Scaffolding talk in EAP lessons: an examination of experienced teachers' practices

HERON, Marion and WEBSTER, Joanne

Scaffolding talk in EAP lessons: An examination of experienced teachers' practices

Marion Heron
Department of Higher Education
University of Surrey
Guildford
Surrey
GU2 7XH

Marion Heron has been working in higher education for 30 years. She is currently Senior Lecturer in Higher Education at the University of Surrey. She has researched in the area of talk in post-observation feedback sessions. She is particularly interested in the application of sociocultural theory to teacher education contexts.

Joanne Webster
TESOL Department
Sheffield Institute of Education
Sheffield Hallam University
Sheffield
S1 1WB

Joanne Webster is a senior lecturer and leader of a business English module at Sheffield Hallam University. She received an MA in Applied Linguistics from the University of Sheffield. Academic interests include teaching business English in an academic context.

Scaffolding talk in EAP lessons: An examination of experienced teachers' practices

Abstract

Purpose: The aim of this study was to explore how experienced teachers use classroom talk to support their pedagogic goals in pre-sessional and in-sessional EAP lessons.
Design: Data were gathered by video recording four teachers' EAP lessons. Two lessons were pre-sessional and two were in-sessional. A framework which identified scaffolding for meta-cognitive, cognitive and affective activities was used to examine how the four teachers supported pre-sessional and in-sessional students' understanding of academic language and discourse practices.
Findings: The data revealed that although scaffolding of language and affect are prevalent in classroom talk in all four lessons, goal-focused metacognitive scaffolding was a distinct feature of in-sessional EAP lessons. The findings suggest that pre-sessional EAP teachers could provide more goal-oriented scaffolding by linking activities to the overall EAP goals.
Originality: The originality of this article lies in the identification of potential differences between pre-sessional and in-sessional EAP classroom talk. In particular, a more 'efficient' type of in-sessional classroom was identified. The implications of this study lie in teacher development for teachers moving from ELT to EAP, as well as the potential use of classroom transcripts as a tool for analysis and reflection on practice.

Keywords: EAP, classroom talk, scaffolding, pedagogic goals, discourse practices

Introduction

Based on the premise that learning is constructed when pedagogic goals and classroom talk align (Seedhouse, 2004; Walsh, 2006, 2013), this research sets out to examine how experienced teachers use classroom talk to scaffold international students' understanding of English for Academic Purposes (EAP). The main aims of an EAP lesson are to equip students with 'the communicative skills to participate in particular academic contexts' (Hyland and Hampton-Lyons 2002, 2). It has been suggested that scaffolding of EAP aims can be realised at the design level through the curriculum, syllabus, choice of texts, topics, and skills (de Chazal, 2014), as well as through lesson structure and teacher talk moves (Lee, 2016; Lee & Subtirelu, 2015). EAP contexts

2

include both pre-sessional and in-sessional classes. While both aim to support students for their academic study, pre-sessional teaching places emphasis on *preparation* for academic study, whereas in-sessional teaching focuses more on *development* of academic skills (de Chazal, 2014).

Despite the research into classroom talk in general L2 contexts (Chappell, 2014; Seedhouse, 2004; Walsh, 2006), studies on interaction and classroom talk in EAP contexts are considered an "under-examined genre" (Lee, 2016, p. 111). An awareness of EAP classroom talk can inform EAP teacher education, in particular supporting the transition of general English language teachers to an EAP context (Campion, 2016)

Background

Scaffolding in language learning
Situated within a sociocultural perspective on learning, scaffolding is an instructional strategy based on assistance by a more able peer through directed 'intervention' (Wood & Wood, 1996). This intervention is contingent on the learner and is provided at the "point of need" (Sharpe, 2006, p. 213) to support learners' development into their zone of proximal development (ZPD). For example, in a second language learning context, a teacher might intervene with the appropriate error correction technique depending on the level of the learners, their current knowledge of language, and their potential to self-correct (Lantolf, 2000). Studies on scaffolding in ESL contexts have identified specific teacher talk strategies which scaffold in the moment-by-moment interaction with students. These include recasting, appropriating learner comments, cued elicitation and making links to prior and future learning (Hammond & Gibbons, 2005), as well as uptake on student contributions and linking learning to students' personal lives (Haneda & Wells, 2008).

In an EAP context, providing contextual support through linking tasks to short-term and long- term goals has been identified as a key scaffolding strategy. Barnard and Campbell (2005) found that in an academic writing class stating the overall goal and rationale for the course and the activities scaffolded the students' understanding of academic practices. The few studies on scaffolding in an EAP context point to the need for high challenge within a highly supportive environment (Alexander, 2012, Hammond, 2006; Wilson, 2016). Wilson (2016) examined scaffolding practices of experienced EAP

3

teachers in teaching critical reading. She concluded that in order for students to find their voice and be inducted into academic discourse practices they needed "delicate scaffolding" defined as engagement "in a challenging, but positive and supportive climate" (p. 257).

The EAP curriculum is largely language-focused and strategies for scaffolding understanding of language have been identified as similar to the strategies pointed out by Hammond and Gibbons (2005) in an ESL context. For example, Li (2012) concluded that in an EAP critical reading class teachers asked 'how'-questions, provide examples and prompt students to notice the gap between their own knowledge and the correct answer.

EAP teachers need to scaffold not just understanding of academic language, but also academic practices as part of the enculturation into a higher education context. However, transfer of knowledge about discourse processes does not always take place (Green, 2015), possibly due to lack of explicit reference to the future discourse practices and academic goals mentioned above. With the aims of EAP in mind then, the explicit alignment between teacher talk and pedagogic goals is central to the students' EAP experience, and pivotal in supporting transfer of skills.

Research question
How do experienced teachers use classroom talk to support the pedagogic goals of EAP lessons?

Methodology

Participants and context
The study took place in UK university. Four experienced EAP teachers and 43 students agreed to take part in the study. The teachers had worked at the TESOL Centre for at least four years prior to the research and had between four and 17 years' experience of teaching pre-sessional and in-sessional courses. The students were from a variety of different linguistic backgrounds, but predominantly Chinese. They were either on a 10-week pre-sessional programme with the aim of starting their post-graduate studies in January 2017, or in the first year of their undergraduate studies (in-sessional). The average age of the students was around 20 years old (see Table 1 for summary). The researchers were also full-time teaching members of the TESOL Centre with considerable experience of teaching EAP to both pre-sessional and in-sessional

4

students. The researchers were well-known to the teachers in the study and had observed them on several occasions for staff development activities. Ethical clearance was obtained from the university Ethics Committee. Prior to the video recording, the researchers visited the classes to explain the research to the students. Students were provided them with an information sheet to read and an opportunity to ask questions. Two days later the researchers obtained informed consent from the students and teachers. The researchers observed and video recorded three of the classes and one class was video recorded by the teacher. All participants had the right to withdraw from the study at any time in the process.

Data collection and data analysis

Data were gathered from video recordings of four lessons each of 45 minutes. The researchers also collected documentary evidence from the lessons such as student handouts. The video camera was placed at the back of the classroom to give a clear picture of the teacher and the audio - visual resources, such as the whiteboard or screen. All four lessons were transcribed verbatim (Rapley, 2008). Alan recorded his own session, placing the video camera at the front of the class. An adapted stimulated response procedure was used to elicit teachers' pedagogic goals and to prompt reflection on these goals. Gass & Mackey, (2000) suggest providing a strong stimulus for retrospective accounts and to this end we sent the four teachers the video recording and transcript of their lesson. Teachers were asked to respond in writing to a series of prompts (see Appendix A).

The framework used in this study derives from the work of Van de Pol et al (2010) who combined Wood, Bruner and Ross's (1976) notion of scaffolding intentions with Tharp and Gallimore's (1991) concept of means to produce a hierarchical structure of scaffolding according to metacognitive, cognitive and affective purposes (see below). We felt these three scaffolding purposes to be particularly relevant in an EAP class which aims to teach language, academic practices, and provide a safe environment for participation of ideas.

Supporting metacognitive activities
- Direction maintenance: the teacher keeps the students focused "in pursuit of a particular objective" (Wood et al 1976, p. 98).
  For example, "*today, we're going to look at paraphrasing and summary*".

Supporting cognitive activities
- Marking critical features: the teacher encourages noticing of correct forms, making comparisons between current knowledge and expected level.
  For example, "*Yes you need to find a topic. Is it only topic?*"

- Reducing the degrees of freedom: the teacher simplifies the task for the student
  For example, *"What, could you think of a word to describe them, adjective so some people believe one thing, some people believe the other thing".*

Supporting student affect
- Recruitment: the teacher engages and interests the student in the activities
  For example, *"what are the disadvantages of immigration so think about China maybe think about China your own country".*
- Frustration control: the teacher maintains motivation through praise
  For example, *"OK really good generally there it's a really good start all you have to do after that is just check the grammar is correct".*

Table 1: Class profiles

Name of teacher	Pre/in-sessional	Students' background	Number of students
Simon[1]	Pre-sessional	Chinese, mixed departments	10
Deidre	Pre-sessional	Mixed, different departments	10
Alan	In-sessional	Chinese, Business School	12
Karen	In-sessional	Mixed, mixed departments	11

Data were analysed iteratively (Richards, 2003) with continuing focusing and refocusing of major themes resulting from watching the video recordings and reading the transcripts.
A detailed and fine-grained analysis of the transcripts was carried out using the

---

[1] pseudonyms

framework above looking at outcomes of the talk and tracing their trajectory back (Silverman, 2011). This was achieved by focusing on understanding and intentions and how they are verbalised through choice of lexical content and the structure of the talk as "word choices and cohesive patterning can represent ways that knowledge is being jointly constructed" (Mercer, 2004, p. 141). Through a study of lexis and structure we were able to trace the scaffolding of specific EAP goals through the data both within and across exchanges.

Results

In the following section we present and discuss findings from the two pre-sessional lessons: Simon, Deidre, and the two in-sessional lessons: Alan and Karen. These excerpts have been selected to illustrate ways teachers scaffold language and an understanding of academic practices and procedures. It is significant to point out that the study was small-scale with data from teachers working in the same institution. Similarly, although excerpts are offered to exemplify scaffolding talk, we should be mindful that these are only short extracts from "longer conversations" (Mercer, 1995, p. 70). The teachers and students work together over a semester and build up a relationship during this time.

Scaffolding metacognitive activities: direction maintenance

Pre-sessional lessons

Both pre-sessional classes were 'reading classes'. The pedagogic purposes of which were, in the case of Simon: *" to remind students that writers' have opinions"* and *"the need to be able to 'notice' opinions in order to evaluate arguments on either side of a debate" (*SR)[2]*and for Deidre's *"to consider the problems /solutions/short term and long around the reading topic 'Air Rage'"* (SR). Both tutors sought to achieve their lesson outcomes using the same approach, common in non-EAP classes, by conducting a series of pre-reading tasks as a lead-in to the reading task.

Teacher scaffolding talk for direction maintenance in the pre-sessional classroom focused on the short-term goals of the lesson, with both teachers instructing students to

---

[2] Stimulated recall responses

focus on the visual aids provided. Simon asks *"what do these pictures show, what's the thing in common with those pictures?"* while Deidre instructs students to *" look at the pictures and continue with the discussion"* Other scaffolding talk intended to maintain direction for lesson aims related to organising student interaction patterns e.g. *"I want you to change partners now" "just tell the person next to you"*

However, there was some attention to the long term EAP goals. In the excerpt below Simon's intention is to extend the students' knowledge from their personal experience of IELTS writing to the requirements of academic writing and in doing so direct them explicitly towards their long-term academic goals.

1	S[3]:	Search in the resources.
2	T:	Search in the resources, yes? If you are doing an IELTS exam what do
3		you do? In an IELTS exam if you got that what would you do?
4	S:	Write about the advantages and disadvantages and then the conclusion.
5	T:	Yea and where is all that information from?
6	S:	Head.
7	T:	From your head. Your brain, isn't it? Just from your brain. So there are no
8		citations, no references. You can't do that at university you have to find
9		evidence to support your ideas, yea, otherwise it's just your opinion.

Simon uses the hypothetical *'if' you'* to encourage the students to relate to the situation and then modal verbs of obligation, *'can't, have to'* to underline the adjustment students will have to make. He asks a series of questions to stimulate student engagement, prompting them to think more clearly about how different the requirements of academic writing are from those they are familiar with when writing for IELTS.

In-sessional lessons

Common features of classroom talk which scaffolded direction maintenance were explicit reference to the academic requirements, the procedures and process of academic skills, and to past and future activities, lessons and assessments. Both teachers highlighted and emphasised the goals of the activities and made links between and across lessons, pointing forward and backwards.
In her stimulated recall reflection, Karen stated that the pedagogic goals of her lesson

---

[3] S refers to student, T refers to teacher, Ss refers to students

were *"To revise the structure of the final seminar exam on the EAP module (reading into speaking) and practise a seminar discussion in groups"* (SR). In the exchange below she elicits this from students.

1	T:	Yes the easier. So basically what is the purpose of the seminar what is the
2		purpose of our seminar (shows new ppt slide entitled 'successful seminar
3		discussions') that you will practice in a few minute's time and and then at
4		the end of the course. What is it basically, why [inaudible] What does this
5	S:	show speaking [inaudible]
6	T:	Interaction
7	S:	Yes interaction
8	T:	You understand the subject
		You understand the subject. If you've read something what does it mean?

Karen asks students for their ideas on the purpose of a seminar. She uses this question to focus their attention on the main goal of the lesson and uses other semiotic resources (PowerPoint slides) to scaffold understanding of seminar purposes.

Pointing backwards and forwards is used by both teachers to situate the activities and highlight the purpose and academic goals. Both used phrases such as "*Remember when we did that listening?"*, "*Do you remember when we had..?*", "*Do you remember from last week I asked you to bring a newspaper today?"*, "*We will do a recap of what we did last week".* The linking is part of creating a bigger picture for students by pointing to their future academic requirements. For example, the excerpt below reveals how Karen explicitly marks academic conventions (using sources) and the genres to read (articles) by linking to previous lessons.

1	T:	We do it when we write and we use different sources, yes however for this
2		seminar what do you need? Yea? Who would like to share [inaudible] from
3		last week John you were not present that's why you're not sure. How many
4		articles do we need? How many sources do we need?"

In the excerpt below, Alan links their current activity (paraphrasing) and a particular lexical item (strategy) to their future academic requirements. Alan explicitly links the content of the EAP class with their current and future disciplinary context. He scaffolds

9

by pointing forwards to a specific assignment.

1   T: Yes you hear this word all the time in the business school, tutors talk about
2   strategies strategies strategies, you have to do an assignment on
3   strategies, management strategies later on don't change it, it's a key word
            for business studies.

In the excerpt below Alan marks the significance and usefulness of the activity by referring to institutional and course documentation, as well as how they are going to use the activity:

1   T: The article is really important because it's a main reading from your
2   module organisational, what's it called? Understanding organisations. Well
3   you should know if you look in your module handbook this is a key reading
4   for one of the core modules, so we're looking at this in our class in order to
5   give you some help in your other module.

In summary, the in-sessional classroom talk revealed references to EAP goals and focused students' attention on goals by pointing forwards and backwards, explicitly linking the activities to disciplinary requirements and expectations.

Scaffolding cognitive activities: marking critical features and simplifying

Pre-sessional lessons

Pre-sessional teachers scaffolded cognitive activities by marking critical features, accepting correct answers and simplifying the task. Both teachers adopted a supportive method using echoing, sometimes with a rising intonation, when correcting errors whilst eliciting vocabulary.

In the following exchange, Simon is eliciting synonyms for 'disadvantages'. In line 3 he echoes the incorrect suggestion and positions it with the original word using rising intonation (there are repeated examples of this below when he is trying to elicit the word 'advantages').When he is given an appropriate word he also echoes it but this time as acknowledgement.

10

1	S:	Disadvantages ok can you think of any other words for disadvantages?
2	T:	Benefits.
3		(Writing on board - 'benefits' / 'disadvantages')
4	S:	Drawbacks
5	T:	Drawbacks (writes 'drawbacks' on board) ok

There is a subtle difference between these two echoing strategies, i.e. to indicate both acceptance of a suggestion and as a response to an incorrect suggestion, which students do not always perceive, as the following exchange between Deidre and a student illustrates:

1	S:	The glasses man can't move.
2	T:	The glasses man?
3	S:	The glasses man can't move his seat.

In line 2 the tutor interrupts the student to indicate that the term 'glasses man' is not acceptable implying that the student should self-correct but the student either misunderstands her intention or chooses to ignore her.

Teachers simplified linguistic tasks by breaking them down into steps. They used choral repetition to elicit vocabulary and supply pronunciation practice. In this excerpt, Simon is attempting to elicit key vocabulary needed to achieve his aim of helping "s*tudents to focus on this functional feature of texts"* (SR). He does this by gradually reducing the degrees of freedom for the students, by revealing more of the target word until they produce it.

1	T:	(writes 'adv' on board) what does that mean?
2	Ss:	Adverb
3	T:	Adverb or?
4	Ss:	Advertising
5	T:	Advertising? (Teacher adds 'n' so 'advan' is on board)
6	Ss:	Advance
7	T:	Advance? (Teacher adds 't' so 'advant' is on board)
8	Ss:	Advantages.

11

In the following excerpt when dealing with prosodic issues with the word 'controversies' Simon uses choral repetition rather than selecting individuals as a strategy to achieve his aim.

1 T: On page 126 you can see a word I want you to look at … (T shows the
2   word 'controversy' and plays the pronunciation. Sts. repeat the pron of
3   both UK and US pron) The same I thought it was different in America
4   anyway erm yes so if you look in your book, page 126 hopefully yes there
5   (points to screen) 'controversies contr'oversies 'controversies I don't know
6   how to pronounce it the different ways 'controversies contr'oversies.
7 Ss: Controversies controversies controversies.

In-sessional lessons

Evaluating student performance was generally very positive, and correction of errors was also carried out in a supportive way by mitigating strategies. For example, in the exchange below, Karen had asked students about the purpose of seminars.

1 S: Yes it was interaction with your partner.
2 T: Yes interaction that's what you like yes.
3 S: And you must let your partner to speak about his topic.
4 T: Right so that means balance yes that you must not dominating yes.

Karen uses "*right*" in line 4 although she then recasts the students response introducing correct terminology "*balance*" and *"dominate"*. In the exchange below she uses "*yes, but…*" to mitigate the evaluation.

1 T: Yes you need to find a topic. Is it only topic?
2 S: [inaudible]
3 T: Yes, but let's go back to topic. Is it only topic that you need?
4 S: Source of a [inaudible]

In line 1 she repeats the previous student's response, but marks the evaluation with a further question *"Is it only topic?"* indicating that a different or more elaborate answer was expected. In line 3 again the evaluation is framed positively with *"yes"* followed by *"but"* to indicate that the response was insufficient. She then repeats the question. In line 4 the student adds a further point. The use of 'yes' and indirect error correction suggests that Karen is maintaining a positive and supportive environment and evaluates
12

the students by recasting and repetition of questions.

Alan uses a similar supportive evaluation. For example, in the excerpt below where students are offering synonyms for key terms in the text, he asks for further responses, rather than focusing on the incorrect response:

1	T:	'Outline's' good, yes they're all good you have. I like outline it's very close,
2		is there anything else?
3	S:	'Goals'
4	T:	Brilliant, fantastic Jamie.

Alan indicates his negative evaluation with *"it's very close, is there anything else?"*. In line 3 a student offers goals, which Alan accepts as correct, and praises. Again, like Karen, he uses 'yes' although the student response is a dispreferred one. Thus both teachers emphasised the need for a supportive and safe environment for students to practise and contribute as emphasised by Wilson (2016) with reference to 'delicate' scaffolding.

Simplifying the task by focusing on the procedures and processes of an academic task was achieved through tightly-controlled question-answer IRF routines. The questions were both "narrow" display questions (one possible answer) and "broad" display questions (range of possible answers known to teacher) (O'Keeffe, McCarthy & Carter, 2007, p. 239). In the exchange below, Karen checks the steps of preparing for the seminar:

1	T:	Yea we need just one. A newspaper or a website, article so basically
2		we've got the article then what do we what is the next step?
3	S:	[Inaudible] read it [inaudible]
4	T:	Yes but what happens before you introduce it. How do you prepare? Let's
5		first focus on the preparation. So how did you prepare at home?
6	S:	[Inaudible]
7	T:	You got an article so you had to research it meaning you had to read it,
8		yea, and then think of?
9	T:	Questions

Karen asks a series of questions to elicit from students the steps in preparation, using the term "*step*" herself. She uses phrases such as "*then*" (lines 2 and 8), "*before*" (line 4), "*first*" (line 4) to emphasise the order of preparation. Karen scaffolds her students' understanding of procedures by taking them through step by step and involving them in the explaining.

Alan uses a similar technique as can be seen below where he focuses on how to approach reading an academic article.

1	T:	Ok so you've got your journal article here, before you take any notes what
2		should you do? Pardon?
3	S:	Vocabulary
4	T:	Before you read it?
5	S:	The title of
6	S:	Abstract, abstract
7	T:	Read the abstract. Why do you need to read the abstract? Because, it's
8		everything, remember the abstract is everything

He marks the organisation and steps of preparation through *"before"* (lines 1 and 4). Alan involves the students in lines 1-7 and then displays "procedural talk" as described by Walsh, Morton and O'Keeffe (2011) where Alan performs the role of both "questioner and answerer as he/she talks through a procedure" (p. 333).

Scaffolding student affect: recruitment and frustration control

Pre-sessional lessons

The high-stakes nature of a pre-sessional course and the high levels of anxiety can challenge the self-esteem and motivation of learners so it is important that the teacher scaffolds student affect in the classroom. This is typically done by recruitment and frustration control scaffolding.

Recruitment by nomination and referring to individual and shared experiences communicates to students that their identity has been recognised and appreciated and that it is important in the learning process. Using the given names of individuals in the class was a strategy the teachers used to engage and motivate students: *So what is air rage then, Dan? Matt, I heard you say a word? Do you agree with that Cameron?* They

14

also asked questions about the students' personal experiences: *Have you ever experienced this? Have you experienced that? Does that make you, I don't know, how do you feel about that?* In addition they asked about shared experiences e.g. coming from China. In the excerpt below Simon uses the fact that the students all come from China to frame the next stage of his lesson.

```
1    T:    OK does that happen in China? OK I'll give you another question (writing
2          on board) is China a great country?
3    Ss:   Yes of course (students laughing)
4    T:    What are the disadvantages of immigration so think about China maybe
5          think about China, your own country.
            .
```

Simon reflected on the success of this strategy, commenting that *"A number of different students contributed to the discussion on 'Immigration and China', especially on the issue of education in China - this generated thoughtful answers"* (SR).

The pre-sessional teachers used scaffolding talk to control frustration in the form of one-word responses, '*OK', 'yes'*, but also with positive adjectives: '*nice word', 'yes', 'good'.*

In-sessional lessons
Reference to students' experiences of different academic skills activities were common means of both attracting attention and establishing a student-centred environment. Both teachers also created a sense of community by using "we" as an inclusive term for "rapport-maintenance effect" (Lee, 2016, p. 108).

For example, in the exchange below Alan elicits synonyms from the students:

```
1    T:    Historically
2    S:    [inaudible]
3    T:    We could say long time ago, I don't really like that 'in the past'
4    S:    We can use the previously
5    T:    That's better than mine, previously very good well done, keep going then
6          what did we say about strategy let's go we need to go as fast as we can
```

Alan invokes a sense of community with "we" (lines 3 and 6). The student appropriates this term in line 4 with "*we can use*". Alan further marks his participation in the community in line 5 with "*that's better than mine*", positioning himself as a member of the class and also as a learner. He praises in line 5 "*very good well done*" and maintains

15

a sense of momentum "*keep going*" and "*we need to go as fast as we can*".

Karen asks students about their experiences of seminars and asks them to reflect on these experiences, linking this with future academic activities. This also emphasises the academic discourse and the academic community in which the students are participating.

1	T:	OK then are we ready? Can I have your attention please? We will do a
2		little recap a little revision of what we discussed last week and the
3		introduction and the introduction that we did to [inaudible] skills erm so
4		basically how what did you say that how did you feel taking part in any of
5		these seminars that you have experienced or even if it's only last week's
6		practice. What were your main feelings about it? Some people said what
		did you say?

Karen uses students' experiences and their feelings about these experiences to introduce the topic of seminar preparation for that lesson. As noted above, this was the pedagogic aim of her lesson, and she starts from the student experience to situate the topic. This also makes the link between the in-sessional EAP class and their disciplinary studies explicit. Karen encourages the 'telling' of experiences which she then uses as teaching resources (Walsh et al, 2011). The questions are no longer display, but referential questions which elicit more elaborate responses from students (Hardman, 2016).

Discussion

Classroom discourse is oriented to the fulfilling of EAP pedagogic goals, therefore classroom talk needs to be examined in the context of these goals (Garton, 2012). The data reveals how teachers scaffold metacognitive and cognitive purposes and student affect. The data also illustrates that pre-sessional and in-sessional classroom talk display significant differences, particularly in terms of explicit reference to EAP goals. Whilst it could be argued that this is unsurprising as the pre-sessional students are not yet members of their disciplinary culture, as stated at the beginning of the article the aims of EAP is to prepare them for these discourse practices.

Metacognitive scaffolding through direction maintenance aims to keep learners focused

16

on the objectives of their learning. These may be micro-goals at activity level as well as goals focused on course outcomes. The pre-sessional teachers scaffolded short -term goals, that is goals related to a specific stage of an activity. Simon does make reference to future academic expectations but this was the only example we found in the data. In-sessional teachers, however, scaffolded an understanding of the broader goals of the lesson or curriculum. They referred to the goals of the lesson through linking back to previous lessons and activities and 'pointing forward' (Hammond and Gibbons, 2005. 21). Experienced in-sessional teachers also scaffold metacognition of goals through explicit reference to expectations of future departments, explicit explanations of requirements of academic task. They used future tense, and statements of obligation ('you have to', 'you need to'). These findings support Green's (2015) claim that EAP teachers need to be explicit in their reference to future goals and bridge their classroom tasks to future academic practices through reflection on learning and identifying comparisons between current and future activities. Lee (2016) found that experienced EAP teachers talk their students through the activities by using moves such as putting the activity in context and presenting a rationale. We found that only the in-sessional teachers did this consistently throughout the lesson. In an EAP context it is crucial that learners see the relevance of their EAP studies to their future academic studies (Green 2015; James 2006).

Scaffolding talk which supports cognitive activities can be seen in the way teachers mark critical features, encourage noticing, and simplify the task through 'segmentation and ritualisation' (Walsh 2006, 35). Both pre-sessional and in-sessional teachers mitigated error correction through recasting and appropriating learner comments (Hammond and Gibbons 2005)

It was noticeable that in sessional teachers provided 'procedural talk' (Walsh, Morton and O'Keeffe 2011) where 'participants orient to the interactional project of informing, and being informed about different types of procedural matters' (p.333). They do this through question-answer routines to elicit the steps of an academic task or skill. These routines were tightly controlled in terms of the display questions, but also in terms of time. Although the pre-sessional teachers also used display question- answer routine, these exchanges formed a larger part of the lesson and a considerably longer stage of preparation.

Teachers in this study scaffolded students' affect through praise, encouragement and linking to personal and academic experiences. Teachers draw on these experiences using empathic talk (Walsh, Morton and O'Keeffe 2011) to establish rapport and to

17

make explicit links to the activities. It was noticeable that the pre-sessional teachers used personal experiences, such as linking the material to home countries. In sessional teachers, on the other hand, drew on academic experiences, such as previous seminar participation. The importance of a supportive environment for EAP learners is highlighted in several studies (Alexander 2005; Wilson 2016). Praise was often given in the form of 'very good' but encouragement was also realised through repetition of students' ideas, confirmation, as well as acknowledgement. It was noticeable that as part of error correction the teachers maintained positive rapport through asking for alternatives or partially accepting incorrect responses. We suggest that acknowledgement, praise and comment moves (Hardman 2016) as well as genuine, authentic responses (Cullen 2002) help create a supportive environment, part of the 'delicate' scaffolding highlighted by Wilson (2016).

Returning to the research question of how experienced teachers scaffold their EAP pedagogic goals, the four classroom transcripts and stimulated recall indicate that where teachers are explicit in their focus on future academic expectations and academic goals there is alignment between the classroom talk and pedagogic goal. One unexpected finding was that in-sessional teachers used more 'efficient' classroom talk in scaffolding their students' understanding of the goals of the lesson, despite the fact that the aim of the EAP courses (in particular pre-sessional) is 'to find the quickest, and most efficient and effective ways to equip students to perform appropriately in academic settings' (Alexander 2012, 99). While pre-sessional spent time eliciting ideas, preparing students for the main academic skills aim of the lesson through vocabulary teaching, use of pictures, and generally setting the scene, in-sessional teachers explicitly stated academic aims of the lesson at the beginning and spent little time on preparation. One reason may be that in-sessional teachers use classroom talk which more closely resembles that of the disciplinary subject. Lee and Subtirelu (2015) make the point that EAP teachers need to be mindful of the type of lesson structure and interactional features of prospective academic genres and Dippold (2014), in her comparison of corrective feedback strategies in an EAP class and an accounting class, argues that 'we need to ask whether the model of classroom interaction given to students in EAP classrooms by usually well-trained experienced native speaker tutors prepares them best for what they will encounter in their disciplines' (Dippold 2014, 403).

18

Conclusion

Pre-sessional and in-sessional EAP learning contexts can present students with considerable stress and anxiety (Wilson 2016) and the stakes are often high (Alexander 2012). We have illustrated the skilful ways in which experienced teachers support understanding of language and academic practices, but would suggest that teachers be mindful of how they can further maintain a focus on the goals of EAP and provide more scaffolding of student affect. Creating a positive learning environment is crucial, as is making explicit connections to future academic expectations and requirements.
It is important to point out several limitations to this study

Firstly, it was a small-scale study drawing on data from four teachers and four classes. Secondly, although the teachers were well-known to the researchers, the classroom interaction and both student and teacher talk could have been influenced by the presence of the researcher and the video camera. Thirdly, only whole class talk was audible and suitable for transcription due to the use of only one video camera and its position in the classroom to be as unobtrusive as possible. There were several stages of the lesson in which students worked in small groups and the teacher facilitated. Recordings from these interactions would build on the work in this study. Similarly, further exploration of teacher and student analysis of the scaffolding talk through stimulated recall interviews would enhance the findings.

Despite these limitations, we believe this study has further developed our understanding of how teachers use talk to achieve certain pedagogic goals in an EAP classroom. Walsh and Li (2013, p. 263) argue that teachers and students can benefit from a more "up-close and ecological understanding of context" to gain greater awareness of classroom interaction. Teacher education could include awareness-raising of EAP lesson genres and familiarisation with discursive repertoires through the close analysis of classroom transcripts. As mentioned, the lack of teacher talk which supports critical thinking was noticeable, and thus we suggest this be an aspect of teacher scaffolding talk deserving of attention in CPD and teacher training. Campion (2016, p. 68) highlights the gap in understanding what EAP involves by stating that whilst new teachers feel confident about their skills, "more needs to be understood about what these skills are". A fine-grained examination of the talk which supports these teaching skills and the goals of an EAP lesson can highlight features that new EAP teachers can develop in their repertoire of teacher talk.

19

References

Alexander, O. (2012). Exploring teacher beliefs in teaching EAP at low proficiency
    levels. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 11*(2), 99-111.

Alexander, R. (2005). Culture, dialogue and learning: Notes on an emerging pedagogy.
    *Keynote address at International Association for Cognitive Education and
    Psychology,* University of Durham.

Barnard, R. C., & Campbell, L. (2005). Sociocultural Theory and the teaching of process
    writing: The scaffolding of learning in a university context. *The TESOLANZ Journal,
    13*, 76-88

Campion, G. C. (2016). 'The learning never ends': Exploring teachers' views on the
    transition from general English to EAP. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes,
    23*, 59-70.

Chappell, P. (2014). Engaging learners: Conversation-or dialogic-driven pedagogy?
    ELT Journal, 68(1), 1-11.

Cullen, R. 2002. "Supportive Teacher Talk: The Importance of the F-move". *ELT
    Journal* 56 (2) 117-127

de Chazal, E. (2014). *English for Academic Purposes*. Oxford: OUP.

Dippold, D. (2014). "That's Wrong": Repair and Rapport in Culturally Diverse Higher
    Education Classrooms. *The Modern Language Journal, 98*(1), 402-416.

Garton, S. (2012). Speaking out of turn? Taking the initiative in teacher-fronted
    classroom interaction. *Classroom Discourse, 3*(1), 29-45.

Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2000). *Stimulated recall methodology in second language
    research*. Routledge.

Green, J. H. (2015). Teaching for transfer in EAP: Hugging and bridging revisited.
    English for Specific Purposes, 37, 1-12.

20

Hammond, J. 2006. "High Challenge, High Support: Integrating Language and Content Instruction for Diverse Learners in an English Literature Classroom." Journal of English for Academic Purpose 5 (4), 269-283

Hammond, J., & Gibbons, P. (2005). Putting scaffolding to work: The contribution of scaffolding in articulating ESL education. *Prospect, 20(*1), 6-30.

Haneda, M., & Wells, G. (2008). Learning an additional language through dialogic inquiry. *Language and Education*, *22*(2), 114-136.

Hardman, J. (2016). Tutor–student interaction in seminar teaching: Implications for professional development. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 17*(1), 63-76.

Hyland, K., & Hamp-Lyons, L. (2002). EAP: Issues and directions. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 1*(1), 1-12.

James, M. A. (2006). Transfer of learning from a university content-based EAP course. *TESOL Quarterly*, 783-806.

Lantolf, J. P. (2000). Second language learning as a mediated process. *Language Teaching*, *33*(2), 79-96.

Lee, J. J. (2016). "There's intentionality behind it…" A genre analysis of EAP classroom lessons. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 23*, 99-112.

Lee, J. J., & Subtirelu, N. C. (2015). Metadiscourse in the classroom: A comparative analysis of EAP lessons and university lectures. *English for Specific Purposes*, *37*, 52-62.

Li, D. (2012). Scaffolding adult learners of English in learning target form in a Hong Kong EFL university. Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, *6*(2), 127-144.

Mercer, N. (1995). *The guided construction of knowledge: Talk amongst teachers and learners*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

21

Mercer, N. (2004). Sociocultural discourse analysis: Analysing Classroom talk as a Social Mode of Thinking. *Journal of Applied Linguistics, 1*(2), 137-168.

O'Keeffe, A., McCarthy, M., & Carter, R. (2007). *From corpus to classroom: Language use and language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rapley, T. (2008). Doing conversation. *Discourse and Document Analysis.* London*:* Sage Publications Ltd

Richards, K. (2003). *Qualitative inquiry in TESOL*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

Seedhouse, P. (2004).The organization of language classroom interaction. *Language Learning*, *54*(S1), 181-222.

Sharpe, T. (2006). 'Unpacking' scaffolding: Identifying discourse and multimodal strategies that support learning. *Language and Education*, *20*(3), 211-231.

Silverman, D. (2011). Interpreting qualitative data: A guide to the principles of qualitative research. Los Angeles: Sage.

Tharp, R. G., & Gallimore, R. (1991). *Rousing minds to life: Teaching, learning, and schooling in social context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Van de Pol, J., Volman, M., & Beishuizen, J. (2010). Scaffolding in teacher–student interaction: A decade of research. *Educational Psychology Review*, *22*(3), 271-296
Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating classroom discourse*. Abingdon OX: Routledge.

Walsh, S. (2013). *Classroom discourse and teacher development*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Walsh, S., & Li, L. (2013). Conversations as space for learning. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *23*(2), 247-266.

Walsh, S., Morton, T., & O'Keeffe, A. (2011). Analysing university spoken interaction: A CL/CA approach. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, *16*(3), 325-345.

Wilson, K. (2016). Critical reading, critical thinking: Delicate scaffolding in English for Academic Purposes (EAP). *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, *22*, 256-265.

Wood, D., Bruner, J. S. & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 17*(2), 89-100.

Wood, D. & Wood, H. (1996). Vygotsky, tutoring and learning. *Oxford Review of Education, 22*(1), 5-16.

Appendix A

Stimulated recall questions

- Ask what were the aims of the lesson and specifically what were the EAP goals of the lesson?
- To what extent do you think they were achieved?
- Why / why not?
- Now you have seen the transcript and the video, any reflections on your EAP goals and how you achieved them?
- Would you do anything differently?
- Would you like to discuss with the researchers?