After repeated listening to the data, it was found that such questions are overwhelmingly used in the teachers’ talk. Conversation analysis (CA) was used as a descriptive approach to examine and illustrate how these questions are constructed and organised as social actions, given that the teacher directs the interactions through his or her initiation questions. The focus is on how these questions are produced in their natural context, rather than relying on their grammatical categories or counting the teacher’s questions through coding schemes (as in, for example, a discourse analysis approach). Although, there are other types of questions which emerged from the data, those mentioned above are the most common ones.

2. Literature Review

Questioning has achieved analytic interest from the discipline of conversation analysis (Heritage,1984a).Teacher questions play an important role in opening and maintaining interaction within the classroom (Brock, 1986). Through asking questions, teachers perform many different tasks such as testing student knowledge, receiving feedback, maintaining control and the most significant of

all is encouraging students' participation (Kucuktepe, 2010). Moreover, Walsh (2011) states that the teacher's questioning gives the student a chance to present their views, as well as testing their understanding, and development of skills, and actively engaging them in learning. Teacher questions have received significant attention in both educational settings and applied linguistics literature. Predominantly, questions can be classified into two categories: 'display (or closed) questions' which call for information that the teacher already knows or for which they have set up the parameters for the students' responses (Nunn, 1999; Long & Sato, 1983; Lee, 2006) and 'referential (or open) questions' which ask for information which the teacher may not have (Brock, 1986; Long & Sato, 1983).

According to Long and Sato (1983) in their study of teachers' questioning behavior, based on six ESL (English as a second language) teachers, display questions are used more than referential questions in classroom interaction. They also claimed that they are less effective compared to referential questions. It has been argued that display questions are less effective in producing opportunities for students to use the target language (McNeil, 2012), whilst, participating through turns in classroom talk, whereas, referential questions are considered typical for social communication, and offer more opportunity for negotiation and discussion (Tsui, 1995). Similarly, Boyd and Rubin (2006) state that IRE sequences often display questions that do not easily produce expanded output. In genuine communication, most questions are referential, and the answers are unknown to the participant who asks the question, whereas, in language classrooms, the most common type of questions asked by language teachers are display questions, to which the teacher already knows the answer (Course, 2014; McNeil, 2012).

Lee (2006) argued that "it would be premature to dismiss display questions as an ineffective teaching variable for language acquisition before looking into the process by which the teachers and students produce and use them, and what they accomplish in



doing so” (p.708). He maintains that it is useful to examine display questions through a sequential approach. Lee (2006) revealed that from his analysis of a second language (ESL) classroom, display questions do more than just provide linguistic functions, as proposed in earlier studies, (Brock, 1986; Long & Sato, 1983). The interactional functions between the participants are also important for the teacher and the students. His analysis concludes that “display questions are situated accomplishments that involve negotiating the sense of the questions through repairs, using a narrative to link common sense knowledge to lesson-relevant terms, and steering the discourse into a particular direction using multiple IRE sequences” (Lee,2006, p.708).

Additionally, Lee (2006, p. 708) states that “close sequential analysis shows that it is in the production of interactional exchanges that display questions are made intelligible; topics are introduced, meanings are clarified, answers are tried, and resources are produced”. In line with Lee, rather than simply categorizing or extracting these questions from their sequence, it is possible to examine these questions related to statistics and the features of the responses they get. However, this sort of examination would not inform us of the array of interactional work included in generating the next questions, or the interactional function they achieved within the three-part sequence. Also, the relationships between form and function would be absent (Lee, 2006). Although these questions have recently become well-known as “display questions” in the SLA literature, Mehan (1979) used “known-information questions” and Hosoda (2014) referred to them as “known-answer questions”. The latter name is typically used in the conversation analysis literature; (Schegloff, 2007; Heritage & Raymond, 2012; Heritage, 2005, 2013) and will be used in this article .This paper takes a further step by examining the two types of questions *in situ* through the whole three-part sequence in the (PSP) classroom, using CA as a sequential approach. Applying CA provides a deep understanding of how a teacher designs and constructs different questions, and how this is carried out on a sequential basis.

3. Data and Method.

The participants in the current study were 24 adult EFL learners undertaking an academic English course who were recorded and observed in a specific classroom (PSP). From a total of 20 hours of recordings of interactions 5 hours were selected and transcribed. CA framework was used to analyze and focused on the occurrence of the teacher's questions as a part of the, adjacency pair sequence and the post-expansions turns. In these instances, the three part sequences would often include the teacher's initiation question, a student-initiated response, and a teacher follow-up in the third turn. This paper will focus on teachers' questions as a first initiation. The specific design of the three-part sequence has a greater impact on the students' responses and the continuation of the sequences. CA is mainly interested in talk as actions and how the production of utterances "is seen not in terms of the structure of language, but first and foremost as a practical social accomplishment" (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008, p. 12). CA has its own principles and features.

Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998, p. 23) list the following as four fundamental principles of CA: Talk-in-interaction is systematically organised and deeply ordered. The production of talk-in-interaction is methodic. CA should be based on naturally occurring data. One should not assume that a piece of data is not worth analysing before attempting to analyse it. The aforementioned principles are essential to my study in examining how teacher initiates repair and pinpoints the trouble source in the sequence. In CA, only naturally occurring interactions are acceptable as data; every minute through a linguistic detailing for example of speakers' pauses, sound, stress pitch, and also non-linguistic elements, such as strengthening the word or in-breaths, and overlaps is considered relevant in uncovering participants' orientation towards the interaction. I include pauses, I timed them to the nearest tenth of a second, overlaps, prosody and falling and rising tone in order to get a fine-grained analysis through teacher and student interaction. Intonation is interactional resource used by the teacher in initiation questions, providing evaluation and initiating repair in the sequence. However, I only will use them as

an additional data the analysis is not measuring them acoustically. In order to enhance confidentiality, I refer to the teacher by T, and students as S1, S2, and S3 and when a group of students are participating this is referred to as SS. However, their identities such as nationalities or genders are not revealed. The extract is referred to as 1 [AE: TST] All of the interactions in the data extracts were performed in English. I transcribed the various interactions in the chosen ⁱⁱ(PSP) classroom from the audio recorder (Zoom MH2N) and ended up with a comprehensive written record of the talk.

4. Analysis and Findings.

4.1 “Known Answer Questions” in the Three-Part Sequence.

In the present data, the following forms of questions are noticed .

4.1.1 The Use of Wh-Questions

The below example is taken from a reading practice activity session. The teacher situates the topical agenda and checks student answers through an exercise related to a story about Kate. In the following analysis, I show the patterns of such questions and how such questions influence student responses and their sequential process, in the ongoing sequence. This extract has two “known answer questions” in lines 1 and 5-7.

Extract 4-1 [AE:TST]

- 1 T: **what decision did Kate**[make]
- 2 S5: [she]decided to join the university
- 3 S5: and study wh er: (.) French
- 4 (.)
- 5 T: good (.) **what did she do before she**
- 6 **made that decision what was**
- 7 **the fi[rst] deci[sion she made]**
- 8 S5: [no] [courses for] [chef]
- 9 SS: [()]
- 10 S5: course she join er er no she er get a job for one year
- 11 T: yes (.) she got a [job for one year so that she]
- 12 could decide

The teacher initiates her “known answer question” using a wh-question format in line 1. The student gives a response overlapped

by the teacher. In the third turn, the teacher provides a positive assessment, “good” marking evaluation of the preferred response to the question, in addition to closing the segment. Interestingly, after a micro pause, the teacher follows up with more “known answer questions” in lines 5-7 building on the previous question – also formatted as wh-questions “what did she do before she made that decision what was the fi[rst] deci[sion she made”. Here the teacher expands her initiation and asks the student for further talk indicating checking understanding. As the teacher is working on a particular exercise with the class, she has identified the correct answers for these questions in advance. In other words, the teacher here is looking for a particular response. In the following turn, the student succeeds in giving a response in lines 8 and 10 and the teacher accepts the student’s response as an adequate one and confirms this by saying “yes” and then repeats the student’s response for emphasis and to show agreement. It appears from the extract above that the teacher is attempting to encourage more students to participate, while asking the student to elaborate more through the use of a follow up question which is also a “known answer question”. By designing her questions in such away, the teacher’s aim is to elicit a direct, precise answer from the students rather than engaging them in lengthy conversations. This finding supports Wells’ (1993) views who believes that asking a follow-ups questions expand students’ responses which enhance opportunities for learning

4.1.2 The Use of Reformulating When Questioning

In the following extract, the teacher produces several “known answer questions” through rephrasing and reformulating.

Extract 4-2 [AE:TST]

- 1 T: ↑what else would we look for↓
- 2 (0.3)
- 3 T: hhhh (Park) What what makes a good presentation
- 4 (0.8)
- 5 T: So we have the speed of voice, we have clarity
- 6 of voice, we have projection of the voice
- 7 pronunciation, eye contact

8 T: [What about]
9 S2: [make it clear as you can]
10 T: > make it clear as you can< so you need to
11 understand the conte
12 T: good↓
13 T: ↑Something else (.)it is really important↓
14 (0.3)
15 S2: Questions↓
16 T: um N::o before questions
17 (0.2)
18 T: Wha-t what should you start with
19 S6: [introduction]
20 S7: [introducing yourself]
21 T: an? introduction and the:n↑
22 S7: [conclusion]
23 S6: [Introducing yourself
24 T: before the conclusion↓

From the above extract, the teacher begins with a question (line 1), “↑ what else would we look for↓”, to which the teacher already knows the answer since the answer is provided in the text book. In the following turn, there is a pause of 0.3 seconds at the transitional place. A response as a ⁱⁱⁱSPP by the student “[make it clear as you can]” occurs in line 9, after the teacher reformulates her question in line 3, “What what makes a good presentation”. Here, the teacher does not nominate any student to take a turn. What is interesting here is that the students’ answer is delayed. However, as soon as the teacher repeats her question, she encourages the students to produce answers by brainstorming and repeating what has been said a minute before as in lines 5-7 “↑SO we have the speed of voice, we have the clarity of voice, we have projection of the voice, pronunciation, eye contact”↓. Thus, the teacher’s question in her third turn is not a simple repetition of the first question, rather, it shows her reaction to the students’ shared silence in the previous turn (line 4), meaning that the students’ silence becomes a constitutive feature of her reformulated question in line 3. Again, the teacher initiates another question asking her incomplete question (I) “What about”, which overlaps with the student responses in line 8. The teacher repeats the student’s answer in line 9 “>make it clear as you can< so you need to↑ understand the content”. In this respect, this repetition gives an

indication of an agreement. In the following turn the teacher produces feedback in the third turn, as an evaluative assessment, in line with Waring (2008), in line 12 “good↓” which shows that this is the teacher’s preferred answer with falling intonation, marking the closing of the sequence (Schegloff, 2007). Indeed, we can see the teacher is expanding her turn and sequences through another elicitation in line 13, since a new turn is produced by the teacher “↑Something else (.) It is really important↓”. It can be seen that the teacher here uses various phonological features, such as stress, and falling and raising intonation, as illustrated in the transcription. These phonological features are useful for indicating emphasis and highlighting importance. A response in line 15 “Questions↓” by S2 follows 0.3 seconds of silence, then the teacher issues a negative evaluation with prolonging “N::o” as shown in line 16, indicating the insufficiency and dispreferred nature of the student’s answer. The teacher’s third turn response in line 16 implies that she is looking for something else that is preferable (McHoul, 1990; Lerner, 1996; Macbeth, 2004). Meanwhile, when the teacher fails to get a response from the student, she changes the format of the question once again by starting to reformulate the questions from general to specific, as in line 18, “Wha-t what should you start with”. S6 and S7 overlapped in lines 19 and 20, giving the same answer. In the following turn, the teacher produces another type of question “and then↑”, with a rising intonation, called a designedly incomplete utterance (DIU) (I. Koshik, 2002b). The DIU offers the potential for a student to take a turn or self-select, as well as to elicit self-correction (I. Koshik, 2002b), and thus to participate. Having examined and identified the recurrent patterns of the design of “known answer questions”, it can be seen that teachers tend to use wh-questions e.g. “what decision did Kate[make]” as in extract 4-1, a combination of wh-questions, yes/no questions and elicitation techniques e.g. “what’s another word for unsu::re” “do you have (0.2) a thesaurus” “how do you feel confident or not confident=” as in extract 4-2, as well as reformulation of questions

(e.g. “↑Something else (.)it is really important↓” “um N::o before questions” as in extract 4-2.

The following section focuses on how “known answer questions” have an impact on the student responses and how students orient to the teacher questions before moving to another initiation

4.2 The Impact of “Known Answer Questions” on Student Responses

Extract 4-3 [AE:TST]

- 1 T: Wha-t what should you start with
- 2 S6: [introduction]
- 3 S7: [introducing yourself]
- 4 T: an? introduction and the:n↑
- 5 S7: [conclusion]
- 6 S6: [Introducing yourself]

It is apparent that the teacher’s initiation question “Wha-t what should you start with” gets multiple responses from S6 and S7 in lines 2 and 3. Based on the students’ responses, the teacher initiates a new turn by repeating the student contributions in line 4. By replicating the particular verbal content of students’ responses, teachers endorse their answers as correct and accepted, as suggested by (Pomerantz, 1984, pp. 66-67; Schegloff, 1996, pp. 78-81). Note that the teacher adds emphasis on “introduction” in line 4 before reaching turn completion and a rising tone with the:n↑ as a next question in the form of a designedly incomplete utterance (DIU). Although DIUs do not take the interrogative form, they actually function as questions (Netz, 2016), which is the case in this extract. As the form is grammatically incomplete, the prosodic features are recognised by the students as an offer to complete the teacher’s utterance (I. Koshik, 2002b; Netz, 2016). Through using the word “the:n↑” with a rising pitch the students are expected to fill the gap and give the required response. Both students’ responses (lines 5 and 6) orient to the teacher’s incomplete response and produce different responses.

In the above extract4-3 it was found the teacher has employed different formats of “known answer questions”, and the students’

responses are still short and minimal; they tend to be restricted and involve a specific response function as filling the gaps.

The following sections will look at how “unknown answer questions” are designed and the impact these have on sequences from students’ perspectives

4.3 “Unknown Answer Questions”

The following extract is part of a speaking practice task where the teacher has been asking the students about population growth, benefits and disadvantages

4.3.1. can you think of an argument

Extract 4-4 [AE:TST]

1 T: population growth (0.5) >benefits< some countrie:s
2 but can (.5) disadvantage others
3 (0.3)
4 T: can you think of an argument or an example
5 S4 in- in Chi::na err zeh number of
6 zeh population is hard to control [and err]=
7 T [right]
8 S4: =(.) it's hard to (.) manage it=
9 T: yes
10 S4: huhmmm
11 T: rig[ht]
12 S4: [may]be some people:: want more child
13 uh zey awoid zeh:: (0.1) ehm zeh people:
14 who is working for the □government [err to] umm
15 T: [yes]

The teacher introduces the topic and after a (0.3) second pause, the teacher initiates the question as an open “unknown question” in line 4, “can you think of an argument or an example”. The teacher, produces the verb “think” and he uses alternatives in the question “argument” or “example”. These kinds of questions encourage and elaborate student responses. In response, S4 self-selects and produces an answer in line 5. In the meantime, The teacher accepts the response with rising tone “[right]” as an acknowledgement token which overlapped with the student response, indicating the student’s correctness. Moreover, rising tone emphasises agreement and the continuation of the turn thus, the student orients to the teacher’s “[right]” as a non-closing sequence and immediately retains the turn

and completes his response building on the prior answer. S4 continues the sequence and initiates new ideas by explaining and providing examples from their own experience, while the teacher provides minimal responses such as “yes” in line 9. This gives confirmation, which shows that this is the teacher’s preferred answer, as well as the teacher acknowledging with “right” in line 11. The teacher produces response tokens indicating listenership and allowing space for the student to give and express his/her views freely.

Another example shows, the student is having a discussion or a debate with the teacher there is no self-selection from other students. It is noticeable that the student produces an arrange of responses, which proves that they do not have a single pre-specified answer.

4.3.2 why do you disagree↓

Extract 4-5 [AE:TST]

1T: why do you disagree↓
2 Ss: (students shouting answers)
3 T: ↑Bewar
4 S2: I think in some points is true for example
5 the best player in football are the ones who born
6 in January February, but this' (.) doesn't mean
7 that they are smarter than others↓
8 T: ↑okay↓ do you think a child that is
9 born in June or July is more likely to be(.)
10 sma:ll and is less coordinator and small from another
11 child born in the beginning of the year
12 T: Is it dependant on which month you're bo::rn
13 ↑ okay
14 Jack what month were you born,
15 when were you born which month
16 S3: hahah err: em ↑November (.) November
17 T: ↑Omar what month were you born↓
18 S4: February =
19 T: =Salam which month were you born
20 S5: er:: April
21 T: I was born in January
22 S2: >me too< =
23 T: ↑o::h o:h

In the above extract, the teacher asks, “why do you disagree” as an unknown question as the teacher does not know (K-) the students’ opinions. In line 2 the students orient to the teacher’s question by self-selecting and shouting answers as every student bids for a turn. In line 4, Bewar the student gives a response and starts justifying his reasons after teacher’s selection as the next speaker in line 3. Questions like “why do you disagree” are open and complex format of question which requires a fuller and possibly more detailed response (Walsh & Li, 2013). This is because it requires their opinion which the teacher does not have access to and thus it requires student's thinking and this is obvious from the extract above. After the teacher’s selection, S2 starts his response by using “I think in some points is true for example” producing multiple units; this is a long response constructed through explaining and providing an example. In terms of the teacher’s third turn response, the teacher acknowledges the student’s answer by saying “okay↓” in line 8 and uses the students’ response as a resource for her new follow-up question that builds on the prior turn. Interestingly, the teacher asks personal questions individually as the discussion carries on. The teacher in this opening sequence is merging the institutional and conversational frames (Waring, 2009) and as such transforming the personal interests of the students into relevant topics which can be shared by others in the classroom. Such questions invite students to produce extended turns in English, and this may encourage language development.

Having described the design of “unknown answer questions”, the following section focuses on how such questions have an impact on the student responses and how student responses set up the following turn.

4.4The Impact of “Unknown Answer Questions” on the Student Responses

The following extract is from a reading practice exercise; the teacher is checking the class homework through asking questions on the work they have been set.

Extract 4-10 [AE:TST:]

1 T: =>if you think< about different countrie:s
2 it could have a greater
3 effect in some (0.2)
4 [countries `yes can you give an example □Hamza`]
5 S5: [if we-if we write]
6 something that argued that we support one
7 side
8 (.) for example (0.5) that the::
9 err:: err:: population □growth can be affect(.)
10 err:: (.) the □economy err err err
11 argued case be□cause >argued but a-a-<
12 and left till that you support your: (.)
13 ah opin□ion fo ex□ample err by err
14 changed the population fro:m err consumers(5.0)
15 to be (0.5) producer (0.2)pro-u[h produ]cer
16 T: [fine]
17 S5: and the=
18 T: =yes=
19 S5: =and the-as with they mentioned
20 in there (1)
21 T: >good [yes<]
22 S5: [in the] text (.)and the-other thing
23 S5: by err immigra-□immigration (0.5)
24 =immigration it will be a solution for that=
25 T: =fine
26 S5: >for that for err so if< any situa27 if any
situation(.)for(pleasure1 and)
28 population it can be solved (0.5) it's not a
29 big deal
30 T: right=

In the above extract, the teacher begins his turn using an elicitation in line 1 “=>if you think< about different countrie:s it could have a greater effect in some (0.5) [countries `yes can you give an example □Hamza`]”. The teacher uses an unknown answer question and selects S5 as the next speaker open question. The teacher also employs the syntax of the ‘if’ conditional and the verb ‘think’. Using this verb encourages the students’ participation by prompting them to think closely about their answer. The teacher allocates the turn by naming the student selecting S5 in line 4 to answer his question. The student responds in lines 5 to 15, with a long turn. The student uses self-repair in their turn sequence, and as a result there are non-

lexical perturbations e.g. err, and sound stretching “the::: err::: err:::” for example in lines 8 to 10. The teacher offers a positive assessment as an agreement in line 16 “[fine]”, and comes in overlap with the student’s continuation, while the assessment occurs later after the student has reached a TRP. The student expands his turn as an SPP in the following sequence by initiating “and the=” the teacher evaluates in the third turn using “=yes=” in line 18, although the student response is incomplete. Here, the teachers’ latching turns made the conversation go smoothly; there are no gaps or silences. The student holds the turn again and completes his answer in lines 22-24, where he refers to the text book “[in the] text (.)and the other thing by err immigra-timmigration (0.5)”. The student clarifies with examples referring to the text and continues the conversation, whereas the teacher’s responses are minimal. It is clear that such questions do encourage long responses and the student is giving genuine knowledge and the teacher is providing space through giving minimal response tokens such as “right”, “fine” as positive assessment indicating agreement and acceptance. In relation to the sequence organization, there are also very few overlaps, which means that turn taking ensues without any trouble of transition, since the teacher here allocates the turns by selecting the next speaker, as in line 4. Remarkably, the student is opening the sequence in each turn and also after the teacher produces his evaluation.

5. Discussion

In the present article the analysis shows that in the design of the “known answer questions” the, teacher either reformulates questions several times, after recurrent pauses as in extract 4-2 or he/s may expand on the same question through adding extra ^{iv}TCUs. It was found that teachers deploy questions that include ‘wh- or yes-no’ questions in terms of alternative questions and what Koshik, (2002b) calls (DIUs) as these questions invite different kinds of responses. This reformulation is important in a teacher-student exchange where there is a certain need to verify that all students



have understood an individual student's contribution, as suggested by Walsh & Li (2013). It was revealed that certain prosodic patterns are common in my data. The teacher produces a cluster of prosodic features, involving high intonation, stress, and falling pitch. For example, in extract 4-3 the teacher employs rising tone and emphasis to provide students with the opportunity to recognize what is left unsaid and thus, to complete the teacher's unfinished utterance.

On the other hand, the analysis shows that "unknown answer questions" are designed to be very broad (see extracts 4-5&4-6), in a sense they invite more responses than "known answer questions". Furthermore, it is obvious that students' turns and responses are expanded more than in extracts 4-1 & 4-2. It is the question design that invites longer responses and students are able to elaborate more on their responses. This is because open questions such as "*can you think of example*" "*why do you disagree*" invite more than a single word or phrase and the students are free to share their opinions and thoughts with the teacher. In "unknown answer question" the teacher provides an extended wait time, encouraging student participation. These findings are in line with (Walsh, 2002, 2011b) and İnceçay (2010). Thus, the time used by the teacher to answer a question not only develops the number of learner responses, it also results in more complex responses, which may lead to an increase in learner interaction, as suggested by Nunan (1991).

In terms of their design, "known answer questions" initiate the typical question-answer exchange in the three-part sequence. The teacher asks the question and the student responds in the second turn, followed by the teachers' evaluation such as "good" or "okay" in the third turn demonstrating a closing sequence. It was found that such questions have an impact on the student responses. The analysis shows that teachers "known answer questions" are designed to seek a specific kind of response, since the teacher has set up the answers in advance. In terms of their sequence the analysis shows that "known answer questions" usually get evaluating responses in the teacher's third turn that shows the teacher already

knew the answer e.g. “good”, “yes that’s right” and treats the responses as preferred and accurate information. This finding supports Mehan’s views, (1979). In that he believes evaluation is an essential interactional component in the third turn sequence. It contributes information to students about the teachers' goals, and contributes to the negotiation of a reciprocally adequate response. Also, it is a feature that differentiates conversations that occur in classrooms from those that occur in ordinary settings.

It was found that teachers implement an array of interactive resources to elicit student responses. For instance, the teacher uses different structures in designing questions. The analysis shows that the teacher deploys questions that include ‘wh- or yes-no’ questions in terms of alternative questions and what Koshik, (2002b) calls (DIUs) as these questions invite different kinds of responses. On some occasions, the teacher delays his acknowledgement or evaluation by asking yes or no questions, since he was seeking answers that are more specific. Initiation turns with ‘wh’ interrogatives open up a wider range of sequential trajectories. The teacher breaks down her sequence through the reformulation of different formats of known questions. This reformulation is important in a teacher-student exchange where there is a certain need to verify that all students have understood an individual student’s contribution, as suggested by Walsh & Li (2013). Also such questions are not randomly chosen, they are systematically selected according to the teacher’s pedagogical engagement in such activities – this finding supports Margutti and Drew (2014), who remarked that the questions were chosen in relation to their pedagogical purposes, guiding the students to the preferred responses. Pedagogically, both types of questions are useful in encouraging student participation. Examining extended sequences of talk demonstrates that some sequences can benefit from encouraging short answers, while some sequences are perfectly appropriate in encouraging more participation. If we enlarge our analytical focus, we are able to see that such questions are appropriate in different environments. Therefore, it is not a

straightforward approach where one type of questioning should be used exclusively, rather, both types of questions are appropriate in different cases. For example, if the teacher is doing a simplistic repair on the student response, the teacher most likely needs a specific answer or one single word to be repaired then the teacher produces a confirmation. It would be an appropriate response for this type of question. However, if the teacher's goal is to encourage more discussion in the class then "unknown answer questions" type will be appropriate. Teachers effectively tailor questioning to specific circumstances in sequences.

6. Conclusion

In conclusion, the analysis found that in the first part of the sequence, the teachers design their questions as "known answer questions" and "unknown answer questions". It was found that "known answer questions" tend to encourage a single word or a phrase, thus inviting short responses from the student, while "unknown answer questions" invite more than a single phrase, and students tend to produce more variety in their answers. The analysis revealed that the type-connected answer in a "known answer question" is often a single word, limiting and constraining the student's response. These findings support previous studies, (e.g. Long and Sato, 1983; Brock, 1986). However, the sequential approach taken in the current article has raised questions about seeing different types of questions as effective or less effective. It was found that teachers implement an array of interactive resources to elicit student responses. For instance, the teacher uses different structures in designing questions. The analysis shows that the teacher deploys questions that include 'wh- or yesno' questions in terms of alternative questions and DIUs as these questions fill the gaps, which invite typical responses.

7. References



تم استلام الورقة بتاريخ: 2023/9/ 15 م وتم نشرها على الموقع بتاريخ: 2023/ 10 / 21 م

- Boyd, M., & Rubin, D. (2006). How Contingent Questioning Promotes Extended Student Talk: A Function of Display Questions. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 38(2), 141- 169. doi:10.1207/s15548430jlr3802_2.
- Brock, C. A. (1986). The effects of referential questions on ESL classroom discourse. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20(1), 47-59.
- Course, S. (2014). ELT Students' Use of Teacher Questions in Peer Teaching. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 158, 331-336. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.12.096.
- Ebshaina, A. (2019). Investigating Three-part Sequence in Classroom interaction: A Case study of Pre-Sessional Program (PSP) as English for Academic Purposes (EAP) University Classroom. PhD dissertation. University of Huddersfield, Huddersfield.
- Heritage, J. (1984a). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement In J. Heritage & J. M. Atkinson (Eds.), *Structures of social action: studies in Conversation Analysis* (pp. 299-345). Newcastle: CUP.
- Heritage, J., & Raymond, G. (2012). Navigating epistemic landscapes: Acquiescence, agency and resistance in responses to polar questions. *Questions: Formal, functional and interactional perspectives*, 179-192.
- Hosoda, Y. (2016). Teacher deployment of 'oh' in known-answer question sequences. *Classroom Discourse*, 7(1), 58-84.
- Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation Analysis: Principles, practice and applications*. Cambridge, England: Polity.
- İnceçay, G. (2010). The role of teacher talk in young learners' language process. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 277-281.
- Koshik, I. (2002b). Designedly Incomplete Utterances: A Pedagogical Practice for Eliciting Knowledge Displays in Error Correction Sequences. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 35(3), 277-309. doi:10.1207/S15327973RLSI3503_



تم استلام الورقة بتاريخ: 2023/9/15 م وتم نشرها على الموقع بتاريخ: 2023/10/21 م

- Kucuktepe, C. (2010). Examination of question types used by elementary school teachers in the process of teaching and learning. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 5190-5195.
- Lee, Y. A. (2006). Respecifying display questions: Interactional resources for language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(4), 691-713.
- Lerner, G. H. (1996). On the "semi-permeable" character of grammatical units in conversation: Conditional entry into the turn space of another speaker. *Studies in interactional sociolinguistics*, 13, 238-276.
- Long, M. H., & Sato, C. J. (1983). Classroom foreigner talk discourse: Forms and functions of teachers' questions. *Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition*, 268-285.
- Macbeth, D. (2004). The relevance of repair for classroom correction. *Language in Society*, 33(5), 703-736.
- Margutti, P., & Drew, P. (2014). Positive Evaluation of Student Answers in Classroom Instruction. *Language and Education*, 28(5), 436-458. doi:10.1080/09500782.2014.898650
- McHoul, A. W. (1990). The organization of repair in classroom talk. *Language in Society*, 19(03), 349-377.
- McNeil, L. (2012). Using talk to scaffold referential questions for English language learners. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28(3), 396-404.
- Mehan, H. (1979). 'What time is it, Denise?': Asking known information questions in classroom discourse. *Theory Into Practice*, 18(4), 285-294.
- Netz, H. (2016). Designedly incomplete utterances and student participation. *Linguistics and education*, 33, 56-73.
- Nunan, D. (1991). *Understanding language classrooms: A guide for teacher-initiated action*: Prentice Hall Internat
- Nunn, R. (1999). THE PURPOSES OF LANGUAGE TEACHERS' QUESTIONS. *IRAL International Review of Applied Linguistics in*



تم استلام الورقة بتاريخ: 2023/9/15 م وتم نشرها على الموقع بتاريخ: 2023/10/21 م

- Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shaped. In J. In: Atkinson & H. Maxwell, John (Eds.), Structures of Social Action (pp. 57-101). Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). Sequence organization in interaction: Volume 1: A primer in conversation analysis (Vol. 1). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff. (1996). Turn organization: One intersection of grammar and interaction. Studies in interactional sociolinguistics, 13, 52-133.
- Seedhouse, P. (2005a). Conversation analysis and language learning. Language teaching, 38(4), 165-187.
- Sinclair, J. M., & Coulthard, M. (1975). Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Tsui, A. B. (1995). Introducing classroom interaction. London: Penguin Books.
- Walsh, S., & Li, L. (2013). Conversations as space for learning. International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 23(2), 247-266.
- Walsh, S., & Li, L. (2013). Conversations as space for learning. International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 23(2), 247-266.
- Waring, H. Z. (2008). Using explicit positive assessment in the language classroom: IRF, feedback, and learning opportunities. The Modern Language Journal, 92(4), 577- 594.
- Waring, H. Z. (2009). Moving out of IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback): A single case analysis. Language Learning, 59(4), 796-824.

SPP Second Pair Part
PSP Pre-sessional program
TCU Turn- Constructional Unit