

Paired lesson recordings: A study of English language lessons across different age groups of learners in the primary classrooms

Małgorzata Szulc-Kurpaska

Foreign Language Teacher Training College, Wrocław, Poland

mszulckurpaska@gmail.com

Abstract

Lesson observations are a method of collecting data on what happens in the classroom while the process of teaching and learning is in progress. The *Classroom Assessment Scoring System* (CLASS) (Pianta & Hamre, 2009) assumes that interaction between the teacher and learners contributes to the effectiveness of the process of learning. The scheme is composed of three domains: emotional support, classroom organization, and instructional support. The paper presents the results of a small-scale study involving eight lessons which were video-recorded in primary school. The subjects of the study were two teachers who planned and conducted four lessons, two of which were in one class. After the lessons, the teachers were interviewed in order to reflect on the lessons and to share their experience of teaching at this educational stage. The lessons were transcribed and analyzed with the use of the CLASS observation scheme. The study aimed at investigating the language used by both teachers, the functions of teacher language as well as the presence of indicators of particular domains of the CLASS observation scheme in the lessons under investigation.

Keywords: lesson observation; interviews; elementary school; classroom interaction

1. Introduction

The use of observation relies on the assumption that with the help of this data collection tool the most reliable data on what happens in the classroom can be collected. Various observation schemes that can be applied in the classroom have been proposed (e.g., *Embryonic Category System*, Flanders, 1970; Long et al., 1976; *FLINT*, Moskowitz, 1971; *FOCUS*, Fanselow, 1977; Naiman, Frohlich, Stern, & Todesco, 1978; *COLT*, Allen, Frohlich, & Spada, 1984) for the analysis of the functions of teacher talk. Bowers (1980, as cited in Malamah-Thomas, 1987) designed the *Categories of Verbal Behavior in the Language Classroom*. A method of observation used in the present study was elaborated on the basis of Pianta and Hamre's (2009) *Classroom Assessment Scoring System* (CLASS) observation system. The research project investigated the language that primary school teachers used in their English lessons, the functions that it performed, and the presence of the indicators of the domains tapped by the CLASS.

2. The CLASS observation system

The CLASS aims at assessing the effectiveness of the teacher's work with pupils in primary classroom and it rests on the assumption that interaction between the teacher and learners is an important factor influencing the development of pupils and their achievement in learning. Pianta and Hamre (2009) distinguished three domains of the teacher's activity which influence learner's progress, that is: *emotional support*, *classroom organization*, and *instructional support* (see Table 1). These are discussed in more detail in the following subsections.

Table 1 Domains, dimensions and indicators in the CLASS (Pianta & Hamre, 2009, p. 111)

Domains	Dimensions	Indicators
Emotional support	Positive class climate	Relationships
		Affect
		Respect
		Communication
	Negative class climate	Punitiveness
		Sarcasm/ disrespect
		Negativity
	Teacher sensitivity	Awareness
		Responsiveness
		Action to address problems
		Comfort
	Regard for learner perspectives	Flexibility
Autonomy		
Student expression		

Classroom organization	Behaviour management	Clear expectations
		Proactiveness
		Redirection
	Productivity	Maximized time use
		Effective routines and transitions
	Instructional learning formats	Variety
		Promotion of student interests
		Clarity
		Engaging approach
Instructional support	Concept development	Analyzing/reasoning
		Creativity
		Integration
	Quality of feedback	Feedback loops
		Encouragement of responses
		Expansion of performance
	Language modelling	Conversation
		Open-endedness
		Repetition/ extension
		Advanced language

2.1. Emotional support

The term *emotional support* was incorporated into the CLASS observation system on the basis of the belief that children are independent, eagerly try out new things and get to know the world around if significant others (i.e., parents, teachers, siblings or more capable peers) provide emotional support and create a supportive and safe environment. In such an environment, pupils will be more motivated and they will achieve better results if they can rely on the teacher's support and feel positively attached to him or her (Hamre et al., 2009). The construct of emotional support includes the following dimensions: positive class climate, negative class climate, teacher sensitivity and regard for student perspective.

Positive class climate reflects the emotional bond between the teacher and learners as well as warmth, respect, and enthusiasm expressed in verbal and nonverbal interactions. This category can be operationalized in the following classroom indicators: relationships, affect, respect, and communication. This may mean that the teacher smiles to learners, uses polite forms of address and humor in class. *Negative class climate* describes unfavorable behaviors of the teacher which include the following indicators: punitiveness, sarcasm/disrespect and negativity. This dimension may be realized by the teacher being ironic, intimidating or shouting at learners. *Teacher sensitivity* refers to the teacher's awareness of the educational and emotional needs of learners and attempts to satisfy them. It is represented by the following indicators: awareness, responsiveness, action intended to address problems, and comfort. In the classroom, responsiveness means that the teacher responds to learners' concerns and queries while the

teacher's alertness is represented by his or her anticipation of learners' possible problems and addressing them. *Regard for student perspective* takes into account the degree to which the teacher's interactions with learners focus on their interests, motivation and points of view as well as the extent to which they stimulate responsibility and the need for autonomy. The following indicators can be qualified as the teacher's concentration on the learners' perspective: flexibility, autonomy and student expression. The teacher may be giving learners a choice with a closed set of options; he or she may be accepting the learner's proposal or checking whether the learners understand the material (Pianta & Hamre, 2009).

2.2. Classroom organization

The next domain which may influence the achievements of learners is classroom organization. The teacher's responsibility is to modify learners' behavior, guiding their attention and moderating the time spent on tasks. It has been confirmed that classes in which repetitive and effective ways of managing behavior have been applied, thanks to which learners take an active part in the lessons, make them less prone to reveal rebellious actions, more engaged in lessons and more likely to absorb more information (Hamre et al., 2009). The following dimensions are representative of this domain: behavior management, productivity, and instructional learning formats.

Behavior management concerns the ability of the teacher to provide learners with clear expectations with respect to their behavior and the ability to predict and manage unwanted behaviors. In this dimension the following indicators may be observed: clear expectations, pro-activeness and redirection. In practical terms, it means that the teacher uses the learner's name, he or she reinforces positive behaviors, or reacts to negative behaviors. The category of *productivity* describes how well the teacher manages the time and order in the lesson as well as whether he or she creates opportunities which enable learners to get involved in the instructional activities. The effectiveness of instructions is also investigated in this category, which is operationalized as the language in which they are delivered (i.e., the target language or the mother tongue), their simplicity, and the extent to which they are supported by demonstration. The following indicators may be identified in this dimension: maximized time use, efficient routines, and transitions. *Instructional learning formats* include ways in which the teacher increases interest, participation and the potential of learners to benefit from the lesson. Indicators contributing to the dimension involve: variety, promotion of student interests, clarity, and an engaging approach. It is executed in the teacher informing learners about the aim of the activity, the lesson or the task, and summarizing the task or the lesson. It is also represented by the way in which the

teacher leads learners into the activity, monitors them as they perform the activity, and collects feedback afterwards (Pianta & Hamre, 2009).

2.3. Instructional support

Instructional support was included among factors influencing the effects of teaching relatively recently. It highlights the difference between learning facts and finding out their causes, relations and their influence on each other. It basically involves processing the information rather than learning it *verbatim*. During the lesson, the teacher should stimulate the use of existing knowledge and skills as well as the development of new abilities (Hamre et al., 2009). Three dimensions are representatives of this domain of teacher's activity, that is, concept development, the quality of feedback, and language modeling.

Concept development describes the extent to which the teacher uses discussion and other activities to stimulate thinking, focusing on understanding the material rather than memorizing it. In this dimension, the following indicators can be detected: analysis or reasoning, creativity, and integration. The teacher recalls the knowledge from previous lessons, thereby demonstrating the link between the new material and previous knowledge, he or she reveals how the new knowledge may be used in everyday life, and challenges learners with a concrete problem to solve. *The quality of feedback* takes into account the degree to which the teacher provides feedback which stimulates learning and understanding as well as encourages learners to participate in the tasks. The following indicators may be assigned to this dimension: feedback loops, encouragement of responses, and expansion of performance. To incorporate these into classroom practice, the teacher may request reconstructing of the thinking process, provide positive feedback, identify mistakes and point out ways of correcting them, or encourage pupils in response to their frustration (Pianta & Hamre, 2009). *Language modeling* refers to assessing the quality and the scale of the language stimulation applied by the teacher as well as the techniques geared to improvement of language abilities. This dimension may be realized by means of the following indicators: conversation, open-endedness, repetition/extension, and advanced language. In practice, the teacher motivates learners to respond with a full sentence, he or she repeats or paraphrases their utterances, asks learners about their opinions, or elicits their responses. Eliciting is understood as encouraging and stimulating a response if the learner faces problems with answering a question.

3. The study

The present study was conducted in primary school using elements of the CLASS observation scheme. The main aim was to analyze the teacher's language with respect to target language use vs. native language use, as well as the functions of language use depending on different age groups. Additionally, the research explored the use of the CLASS observation scheme for exploring the interaction between the teacher and learners in a foreign language context. More specifically, the following research questions were addressed:

- What is the language used by the teachers in the recorded lessons?
- What are the functions of the language used by both teachers?
- Which indicators of the CLASS observation scheme were detected in the data?

3.1. The participants

Two teachers participated in the study. Teacher A was an English teacher with 15 years of experience while Teacher B was an English teacher with 6 years of teaching experience. Both Teacher A and Teacher B were college graduates holding an MA degree and they both taught in two different state primary schools. They were recorded teaching two lessons in two different grades of primary school, with the four lessons in each case being video-recorded (see Table 2). The design of the study rests on the principle that each of the teachers taught two lessons with lower primary school learners and two lessons with upper primary school classes. The lessons conducted by Teacher A were recorded in February, 2012 while the lessons delivered by Teacher B were carried out and recorded in March, 2013.

Table 2 Lessons taught by Teacher A and Teacher B

Teacher A	Teacher B
2 lessons in Grade 1	2 lessons in Grade 3
2 lessons in Grade 4	2 lessons in Grade 6

3.2. The method

The teachers were asked to prepare lessons plans which were to be executed in class. The lessons were planned for two consecutive weeks in each case. The lesson plans designed by the teachers were consulted with the researcher to discuss methodological aspects. The lessons were recorded by a professional team, using two different cameras each time, in order to simultaneously document the actions of the teacher and the learners, and then the films were edited. Two lessons in each grade were designed in order to offer some continuity

in the teaching process, reveal a greater variety of teacher's actions, and get the learners used to the presence of the filming team, thereby allowing obtaining more natural data in the second lesson in each case. Afterwards, each teacher was interviewed and asked to reflect on the lesson and compare its implementation with the initial plan. Both of the lessons and the interviews were transcribed, and then subjected to analysis with respect to the language used by the teacher.

3.3. Data analysis

As Walsh (2013, p. 97) comments, “[i]nteraction analysis entails the use of observation instruments or *coding systems* to record what an observer sees or thinks is happening at any given moment”. The analysis of the data was carried out on the basis of the researcher's own observation of all the lessons taught for the purpose of the study, the analysis of the video recordings while doing the transcripts, as well as insights into the transcriptions themselves. This analysis was augmented by the interviews with the teachers held after the lessons with the help of the questions formulated by the researcher, which were audio-recorded and later transcribed. The data collected in these ways allowed answering the research questions as well as gaining better understanding of the nature of the processes underpinning classroom interaction between the teacher and the learners. The data collected in the study were both quantitative (i.e., the number of particular instances of teacher talk functions) and qualitative (e.g., the examples of particular functions in classroom interactions), and they were analyzed accordingly.

3.4. Research findings

In the analysis of the data from the transcripts and the video recordings of the lessons, the following functions of the teacher language were identified: instructions, eliciting, feedback, repetition, and paraphrasing. Instructions contribute to the *productivity* of the teacher, feedback and eliciting are representative of *instructional support* while repetition and eliciting are considered instances of *language modeling* which is also a part of the *instructional support*. Instances of instructions, elicitation and paraphrases can be found in the following lesson extract:

Extract 1

T: Close your notebooks now. Close your exercise books. Close your books now. Let's revise some free time activities (instructions).

T: Do you remember what's this? (elicitation).

L1: Eating...

T: Kuba? What? Having breakfast is it? (paraphrase)

- L1: Eating
T: No, no... What is it Hania? (eliciting)
L2: Picnic?
T: Come to a picnic or go to a picnic yes? (paraphrase)

Examples of eliciting, prompting and repetition and feedback can be identified in the following passage:

- Extract 2
T: You do it before dinner when you could place cups... (eliciting)
L1: Table on the table...
T: Three words (prompting)
L1: To tutaj było ['It was here'] ... set?
T: Set... the... what? (prompting)
L1: The cup?
T: No, not the cup... Set the... remember this is what? Stasiu? (eliciting)
L2: Set the table
T: Set the table. OK (repetition, feedback)

Prompting is used as a form of elicitation in which the teacher provides additional cues to facilitate a learner's response.

Lessons taught by Teacher A both in Grade 1 and in Grade 4 were partly delivered in English and partly in Polish (see Tables 3 and 4). Teacher A was often smiling and she was very supportive of the children. A positive climate was created through the use of warm forms of address and manifestations of respect for the learners. In both lessons in Grade 1, most of the instructions were delivered in Polish. However, in the second lesson there were approximately four times more of them than in the first, mainly because the learners were working in groups drawing a monster on the basis of the number thrown on a dice. Unfortunately, the teacher conducted most of this lesson in Polish, starting with dividing the learners into groups and then explaining the rules of the game, while monitoring the activity and also in offering feedback afterwards. The target language was used mainly by Teacher A for instructional purposes, for instance while singing songs and while asking learners questions ("Can you repeat?", "What's this?", "Touch your..."). Teacher A also switched the codes within the same utterance, as in "Gabrysiu tam brakuje hands" (Gabrysia there are hands missing), "Dorysuj sobie nose, dobrze?" (Draw a nose, OK?) or in the consecutive utterances "Tutaj na podłogę rzuć" (Throw it on the floor here) And say the number". Teacher A also translated some of the instructions from English into Polish, as in "I want you to get into groups. Czyli podzielimy się na grupy" or from Polish into English, as in "I ostatnia grupa, która jest ostatnia? The last group!".

Table 3 Teacher A language in Lesson 1 in Grade 1

Teacher language	Number of utterances in English	Number of utterances in Polish
Instructions	36	57
Eliciting	69	27
Feedback	29	2
Repetition	22	0
Paraphrasing	2	0

In both lessons in Grade 1, feedback was predominantly administered in English in the form of the phrase "Very good!" and there were not many repetitions and paraphrases of the learners' utterances. It was also observed that the use of the target language for classroom purposes occurred more frequently at the beginning of every lesson but towards the second part of each class, the teacher used the mother tongue more.

Table 4 Teacher A language in Lesson 2 in Grade 1

Teacher language	Number of utterances in English	Number of utterances in Polish
Instructions	77	210
Eliciting	85	30
Feedback	33	1
Repetition	17	0
Paraphrasing	3	0

In the first lesson in Grade 4, the proportion between instructions in L1 and L2 broke even, that is the same number was delivered in the target language and in the mother tongue (see Tables 5 and 6). In the second lesson in Grade 4, however, as in the second lesson in Grade 1, instructions in L1 were dominant and they were five times as frequent as instructions in L2. The reason for this might have been the type of activity in which the learners were asked to move around and find classmates who had a particular electronic device and those who did not. Both introducing the activity, monitoring and providing feedback mainly happened in the learners' L1.

Table 5 Teacher A language in Lesson 1 in Grade 4

Teacher language	Number of utterances in English	Number of utterances in Polish
Instructions	70	73
Eliciting	110	3
Feedback	23	0
Repetition	6	0
Paraphrasing	3	0

As in the case of the lessons taught by Teacher A in Grade 1, in the lessons delivered by the same teacher in Grade 4, feedback was mainly provided in the target language. The teacher used English to practice linguistic features, as in: "Have you got a mobile?", "What have you got?", "What has she got?", or "What hasn't he got?" She also resorted to code-switching within utterances, as in "Muszę zmienić picture" (I have to change the picture), and translated instructions from the target language into the mother tongue, as in "What can you see in the pictures? Co widzimy na obrazkach?" or the other way around, as in "To będzie taka nasza ankieta klasowa. A class survey it is called". Repetitions and paraphrases of the learners' utterances were not frequent when compared to other functions of teacher language (i.e., instructions, eliciting, feedback).

Table 6 Teacher A language in Lesson 2 in Grade 4

Teacher language	Number of utterances in English	Number of utterances in Polish
Instructions	30	174
Eliciting	44	6
Feedback	17	1
Repetition	6	0
Paraphrasing	5	0

The main difference between Teacher A and Teacher B in conducting the lessons was the language of instruction. While Teacher A frequently switched the codes, Teacher B used only the target language. This meant that Teacher's B instructions were shorter, there were fewer of them, and all of them were supported with demonstration or repetition to ensure comprehension. The learners were provoked to respond to the short utterances of the teacher as they provided room for linguistic contributions. Similarly to Teacher A, Teacher B also used her language mainly to teach target language features and to elicit responses from the learners. As in the lessons delivered by Teacher A, feedback in lessons conducted by Teacher B was provided in the target language, usually in the form of such phrases as: "Very good!", "Excellent!", or "Well done!". Teacher B challenged the learners in Grade 3 with a task they had never done before. Not only were they required to collect information from each other in groups of four about their favorite activities, but also to process the collected information in order to create a graph.

Table 7 Teacher B language in Lesson 1 in Grade 3

Teacher language	Number of utterances in English
Instructions	66
Eliciting	145
Feedback	28
Repetition	6
Paraphrasing	8

Just like Teacher A, Teacher B did not use repetitions and paraphrases of the learners' utterances too often in the lessons in Grade 3. This might suggest that teacher language was exploited mainly to model the target language rather than to correct errors explicitly or to indicate incorrectness. Repetitions and paraphrases may also suggest some communication problems which did not occur in the lessons under investigation.

Table 8 Teacher B language in Lesson 2 in Grade 3

Teacher language	Number of utterances in English
Instructions	77
Eliciting	83
Feedback	8
Repetition	22
Paraphrasing	6

As can be seen in Tables 7, 8, 9, and 10, Teacher B used a similar number of instructions in the target language in each of them but, on the whole, the number was smaller than in the lessons taught by Teacher A. The analysis of the transcripts also revealed that Teacher B provided single instructions while Teacher A used several ones in a sequence. What is more, Teacher's B instructions were shorter than those delivered by Teacher A in Polish.

Table 9 Teacher B language in Lesson 1 in Grade 6

Teacher language	Number of utterances in English
Instructions	58
Eliciting	139
Feedback	3
Repetition	10
Paraphrasing	9

Many more instructions were delivered in Lesson 2 in Grade 6 mainly because the learners were working in groups. This required the teacher to introduce the tasks through demonstration but also called for a lot of monitoring and prompting while the activity was in progress as well as offering feedback. However, in contrast to group work in the lessons conducted by Teacher A, only the target language was used for such purposes by Teacher B. Feedback was used less frequently in Grade 6 than in Grade 3 in the lessons taught by Teacher B. This may be explained by the fact that younger learners need more encouragement while older learners rely on external motivation less and develop more intrinsic drives to learn the target language.

Table 10 Teacher B language in Lesson 2 in Grade 6

Teacher language	Number of utterances in English
Instructions	118
Eliciting	75
Feedback	7
Repetition	9
Paraphrasing	3

Apart from quantitative analysis, the data was also subjected to qualitative analysis to observe how the categories in the CLASS observation scheme were evident in the language classroom in Polish primary school. Teacher A adopted an individualized approach while addressing the learners, using personal questions in order to make them relaxed. This is illustrated in the following example:

Extract 3

T: Wiktoria! Have you got a car? [*the teacher is showing a flashcard of a car*]

L: Yes, I have!

T: OK. Have you got your own car? Is it your own car? Twój własny? [*'Your own?'*] [*the teacher is smiling*]

L: No!

Elements of humor may be found in the following exchange which took place between Teacher B and a learner in class 6.

Extract 4

T: When you spend some time with your friends, you just chat, you do nothing...Mikołaj? [*the teacher is showing a flashcard*]

L: Sitting on the sofa?

T: And that's a free time activity?

L: Well, they are talking to each other and sitting...

T: Hang out... That's *hang out* with friends.

Teacher B provided a clear example of the CLASS category *encouragement as a response to frustration* as a form of providing feedback in the following exchange:

Extract 5

T: OK. What about this one [*the teacher is showing a flashcard to elicit the activity*]

L1: I know! [*learners are raising their hands*]

T: Nikola [*the teacher appoints a learner who is not raising her hand*]

L2: Visit

T: A kind of ...

L3: Meet! [*prompting Nikola*]

L2: I don't know...

T: Who is this woman, Nikola? But stop it, stop it [*the teacher shows other learners with a gesture not to raise their hands and addresses Nikola*]
L2: Grandmother...
T: Grandmother, yes! So...
L2: Visiting grandmother?
T: Yeah, visiting your grandmother.

In this example not only did the teacher prompt the learner ("A kind of...", "So..."), repeating the learner's utterance and modeling the requested response ("visiting your grandmother") but also provided positive feedback ("Yeah!"). Teacher B encouraged the learners to discover the question which was to be used in an activity *Find someone who* in the following way:

Extract 6

T: How can I ask a question *Find someone who was painting...* Good question?
LL: No!
T: No! It's not a good question. Is it a question? How can I ask Marta? Weronika!
L1: Who was painting yesterday?
T: Who? Who? Is who a good one?
L1: What was Marta doing yesterday?
T: What was Marta doing yesterday? Good question?
LL: No!

In this exchange, the learner is trying to arrive at the correct question which is eventually prompted by the teacher by using a word card with the word *you* and indicating in this way which question is being searched for, that is "Were you painting yesterday?"

Both Teacher A and Teacher B created a positive class climate by smiling at the learners, but it was Teacher A who did so more often. They were both enthusiastic, they used polite forms of address, and they showed that they were listening to the learners. No instances that would be indicative of a negative class climate (e.g., sarcasm/irony, intimidating or humiliating learners, shouting, ignoring learners) were observed in the lessons under investigation. On the contrary, instances of reactivity were quite frequent, which means that the problems that the learners experienced in class were immediately addressed. Anticipating such problems was less frequent and only one such situation was identified in the lessons in question. This was when the teacher said "You may not remember this one so I'll write it down: *hang out with friends*", and then in fact wrote the phrase down on the board. Reactivity is also evident in an exchange which followed the teacher's move in the next segment of the same lesson, as is shown in the following extract:

Extract 7

L1: If it is in the first person you hang out with one friend or spending time with a friend?

T: I always hang out with my friends on Friday afternoon yes? Or what else do you want to say?

L1: I'm always... no I'm always...

L2: I was hanging out with friends...

T: Or what else can we say? With one friend?

L1: Yes!

T: With my friend!

4. Discussion and conclusion

The data collected for the purpose of the study made it possible to answer the research questions posed.

What is the language used by the teachers in the recorded lessons?

Teacher A used a mixture of L1 and L2 for both the Grade 1 and Grade 4 lessons. Her instructions in Polish were long, the target language was quite often translated into the mother tongue or instructions produced in the mother tongue were then translated into English. By contrast, Teacher B was determined to use English in both lessons in Grade 3 and Grade 6. Her instructions were short and explicit, and aided by the use of body language, facial expressions, and examples. There was little difference between the pairs of lessons taught by the same teacher with respect to her teaching style. It turned out that the age of the learners was not the main indicator of this style. In fact, the two teachers adopted their own teaching styles which were not adjusted to the age group but rather suited their personality and beliefs about teaching rooted in their own teaching experience.

What are the functions of the language used by both teachers?

Both Teacher A and Teacher B applied the target language for teaching linguistic features. They both used English for elicitation and provision of feedback and they did not employ *repetition* and *paraphrasing* of the learners' utterances. They both used polite forms of address and nominated the learners to answer questions with the help of their first names. Teacher A employed long instructions in Polish for managing the tasks; she translated such instructions from English into Polish or mixed the codes. Teacher B used English for the whole lesson and opted for more *elicitations* than *instructions*. Teacher B's instructions were shorter and there were fewer of them than in the lessons conducted by Teacher A. The learners in the lessons taught by Teacher B seemed to be able to follow the lesson, although it was mainly executed in English. This can perhaps be attributed to the support they received through demonstration and the use of examples as

well as the repetitiveness and predictability of instructions. The fact that all the lessons performed by Teacher B were conducted in the target language proves that it is possible to teach English through English both in Grade 3 and Grade 6 of primary school. As regards the classroom climate, Teacher A seemed to have created a more supportive learning environment; however, Teacher B was more successful in stimulating the learners to think and solve problems. A lot of the time spent by Teacher A on explaining the activities in Polish could have been replaced with demonstrations and short instructions in the target language. Teacher B was definitely more challenging, more interactive, and more likely to provide meaningful exposure to the target language.

Should then learners feel safe, as in the lessons taught by Teacher A, or challenged, as was the case in the lessons delivered by Teacher B? The answer depends on individual learner preferences, on the age group of the learners, and on the personality of the teacher. A surprising finding also concerned the ways in which the lessons taught by Teacher A and Teacher B were conducted, as the lesson plans were consulted with the researcher beforehand and there were no methodology flaws in them. The differences in the actual implementation resulted exclusively from the teaching style of the teachers. The fact that both of them were college graduates and, thus, they had undergone the same training, indicates that in the course of their teaching practice the teachers had developed their own professional *know-how* which suited their personalities and their own beliefs about teaching.

Which indicators of the CLASS observation scheme were detected in the data?

Most of the indicators distinguished in the CLASS observation scheme were present in the lessons observed in the study. A positive climate was maintained in all the lessons under investigation and no indicators of negativity were observed. The teachers revealed sensitivity to the learner's needs concentrating on the learner perspective. However, only in lessons in Grade 6 were there instances of learners having their suggestions accepted by the teacher. In the classes carried out by Teacher B, discovery techniques were also observed in Grade 3 and Grade 6 while questions were being formulated for a game or a class survey, such as: "What's the weather like?", "What are you doing?" (Grade 3), "Find someone who...", or "Where you painting yesterday?" (Grade 6). Teacher A responded to discipline problems by stopping the lesson and reprimanding the learners in L1 while Teacher B applied the technique of counting in English from one to whichever number was necessary for the class to calm down.

As far as productivity is concerned, Teacher B seemed to be more efficient as her time management was better, the instructions were shorter and there were fewer of them, which increased student talking time, thus contributing to

the effectiveness of the lesson. Besides, because the lessons were carried out in the target language, the learners had to focus and be more attentive than the learners in the lessons conducted by Teacher A where the use of Polish did not require so much alertness. What is more, teacher talking time in the case of Teacher A was predominant and, thus, learners' opportunities to speak were considerably reduced.

Neither of the teachers informed the learners about the aim of the lesson or a specific task; however, both teachers offered feedback after each activity and summarized the results of pair or group work. Both of them conducted revisions at the beginning of each class to link previous knowledge with new information. Both teachers attempted to connect the material with real life contexts relevant to the learners (e.g., asking what electronic devices pupils have or what kind of free time activities they like). In Grade 3, the learners were asked to solve the problem of designing a graph to depict the findings of group work, while in Grade 6 the students were asked to find a solution to a criminal story.

Concept development did not happen to a great extent in the lessons observed, regardless of the teacher or the level of the class. It cannot be ruled out that at this stage of cognitive development, linking what is new with what learners already know, practical application of knowledge, and reliance on problem-solving in a foreign language may be achieved only to a limited degree. English lessons cannot be expected to develop learners cognitively to the same extent as lessons in other subjects due to the language of instruction. In foreign language lessons, it is recommended to reinforce concepts learners already are familiar with in their mother tongue rather than try to introduce new concepts because delivering them in the target language would make them difficult to understand. What is more, the CLASS observation system was designed for observing lessons taught in the mother tongue where cognitive development is more likely to be stimulated successfully.

The teachers provided a lot of feedback on the learners' performance, mostly in the target language, by indicating mistakes and scaffolding the correct responses. Both of them used elicitation techniques by asking questions and prompted answers by beginning the utterance and inviting the learners to finish it. They also encouraged the learners to answer questions when they were apprehensive. More spontaneous learner utterances could be observed in the lessons conducted by Teacher B, especially in Grade 6, which was partly due to the proficiency level of the learners, but also the outcome of the exclusive use of English, which made reliance on the target language somewhat routine. More spontaneous learner contributions were also encouraged by the teacher's elicitations in the target language.

References

- Allen, P., Frohlich, M., & Spada, N. (1984). *The Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching: An observation scheme*. Sydney: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research.
- Fanselow, J. F. (1977). Beyond Rashomon – conceptualizing and describing the teaching act. *TESOL Quarterly*, 11, 17-39.
- Flanders, N. (1970). *Analyzing teaching behavior*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Hamre, B. K., Pianta, R. C., & Choomat-Mooney, L. (2009). Conducting classroom observations in school-based research. In L. Dinella (Ed.), *Conducting psychology research in school-based settings: A practical guide for researchers conducting high quality science within school environments* (pp. 79-106). Washington DC: APA Press.
- Long, M. H., Adams, L., McLean, M., & Castanos, F. (1976). Doing things with words: Verbal interaction in lockstep and small group classroom situations. In J. Fanselow & R. Crymes (Eds.), *On TESOL 1976* (pp. 137-153). Washington, DC: TESOL.
- Malamah-Thomas, A. (1987). *Classroom interaction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Moskowitz, G. (1976). The classroom interaction of outstanding language teachers. *Foreign Language Annals*, 9, 125-143.
- Naiman, N., Frohlich, M., Stern, H. H., & Todesco, A. (1978). *The good language learner*. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Pianta R. C., & Hamre, B. K. (2009). Conceptualization, measurement and improvement of classroom processes: Standardized observation can leverage capacity. *Educational Researcher*, 38, 109-119.
- Walsh, S. (2013). *Classroom discourse and teacher development*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.