Questioning Techniques and Student Participation

Nuttawarin Teerakornvisatpugdee
Wilaksana Srimavin
King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi

Abstract
This paper investigates the use of Cole & Chan's (1987) questioning techniques to see the factors affecting the success of their use. The study was conducted with three native teachers of English who used the same topic in three classes of undergraduate students in the Engineering Faculty of a Thai university. The research instrument was the transcripts from the video recording of the classes. The results of the study indicate that the teachers varied in their use of questioning techniques to help their students answer questions. While 'redirecting' was the only technique that none of the teachers used, the most successful technique was 'prompting'. However, the success of teachers' questioning did not depend on the numbers of techniques used. It can be concluded that, in order to get students' participation when asking questions, teachers should be aware of the difficulty level of the questions in terms of such matters as students' language proficiency and background knowledge, waiting time and classroom atmosphere.

Introduction

In the past, most teachers usually gave their knowledge and experience to students directly, controlled them and corrected their performance. It seemed that everything depended on the teachers being teacher-centered and the students waiting passively for their teachers to lecture them. Nowadays, there is a modern learner-centered approach used to change passive learners into active ones. Students are expected to be more involved in learning and teaching. Dickinson (1987) states that, in a learner-centered approach, there are many ways that teachers can give learners opportunities to use language to communicate and participate in the classroom, for instance, using pair work or group work; letting students guess the meanings of words; or eliciting, which is a technique that activates students to participate more in the class.

Literature review

Elicitation and questioning

Practically, there are many ways to elicit information from students. Gower et al. (1995) suggest that teachers could elicit information from their students by using gestures, pictures, information from previous lessons, or providing prompts or cues. Questions could be used as well to elicit information from students. Watson Todd (1997) supports the idea that teachers could use a series of questions to elicit the required information from students. Ur (1996) adds that using questions makes student active in learning and also allows weaker students to have a better chance to participate. Thus, it is clear that questioning is one elicitation technique that creates interaction between teachers and students in the classroom.

Why teachers use questioning techniques

Teachers frequently ask questions in the classroom, and there are many reasons why. Freiberg & Driscoll (2000) mention the three most common purposes: to check for students' understanding of instructions, to evaluate the effectiveness of the lesson, and to increase higher-level thinking. Watson Todd (1997) adds some further reasons: questions

can be asked to facilitate communication; questions can be used to focus attention on a topic; and to stimulate motivation, interest and participation.

Furthermore, Ur (1996) supports the idea that questioning can be used to find out facts, ideas or opinions from learners. Lastly, concerning language learning, Richards & Lockhart (1994) state that the teacher can use questions to elicit particular structures or vocabulary items. From the ideas aforementioned, it is obvious that questions are important for teaching and learning in the classroom.

How teachers use questioning techniques

Normally, teachers often ask questions, get responses, give feedback and then ask new questions; however, they do not always get responses from the students. White & Lightbown (1984, cited in Chaudron, 1988) found that three secondary ESL teachers asked up to four questions per minute and 40% of the questions did not receive responses. There are many reasons why students may not answer questions; for example, students are thinking, do not hear clearly or have no ideas to tell the teacher. To deal with this, teachers should know effective questioning techniques.

There are many techniques that teachers can use to let students talk and participate in the classroom. Cole & Chan (1987: 122-4) describe ten techniques for teachers to help students formulate an appropriate response.

- *Pausing*: The teacher might give the student time to think about the question and formulate a response.
- *Prompting*: The teacher gives a cue or prompt, which could be visual or verbal, to help students find the answer.
- *Repeating*: During repetition, the teacher might stress key words and phrases to highlight underlying meanings in the question.
- *Rephrasing*: The teacher might rephrase the question, such as by replacing the term ‘good points’ with ‘advantages’.
- *Providing additional information*: The teacher then might give the missing information that might have caused the difficulty.
- *Asking supplementary questions*: If students’ answers are too broad or too narrow, the teacher might ask a sub-question to help them give a more appropriate answer.
- *Encouraging students to predict answers*: Students might not be sure about an answer, so the teacher might encourage them to think about possible answers by asking a question or making a statement to help them to predict the answer.
- *Redirecting*: The teacher asks other students to answer a question if the first nominee cannot answer.
- *Changing level of cognitive demand*: If the question is too difficult or needs cognitive skills that are beyond students’ level of competency, the teacher might have to change the cognitive demand level to suit the students. This could be done by making the vocabulary easier, providing a diagram or model or aid to assist in the interpretation of the question, shifting the emphasis of the question from comprehension to recall, or changing a wh-question to another one.
- *Structuring*: Teachers can link the answers to a sequence of questions with evaluative comments or interpretations, or summarize the information at the end of a question-and-answer series.

When teachers use questioning techniques

Normally, teachers can use questioning for different purposes, but this study focuses only on asking questions to elicit information from students. Moreover, the researchers believe that, assuming use of the paradigm ‘presentation, practice, production’ (PPP), amount of

elicitation used in the presentation stage is higher than the amount of elicitation used in the practice or production stages. Supporting this idea, Watson Todd (1997: 69-70) says, "Eliciting can occur at any time in the lesson, but is perhaps most commonly conducted during the presentation stage".

Methodology

This section describes the participants, instrument, procedures and data analysis.

Participants

Subject teachers

This study focuses on the use of questioning techniques by native teachers of English. Due to limitations of time, the researchers decided to have only 3 subjects, all native teachers of English teaching the same topics in a course that emphasized oral communication (Oral Communication I). This course was selected because it provided a lot of interaction between the teacher and the students. To try to protect the research from being biased, the first researcher did not tell the subject teachers directly that she would observe their questioning techniques but just informed them in general terms that the study was about teachers asking questions and students participating in class.

Students

The students who participated in this study were undergraduates studying in the oral communication course. There were three classes, with 25-30 students in each, all of them from the Faculty of Engineering and with intermediate proficiency in English.

Instrument

The researcher used a video recorder to capture the details of the questioning techniques used and the students' reactions to each questioning technique. In this study, each subject teacher was recorded only once for one hour. The video recorder was set in a corner at the front of the class, where the subject teachers and students could see it. After collecting the data through the video recorder, transcripts (see appendix) were used as the research instrument. The first researcher selected for transcription only the parts of the lessons where questioning techniques were used. The data in the transcripts were classified to identify types of questioning techniques and also analyzed to find out which types of question most frequently received responses.

Procedures

The first researcher asked permission from each of the three subject teachers to video-record their class for one hour; the topic of each recorded class was job interviews. Next, the episodes of questioning techniques in the presentation stage were selected and transcribed. Since the first researcher did not directly observe the classes and the subject teachers did not use microphones, she sometimes could not hear some words clearly. Therefore, she asked one of her MA classmates to double-check the video and the transcripts. Then, she labeled each type of questioning technique used to find out which ones were most likely to receive a response. A response is defined as at least one word that is meaningful in the context.

Data analysis

The data in the transcripts were analyzed and categorized under Cole & Chan's aforementioned questioning technique categories. After that, the data from the transcripts were tallied to show the number of each subject teacher's use of questioning techniques. Later, the questioning techniques were arranged in descending order of frequency. Finally, the data from the transcripts were analyzed again for techniques most likely to receive a response. In the same way, the percentages of success (i.e. subject teachers

obtaining a response) were arranged from maximum to minimum in order to interpret the results.

Data presentation

This section begins by presenting the questioning techniques used by the subject teachers and then focuses on those that were most likely to receive a response.

General findings

The frequency of use of the questioning techniques by each subject teacher is shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Frequency of use of questioning techniques by each subject teacher

Questioning techniques	ST1	ST2	ST3	Total
Pausing	3	3	7	**13**
Rephrasing	0	2	9	**11**
Asking supplementary questions	1	1	9	**11**
Repeating	3	0	7	**10**
Providing additional information	1	0	7	**8**
Prompting	0	1	4	**5**
Changing level of cognitive demand	0	0	3	**3**
Encouraging students to predict answers	0	1	0	**1**
Structuring	0	0	1	**1**
Redirecting to other students	0	0	0	**0**

Note: ST1 = Subject Teacher 1, etc.

Table 1 shows that the subject teachers used ‘pausing’ more frequently than any of the other questioning techniques (totalling 13 times); meanwhile, ‘rephrasing’ and ‘asking supplementary questions’ were equally used (11 times). Another technique which was used fairly frequently was ‘repeating’ (10 times), as was ‘providing additional information’ (8 times). The techniques that were used less often were ‘prompting’ (5 times) and ‘changing level of cognitive demand’ (3 times). The techniques used only once were ‘encouraging students to predict answers’ and ‘structuring’. There was only one technique, ‘redirecting to other students’, that none of the three subject teachers used to help students respond.

Focusing on individual subject teachers, Table 1 shows that 4 questioning techniques were used by the first subject teacher (ST1). ‘Pausing’ and ‘repeating’ were used the most (3 times each); both ‘asking supplementary questions’ and ‘providing additional information’ were used only once. The second subject teacher (ST2) used ‘pausing’ more than other techniques (3 times) to give students time to answer questions; ‘rephrasing’ was used twice; and the least used techniques (only once each) were ‘asking supplementary questions’, ‘prompting’ and ‘encouraging students to predict answers’. In contrast to the other two subject teachers, the third subject teacher (ST3) used many techniques: ‘rephrasing’ and ‘asking supplementary questions’ were the most used (9 times) whereas ‘pausing’, ‘repeating’ and ‘providing additional information’ were used less often (7 times each). This subject teacher also helped students give answers by ‘prompting’ (4 times), ‘changing level of cognitive demand’ (3 times) and ‘structuring’ (once).

Questioning techniques that received a response

In order to see which questioning techniques are most likely to receive a response, the total frequencies of each technique to receive a response and non-response and also the percentages of success in using such techniques (i.e. triggering a response) are presented in Table 2, below.

Table 2: Questioning techniques that received responses

Questioning techniques	Successful				Unsuccessful				Total	Success (%)
	ST1	ST2	ST3	Total	ST1	ST2	ST3	Total		
Prompting	0	1	3	**4**	0	0	1	**1**	**5**	**80.00**
Changing level of cognitive demand	0	0	2	**2**	0	0	1	**1**	**3**	**66.67**
Asking supplementary questions	0	1	6	**7**	1	0	3	**4**	**11**	**63.64**
Pausing	1	3	2	**6**	2	0	5	**7**	**13**	**46.15**
Rephrasing	0	0	3	**3**	0	2	6	**8**	**11**	**27.27**
Providing additional information	0	0	2	**2**	1	0	5	**6**	**8**	**25.00**
Repeating	1	0	1	**2**	2	0	6	**8**	**10**	**20.00**
Encouraging students to predict answers	0	0	0	**0**	0	1	0	**1**	**1**	**0**
Structuring	0	0	0	**0**	0	0	1	**1**	**1**	**0**
Redirecting to other students	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Note: ST1 = Subject Teacher 1, etc.

From Table 2, it can be seen that 'prompting', with a success rate of 80%, was the technique that was most likely to receive a response from the students; the subject teachers used 'prompting' a total of 5 times, but it failed to work only once. The percentages of success for 'changing level of cognitive demand' and 'asking supplementary questions' were quite high: respectively, 66.67% (3 times used, worked twice) and 63.64% (11 times used, worked 7 times); this means both these techniques also worked well. The subject teachers used 'pausing' a total of 13 times and it worked 6 times (46.15%). However, they were not very successful at using 'rephrasing', 'providing additional information' and 'repeating' techniques, as evidenced by the fairly low percentages of success (27.27%, 25% and 20%, respectively). Worse, two rarely used techniques, 'encouraging students to predict answers' and 'structuring', were completely unsuccessful (0%). 'Redirecting to other students' was not used; consequently, there was no information to reveal whether it worked or not.

Discussion

This discussion includes implications and recommendations.

The unused technique

In this study, the questioning technique 'redirecting' was unused. In cases where the first student failed to respond, the subject teachers did not call upon any other students to answer the questions. Considering the data in the transcripts (see appendix), there were some reasons why the subject teachers did not do so. Initially, the students might know the answers, so they answered the question right after hearing it. Next, the subject teachers might have seen that the students regularly participated in the classroom; thus, it was not necessary to call a student's name to draw his/her attention. Alternatively, they may have thought that the students wanted time to think, so they tried to use other techniques, such as 'pausing', 'paraphrasing' or 'repeating'.

Additionally, the researchers believe that there might be other reasons why the subject teachers may not have wanted to use this technique. Watson Todd (1997) mentions a

number of relevant factors. First, class size is an important factor; if the class is big, 'redirecting' might be avoided. Second, the cultural environment might affect the teacher's decision-making in the sense that some cultures might prefer choral responses. The last factor is classroom atmosphere; the teacher might not want to put pressure on an individual student to answer.

The researcher also believes that, in some cases, a teacher should use 'redirecting' because it encourages students to participate. Gower & Walters (1983: 48-50) mention that calling a student's name might make the student feel good that the teacher sees them as important in the class. However, they add that "the student's name is best used after the question has been asked or the instruction given"; if the person is called before the question is asked, he/she may panic or lose confidence.

Factors promoting the success of questioning

The subject teachers used many questioning techniques, some successful and others unsuccessful. The two main factors promoting the success of questioning (choosing suitable techniques for the situation and encouraging students to respond) are discussed and illustrated; this will be followed by consideration of factors hindering success. (For full contexts of the data samples in this discussion as well as transcript conventions observed, see appendix.)

Choosing suitable techniques for the situation

First of all, the subject teachers often gave proper guidance to their students. From the results in Table 2, it can be seen that 'prompting' was the most successful technique. The question-answer series below (see Extract 1, lines 4-7, in the appendix) illustrates how subjects can succeed with 'prompting'; here, ST2 guided students by giving an appropriate example, enabling them to answer the question.

ST2: What are your languages? Thai- **[Prompting]**
Ss: And English.
ST2: And English, yes.

Secondly, the wording, structure and difficulty level of questions were often suited to the students' level of comprehension. Cole & Chan (1987) suggest that the vocabulary and syntax of the questions should match the students' ability. Good & Brophy (2000: 391) support that "questions should be phrased in natural, simple language (as opposed to pedantic, textbook language) and should be adapted to the level of the class". In terms of content, Watson Todd (1997: 36) says that teachers "should try to match the level of difficulty of their questions with the students' level". According to the results (Table 2), 'changing level of cognitive demand' had quite a high percentage of success (66.67%); therefore, when the subject teachers changed from a difficult question to an easy one, the students might give a response, as shown below (see Extract 2, lines 51-60, in the appendix).

ST3: Pardon. Well, the first part is… This is an 'if-clause', you're right. And sentences with if-clauses have a name.
Ss: (Silence for two seconds) **[Pausing]**
ST3: Begin with 'c'. **[Prompting]**
Ss: Condition …
ST3: Yes, it is conditional, isn't it? Which one is it? **[Changing level of cognitive demand]** First, second or third? **[Changing level of cognitive demand]**
Ss: Third.

In this part, when the students knew that sentences with an if-clause were 'conditional', ST3 changed the difficulty level of the question by using the 'changing level of cognitive demand' technique; as a result, he/she received responses. The reason why ST3 used this technique was probably because he/she saw that it was too difficult for the students to tell the complete name of the particular type of conditional sentences.

Next, the results in this study showed that 'pausing' had a 46.15% success rate. The example below (see Extract 3, lines 1-5, in the appendix) shows how this technique succeeded; ST2 used only the 'pausing' technique to give students enough time to think about the answers.

ST2: What about your education?
Ss: (Silence for three seconds) **[Pausing]**
S5: Major study.
S6: Name of university.
ST2: Major study, name of university. Yes.

Long et al. (1984, cited in Richards & Lockhart, 1994) found that teachers frequently used a very short wait time, around one second, which is barely adequate time for students to respond. If teachers gave more time, around three to five seconds, student responses would almost certainly increase.

Another technique utilized by the subject teachers was 'providing sufficient information' or additional information to the students; the following data sample (see Extract 2, lines 45-51, in the appendix) provides an illustration.

ST3: Now, what name do we give to this structure?
Ss: Because …
ST3: What name? This structure 'if and the past tense, *would* and the base verb' has a name. **[Providing sufficient information]**
Ss: (Whisper)
ST3: Pardon. Well, the first part is … This is an 'if-clause', you're right.

Before this interaction took place (see Extract 2, lines 1-44, in the appendix), ST3 had read the sentence, "If I had that kind of marriage, we wouldn't have much at the home." Then the subject teacher asked the students about the name of the structure. Such a question was too difficult; therefore, when the subject teacher added that the structure consists of 'if' followed by 'would' and the base verb, the students were able to respond. In short, the subject teachers could help their students by 'providing sufficient information' to answer the questions.

Encouraging students to respond
Apart from the role of questioning techniques in promoting students' responses in questions, the data showed that the subject teachers also obtained responses by encouraging their students. There were several ways in which they did this. For instance, ST2 raised his/her voice and this was successful in eliciting a response, albeit a silent one (see Extract 1, lines 1-3, in the appendix):

ST2: How many people here have more than one language? **{Question}** Yes. Put your hands up, please. All of you? **{Encouraging students to answer}**
Ss: (@ Raise their hands. @)

Meanwhile, another subject teacher successfully coaxed his/her students to respond by giving words of encouragement, such as “come on, don’t be timid”.

Factors obstructing the success of questioning

There are some factors which caused the use of questioning to fail. One factor is the asking of vague questions. If the question is too broad, students might not know the focus and so be unable to respond. In this study, sometimes the subject teachers asked vague questions, as illustrated below (see Extract 4, lines 1-5, in the appendix).

ST3: We are going to listen to something about ideal jobs, an ideal job, so close your books. What words do you think is ideal? **{Question}** What is that?
Ss: (Silence for two seconds)

Even though ST3 then repeated the question, the students did not respond. It might be because the subject teacher’s question was vague. The students did not know what the subject teacher wanted them to answer. Brown (2001) mentions that a vague question that uses abstract or ambiguous language may depress interactive learning. Groisser (1964, cited in Good & Brophy, 2000) says that, when teachers ask a vague question that can be responded to in too many ways, such questions will confuse students. To solve this problem, teachers should ask obvious, straightforward questions at the beginning.

Moreover, students’ knowledge and language ability are also important factors. If teachers ask questions which are not suited to their language ability, they may not be able to answer because of difficulties with vocabulary or grammatical structure. In addition, students might have no idea how to answer because they do not have sufficient background knowledge. The example below (see Extract 2, lines 53-66, in the appendix) illustrates how students’ insufficient knowledge and/or language ability can obstruct the success of teachers’ questioning.

ST3: And sentences with if-clauses have a name. **[Rephrasing]**
Ss: (Silence for two seconds) **[Pausing]**
ST3: Begin with ‘c’. **[Prompting]**
Ss: Condition.
ST3: Yes, it is conditional, isn’t it? **[Providing additional information]** Which one is it? **[Changing level of cognitive demand]** First, second or third? **[Changing level of cognitive demand]**
Ss: Third.
ST3: There are four types of conditional sentences. **[Providing additional information]** We give them a number. **[Prompting]** Which one is it? **[Repeating]**
Ss: (Silence for two seconds) **[Pausing]**
ST3: I’m not sure. OK. In this case, this is the second. OK.

Here, ST3 asked about the name of a structure that has an if-clause, but students could not answer the question. Next, ST3 tried to help them by giving the prompt, until they could name the structure; however, the answer was not complete. Later, he/she used many techniques to help them, but they still could not give the answer. It was because they had no idea how to answer and their language abilities were not good enough. From this study, it seems that providing suitable information might assist teachers in solving this problem. This idea is reinforced by Cole & Chan (1987) as they state that, if teachers asked questions appropriate to students’ knowledge, experience and abilities, students would respond because they understand and have enough knowledge to do so.

However, sometimes the subject teachers asked suitable questions, but the students still did not answer. This is possibly because they lacked confidence and felt reluctant to speak out or were afraid to lose face if their answer was wrong. Tarone & Yule (1989: 139) state that "self-confidence is normally assumed to have an influence in successful learning". Hence, to solve this problem, teachers might try to create a secure atmosphere in class such as by asking an easy question before a difficult one so students could take risks to answer. Watson Todd (1997) adds that a series of questions can be sequenced from the familiar to the new, from general to specific, from factual to inferential, or in a chronological order. Cole & Chan (1987: 131–132) support the idea, saying, "asking questions in the order from easy to difficult, students will gain confidence". They add that students prefer teachers to ask questions that they are able to answer and so get positive reactions from their teachers or friends. Brown (2001) mentions that teachers should make students believe in their ability and suggests many ways to encourage every student to take risks. Firstly, teachers should create an atmosphere in class by encouraging students to try to respond and not simply wait for a volunteer. Moreover, they might try to respond to students' answers in a positive way such as praising; in doing so, students will dare to take further risks in answering questions.

Conclusion

This study was designed to find out how three teachers used questioning techniques (Cole & Chan, 1987) and which of these techniques was most likely to elicit student responses. The results of the study indicate that each teacher used different questioning techniques to help students answer questions. 'Redirecting' was the only technique that none of the teachers used. The most successful technique in terms of triggering student responses was 'prompting'. It should be noted that the success of teachers' questioning did not depend on the frequency of use of each technique. There are many factors promoting the success of questioning, such as proper guidance, sufficient time, appropriate wording, structure and level of difficulty, and encouragement. As illustrated in the implications and recommendations in this study, to prevent failure in questioning and so they can give proper support, teachers should be aware of their students' background knowledge and level of language proficiency.

References

Brown, H. D. (2001) *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy* (2nd edition). New York: Longman.

Chaudron, C. (1988) *Second Language Classrooms: Research on Teaching and Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cole, P. G. & Chan, L. K. S. (1987) *Teaching Principles and Practice*. Sydney: Prentice Hall.

Dickinson, L. (1987) *Self-Instruction in Language Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Freiberg, H. J. & Driscoll, A. (2000) *Universal Teaching Strategies* (3rd edition). Needham Heights: Allyn & Bacon.

Good, T. L. & Brophy, J. E. (2000) *Looking in Classrooms*. New York: Longman.

Gower, R. & Walters, S. (1983) *Teaching Practice Handbook*. London: Heinemann.

Gower, R., Phillips, D. & Walters, S. (1995) *Teaching Practice Handbook*. Hong Kong: Heinemann.

Groisser, P. (1964) *How to Use the Fine Art of Questioning*. New York: Teachers' Practical Press.

Long, M. H., Brock, C., Crookes, G., Deike, C., Potter, L. & Zhang, S. (1984) *The Effect of Teachers' Questioning Patterns and Wait-Time on Pupil Participation in Public High School Classes in Hawaii for Students of Limited English Proficiency*.

Technical Report 1. Honolulu: Center of Second Language Classroom Research, Social Science Research Institute, University of Hawaii at Manoa.
Richards, J. C. & Lockhart, C. (1994) *Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Tarone, E. & Yule, G. (1989) *Focus on the Language Learner*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Ur, P. (1996) *A Course in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Watson Todd, R. (1997) *Classroom Teaching Strategies*. London: Prentice Hall.
White, J. & Lightbown, P. M. (1984) Asking and answering in ESL classes. *Canadian Modern Language Review* 40: 228-244.
Wilen, W. W. (1984) Implications of research on questioning for the teacher educator. *Journal of Research and Development in Education* 17: 31-35.

Appendix: Transcripts

@	=	Laughing	↗	=	Raising voice
-	=	Stopping in middle of phrase	[ ]	=	Overlapping speed
( )	=	Acting or unclear words	…	=	Pausing
[*Q*]	=	Name of each technique	**{ }**	=	Initial question/Question/
[sic]	=	Error from subject			Encouraging students to answer
[5]	=	Line number in original transcript			

Extract 1: Subject Teacher 2

This extract came after the subject teacher elicited the contents of resumés and, with this in mind, asked the students about their languages.

ST2: How many people here have more than one language? **{Question}** Yes. Put your hands up, please. All of you? **{Encouraging students to answer}**
Ss: (@ Raise their hands. @)
ST2: Yes. What are your languages? **{Initial Question}** [5] Thai- **[Prompting]**
Ss: And English.
ST2: And English, yes.

Extract 2: Subject Teacher 3

In this extract, the subject teacher let the students do a dictation activity. After they finished it, the subject teacher used the dictation passage to discuss a language point, the second conditional, beginning by trying to elicit the name of the structure.

ST3: Now, I want you to look at some of the language used particularly in this last paragraph. Look at the first sentence, "If I had that kind of marriage, we wouldn't have much at the home." Do you know what structure is? **{Initial Question}** [5] What grammar is it? **[Rephrasing]** We have a name for it. **[Providing additional information]** What's the first word? **[Asking supplementary questions]**
Ss: (Silence for three seconds) **[Pausing]**
ST3: First word in the sentence? **[Rephrasing]**
S1: [10] If.
ST3: Right. What tense is the verb? **[Asking supplementary questions]**
Ss: Past.
ST3: Past tense. [15] Now, what's the next word? **[Asking supplementary questions]** "If I had that kind of marriage…" Is this 'I' or 'we'? **[Asking supplementary questions]**
Ss: We.
ST3: What's after that? **[Asking supplementary questions]**
Ss: [20] Would, wouldn't.
ST3: And then? **[Asking supplementary questions]**

Ss: Have much.
ST3: OK. So, what tense is ‘have’? **[Rephrasing questions]**
Ss: Simple.
ST3: [25] Not really. No. Does it change? **[Asking supplementary questions]** If it was the simple present, we would say “we wouldn’t has”. **[Providing additional information]** Does it change? **[Repeating]** [30] Sorry! “He wouldn’t has [sic]”. Does it change? **[Repeating]** If it was ‘he’ instead of (unclear), what would come next? **[Asking supplementary questions]**
Ss: [35] Have.
ST3: Have or has? **[Changing level of cognitive demand / Providing additional information]**
Ss: Have.
ST3: It always (unclear; base verb …) It would never be ‘has’, always ‘have’. **[Providing additional information]** [40] Let’s put the verb here. If I – **[Prompting]**
Ss: Had.
ST3: ‘Had’ OK. We wouldn’t – **[Prompting]**
Ss: Have.
ST3: Have much at the home. [45] Now, what name do we give to this structure? **[Rephrasing]**
Ss: Because.
ST3: What name? **Repeating]** This structure ‘if and the past tense, would and the base verb’ has a name. **[Providing additional information]**
Ss: [50] (Whisper)
ST3: Pardon. Well, the first part is … This is an ‘if-clause’, you’re right. **[Structuring]** And sentences with if-clauses have a name. **[Rephrasing]**
Ss: (Silence for two seconds) **[Pausing]**
ST3: [55] Begin with ‘c’. **[Prompting]**
Ss: Condition.
ST3: Yes, it is conditional, isn’t it? **[Providing additional information]** Which one is it? **[Changing level of cognitive demand]** First, second or third? **[Changing level of cognitive demand]**
Ss: [60] Third.
ST3: There are four [sic] types of conditional sentences. **[Providing additional information]** We give them a number. **[Prompting]** Which one is it? **[Repeating]**
Ss: [65] (Silence for two seconds) **[Pausing]**
ST3: I’m not sure. OK. In this case, this is the second. OK.

Extract 3: Subject Teacher 2

For this teaching, the subject teacher let the students write a resumé for a job application and tried to elicit what they should put it. At the beginning, this subject teacher asked the students “Tell me! What needs to go on your resumé?” and then the students gave a lot of answers. Until the teacher asked them about their education, questioning techniques were used.

ST2: What about your education? **{Initial Question}**
Ss: (Silence for three seconds) **[Pausing]**
S5: Major study.
S6: Name of university.
ST2: [5] Major study, name of university. Yes. In the resumé, …

Extract 4: Subject Teacher 3

Here, the subject teacher taught the students about ideal jobs, initially eliciting what they think about ideal jobs.

ST3: We are going to listen to something about ideal jobs, an ideal job, so close your books. What words do you think is ideal? **{Initial Question}** What is that? **[Repeating]**
Ss: (Silence for two seconds) **[Pausing]**
ST3: [5] What vocabulary by ideal? **[Rephrasing]**
Ss: (Silence for three seconds) **[Pausing]**
S1: (Whisper) High salary.
ST3: I can't hear you. Ideal. What about ideal? **[Rephrasing]** [10] Do you understand this word? **[Asking supplementary questions]**
Ss: Yes.
ST3: Perfect, (unclear; so that you can guess.) Think about what you think is an ideal job. **[Rephrasing]** What goes to that? **[Rephrasing]** [15] What goes towards an ideal job? **[Repeating]**
Ss: (Silence 2 seconds) **[Pausing]**
ST3: Come on. Don't be timid. **{Encouraging students to answer}** Give me some. **{Encouraging students to answer}**
S1: High salary.
ST3: [20] OK.

Nuttawarin Teerakornvisatpugdee is a lecturer of English at Christian University, Nakornpathom province. Her main interests are in teaching techniques, language awareness and materials design.

Assistant Professor Wilaksana Srimavin works in the Department of Language Studies, School of Liberal Arts, King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi. She works as a teacher of English to undergraduate and graduate students in several faculties for both compulsory and elective courses.