Pedagogical implications of discourse analysis: One-on-one teacher-student interaction in a second language preschool class

Anna Belobrovy[1]
Bunkyo Gakuin University

ABSTRACT

The study connects two areas of language research: discourse analysis and second language pedagogy. The overall goal of this study is to raise young learners' language teachers' awareness on how to improve the quality of classroom talk in order to make it more comprehensible to students. As professional development is a long process, in this study I will only introduce three techniques language teachers of young children can explore in order to achieve a more comprehensive and engaging language classroom without having to give up natural speech. The language activity chosen for analysis is based on the content-based theory, which allows connecting drawing with language learning in the international preschool context. In the activity described in this research, students were engaged in one-on-one conversations with teachers and answered their questions to show comprehension. Two teachers' interaction patterns were tested in terms of repetitiveness, turn-distribution and reference to the information provided by students. Based on my findings, I recommend three tools language teachers can utilize to modify their interaction style and enhance students' comprehension: systematically repeat key words provided by students, create opportunities for students to initiate conversation and use reiteration to emphasize grammatical patterns. With this study, I hope to open new doors in the field of preschool language acquisition in Japan and encourage more researchers to support second language educators of that age group.

---

[1] Anna Belobrovy is an English lecturer in Bunkyo Gakuin University in Tokyo, Japan. Her research interest is in discourse analysis in the EFL communication classroom. Correspondence should be sent to Anna Belobrovy. E-mail: annabelobrovy@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, English language education of young learners has been getting more attention in Japan. Along with the elementary, junior-high and high school immersion programs already introduced to Japanese parents in the late nineties, a new system of English immersion, or so-called international preschools and kindergartens, started to gain popularity as an alternative to the formal Japanese daycare system (Bostwick, 2001).

My study takes place in one of those schools where I have been working as a head teacher and a teacher trainer for six years. Already, at the beginning of my career I encountered important issues, which require the attention of classroom researchers and educators: lack of research in classroom language for this unique setting and the development of communicative strategies for teachers to activate language acquisition devices for their students. This research attempts to fill teachers' practical need for designing language of instruction that will support students on their way to develop aural linguistic skills.

The choice of aural focus for this research was not coincidental. Nunan (2007), in a section pertaining to interaction analysis, first expressed the need for aural focus, an issue especially pertinent to the age group in this research. Nunan provides an important starting point for my study when he suggests applying child-adult interaction analysis in the first language to improve pedagogical methods in the second language. The analysis of interaction between child and adult in the first language can contribute to second language pedagogy as it provides knowledge of conditions under which languages are acquired.

In my study, I designed and piloted a language learning activity that included one-on-one interaction between teacher and student. All interactions were transcribed then analyzed. The activity was implemented in a preschool drawing class for students between ages two and three. This study, using classroom interaction analysis, will attempt to provide a practical response for further linguistic and pedagogical research on teaching English at preschool level in the immersion context (Garcia, 2006). The research question raised is the following: What discourse patterns in teacher talk enhance comprehension in one-on-one teacher-student interaction?

The theoretical background I found relevant to my study includes content and theme based learning theories, language comprehension processes in general and in young learners classroom in particular, and discourse analysis with emphasis on classroom discourse. In the next section, I will provide a short overview of the major research in those areas.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Teaching environment of L2 teacher in immersion preschool: content-based classroom rationale for immersion preschool curriculum

As it will be seen in the methodology section, the curriculum of immersion preschool is conducted and designed according to the principles of content-based instruction. The daily schedule of the students is divided into subjects such as drawing, phonics, math, crafts, culture and science. Thus, language is introduced to the students through subject contents. In this section of the chapter, I will introduce general ideas regarding the rationale of content-based instruction and its place in the language learning system.

One of the core works in content-based method belongs to Dewey (1943), who saw a general need for unification of all disciplines and for creating contextual and interactive learning frameworks. In the specific field of language acquisition, Graves (1975), Clay (1979) and Zepeda-de-Caney (1980) argued that children do not learn the language arts in discrete instructional context.

There is an important role of inter-subjectivity in the learning process in which valuable connections are made by the students between language classes and other school subjects (Genishi, 1981). Focus on content in language acquisition is supported by Moll and Diaz (1987), who state that children achieve greater comprehension when the focus is on making meaning rather than on the correctness of the utterance.

Gordon (2007) expressed a similar idea in his work when he described successful learning processes of the first language as "exploration of the world by students and discussions of those explorations with adults" (p.132) rather than by means of studying vocabulary and then learning how to use the words. I share Gordon's (2007) concern and clearly see a need to design experiential activities that provide contextual clues and comprehensive input.

In Celce-Murcia and Olshtain (2000), I found studies that expand on Gordon's (2007) ideas regarding the curriculum designed on the content-based approach. According to Celce-Murcia and Olshtain (2000), the term "content" can be divided into three different types: "linguistic content, thematic or situational content and subject-matter content" (p.187). While linguistic contents apply to language, thematic or situational approaches emphasize contextualization and meaningful, as well as, relevant use of target language during the learning process. (ibid.)

Several studies (Cameron, 2001; Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2000) discuss the appropriateness of using theme-based teaching in the primary foreign classroom as an approach that introduces the language as a communicative tool through which children acquire thematic contents. In my analysis of the activity for preschool-aged students in an immersion setting using a theme-based learning approach, I wish to introduce the concept of effective and comprehensive instruction in the target language.

Comprehension: how children process what they hear

Widdowson describes the listening process as "unseen and inaccessible" (Widdowson, 1990, p.108, as quoted in Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2000, p.102). I attempted to access the "inaccessible" (ibid.) by designing a listening activity that offers students an opportunity to demonstrate they can successfully convert part of the information from comprehensible teachers' input (Krashen, 1985) and make it accessible for their own consumption.

Several studies (Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2000) describe listening as the most frequently used language skill in everyday life that has both top-down and bottom-up processes. (Anderson & Lynch, 1988, quoted in Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2000, p.102)

Celce-Murcia and Olshtain (2000) provide an outlook on both, and reveal the complexity of listening mechanisms. The top-down process is described as an "activation of schematic knowledge and contextual knowledge". (p.102) As I will show later in the discussion section, the top-down listening process has more weight in the case of young learners. The bottom-up process of listening involves prior knowledge of the language system (phonology, grammar, vocabulary) (ibid.) At the beginning of their first and/or second language acquisition, children might still be in the process of building their knowledge (Lightbrown and Spada, 2006).

Cameron (2001) emphasizes two guiding principles for teaching aural and oral language to young learners: 1) meaning comes first, 2) importance of active student participation in the learning process. My concern is that excessive focus on the delivery of the exact meaning to the students and excessive usage of the first language in the second language classroom can cause a shortage of second language input and/or output, causing a general delay in acquisition as a result (Swain 1995).

Locke (1993, as cited in Cameron, 2001) argues that for infants, language often "plays a secondary role to the social and affective components, and less attention is paid to the actual language content of talk than to its probable social meanings" (p.38) Another point Locke makes is that children inevitably operate with only partial understanding of what they hear, but it does not stop them from communicating and interacting, even in a second language environment (ibid.).

Along with Locke (1993), Donaldson (1978) and Meadows (1993) (all cited in Cameron, 2001), there is research on additional mechanisms such as 'innate drive to "coherence"' (Meadows, 1993, p.72, quoted in Cameron, 2001, p.38) and usage of experience of intention and purpose by children while performing new tasks in various areas such as second language learning (Donaldson, 1978). I cannot fully agree with "innate drive to coherence" (Meadows, 1993) as a sole learning mechanism and will present my arguments in the discussion section.

Research on analyzing classroom discourse

As the focus of data analysis in my study will be on contextual and interactional components of classroom discourse, in this section I will introduce some of the related theories from the field of discourse analysis.

Contextual elements of analysis are represented by the concept of cohesion analysis as implemented by Halliday and Hasan (1976, 1989). The concept of cohesion is semantic and refers to relations of meanings that exist within each text, spoken or written, and defines text as text" (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p.4). In my study I will implement part of cohesion analysis elements to identify contextuality, which will be described in further details in the methodology chapter.

Systemic functional linguistics theory based on the model of "language as social semiotics" developed by Halliday and his followers (Eggins and Slade, 1997) contributed to the foundation of my study in classroom interaction analysis as it enables conversational patterns to be "quantified at different levels and at different degrees of details" (ibid., p.45).

Finally, one last component used in my analysis of classroom interaction relies on Halliday's idea of "primary and secondary positions of actors" (Wells, 1995). In research on classroom discourse, the idea was developed into a model of distribution of roles in classroom interaction (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975).

As for the more specific field of classroom discourse, Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) suggested a framework of analysis where exchanges between the teacher and students are framed into I-R-F moves: "I" stands for initiation of the teacher; "R" for response of the student and "F" for feedback or for follow up by the teacher. The teacher can be recognized as a primary actor or a knower who initiates the exchange and provides the evaluation or follow-up to students' moves. The students' response is essential, because without it, there is no exchange (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975).

Studies designed by Wells (1981,1995), Hughes and Westgate (1997, 1997a, 1998) and Lemke (1990, cited in Wells, 1995) took the research of classroom discourse analysis a step

further by creating an alternative to the I-R-F method. Lemke (1990) proposed the idea of analyzing the structure of the activity in terms of functions performed by "successive moves in the exchanges through which the activity is realized" (Lemke 1990, as cited in Wells, 1995, p.8). The idea of successive moves in classroom interaction gives me a focus on factors that promote students' comprehension by identifying the successive moves that are significant to my study rather than just analyzing I-R-F structure.

Studies by Edwards & Westgate (1994), Westgate & Corden (1993) and Westgate & Hughes (1997, 1998) investigate possible enabling strategies in teacher-led talk with young learners. The main concern of the researchers is to identify strategies in student-teacher communication that will take students' moves to a higher level of initiation and have them be engaged in speculative or interpretive talk.

As for the practical side, I encountered several recent studies that were similar to my research environment. The following studies illustrate the implications of applying some of the theories of analysis I introduced in the theoretical section of classroom interaction research. Although none of the following research is covered in my study, works by Akcan (2005), Wiebe Berry and Englert (2005), Garcia (2006), Gillies and Boyle (2006) and Radford, Ireson and Mahon (2006) identify recent pedagogical trends in classroom interaction structure. Garcia's work (2006) was especially significant to my study as it refers to the clear need for further research in the field of immersion preschool settings.

Gee, Michaels and O'Connor's (1992) research provides an example for practical applications of cohesion analysis that combines other elements of discourse analysis. The study describes one-on-one interactions, between teachers and students who are English native speakers, taking place during "sharing time" in American elementary school. Although the study focuses on oral production of students, researchers analyze teachers' utterances for the purpose of evaluating lexical supportiveness. The idea of lexical analysis of teachers' utterances inspired me to analyze connections between lexical elements in teachers' talk and student comprehension.

In the next section I will introduce methods that motivated my choice of research topic that addresses this very question because I feel there is a need to create more practical studies of classroom interaction in the preschool immersion context, a concern also expressed by Garcia (2006).

METHODOLOGY

This study aims to collect qualitative and descriptive information supported by quantitative analysis regarding pedagogical issues related to listening comprehension activities in the immersion preschool second language classroom. I explore the factors that made classroom teacher-student interaction comprehensible and effective for students' language learning process.

Settings

The data was collected in the classes of an immersion preschool and kindergarten in central Tokyo. Students spend at least five hours a day, five days a week at school interacting in English as the main language of instruction. As it was mentioned in the literature review, the school's curriculum was designed based on the idea of content-based instruction. The

students are engaged in disciplines such as math, reading, phonics, drawing, crafts, painting, science and culture. A monthly theme is introduced from different disciplines. Examples of monthly themes include seasons of the year, opposites, animals, etc. If the theme of the month is winter, students will accomplish drawing activities related to that theme, count snowflakes in math classes, make winter crafts or learn about winter weather in science.

I found the school to be a convenient research site, as I have been working there as a head teacher for six years and succeeded in building a relationship with the parents and the Japanese director of the school. At the beginning of the project, the school's Japanese director gave an oral official permission for the research. The parents and other caregivers were informed the video material would only be used for research purposes and would therefore not be distributed or presented in research conferences. By doing so, I received their permission for the research. In order to achieve maximal confidentiality, I refrained from using students' names, replacing them, instead, with numbers.

Participants

The participants in the study were a class of five preschool students, all native speakers of Japanese, between ages two and a half and three, two homeroom teachers and myself as an observer and advisor.

Students

The five students were members of the same class. They all entered the preschool and started their second language acquisition in April 2008. I selected the preschool group for several reasons. The students had a similar language background as Japanese was the language spoken at home. All the class members started their formal English acquisition at the same time. Finally, there was a need for curriculum development as the toddlers' program started to function in April 2008. Lack of research in the area of curriculum development for the second language preschool classroom in the immersion context in a non-English speaking country created the need for observation and analysis to enrich the contents, adjust the program to the students' language needs and engage students in the acquisition process.

Teachers

Two female homeroom teachers in their early twenties and with no former teacher training were involved in the project. Both graduated from an American college and majored in Liberal arts. While Teacher Lisa specialized in history of education, Teacher Akriti majored in psychology. Lisa is an English native speaker from the United States fluent in Japanese. Akriti is a bilingual teacher from India who speaks both Hindi and English with minor knowledge of Japanese. Lisa fulfilled the function of senior teacher as she was in the field for a year and a half when the project started, while Akriti had only six months of teaching experience. Both started teaching in the toddlers' class in April 2008.

My role

I'm Russian-born Israeli, a native speaker of Russian and fluent in English, Japanese and Hebrew. I majored in East-Asian Studies and International Relations for my undergraduate studies in Israeli University and completed my graduate studies in TESOL at Teachers

College Columbia University. I fulfilled the role of head teacher in the immersion preschool where the study took place. On a daily basis, I informally interact with the students, outside the classroom, during free play hours. For the teachers involved in the project, I act both as a supervisor and an advisor. My responsibilities are to advise on curriculum planning, language development of students, classroom observation and provide feedback regarding language-teaching issues based on my experience as a graduate student in the field. As I participated in classroom sessions before the project started, my presence as an observer was taken naturally by the students and by the teachers during the project; something that helped to reduce "observer paradox" (Labov, 1972b) and contributed to creating a natural classroom atmosphere.

Procedure

The schedule of the project started at the beginning of November 2008 and lasted approximately three months. The classroom sessions recorded in the project were drawing sessions for five students conducted by two homeroom teachers. Due to the very young age of the students, the toddler program's classes are usually taught by a team of two teachers. One of the teachers fulfills the role of leader and the other of assistant. They switch roles every other session. As I mentioned earlier, both of the teachers started to teach the toddlers' class in April 2008. That way, both were given an equal opportunity to familiarize themselves with the students.

The drawing classes took place once a week and lasted 20 to 25 minutes. Each session is divided into three parts around 8-10 minutes each. In the first part, the leading teacher introduces the theme. In the second part, a free drawing activity, both teachers assist the students by providing paper and color pencils, and by encouraging students in the drawing process. For the third part, teachers talk to students individually about their drawings. Each interaction lasts no longer than 3 minutes. As one of the main goals for this study was to assess the ability of teachers to create comprehensive interactions and keep students engaged, the questions for the interaction were not prepared in advance. Each teacher could freely choose the theme for each interaction and questions for the discussion of the drawings. The only instruction they were given was to encourage students to develop a three-minute conversation. The students' short attention span allowed conducting only one conversation during each session. All sessions were videotaped. After I collected two recorded sessions (with one teacher) of classroom interactions for each of the five students, I transcribed the interactions and analyzed all ten transcripts.

Data Collection and Units of Analysis

The methods of analysis I used in this study combine the elements of classroom interaction analysis based on Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) with elements of cohesion analysis (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, 1985). From the classroom interaction analysis, I partly borrowed the idea of I-R-F structure introduced earlier in the literature review. In this study, I will focus on I-initiation and R-response concepts to analyze the distribution of roles in the setting.

Elements of cohesion analysis, such as reference and repetitions, served as additional tools to analyze the interactions in terms of cohesiveness and existence of contextual ties between lexical items on the text. Cohesion analysis according to Halliday and Hasan (1976) defines the semantic relations in the text and consists of six categories: reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, repetition and lexical cohesion. In this study I will focus on

reference and additional category that indicates cohesiveness-repetition. References are divided into two types: exophoric reference-situational references (referring to the situation outside the text) and endophoric references-textual references (referring to the features inside the text). Repetition of lexical items serves as an additional indicator of the cohesive ties in the text and enlarges the impact of lexical meaning (Halliday, 1989). The importance of cohesive devices of repetition and reference for teacher-student interactions will be introduced later in the discussion section.

I analyzed ten examples of teacher-student interactions (Appendix 1). I divided the turns taken by students in each interaction into successive moves (Lemke, 1985) or as I called them *successful student turns* (SST) and *missed student turns* (MST). Successful students' turns referred to all the correct answers of students to teachers' questions that contributed to a flow of the conversation and helped the teacher to proceed to her next turn. The short "yes" and "no" answers and answers in Japanese were accepted as well if they fit in SST category.

For the quantitative part of the study, I calculated the number of SST and MST for each teacher and summarized them in tables 1,2,3 and 4. Based on the number of SST and MST, I calculated the percentage of comprehension. The percentage of comprehension was calculated as the percentage of MSTs from the total number of students' turns in each interaction. Also, I calculated the percentage of repetitions (Table 4) as the percentage of teachers' turns with repetitions of the information provided by the students from the total number of teachers' turns in each interaction. For the descriptive part of the study, I will present the categories of SSTs and MSTs followed by examples of interactions from the transcripts.

FINDINGS

This section of the study identifies factors influencing the level of students' comprehension of teachers' questions. Table 1 shows, in percentage, the level of comprehension of students. Table 2 shows the number of SST and MST for teacher Lisa. Table 3 shows the SST and MST for teacher Akriti. Table 4 shows the percentage of repetitions in teachers' turns.

TABLE 1
Percentage of comprehension

	S 1	S 2	S 3	S 4	S 5
Lisa	97%	96%	93%	100%	100%
Akriti	75%	86%	85%	77%	75%

S = Student

Table 1 shows a clear difference in percentage of students' comprehension within the interactions. In Lisa's case, the level of comprehension is higher than in Akriti's. While all of Lisa's interactions are situated above 90%, Akriti's are below 90%, the highest are 86% (S2) and 85% (S3). The rest of Akriti's interactions are below 80%. While Lisa reached 100% comprehension in S4 and S5 interactions, Akriti attained 77% for S4 and 75% for S5. In

addition to the range in level of comprehension, Table 2 and Table 3 display the gap between the number of SST and MST.

TABLE 2
Number of students' responses (MST AND SST) teacher Lisa

	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5
SST	26	16	14	11	21
MST	1	1	1	0	1

S = Student

TABLE 3
Number of students' responses (MST AND SST) teacher Akriti

	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5
SST	9	12	11	11	6
MST	4	2	2	3	2

S = Student

In interactions with Lisa, students' maximal number of MSTs equaled 1. For Akriti, the minimum was 2 and the maximum was 4. I believe the quantitative data in all tables speaks for itself: the gap between interactions has causes and implications. Because numerical values are not sufficient to explain the gap, in the next section I will provide examples for major tendencies in SSTs and MSTs for both teachers, and discuss their value for teaching practices.

TABLE 4
Repetitions

	S 1	S 2	S 3	S 4	S 5
Lisa	48%	47%	44%	42%	45%
Akriti	14%	20%	43%	27%	33%

S = Student

Main features of successful students' turns (SSTs)

Teacher Lisa
In Lisa's interaction with the students I found the following patterns that led students to answer successfully.

Variety of repetitions. Table 4 reveal a highly repetitive style of Lisa's interactions, that is to say, in approximately 45% of her turns, she consistently repeated the most important part of the new information provided by students.

Excerpt from transcript 1[2]. S1 is telling Lisa about his drawing of his interaction with peers from an older group.
4. S1: **Angry!**
5. L: **Angry** at who?
6. S1: Angry at **Sumire**! –new topic
7. L: What did **Sumire** do?
8. S1: Konan **angry** –new topic
9. L: Is he **angry at Sumire**, because Sumire doesn't want to play with him?

In turn 5, Lisa repeats the key word "angry" from turn 4 and asks for clarification about the name of the classmate, the student or one of his classmates, is angry at. In turn 6, the student shares additional information required to continue the interaction. In turn 7, Lisa asks for the reason for the feelings the student experienced and repeats the key item of the previous turn. In turn 8, the student provides the name of the angry classmate and in that way expands teacher's opportunities for interaction.

Reiteration. Also Lisa used the technique of reiteration when she consistently repeated similar grammatical structures in the interactions. The structure "What are/is …. doing?" was very common in transcript 1. The structure "What is it?" consistently came up in transcript 5. Finally, in transcript 7, the structure "Is it….?" was repeated more then three times.

Emphasis on context. In part of the interactions, the teacher repeated the information provided by the student earlier in the interaction to show her engagement and in order to underline the contextual background of the interaction with the student.

Excerpt from transcript 5. S3 is telling Lisa about a rainy day she drew.
21. TL: **This one** is what?
22. S3: **Rain**
23. TL: And where are you going? To school or outside? Where are you going?
24. S3: To pool.
25. TL: To pool? In the **rain**?
26. S3: Yes
27. TL: And what did you do? Did you go swimming?
28. S3: Swimming.
29. TL: With everybody? And what is it? More **rain**? Lots of colors?

Lisa repeated the word "rain" in turn 25 and 29 after the student introduced the concept in turn 22. As "rainy day" was the key point of the session, Lisa offered additional opportunity for review and kept the dialogue focused by repeating the concept and showing interest in student's theme.

Reference. Along with repetitions, the references to the information provided by students prevailed in Lisa's interactions. In a majority of interactions, I noted the comprehension of endophoric pronominal references, advanced grammatical concepts for non-native students of English in general and toddler groups specifically. Multiple references to the student's

---

[2] Repetitions are bolded.

concepts inside the text, supported by consistent repetitions, contributed to a high percentage of comprehension.

Excerpt from transcript 9[3]. S5 is telling Lisa (TL) about the fish she drew.
6. S5: Snowfish!
7. L: Where?
8. S5: Here
9. TL: And what's the snowfish doing?
10. S5: Santa
11.TL: Santa? What is **it** doing with Santa?
12. S5: Drawing!
13. TL: The snowfish is drawing with Santa?
14. S5: Yes
15. TL: Wow, how interesting and where are **they**?
16. S5: Water

In turn 11, the pronoun "it" refers to the snowfish mentioned by the student in turn 6 and by Lisa in turn 9. In turn 12, the student succeeded in answering the question that referred to the word "snowfish". In turn 15, "They" refers to "Santa" and "snowfish" from the previous turns. The student replied correctly to the questions about "they" as the references were endophoric, thus backed up by nouns in the text. In the text, the nouns were located close enough to the pronouns to emphasize a lexical tie and assist the student in making immediate contextual connections.

In addition to pronominals, Lisa incorporated demonstrative references such as "this", "that" and "these".

Excerpt from transcript 3: S2 is telling Lisa about his classmate's face he drew:
20. TL: And what is this?
21. S2: Circle
22. TL: Circle? And what is this? What is this?
23. S3: Hair
24. TL: What is the blue? This one blue.
25. S3: *Kaminari* (lightning-japanese)

"This", backed up with lexical meanings provided by the student, served as an endophopric reference. It seems that the reference "this" included clear request for specification as the student responded correctly with one lexical item at a time as a response to teachers' questions.

The reference "this" seems to include a clear request for specification, as the student responded successfully to the teachers' questions.

Student in the role of the initiator: The students were given various opportunities by Lisa to initiate the turns. In part of the interactions, the students took the role of the initiator in the opening part.

Excerpt from transcript 7. S4 is telling Lisa about a snake he drew:
1. S4: Snake.

---

[3] References are bolded.

2. TL: A blue snake? A bad snake?
3. S4: Yes, bad snake.
4. TL: Is it scary?
5. S4: Yes, scary.
6. TL: It gets the bad guys?
7. S4: *Namae mo aru yo.* (It has a name-japanese)
8. TL: Does he have a name?

S4 opens the interaction by mentioning the "snake" in turn 1. Lisa acts as a receiver and requests S4 initiator to give more information about the snake in turns 2 and 4. S4 confirms Lisa's ideas regarding the features of the snake in turns 3 and 5. In turn 7, the student adds information, in Japanese, about the snake having a name. Here, Lisa acts as a receiver. Instead of overlooking the Japanese information, she interprets it into English. By doing so, she demonstrates her curiosity and avoids a breakdown in the conversation, which as I will show in the MSTs section, happens when the student switches to Japanese.

Teacher Akriti

In Akriti's interactions with students, the patterns of interactions resulting in SSTs were similar to Lisa's, though her interactions lacked consistency.

Variety of repetitions. Akriti applied the technique of repetition to some extent. Like to Lisa, she repeated the key concepts introduced by the students and expanded on them. Although as table 4 demonstrates, Akriti consistently repeated the main pieces of information from students' turns in approximately 20% of her turns.

Excerpt from transcript 6[4]: S3 telling Akriti about the ghosts she drew.
1. TA: What is it?
2. S3: **Ghost!**
3. TA: Is there two **ghosts** or one **ghost**?
4. S3: Two **ghosts**
5. TA: Wow and what is the **ghost** doing?
6. S3: **Play**
7. TA: Are they **playing** with each other? Two **ghosts playing** with each other?

As it appears in Table 4, Akriti achieved the highest percentage (43%) of repetitions in this interaction with S3. The highest amount of repetitions explains the highest percentage (86%) of students' comprehension in the same interaction. In turns 3, 5, 7, Akriti repeats the information provided by the student and shows her curiosity by asking additional questions without changing the subject for three turns. Even when the student starts a new topic in turn 6, she remains focused on the key concept and requests more information to enhance the contextual connections.

Reiteration. In terms of application of similar grammatical structures in the interactions, Akriti was less systematic than Lisa. I noted examples of reiteration in transcript 6 when the student scored 85% of comprehension. The structure "Is the …" was systematically repeated more then three times during the interaction.

Emphasis on context. In part of the interactions, Akriti repeated bits of information provided by the student earlier in the interaction, so the repetitions did not follow each of the student's turns, but were spread over the interaction to strengthen the contextual background.

---

[4] Repetitions are bolded.

Excerpt from transcript 4: S2 is telling Akriti about a snowman he drew.
9. TA: Is a **snowman** happy?
10. S2: Angry
11. TA: Angry, I can tell!
Are his eyes opened or closed?
12. S2: Closed
13. TA: OK, is **snowman** near school?
14. S2: No
15. TA: Is he near Takumi's house?
16. S2: Yes.
17. TA: And where is Takumi?
18. S2: Not here. Sick.
19. TA: Oh, you're sick! And did you make a **snowman**?
20. S2: Yes

Repetitions of the keyword "snowman" appear in turn 9, 13 and 19. Though there is no consistency in repetition pattern the repetitions are located close enough to each other to keep focus on the main concept and maintain the thematic flow of the interaction.

Reference. References are less common in Akriti's interactions, although I could still identify some referential patterns that added contextual links and supported comprehension.

Excerpt from transcript 6[5]: S3 is telling Akriti about the ghosts he drew.
19. A: What color are the ghosts?
20. R: Black and yellow
21. A: Great
Are **they** Rei's friends?
Do you see **them**?
22. R: Yes
23. A: Cool
Anything else? Are they cool ghosts? Are **they** friendly or scary?
24. R: Scary

Akriti makes use of pronominal endophoric references "they" in turns 21 and 23 and "them" in turn 21 to refer to the word "ghosts" from turn 19. In turn 23, the reference "they" is backed up by the term "ghosts" that appears right before the question with the reference in it. By doing so, Akriti achieved comprehension of the student by referring to the key concepts from the text shortly enough before the pronominal reference and clarifying the context.

Student in a role of initiator: In Akriti's interactions with students, the role-switch took place, though less frequently then in Lisa's case.

Excerpt from transcript 10: S5 is telling Lisa about her Christmas drawing.
5. S5: Akriti
6. TA: Is teacher Akriti talking to Santa and Sae is Anpanman?
7. S5: Yes. Lisa.
8. TA: What is teacher Lisa doing?
9. S5: Lisa - Santa.

---

[5] References are bolded

10. TA: Is teacher Lisa talking to Santa?
11. S5: Yes

S5 fulfills the role of the initiator by starting a new topic. Akriti accepts the position of receiver by asking for elaboration in turn 6. In turn 7, unexpected appearance of new information about Lisa in S5's turn requires Akriti to take the role of receiver and request to fill the contextual gap to continue the interaction. In turn 9, the student adds a new character "Santa" to the scene and by doing so, creates the need for clarification from the teachers' side.

In this part of chapter, I introduced the conditions formed by the teachers under which the students generated an extensive number of successful turns. Before starting the discussion, I will highlight the main tendencies in teachers' talk causing students to miss their turns.

Main features of missed students' turns (MSTs)

In this section, I collected all the turns the students missed and explored the possible causes for the misses.
Teacher Lisa
The transcripts revealed two types of conditions under which the MSTs occurred. First, there was the use of ungrammatical structures and informal language in 1 and 2.

Excerpt from transcript 1: S1 is telling Lisa about his peers.
13. L: So what's up with Sasuke doing?
14. S: -

The question presented by the teacher consisted of ungrammatical element "what's up". Possibly the concept was unfamiliar to the student used to a formal style of questions such as "What is Sasuke doing?". As the formal questions were prevalent in the rest of the interaction, a new type of question brought confusion and caused a comprehension gap.

A second type of MST was connected to the semantic complexity of the questions. Two following examples illustrate this complexity.

Excerpt from transcript 3: S2 is telling Lisa about a face he drew.

15. L: Here? Why is a black eye?
16. T: -

It seems like S2 is unfamiliar with the whole range of wh-questions, especially those requiring reasoning. Due to the very young age of the student, that skill is probably has yet to be mastered, even in his first language.

Excerpt from transcript 5: S3 is telling Lisa about the rain she drew.
7. L: From who?
8. R: -

The MST occurred, as the question was asked in the very early stages of the interaction. In addition, it seems as if the student was not provided with enough contextual background to respond successfully to this complex question at such an early stage of the interaction.
Teacher Akriti

Akriti's interactions consisted of a larger number of MSTs than Lisa's. I detected four major categories of conditions that could be identified as possible causes: use of abstract language categories, placing more than one idea in a question, placing more than one question in a turn, lack of the contextual background and sudden switching of roles.

Use of abstract categories. **Excerpt from transcript 2: S1 is telling Akriti about a ball he drew.**

9. A: What *kind* of ball is it? Does it have a color?
10. S: -

The terms "kind" can be challenging for the student. It is a general term and incorporates multiple possibilities of responses. The student missed his turn due to an abstraction that affected textual unity and caused confusion.

Placing more than one idea in a question. **Excerpt from transcript 4: S2 is telling Akriti about a snowman from his drawing.**

21. TA: Did you make a snowman and got sick after?
22. S2: -
In turn 21, Akriti placed two events in one question and caused the students to miss the turn.

Placing more than one question in a turn. **Excerpt from transcript 4: S2 is telling Akriti about a snowman from his drawing.**

23. A: Did you make a snowman and went atchoo and then you went inside? Is that what happened?
24. T: -

In turn 23, I indicated two questions with four events in one turn. Obviously overwhelmed by the amount of information, the student was confused and missed the turn for the second time in a row.

Lack of the contextual background. **Excerpt from transcript 2: S1 is telling Akriti about a ball he drew.**

21. A: Cool. What's this part? open
22. S: -

The reference "this" in turn 21 is exophoric and not related to the text, but to the situation. S1 was challenged by the question as he was lacking the background textual context.

Sudden switching of roles. **Excerpt from transcript 6: S3 is telling Akriti about ghosts he drew.**

13. TA: Is the water cold? Or is it cold?
14. S3: -

In the previous turns of the interaction, the student initiated the new topic of his interest - "ghosts". After 12 turns related to the topic, the teacher decided to change the topic to the one the student was unfamiliar with. By doing so, the teacher imposed the role of the receiver on the student and took the role of the initiator. The topic initiated by the teacher was not of student's interest and as a result the student did not respond and missed the turn.

In the next chapter, I will introduce the analysis of the findings and their relation to the main goal of this study: creating pedagogical implications for teachers' professional development.

DISCUSSION

Now I would like to go back to my research question: What discourse patterns in teacher talk enhance comprehension in one-on-one teacher-student interaction?

In my research, I found three conditions that resulted in SSTs: systematic repetitions, providing an opportunity for students to take on the role of initiator and reference. On the other hand, nine conditions resulted in MSTs: lack of consistency in repetition, multiple questions, multiple ideas in one sentence, sudden role switch with new topic introduction by teacher, lack of consistency in reference, use of abstract language, use of informal language, use of ungrammatical structure and lack of contextual background.

Most of the literature on teaching young learners expresses the need for engaging classroom contents in order to activate the language learning process (Genishi, 1981; Cameron, 2001; Gordon, 2007). The findings of my study deliver a very significant message to teachers working with young children in general and second language learners specifically: The teachers' talk in language-learning process cannot be underestimated.

My study emphasizes that the language teacher is responsible for creating output that activates the language-learning process. As it was mentioned in the literature review, comprehension is seen as an initial step in language acquisition (Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2000). This view gives even more weight to teacher talk as a major language-learning tool.

The components of teachers' interaction language that enhanced comprehension and facilitated students' output can be divided into two categories: text-related and interaction style related. Text related factors are the indicators of cohesiveness, endophoric references, and repetitions that prevailed in SSTs. Interaction style related factor deals with distribution of roles that have a supportive function in the classroom. Next, I will discuss the concepts and their implications I found significant for the teaching practices.

Benefits of the cohesive talk

As it was illustrated in the findings, there was a clear gap in the level (percentage) of student's comprehension between the two teachers. Lisa achieved an average level of comprehension above 90%, while Akriti's was around 80%. Although the gap was not very large, what the findings illustrate is that the main difference between the teachers lied in the ability to create cohesive and repetitive narratives that enforces students' comprehension. Why do the elements of cohesion (Hasan and Halliday, 1976) play such an important role as stimulator of comprehension?

Celce-Murcia and Olshtein's (2000) schematic condition of the top-down listening process is achieved by consistent repetition of vocabulary and reiteration of grammatical structures by teachers. In my opinion, variety of repetitions, another aspect of semantic unity

(Halliday & Hasan, 1976, 1989), were the major contributing factor to the gradual formation of students' contextual knowledge through interactions. Repetitions not only strengthened context hints fed to students by teacher, but also provided a learning tool that strengthened new vocabulary and grammatical structures.

The use of endophoric references, or textual references, well implemented by Lisa, resulted in logical chains of narratives in the interactions and supplied students with necessary contextual knowledge. In each interaction, Lisa constructed questions that systematically referred to the information provided by the student. Akriti's referencing style was less consistent and logical ties were not always clear.

Both teachers relied on a good amount of repetition to form meaningful texts that appealed to students' background and supported the processing of teachers' output. Although I could observe a consistent effort to reinforce grammatical structures and vocabulary in Lisa's interactions, in Akriti's case the reinforcements were not as systematic and the amount of reiterations was significantly less.

Contextual analysis in my study proves the importance of the textual component in comprehension processing. As the findings of my research show, second language teachers cannot rely solely on children's innate communication ability guided by social context and intonation (Locke, 1993), 'innate drive to coherence' (Meadows, 1993) or experience of intention (Donaldson, 1978). From the perspective of this study, language teachers have to strive to adopt coherent and strongly repetitive classroom interaction style that will trigger enhance comprehension and trigger students' curiosity to language learning as a result.

Distribution of the roles in interaction and level of comprehension.

As I indicated in the literature review, which was then supported by findings, the distribution of roles in interactions is another vital aspect of classroom dynamics as it improves comprehension level. The amount of research on the subject indicates a definite desire to find new ways to create a supportive and relaxing environment of communication between students and teachers (Wells, 1981, 1998; Edwards & Westgate, 1994; Westgate & Corden, 1993; Westgate & Hughes, 1997).

In my opinion, teachers using the I-R-F, triadic dialogue, (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975) are "constricted" by their obligation to use fixed structured conversation style that prevents them from maintaining a flowing conversation. In my study, the nature of the setting allowed teachers to create interactions where student could take on the role of initiator and were then allowed to express their ideas.

Students' drawings were the only source of information available to teachers in structuring a conversation. In other words, they had to center their conversation mainly on the information provided by students. Naturally, teachers being limited to knowledge provided, students then received the status of the knower of information and, by default, the teacher that of the receiver of information.

In Lisa's interactions, student initiating the conversation was a common occurrence. Every bit of new information contributed by the student was carefully recycled, extended and processed by the teacher. In part of Akriti's interactions, she attempted to take the role of initiator by changing the topic of discussions and causing the student to loose the significance of his role.

It seems to me that imposing a new topic on students without clear references to the main topic of discussion may create a communication barrier, as well as hinder comprehension. The students may also receive the message that their subject-matter does not appeal to the

teacher. Psychological factors and motivational factors are not measured in this study, but there is little doubt that along with comprehension, the result of sudden introduction of new topic might bring about a drop in the level of motivation of student to actively participate.

Finally, going back to the context matter (repetition and references) discussed earlier in this chapter, I believe that engagement of students in the role of initiator is a basic condition for cohesive classroom interaction. Students who are offered the role of initiator supply an important source of information that allows for repetitions and references, which can, in turn, be recycled and consumed by teachers.

The study demonstrates that professional development of language educators in the young learners second language classroom does not have to be such a challenging tasks. The factors that influenced comprehension are practical techniques of discourse analysis that can easily be acquired. Raising teacher awareness about the importance of repetitions and references, alternative turn-distribution, systematization of grammatical structures and contextual background will help teachers to achieve more comprehension, obtain better involvement from their young learners and by doing so improve the quality of second language education.

CONCLUSION

The aim of this paper was to shows how second language pedagogy in young children can benefit from applying concepts from the field of discourse analysis such as cohesion analysis and classroom interaction in order to find patterns in teacher-student interaction that would promote student comprehension. In the process, I also hoping to raise teachers' awareness of the influence they have on their students, as the way they speak impacts the process of interaction. I also wish to show that achieving more comprehensive and engaging language classroom does not necessarily require giving up natural speech.

In my analysis, I discuss a language activity connecting drawing with language learning in the preschool environment, which I designed using the content-based theory. In classroom sessions, students engaged in one-on-one conversation with the teacher and answered the questions to show their comprehension. Two teachers' interaction patterns were tested in terms of repetitiveness, turn-distribution and reference to the information provided by students.

The study has certain limitations as it involves a small group of children guided by only two teachers. The setting then makes it hard to generalize for cases in public Japanese kindergartens and preschools with larger classrooms. Another issue relating to the setting is the number of hours students are exposed to the target language in immersion school, which significantly differs from Japanese public kindergartens that offer English classes on a weekly basis.

The findings that emerged from the experiments describe the nature of SSTs and MSTs. In my research, I found three conditions that resulted in SSTs: systematic and various repetitions, opportunity of students to take on the role of initiator and reference. On the other hand, nine conditions resulted in MSTs: lack of consistency in repetition, multiple questions, multiple ideas in one sentence, sudden role switch with new topic introduction by teacher, lack of consistency in reference, use of abstract language, use of informal language, use of ungrammatical structure and lack of contextual background.

Despite these limitations, the findings of this research can assist teachers in obtaining higher levels of comprehension from students in small classroom settings and should be tested in and adapted for larger classrooms.

I covered a very narrow aspect of teaching English to young learners. The data accumulated in this study can be transformed into further studies. The aspects of praise, personalization, analysis of interaction topics, gender issues, bilingual issues, oral production are all possible future directions of the research. Another dimension can be multimodal analysis of possible connections between the visual component (student drawings) and lexical aspects (comprehension or oral production). All these direction definitely deserve attention in order to support the teachers with their task of raising a generation of fluent English speakers in Japan.

Based on my findings, I recommend four tools that language teachers can utilize to modify their interaction style to enhance students' comprehension: create opportunities for students to initiate conversation, systematically repeat key words provided by students, use reiteration to emphasize grammatical patterns and refer to contextual background. With this study I hope to open new doors in the field of preschool language acquisition in Japan and encourage more researchers to focus on quality of instruction of second language educators of that age group.

REFERENCES

Anderson, A., & Lynch T. (1988). *Listening.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Akcan, S. (2005). Supporting oral second language use: A learning experience in a first grade German immersion class. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 33(*6), 359-364.

Anderson, A., & Lynch T. (1988). *Listening.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. (cited in Celce-Murcia and Olshtain, 2000)

Bostwick, M.R. (2001). Bilingual education of children in Japan: Year four of a partial immersion program. In M. Goebel Noguchi M. & S. Fotos (Eds.), *Studies in Japanese bilingualism* (pp. 272-312). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Cameron, L., (2001). *Teaching languages to young children.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Celce-Murcia, M., & Olshtain, E. (2000). *Discourse and context in language teaching: A guide for language teachers.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Clay, M.M. (1979). *Reading: The patterning of complex behaviour.* (2nd ed.). Exeter, N.H.: Heinemann.

Dewey, J. (1943). *The school and society & The child and the curriculum.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Donaldson, M. (1978). *Children's minds.* London: Fontana. (cited in Cameron, 2001)

Eggins, S., & Slade, D. (1997). *Analyzing casual conversation.* London: Cassell.

Genishi, C. (1981). Language across the contexts of early childhood: Theory into practice, *Early Education: Child and Context, 20*(2), 109-115.

Garcia, A.L. (2006). A pragmatic analysis of children's interlanguage in EFL preschool contexts. *Intercultural Pragmatics, 3*(2), 171-193.

Gordon, T. (2007). *Teaching young children a second language.* Bel Air, LA: Praeger Publishers.

Graves, D. (1975). An examination of the writing processes of seven-year-old children. *Research in the Teaching of English, 9*(1), 227-242.

Halliday, M.A.K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English.* London: Longman.

Halliday, M.A.K., & Hasan, R. (1989). *Language, context and text: Aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Krashen, S.D. (1985). *The input hypothesis.* London: Longman.

Labov, W. (1972b). The study of language it its social context. In P. Gigilou (Eds.).Language and social context (pp. 283-307). Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Lightbown, P.M., & Spada, N. (2006). *How languages are learned.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Locke, J. (1993). *The child's path to spoken language.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Meadows, S. (1993). *The child as thinker.* London: Routledge.

Moll, L.C., & Diaz, S. (1987). Change as the goal of educational research. *Anthropology and Education Quaterly, 18*(4), 300-311.

Nunan, D. (2007). *Research methods in language learning*. (17th ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sinclair, J. McH., & Coulthard, R.M. (1975). *Towards and analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils.* London: Oxford University Press

Wells, G. (Eds.). (1981). *Learning through interaction: The study of language development.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wells, G. (1995), Reevaluating the I-R-F sequence: A proposal for the articulation of theories of activity and discourse for the analysis of teaching and learning in the classroom. *Linguistic and Education*, *5*, 1-37.

Westgate, D., & Hughes, M. (1997). Identifying `quality` in classroom talk: An enduring research task. *Language and Education*, *11*(2), 125-39.

Widdowson, H.G. (1990). *Aspects of language teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zepeda-de-Kane, F. (1980). *Young children's drawings as related to basic communication skills.* Gainesville, Fla.: University of Florida.

APPENDIX 1
Transcript 1: Lisa (L) – Student 1 (S1)
1. L: Alright Sena, tell me what you have! Who is this?
2. S1: Konan
3. L: Konan! And what is he doing?
4. S1: Angry!
5. L: Angry at who?
6. S1: Angry at Sumire!
7. L: What did Sumire do?
8. S1: Konan angry
9. L: Is he angry at Sumire, because Sumire doesn't want to play with him?
10. S1: Sasuke
11. L: Sasuke? Not Konan?
12. S1: Yes
13. L: So what's up with Sasuke doing?
14. S1 : -
15. L: Is he a butterfly, in the butterfly class?
16. S1 : Yes
17. L: In the butterfly room? What is he doing?
18. S: House! Success
19. L: Playing house? With who?
20. S1 : Sumire
21. L: And is Sasuke daddy?
22. S1: Yes and Sumire mommy!
23. L: And is Sena playing too?
24. S1: Yes, mommy success
25. L: You're mommy? Who is Sumire?
26. S1: Here.
27. L: Oh, on the other side!
So who is this?
28. S1: Ginjiro
29. L: Is he playing in the house too?
30. S1: No
31. L: No? What's he doing?
32. S1: Mmmmm
33. L: What Gin doing? Is he happy?
34. S1: No, angry
35. L: Who's he playing with?
36. S1: Konan success
37. L: Is he angry because of Konan? What are they playing?
38. S1: Kakurenbo
39. L: Hide-and-seek? clarif
40. S1: Yes
41. L: Oh and is Sumire and Sasuke playing too?
42. S1: Yes
43. L: But they are playing house! Is Sena playing with Sasuke and Sumire or Ginjiro and Konan?
44. S1: Gin and Konan
45. L: And who is the monster?

46. S1: Ginjiro
47. L: Ginjiro?! And where is Sena hiding?
48. S1: Butterfly room
49. L: I see in the butterfly room with Sasuke and Sumire?
50. S1: Yes
51. L: And did Ginjiro find you?
52. S1: Yes
53. L: And then what?
54. S1: Run in butterfly room
55. L: So you weren't hiding in there, but you ran into there?

Successful S's turns: 25
Missed S's turns: 2
S's comprehension : 93%
Teacher's turns: 29

Transcript 2: Akriti (A) – Student (S1)
1. A: What is it?
2. S1: -
3. A: Whats is it?
4. S1: Japan
5. A: Whats ensenshuro?
6. S11: Ball.
7. A: Ball?
Wow this whole big thing is a ball?
8. S1: Yes
9. A: What kind of ball is it? Does it have a color?
10. S1: -
11. A: Can you do something cool with the ball?
12. S1: Yes, Soccer.
13. A: Wow, it's a soccer ball!
14. S1: Yes
15. A: Do you play with the soccer ball?
16. S1: Yes
17. A: Wow, it's cool!
So it doesn't have any color?
18. S1: No
19. A: Where do you play with it? House or the park?
20. S1: Park!
21. A: Cool. What's this part?
22. S1: -
23. A: Can you say it one more time?
24. S1: -

25. A: Are you gonna fight with somebody?
26. S1: Yes
27. A: Did you say dark lake? Ok, thank you

Teacher's turns: 14
Successful turns: 9
Missed turns: 4
S's comprehension: 75%

Transcript 3: Lisa (L) – Student 2 (S2)
1. L: Ok, Takumi! Do you wanna tell me what you drew? Who is this? What is this? open
2. S2: Takumi! Konan!
3. L: Oh, Its Konan?
4. S2: Scary!
5. L: Oh, he's scary?
Who is this? What is this? open
6. S2: Me. (eyes - Japanese)
7. L: His eyes? Clarif
8. S2: Odeko (forehead-Japanese)
9. L: Odeko? Points to her forehead. This? Yes/no clarif
10. S2: Points to his head. This.
11. L: And what's wrong? Does he have an ouchy? Yes/no clarif
12. S2: Yes
13. L: Does he have a hat? Yes/no clarif
14. S2: No
15. L: Here? Why is a black eye? open
16. S2: -
17. L: Why is his eye black? Is he angry? Yes/no clarify, investigating
18. S2: Angry
20. L: And what is this? open
21. S2: Circle
22. L: Circle? And what is this? What is these big lines? Open-specific
23. S2: Hair
24. L: What is the blue? This one blue open-specific
25. S2: Kaminari
26. L: Lightning? Thunder reflection
Why, because you're angry? Open followed by suggestion
27. S2: No, Konan is angry.
28. L: And blue thunder? investigation
29. S2: Jap
30. L: Long? clarif
31. S2: Yes
32. L: Konan is angry and there is blue thunder? Yes/no clarif
33. S2: This one and this one and this one.
34. L: Do you wanna tell me more about Konan? open
35. S2: Here too, here too.

Teacher's turns: 17
Successful S's turns: 16
Missed turns: 1
S's comprehension: 89%
Co-efficient of efficiency: 0.9

Transcript 4: Akriti (A) – Student 2 (S2)
1. A: Ok, Ta-kun, this is so cool1
 Is it this way? Yes/no clarif
2. S2: This way -reassuring
3. A: And what did you make? open
4. S2: Snowman, snowman.
5. A: Snowman? Yes/no clarif
6. S2: Yes
7. A: Is it snow falling like this? Yes/no
8. S2: Snowman-
9. A: Is a snowman happy? Yes/no new info-investigating
10. S2: Angry
11. A: Angry, I can tell!
Are his eyes opened or closed. Like this (showing) yes/no clarify-choice
12. S2: Closed
13. A: OK, is snowman near Microcosmos? Yes/no clarif
14. S2: No
15. A: Is he near Takumi's house? Yes/no clarif
16. S2: Yes.
17. A: And where is Takumi? open
18. S2: Not here. Sick.
19. A: Oh, you're sick! And did you make a snowman? Yes/no clarif
20. S2: Yes
21. A: Did you make a snowman and got sick after? Yes/no clarif
22. S2:
23. A: Did you make a snowman and went atchoo and then you went inside? Is that what happened?
24. S2: -
25. A: Cool, I like it! Anything else?
26. S2: Yes
27. A: What? What else? Who else is here? open
28. S2: Happy is not here!
29. A: Ok, alright, thank you Takumi!

Teacher's turns: 15
Successful S's turns: 12
Missed S's turns: 2
S's comprehension: 86%
Co-efficient of efficiency: 0.8

Transcript 5: Lisa (L) – Student 3 (S3)

1. L: This one's an umbrella? How many umbrellas? Yes/no initiation
2. S3: This one. Moon.
3. L: And many umbrellas? Yes/no connector –focusing
4. S3: Many umbrellas.
5. L: Many umbrellas? Confirming yes/no
6. S3: Yes
7. L: From who? open
8. S3: -
9. L: Daddy or Rei-chan? Clarifying the open question
10. S3: Rei-chan, this one Rei-chan.
11. L: Who's is this? open
12. S3: This one Mommy's!
13. L: And who's is this? Open repetitive
14. S3: Mai-chan!
Mai-chan'a pink. Providing more information
15. L: I thought it was the moon. Reflecting -feedback
Moon for Mai-chan? Yes/no request for new information
16. S3: Yes
17. L: Wow! Is it raining? Is that what this is? Yes/no –negotiating the meaning
18. S3: This one agreeing
19. L: And where is everybody going? open-initiating a new topic
20. S3: This one, this one, this one (pointing at different objects)
21. L: What is it? Open-
This one is what?
22. S3: Rain
23. L: And where are you going? To school or outside? Where are you going? open-providing clue and choice
24. S3: To pool.
25. L: To pool? In the rain? Yes/no request for child's approval
26. S3: Yes
27. L: And what did you do? Did you go swimming? Open- clueing and initiating a new topic
28. S3: Swimming.
29. L: With everybody? And what is it? More rain? Lots of colors? Summarizing and asking for child's feedback
30. S3: Yes.
31. L: Very nice, thank you Rei-Rei.-praise

Teacher's turns: 16
Successful S's turns: 14
Missed S's turn: 1
S's comprehension: 100%
Co-efficient of efficiency: 0.9

Transcript 6: Akriti (A) – Student 3 (S3)

1. A: What is it?
2. S3: Ghost!
3. A: Is there two ghosts or one ghost?
4. S3: Two ghosts
5. A: Wow and what is the ghost doing?
6. S3: Obake asobi
7. A: Are they playing with each other? Two ghosts playing with each other?
8. S3: Yes! Obake no mizu asobi!
9. A: Are they playing in the water?
10. S3: Yes
11. A: Wow Are they playing with each other in the water?
Are they cold?
12. S3: -
13. A: Is the water cold? Or is it cold?
14. S3: -
15. A: Cold or hot?
16. S3: Hot
17. A: Hot water! Wow
18. S3: Yes
19. A: What color are the ghosts?
20. S3: Black and yellow
21. A: Great
Are they Rei's friends?
Do you see them?
22. S3: Yes
23. A: Cool
Anything else? Are they cool ghosts? Are they friendly or scary?
24. S3: Scary
25. A: Scary, but they're friends with Rei!
26. S3: Yes
27. A: Good job Rei!

Teacher's turns: 14
Successful S's turns: 11
Missed S's turns: 2
S's comprehension: 85%
Co-efficient of efficiency: 0.7

Transcript 7: Lisa (L) – Student 4 (S4)

1. S4: Snake-child –initiated
2. L: A blue snake? A bad snake? Clarification – yes/no questions
3. S4: Yes, bad snake. Success-answer, followed by clarification

4. L: Is it scary? Yes/no initiating a new topic-personalization of experience

5. S4: Yes, scary. Success-Complex answer

6. L: It gets the bad guys? Yes/no –asking for details

7. S4: Japanese

8. L: Does he have a name? yes/no-bringing back the focus-personalizing

9. S4: Yes-agreement

10. L: What's his name? open-request for details

11. S4: Bob

12. L: Interesting. Bob. Is there one snake? Feedback yes/no question, asking for more details

13. S4: Yes

14. L: Only one? Yes/no –more clarification

15. S4: Yes

16. L: is it big or small? Choice question, avoiding the breakdown

17. S4: big

18. L: And where does he live? Does he live in Takao's house? Open followed up by yes/no - clarification

18. S4: Yes. This one. Success- referring to his picture-personalization

19. L: In your toilet? Yes/no –initiating a new topic , personalizing

20. S4: this one – reinforcing

21. L: where is this? Here? In your kitchen open – request for details

22. S4: This one in takao's house- complex answer

23. L: Good, let me write it down. Feedback

Teacher's turns: 12
Successful S's turns: 11
Missed S's turns: 0
S's comprehension: 100%
Co-efficient of efficiency: 1

Transcript 8: Akriti (A) – Student 4 (S4)

1. A: What did you make Takao?

2. S4: Ultraman

3. A: Who's that?
What did this Ultraman do? What did he look like? Red?

4. S4: …

5. A: Does he wear red cloth?

6. S4: Yes

7. A: Where is he? Show me!

8. S4: …

9. A: He lives there?

10. S4: Yes

11. A: Where is he? Show me?

12. S4: Here

13. A: Oh, cool?
Whats' this one? A toy? An Ultraman toy? What kind of toy is it? Does it look like a car?

14. S4: …

15. A: A house?

16. S4: Yes, house.
17. A: Cool. What's this one?
18. S4: Daddy
19. A: Is Daddy in Ultraman's house playing with his toys in the toy house?
20. S4: Yes
21. A: What's this?
22. S4: A snake.
23. A: Is it a toy snake or a real snake?
24. S4: Real snake.
25. A: Scary! Is the snake a friend or is he fighting the snake?
26. S4: Fighting
27. A: My god, that's scary! And what's this purple line?
28. S4: Gonja- name of the character
29. A: Alright, thank you Takao!

Teacher's turns: 15
Successful S's turns: 11
Missed S's turns: 3
S's comprehension: 77%

Transcript 9: Lisa (L) – Student 5 (S5)
1. L: Ok, Sae what is it?
2. S5: Snow
3. L: This is a snow?
4. S5: Yes
5. L: Snow and what?
Snowflakes? Snow and fish?
6. S5: Snowfish!
7. L: Where?
8. S5: Here
9. L: And what's the snowfish doing?
10. S5: Santa
11. L: Santa? What is it doing with Santa?
12. S5: Drawing!
13. L: The snowfish is drawing with Santa?
14. S5: Yes
15. L: Wow, how interesting and where are they?
16. S5: Water
17. L: Wow, how interesting! Snowfish in the water!
18. S5: Yes
19. L: Funny! And it's snowing off the water?
20. S5: Yes
21. L: And is Saeka here or no?
22. S5: No
23. L: Oh, she's just watching?
24. S5: Yes
25. L: Anything else?
26. S5: Yes, wash?

27. L: Wash hands in the water?
28. S5: Yes, with soap!
29. L: With soap? Who's washing in the water?
30. S5: Fish
31. L: Funny, the fish?
32. S5: Yes
33. L: Is he washing his fin and Santa helping him?
34. S5: Yes
35. L: Funny
Do you want to tell me anything else?
36. S5: Yes, toilet.
37. L: What about it?
38. S5: Fish - Japanese
39. L: Is fish in the toilet washing his hands?
40. S5: Yes
41. L: Oh, my! Isnt that dirty?
43. S5: Yes
44. L: Give five! Funny story

Teacher's turns: 22
Successful S's turns: 21
Missed S's turns: 1
S's comprehension: 100%
Co-efficient of efficiency: 0.95

Transcript 10: Akriti (A) – Student 5 (S5)
1. S5: Akriti.
2. A: Is that teacher Akriti? What is teacher Akriti doing?
3. S5: -
4. A: is teacher Akriti talking to Santa.
5. S5: Akriti
6. A: Is teacher Akriti talking to Santa and Sae is Anpanman?
7. S5: Yes. Lisa.
8. A: What is teacher Lisa doing?
9. S5: Lisa- Santa.
10. A: Is teacher Lisa talking to Santa?
11. S5: Yes
12. A: What are they talking about?-twice
13. S5: -
14. A: Are they talking about Caterpillars?
Are they showing Santa who's naughty and nice?
15. S5: Nice
16. A: They are telling Santa about the Caterpillars presents.
Wow, good job, Saeka!
Is Saeka gonna get a present?
17. S5: Yes
18. A: We'll tell Santa to get you Anpanman.

Teacher's turns: 9

Successful S's turns: 5
Missed S's turns: 3
S's comprehension: 63%
Co-efficient of efficiency: 0.7