

영어어문교육 9권 특별호 2003년 가을

A Small Scale Investigation into Teacher Questions in the Primary English Classroom

Kyung-Suk Chang

(Korea Institute of Curriculum & Evaluation)

Chang, Kyung-Suk (2003). A small scale investigation into teacher questions in the primary English classroom. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 9(Special Edition)*, 39-60.

The purpose of the present classroom research is to investigate teacher talk in the primary English classroom with special reference to teacher questions. The analysis of the recorded teacher questions reveals that the teacher asks a carefully structured sequence of questions leading to the clear pedagogical goals she has set: to encourage students to correct themselves; to find out what students know; to personalize the task; and to elicit culture talk. It is also shown that her use of display questions is supportive of learning; the teacher provides feedback in a way which is as communicative as possible in the context of the classroom and which facilitates the attainment of the pedagogical purposes. All these findings suggest that we consider how teacher talk may perform communicative functions in the classroom context rather than defining communicative teacher talk purely in terms of the norms of communication outside the classroom.

[teacher talk/teacher question/classroom research/young learners,
교사질문/교실연구/초등영어교육]

1. INTRODUCTION

Interest in what actually happens in a second language classroom, as opposed to what people think happens, has been growing (Allwright, 1988; Ellis, 1985; Long 1980 & 1983; Nunan, 2000). It has been widely recognized that the classroom is not an impenetrable 'black box', but the setting for a vital field of inquiry (Long,

1980:3). Van Lier (1988:47) defines the language classroom as the gathering, for a given period of time, of two or more persons for the purposes of language learning. He argues that this is the setting of classroom research, the place where the data are found. In a similar context, Gaies (1980) notes that the classroom is the crucible place where teachers and learners come together and language learning happens. Throughout the present study, language classroom investigation, in Allwright and Bailey's (1991:3) terms, refers to research into language learning and teaching, all or part of whose data are derived from the observation or measurement of the classroom performance of teachers and students.

The present paper gives an account of a small-scale classroom investigation. The first part of the paper describes the background of the research. Then the methodology employed for the investigation is described. The third part gives a descriptive account of the data collected. The findings of the investigation are discussed in the final part of the paper. Some excerpts from the transcript of the class under investigation appears in the appendix.

II. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

1. Teacher Questions in Teacher Talk

Studies on second language acquisition have found that comprehensible input is essential for language acquisition (Krashen, 1981; Lightbown & Spada 1999). Recent interest in teacher talk reflects the importance of comprehensible input. It has been suggested that teacher talk can be a valuable source of comprehensible input. Studies of second language classroom interaction have focused on the kind of questions teachers ask, the speech modifications they make when talking to learners, or the way they react to student errors (Allwright & Bailey, 1991; Chaudron, 1988). These features of teacher talk have been examined in terms of how effective they are in facilitating learning and promoting communicative interaction in the classroom.

Teacher questions as an important aspect of teacher talk have received much attention in second language classroom research. Banbrook and Skehan (1989, in Richards & Lockhart, 1994: 185) emphasize the important role of teacher questions in keeping the learner's participation in the discourse and making the language used more comprehensible and personally relevant. A distinction has been made between

display questions and referential questions. Display questions are ones to which the asker knows the answer, whereas referential ones are those to which the questioner does not know the answer.

Long and Sato(1983, in Nunan, 2000) found that display questions were predominant in language classrooms. On the other hand, outside the classroom, the opposite was the case. Nunan (2000:194) found that the teacher's referential questions prompted students to provide more complex language. In this respect, it has been suggested that teachers should increase the use of referential questions in the communicative language classroom. All these findings and suggestion reflect an attempt to characterize the communicativeness of teacher talk in terms of features of authentic communication which are pertinent outside the classroom.

More recently, Cullen (1998: 180) notes that the criteria for assessing the communicativeness of classroom discourse are taken from what is perceived to constitute communicative behaviour in the world outside the classroom. He further argues that the criteria ignore the reality of the classroom context and the features which make for effective communication within that context. He claims that the application of criteria of communicativeness solely on the basis of social behaviour which exists in certain contexts outside the classroom could result in an inappropriate and ultimately unattainable model for the majority of language teachers to follow. Cullen(1998:183) suggests that rather than defining communicative teacher talk purely in terms of the norms of communication outside the classroom, it would be more productive and realistic to consider how teacher talk may perform communicative functions in the classroom context. In other words, he suggests that attempts to define communicative talk in the classroom must be based primarily on what is or is not communicative in the context of the classroom itself, rather than on what may or may not be communicative in other contexts. His assertion is based on Breen and Candlin's (1980) observation that the classroom is a unique social environment with its own human activities and its own conventions governing these activities. It has been recognized that attempts should be made to determine what it means to be communicative in the classroom context and the importance of the pedagogical function of teacher talk within the classroom context.

2. The Focus and Aims of the Investigation

The present study investigated the question: In what ways does the context of the primary English class affect teacher questions? It particularly aimed to see how

communication took place through display questions within the classroom context. It also focused on pedagogical purposes that display questions served in the given context.

III. METHODOLOGY

1. The Context of the Investigation

The participants were ten children learning English in a university language center in S city. They shared Korean as their mother tongue. They attended different local primary schools and were in the fourth and fifth grade. They ranged in age from ten to twelve years. Half of them were boys and the other half were girls. They had been learning English at least two and a half years in the language center. The teacher was a native speaker from Australia. She had taught English in Korea for three and a half years. She had had experience in teaching English in primary schools in Australia for more than twenty years.

The observed class was part of an English program called Super Kids, which the language center had run for local children since 1995. The textbook the class used was a commercial one called 'Firsthand Access'. The aim of the lesson under investigation was to check the students' grammatical competence in the use of Wh questions. The students were given the task to put the words in the correct order, crossing out one extra word. While the students were doing the task, the teacher circulated and helped them. Check-up and further activities were followed.

2. The Investigation Procedure

The data were gathered through a three-stage procedure. Before the classroom observation, the investigator met the teacher and got permission for observation. The researcher was given a copy of the lesson materials as well as biographical data of the students and the teacher. Then five lessons were observed and filmed. Notes were taken to facilitate the transcription and interpretation process later. In the follow-up stage, the lessons were transcribed and the video was played back for the post-lesson debriefing session, which played an important role in interpreting the gathered data. The data from the transcript, the researcher's

observation notes and the post-lesson annotations were analysed by using a qualitative data analysis procedure called triangulation, which used multiple methods to provide a basis for research. It was assumed that the triangulation strategy would improve the validity of the investigation as multiple perspectives were examined. The extracts of the researcher's notes and the post-lesson annotations were given in the data analysis section to strengthen arguments.

3. Problems Anticipated and Encountered

It was expected that there would be a difficulty getting permission to conduct the present investigation from the university language center. The researcher had to meet the director of the center several times and explain her personal interest and need for the present classroom observation. Eventually, with the help of the teacher, the researcher could gain access to the class for the purpose of the research.

The technician was not available so the investigator had to operate the video tape recorder herself. This affected the amount of the field notes she took during the observation. Another concern related to the video tape recorder was its disruptive influence on classroom behaviour pattern because of its novelty. However, the novelty seemed to disappear rapidly as the class became accustomed to its presence. It took about five minutes.

Confidentiality was closely related to the interests of subjects. Before the observation, the investigator orally promised that in any case, the identities of participants would be confidential and pseudonyms would be used when individuals were referred to in the report.

IV. DATA ANALYSIS: TEACHER QUESTIONS IN ACTION

Display questions the teacher asked were classified into four groups according to the instructional goals they intended to serve. They were analysed to see how communication took place within the classroom context in order to achieve the goals. The following fragments of the lesson were transcribed from a video recording of the lesson.

1. To Encourage Students to Correct Themselves

When the teacher found errors in the students' written work, she encouraged them to correct themselves, instead of telling directly what the correct answer was. The following occasion illustrates that the teacher asked questions to help the student change the first letter of the sentence to a capital letter.

T: It's a question. What do we start with the first letter, Mike? Peter, too. Good. Good, girl. What is the first letter of a sentence, Lucy? How do we write it, Sue, first letter of a sentence? He, okay, can you write it as a first letter? What do we do?

L8: Do.

T: No, no, no. Look at HE. Look at this H. When we use as a first letter of a sentence, well, what happens with the W?

L8: (coughing) (correcting the error)

T: Okay.

On reviewing the lesson transcript, the teacher made the comment that it was important to call students' attention to the error in the meaningful learning. As the researcher observed the lesson, she noted:

The class looked quite familiar with the way the teacher provided feedback. Immediately after the teacher's question, most of them changed the errors themselves.

She gave some examples of helping her students correct themselves. One example was that she highlighted errors by saying loudly until the student got the correct answer.

2. To Find out What Students Know

There were some occasions when the teacher asked questions to find out what the students already knew before telling them. This is illustrated in the following lesson extract:

T: Thank you very much. Just one word may be a problem. The second

- word. Mike, sorry, Sue. How is the second word pronounced?
- L1: from
- T: No, the second word that Mike read.
- L1: (silence)
- T: (coming closer to Sue) The second word.
- L1: Works.
- T: Good. Look at the board, please.
(writing the word work on the board)
Everybody, say this word, please.
- LL: Work.
- T: Work, okay? Now, add 's' at the end, not works[wɜ:rkz]. Just works[wɜ:rks]. Everybody works[wɜ:rks].
- LL: Works.
- T: Good.

In the extract above, the teacher asked how to pronounce *works* before she explained the difference between *works* and *work*.

In the post-lesson session, when asked for a commentary on this part of the lesson, the teacher reported:

After teaching this group for about three months, I found one of the most common errors was the pronunciation of 's' in verbs like *works*, *helps*, *plays*, *swims*. I just wanted to check they still remembered how these words were pronounced. If I tell them how to pronounce the word directly, it can save time, but does not give the students time to think about it.

Here is another illustration that the teacher asked questions with an intention to help the students report what they had done with the task of writing a sentence by unscrambling words:

- T: Okay, now we've got some interesting some different. Okay. Mike, read yours, please?
- L9: Do you eat breakfast everyday?
- T: Good. Nobody change because there are one or two different ways, good. So, Mike, do you eat breakfast everyday at school? Let me

write it. (Write the question on the board.) Okay, Rosy, what's your sentence question?

L3: Everyday do you eat breakfast?

T: Good. Good now, usually we say do you eat breakfast everyday? But Rosy is also right. Right, right. Everyday, do you eat breakfast. Okay. They're both right. Anyone got anything different? What was yours, umm, Mary?

L2: Do you eat breakfast everyday?

T: Good, same.

Before she presented two ways of making a correct sentence, she asked a question who had a different type of questions from others. The teacher already knew that one girl student had a different sentence from others. While circulating the group and monitoring their performance, she realized that the girl put the word everyday at the beginning of the sentence, which was also acceptable. She felt that the alternative sentence was worthy mentioning to the other students.

In the debriefing, the teacher provided the following explanation:

My students usually think there is only one correct answer to each question. It is true most of time but not always. Before they rub out their sentence, I asked the girl to read her sentence. I knew that she had a different one from the other students.

The researcher also observed the effect of asking such questions:

I saw the teacher was trying to highlight the difference by asking a student for her alternative sentence. She also made an effort to tell the class two types of sentences are both acceptable.

3. To Personalize the Task

The teacher sometimes asked questions which could elicit the students' personal response. The following extract illustrates what happened in the classroom discourse:

T: Good. Ah-ah, you had it right. Good. Okay. Pencils down when you finish. For you not to work, where do you go, you don't go to work, where do you go?

L8: School.

T: School, put that in a sentence, please, Richard.

L8: Put (repeating the instruction.)

T: We now Where do you go? We

L8: Go to school.

T: Well-done. I just want that answer school, so the question for you.
Everybody, read it please.

LL: What time does she go to school?

T: We have to change it. I want to ask you how do I change it?

LL: What time do you

L8: Do you (saying it loudly)

T: Well-done, okay, everybody, read this one, please.

LL: What time do you go to school?

T: Okay, ah, Lucy, what time do you go to school?

L5: I

T: 크게해요. (saying Speak loudly in Korean)

L5: I go to school.

T: Good girl. Remember you change to I.
(writing the sentence I go to school)

L6: I go to eight o'clock.

In the interaction, the teacher asked questions to personalize the question, What time does she go to work? She changed the question into What time do you go to school? Then the students seemed to provide their personal responses, emotionally involved in the question.

In the post-lesson discussion, she gave her explanation on the pedagogical intention she had when she asked questions in this part of the lesson:

This question is not suitable for children. So I changed the question to help the children feel more involved. I tried to make the task more relevant to the children by asking questions on personal experience.

4. To Elicit Culture Talk

The teacher sometimes asked questions to elicit culture talk relevant to tasks. In the following example, she focused on the Korean culture in having breakfast:

T: I eat. Think about it. Okay. Richard, what do you eat for breakfast?

L8: I eat Kimchi.

T: Only Kimchi? What else do you eat?

L8: Kimchi, rice.

T: Rice.

L5: Rice and.

T: Ah-ah. What did you have this morning?

Okay Korean word. What is it called in Korean?

L5: Hopakjeon.

T: Okay.

In the classroom discourse above, the teacher already knew about the Korean culture where people usually eat Kimchi and other side dishes with rice for breakfast. The teacher and the boy seemed to be involved in meaningful communication by talking about the cultural aspect of having breakfast.

The teacher explained that she often introduced topics closely related to the given culture in order to make tasks more meaningful and elicit more student talk. It was observed that the students looked engaged in learning when they were talking about the culture they live in.

In another part of the lesson, the following interaction took place:

T: Okay, Mike, do you go to a different class?

Do you go to computer class or mathematics class or Taekwondo class?

L9: (inaudible)

T: No?

L9: English class.

T: Only English Class. Jo, do you go another class? Piano class?

L4: Painting, painting.

T: Painting class, Okay. Rosy, when do you go to painting class?

L3: I go to class at four o'clock.

T: Good, girl! Well-done. Rosy, do you go to a different class?

L3: Computer class.

T: Okay, computer class, okay. Rosy, when do you go to computer class?

L3: I go to class at six o'clock.

T: Six o'clock, good. Okay.

In the above interaction, the teacher seemed fully understand the culture that most of Korean children go to a private institution to learn something after school. Her questions also revealed that she already knew that boys usually go to Taekwondo class while girls usually go to piano class.

The teacher provided the explanation why she asked such questions. She said that she found it very helpful to make tasks more meaningful to young learners. She added that the students seemed to feel closer to her when they talked about Korean things.

V. DISCUSSION

The majority of the questions the teacher asked are display question types. If the class is assessed by the criteria taken from the context outside the classroom, the class appears to be uncommunicative. The distinction between communicative and uncommunicative questions was given earlier. In the context of the classroom, however, it could be argued that many communicative aspects of the discourse are illustrated in the display questions the teacher asks. The analysis of the questions shows that the teacher asks a carefully structured sequence of questions leading to the clear pedagogical goals she has set: to encourage students to self correct; to find out what students know; to personalize the task; and to elicit culture talk. It is also shown that her use of display questions is supportive of learning; the teacher provides feedback in a way which is as communicative as possible in the context of the classroom and which facilitates the attainment of the pedagogical purposes. All these findings support Cullen's (1998:186) assertion that in order to determine how communicative a teacher's use of questioning is in a particular lesson, one should take into account not only the extent to which particular questions engage the students in meaningful, communicative use of language, but also the pedagogical purpose of the questions asked, and the teacher's success in

communicating this purpose clearly to the learners.

The analysis of the teacher questions shows that the display questions may have valid communicative reasons, for example, to personalize the context for effective learning. The analysis also illustrates the point that what appears to be non-communicative teacher questions is not necessarily so in the classroom context. In the same way, the teacher's classroom questions might be assessed as being more or less communicative according to how clearly they are understood and followed, whether the teacher allows opportunities for the students to provide their response, and whether the instructional goals are achieved. In this context, Cullen (1998) suggests that, rather than regard such discourse as essentially uncommunicative, it would seem more productive and more realistic in terms of our expectations of teachers~ to consider how to provide feedback in a way which is as communicative as possible in the context of the classroom and which assists in the attainment of the pedagogical purposes for which the students are there.

In regard to the scope of the research, the validity of the findings is limited to young learners. It might be that variables related to age or English level affect research on teacher questions and their effects on student learning. Another limitation of the present study is a number of classes observed and analyzed. It is suggested that a long-term observation be done to validate the findings. This might reveal how teacher questions develop as learning takes place.

W. CONCLUSION

The present study investigates how classroom contexts might affect questions the teacher asks. It reveals that teacher questions may be contingent upon instructional goals the teacher has set. It seems that the classroom, typically a large, formal gathering which comes together for pedagogical rather than social reasons, will also have its own rules and conventions of communication, understood by all those present. It would be unrealistic to make a judgment on communicativeness of teacher questions only by the norms of communication outside the classroom. This suggests that classroom contexts should be taken into account in defining communicative teacher questions. However the emphasis on communication with the instructional goals does not mean that it ignores the importance of the insights that spoken discourse found in contexts outside the classroom sheds on classroom

discourse. Rather, the inclusion of such features might well enhance teacher effectiveness by stimulating more productive and varied use of English by students. To that extent, the study of discourses outside the classroom can serve to enrich the interaction and the pedagogical effectiveness of what goes on inside the classroom. It is suggested that any analysis of the characteristics of the communicative classroom needs to take these differences into account.

REFERENCES

- Allwright, D. (1988). *Observations in the language classroom*. London: Longman.
- Allwright, D. & Bailey, K. M. (1991). *Focus on the language classroom*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Breen, M. & Candlin, C. N. (1980). The essentials of a communicative curriculum in language teaching. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(2), 89-112.
- Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classroom: research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Cullen, R. (1998). Teacher talk and the classroom context. *ELT Journal*, 52(3), 179-187.
- Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding second language acquisition*. Oxford: OUP.
- Gaies, S. J. (1980). The investigation of language classroom processes. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17(2), 205-217.
- Krashen, S. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Lightbown, P. M. & Spada, N. (1991). *How languages are learned*. Oxford: OUP.
- Long, M. H. (1980). Inside the 'black box': methodological issues in classroom research on language learning. *Language Learning*, 30(1), 1-42.
- _____. (1983). Does second language instruction make a difference?: a review of research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17(3), 359-382.
- Nunan, D. (2000). *Language teaching methodology*. London: Longman.
- Richards, J. C. & Lockhart, C. (1994). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Van Lier, L. (1988). *The classroom and the language learner*. London: Longman.

APPENDIX

Excerpts from the transcript of the observed lesson

Van Lier's (1988) conventions are adopted to the following transcription. T presents the teacher, L an unidentified learner, L1 an identified learner, and LL several or all learners simultaneously. Sue, Mary, Rosy, Jo, Lucy, Chris, Robert, Richard, Mike and Peter are pseudonyms of the learners.

T: ... Right, page thirty-four. Its a language check. Remember we did with the time? Okay? Right. And now were looking at some language on thirty-four.

Right, Richard. Would you read the instructions of Grammar Check, please?

L8: Put the words in the correct order. There is one extra word.

T: Okay, Ah-ah, Mike. Would you read the words from the Number One, please. Just one word not the sentence. Just words.

L9: From, work

T: (saying read loudly in Korean.)

L9: From, works, o'clock, to, the, he, eight, five o'clock.

T: Thank you very much. Just one word may be a problem. The second word. Mike, sorry Sue. How is the second word pronounced?

L1: From

T: No, the second word that Mike read.

L1: (silence)

T: (coming closer to Sue) The second word.

L1: Works.

T: Good. Look at the board, please. (Writing the word work on the board) Everybody, say this word, please.

LL: Work.

T: Work, okay? Now, add s at the end, not works[wə:rkz], just works[wɜ:ks]. Everybody works[wə:ks].

LL: Works.

T: Good. Okay, Now Sue, would you read the sentence for Number one?

L1: He works from eight o'clock to five o'clock.

T: Good. Okay, Rosy, in a BIG voice. Would you read the words for Number two, please.

L3: Class, do, you, when, go, to, at.

T: Remember? There's one extra word, okay. See if you can write a sentence from those words. And you can work with partners if you want. Okay, its okay. Three together. Okay, Number two. Here are the words. Turn into the sentence. What the first word of the sentence? We all none of us know. Okay, stop look back at Number one. Look the words. Look at the sentence. The sentence, Peter! Look! Its made from the words. He okay first one word. Point to them. He He point to he good. He works. He works from eight o'clock to five o'clock.

T: Whats the extra word?

LL: The.

T: The, thank you. Okay, the. So, Number two. The words, class, do, you, when, go, to, at. Change them into a sentence. Its a question. What do we start with the first letter, Mike? Peter, too. Good. Good, girl. What is the first letter of a sentence, Lucy? How do we write it, Sue, first letter of a sentence? He, okay, can you write it as a first letter? What do we do?

L8: Do.

T: No, no, no. Look at HE. Look at this H. When we use as a first letter of a sentence, well, what happens with the W.

L8: (coughing) (correcting the error)

T: Okay. When you are finished, check is it the same? When you are finished, is it the same? Robert, look at Mikes. See if it is the same. Can you three work together? Okay, everybody is finished?

L: (inaudible)

T: Yes, Peter, would you read your sentence, please?

L10: When do you go to at three?

T: Oops, remember one extra word, one word don't use, don't use one word. Okay, Robert, would you read your question, please?

L7: When do you go to class?

T: Good, boy. So, whats the extra word?

LL: At.

T: At, so everybody read the sentence, please?

LL: When do you go to class?

T: Okay, Sue, when do you go to class?

L1: Um.

T: Sentence, better.

L: (inaudible)

- T: Come on. Look at the board. We know we have to answer the question.
(writing a sentence, When do you go to class? and reading it word by word)
- L: (inaudible)
- T: Sue, what is the first word?
- L1: I.
- T: Good, So thats you change to I.
- L: Go to class.
- T: Good girl. (Writing the answer on the board) Now, what do we need there and this class? When do you go to English class?
- L1: Five.
- T: Ah-ah. Five o'clock. What?
- L1: At.
- T: Thank you. Now read the answer, again, please, Sue.
- L: I go to class at five o'clock.
- T: Okay, Mike, do you go to a different class?
Do you go to computer class or mathematics class or Taekwondo class?
- L9: (inaudible)
- T: No?
- L: English class.
- T: Only English Class. Jo, do you go another class? Piano class?
- L4: Painting, painting.
- T: Painting class, Okay. Jo, when do you go to painting class?
- L4: I go to class at four o'clock.
- T: Good, girl! Well-done. Rosy, do you go to a different class?
- L3: Computer class.
- T: Okay, computer class, okay. Rosy, when do you go to computer class?
- L3: I go to class at six o'clock.
- T: Six o'clock, good. Okay. Okay, lets look at Number Three. Right, Mary, can you speak very loudly? Would you read the words of Number three, please?
- L2: Every, day, some, breakfast, do, eat, you.
- T: Good, Okay. Remember one word use don't want.
- L: (inaudible)
- T: This is a bit more difficult but I think you can do. Its a question. Try to turn into sentence. What word might start? Richard, small letter or big letter.
(circulating and monitoring the class.)
- T: Ah-ah: Um-um.. Good girl, Jo. Ah-ah.

T: Do you. Good. Finished? What kind of d? Look.

L: (saying Ah! Thats right in Korean)

T: Big W, Big D to start a sentence. Good. Okay, but right verb, Chris. Ill come back to you.

Good girl. Good. Not quite , but its okay, Rosy. You've got right words. Oh! Good. Thats a different one. But the first letter?

T: Big H, Big W. Okay, can you speak? Every day. Two words. So maybe if you got that one.

L8: (saying something funny in Korean with the partner.)

T: Add those two. Richard, English only. Good boy. Good. First big D. Peter is busy. Good boy. Good. Big D. Good. Okay, now we've go some interesting some different. Okay. Mike, read yours, please?

L9: Do you eat breakfast everyday?

T: Good. Nobody change because there are one or two different ways, good. So, Mike, do you eat breakfast everyday at school? Let me write it. (writing the question on the board) Okay, Rosy, whats your sentence question?

L3: Everyday do you eat breakfast?

T: Good. Good now, usually we say do you eat breakfast everyday? But Rosy is also right. Right, right. Everyday, do you eat breakfast? Okay. They're both right. Anyone got anything different? What was yours, umm, Mary?

L2: Do you eat breakfast everyday?

T: Good, same. Yours is the same as Rosy's? Good. Yours is the same as Mary's?

L5: Do you eat everyday breakfast?

T: No, you cant do that. We have to put it usually at the end. Chris has Do you eat everyday breakfast? We cant put it here. Usually goes at the end but it can go at the beginning but not in the middle, okay? Richard, what was your answer?

L8: Do you everyday eat breakfast?

T: No, you're like Chris. Begin or end. End is better but beginning is right, too. Peter, what was yours?

L10: Do you eat breakfast everyday?

T: Good, Mike. Do you eat breakfast everyday?

Robert, you're still working on with that, okay?

T: Do you? Okay while Roberts finishing. Jo, do you eat breakfast everyday?

L4: I eat.

T: Okay remember what kind of answers are do questions?

LL: Yes, I do.

T: Good. Or.

LL: No, I don't.

T: Good. Merciful!

They're easy answers. Okay when sentence wh questions, when, where, why, and um-um pardon me, and how and some sentences. But do you, yes, I do, No, I don't. And you, yes, I am, No, Im not. So do is easy. So, Jo, do you eat breakfast everyday?

L4: Yes, I do.

T: Okay, now, wh question. What do you eat?

L5: (inaudible)

T: Lets me write it for you. You can look at. (writing the sentence, What do you eat?) Good.

L5: Eat.

T: Good girl. I eat I eat.

L5: No.

T: What do you eat for breakfast?

L5: (inaudible)

T: I eat. Think about it. Okay. Richard, what do you eat for breakfast?

L8: I eat Kimchi.

T: Only Kimchi? What else do you eat?

L8: Kimchi, rice.

T: Rice.

L8: Rice and.

T: Ah-ah, What did you have this morning?

Okay, Korean word. What is it called in Korean?

L8: Hopakjeon.

T: Okay. Sue, what do you eat for breakfast?

L1: I Sometimes bread.

T: Bread or toast?

L1: Rice, sometimes bread.

T: Lucy, do you eat breakfast everyday? Do question. Do you eat breakfast everyday? Wh question, what do you eat?

L5: Eat rice and.

T: Korean words, thats okay. The names of food.

L: (inaudible)

T: Peter, and Richard you are listening, aren't you? Breakfast.

L: (saying soup in Korean)

T: Robert, are you listening? Thank you. Right, lets go Number four.

T: Okay good. Okay Chris, would you read the word for Number four?

L6: work, time, what, when does, she, go, to.

T: Good, okay remember one extra word. Try and write a question. Another question yes.

T: Okay. (circulating the class and correcting mistakes) Okay, okay a word out. Wh or. Not quite or don't rub it all out. The rest is all right. This one is difficult. Everyone makes the same mistakes. Ah-ah, Yeah, thats a good question, but how many extra words?

L8: Two.

T: You use when, Two extra words No. no. you cant. Pencils down for a minute and look at the board, please. (writing a sentence, When does she go to work?)

T: Okay, read that question, please?

LL: When does she go to work?

T: Okay, thats a good question. But you have what time.

How can you change it to take out one word and put in both of those?

L8: Doe she go to work what time.

T: No, thats not right. What time is not English. So cant put time at the end. We have to change one word here for both of those words. Sue?

L1: What does she go to work time?

T: No we cant have time not English.

L1: What time does she go to work?

T: Well-done. When, and what time mean the same When does she go to work? She goes to work at seven o'clock. What tie does she go to work? She goes to work at seven o'clock. So when equals what time. Okay, we can leave out when and we can write in Oops what time. Okay? So Rosy had when does she go to work? Good question but it makes two extra words, not one. Okay so, when mean what time. So, fix up your sentence, please. Good. Ah-ah, you had it right, Good. Okay. Pencils down when you finish. For you not to work, where do you go, you don't go to work, where do you go?

L8: School.

T: School, put that in a sentence, please, Richard.

L8: Put: (repeating the instruction.)

T: We now, where do you go? We.

L8: Go to school

T: Well-done, I just want that answer school, so the question for you. Everybody, read it please.

LL: What time does she go to school?

T: We have to change it. I want to ask you How do I change it?

LL: What time do you..

L8: Do you... (saying it loudly)

T: Well-done, okay, everybody read this one, please.

LL: What time do you go to school?

T: Okay, Ah, Lucy, what time do you go to school?

L5: I.

T: (saying Speak loudly in Korean)

L5: I go to school.

T: Good girl. Remember you change to I.(writing the sentence, I go to school)

L6: I go to eight o'clock.

T: Eight o'clock. Good girl. I go to school at eight o'clock. Chris, what time do you go to school?

L6: I go to school at eight o'clock.

T: Good, Rosy, what time do you go to school?

L3: I go to school at eight o'clock.

T: Everybody is going to go at eight o'clock out then, are they? Mary, what time do you go to school?

L2: I go to school at eight o'clock.

T: Anyone at a different time?

L8: Me.

T: yes, Richard.

L8: I go to school at quarter after eight.

T: Well-done. A quarter after eight. Good. We did that last week. Well-done. Anyone else at different time? Okay, A quarter after eight. What is the other way to say that?

L8: To.

T: No, a quarter after eight. Remember we could have seven-thirty or (writing 7:30, $\frac{1}{4}$ past seven) Oops, a half past seven. Same a quarter after eight. (writing $\frac{1}{4}$ after eight). What is the other way to say?

L8: Eight fifteen.

- T: Well-done, eight-fifteen (writing 8:15, a quarter after eight.)Okay, eight fifteen or a quarter after eight.
- T: Okay, good. Number five, yes. This is, Peter. Read the words, please.
- L10: does, at, do, TV, he, watch, night.
- T: Okay remember one extra word. (circulating and monitors the students work)
You finished, dear?
- L: No,
- T: Well, come on. Is it the wh or do does question? What kind of letter? Remember its a question so cant start with that. Good. Good. Good. Um, no, its a question. So you don't that way for a question not the. Don't forget to start with a capital with. Capital letter.
- T: Good girl. You too, question. That's an answer. That's an answer.
- T: This is a question. Don't forget to. Don't forget the capital letter to start with.
Ah-ah, Do you.
- L: (inaudible)
- T: Yes. Good boy
- L4: (correcting the error himself)
- T: Just through a few minutes.
- T: Okay, Sue. Did you do have your part?
- L1: Yes.
- T: Good. Question, please?
- L1: Does he watch TV at night?
- T: Well-done, everybody read the question.
- LL: Does he watch TV at night.
- T: Good okay. Now if I ask you not about him but about you whats the question?
- L8: Do you?
- T: What? Do you what?
- L8: Do you watch TV at night?
- T: Well-done, do you watch TV at night? Okay, Rosy, ask Mary.
- L3: Do you watch TV at night?
- L2: Yes, I do.
- T: Well-done. Ask Sue.
- L2: Do you watch TV at night?
- L1: Yes, I do.
- T: Ask Lucy.
- L1: Do you watch TV?

L5: Yes, I do.

T: Ask Jo.

L: Do you watch TV at night?

L4: Yes, I do.

T: Can you ask Chris, please?

L4: Do you watch TV at night?

L6: Yes. Do you watch TV at night?

T: Do you?

L6: Yes, I do.

L6: Do you watch TV at night?

L8: Yes, I do.

L8: Do you watch TV at night?

L7: Yes.

T: Pardon, pardon, because I cant hear. Look at Richard when you answer. ...

예시언어(Examples in): English

적용가능 언어(Applicable Languages): English

적용가능 수준(Applicable Levels): Secondary/Higher

Chang, Kyung-Suk

서울특별시 종로구 삼청동 25-1 수능연구 개발팀

Tel: 019-402-3566

E-mail: kschang@kice.re.kr

Received in Sept., 2003

Reviewed in Oct., 2003

Revised version received in Nov., 2003