
Studies on Multilingualism in Language Education

Issue 4

Teacher Input Observation Scheme (TIOS)

Kristin Kersten, Ann-Christin Bruhn,
Julia Böhnke, Katharina Ponto, Werner Greve

2018

Institut für englische Sprache und Literatur
Universität Hildesheim
Universitätsplatz 1 | 31141 Hildesheim
+49.(0)5121.883.30506 | kristin.kersten@uni-hildesheim.de
www.uni-hildesheim.de/kristin-kersten/



smile 
Studies on Multilingualism
in Language Education

Acknowledgments

Lisa Bade, Imke Blank, Lisa Bode, Katrin Bürger, Lisanne Conradi, Svenja Frömming, Laureen Gallwitz, Martin Koch, Valerie Lietzau, Esther Maier, Larissa Mielke, Katharina Vilbrandt, Christoph Schüle

Suggested citation:

Kersten, Kristin, Bruhn, Ann-Christin, Ponto, Katharina, Böhnke, Julia, Greve, Werner (2018). Teacher Input Observation Scheme (TIOS) and Manual. *Studies on Multilingualism in Language Education*, 4, Hildesheim University.

Associated publications:

Kersten K. (2019). Einflussfaktoren im bilingualen Fremdsprachenerwerb. In A. Rohde, A.K. Steinlen (Hrsg.), *Sprachenvielfalt als Ressource begreifen: Mehrsprachigkeit in bilingualen Kindertagesstätten und Schulen (Band II)*. Berlin: dohrmannVerlag, 35-70.

Kersten, K. (2020). Der Zusammenhang von kognitiven Fähigkeiten und Mehrsprachigkeit im frühen L2-Erwerb: Individuelle und externe Variablen. In H. Böttger, J. Festman, T. Müller, T. (Hrsg.), *Language Education and Acquisition Research: Focusing Early Language Learning*. Bad Heilbrunn: Klinkhardt Verlag, 81-118.

<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/340104905> The interplay of cognitive linguistic and instructional factors in early language acquisition

Kersten, K. (accepted, November 2021). Effective L2 input and teaching characteristics for the foreign language classroom. *The European Journal of Applied Linguistics and TEFL*. Preprint:

<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344402808> L2 input and characteristics of instructional techniques in early foreign language classrooms - Underlying theory and pedagogical practice

This research was funded by:

Ministry for Science and Culture, Lower Saxony (MWK)
VW Vorab Grant Number: 12.3-76251-99-55/14

Teacher Input Observation Scheme (TIOS)



PART I

General Information	Observer:
	Date of rating:
	Teacher:
	School:
	Class:
	Topic of the lesson:
	Type and start grade of English program:
	Numbers of English lessons per week:
Title / Coding of video:	

PART II

Class Arrangement	Individual work	%
	Pair work	
	Group work	
	Plenary	
	Other	

Focus on Language Skills	Focus on Reading	%
	Focus on Writing	
	Focus on Listening	
	Focus on Speaking	

PART III

Rating Scale:

0 : not present at all, 1 : present to a low degree, 2 : partly present, 3 : present, 4 : present to a high degree, 5 : present to a very high degree
n.a. = not applicable

Characteristics of Tasks / Activities: Cognitive Stimulation of Learners' Realm of Experience	Cognitively Stimulating Tasks / Activities		n.a.	Possible Score: 65 (subtract 5 points for each n.a. given)	Percentage Score
	Tasks / Activities ...				
	1. ... focus on meaningful content goals				
	2. ... focus on meaningful language use /* meaningful conversational goals				
	3. ... are clearly introduced / explained				
	4. ... are modelled / demonstrated				
	5. ... are explicitly linked to their specific learning goals / learning objectives				
	6. ... require specific linguistic elements				
	7. ... require active problem-solving by the learners				
	8. ... are based on the prior world knowledge of the learners (i.e., their everyday experiences)				
	9. ... include all learners actively at all times				
	10. ... provide opportunities for genuine interactions between learners				
	11. ... provide opportunities for genuine output (language use) of the learners				
	12. ... are based on authentic materials / realia / texts / auditory displays				
13. ... and materials differ with respect to the diverse abilities of the (groups of) learners (differentiation)					
Score Earned:					

Support of Comprehensible Input	Verbal Input		n.a.	Possible Score: 60 (subtract 5 points for each n.a. given)	Percentage Score
	The teacher ...				
	14. ... has a high language proficiency in the L2				
	15. ... exclusively uses the L2 in class				
	16. ... provides a high amount of L2 input (i.e., uses L2 a lot to accompany all actions)				
	17. ... uses varied L2 input				
	18. ... uses recurring verbal routines / rituals				
	19. ... uses repetitions of key words and phrases				
	20. ... adapts the L2 input to different (groups of) learners				
	21. ... articulates and enunciates clearly				
	22. ... slows down speech rate for selected contents				
	23. ... uses intonation to stress key words / phrases in the L2				
24. ... uses pauses to indicate key words / phrases in the L2					
25. ... uses comprehension checks					
Score Earned:					

Support of Comprehensible Input	Non-Verbal Input		n.a.	Possible Score: 25 (subtract 5 points for each n.a. given)	Percentage Score	
		The teacher...				
	26.	... uses body language				
	27.	... uses visual illustrations				
	28.	... uses manipulatives (hands-on materials)				
	29.	... uses written labels / phrases / texts in the L2				
30.	... provides displays (words / phrases / materials) in the L2 within the classroom					
	Score Earned:					

Support of Comprehensible Output: Promoting and Reacting to the Learners' L2 Production	Support of Learners' Output		n.a.	Possible Score: 55 (subtract 5 points for each n.a. given)	Percentage Score	
		The teacher...				
	31.	... asks questions which promote open answers				
	32.	... waits for learners' reactions / answers				
	33.	... encourages the learners to use the L2				
	34.	... allows learners to code mix / use the L1 to compensate for gaps in the L2				
	35.	... allows learners to use alternative non-verbal ways of expression				
	36.	... provides prepared key vocabulary and phrases in the L2 for learners' utterances				
	37.	... appreciates the learner's L2 production (i.e., their L2 language use)				
	38.	... corrects the learners' content errors				
	39.	... corrects the learners' language errors				
	40.	... prompts learners' self-correction during interaction (i.e., encourages them to correct themselves)				
41.	... reacts to errors by focusing on linguistic form within a meaningful context (i.e., at the moment the error occurs in a meaningful interaction)					
	Score Earned:					

Total Score	Total Possible Score: 205 (subtract 5 points for each n.a. given):		
	Total Score Earned (sum up all ratings of Part III):		
	Percentage Score ((Total Score Earned/Total Possible Score)*100):		

Support of Comprehensible Output: Reacting to the Learners' L2 Production	Corrective Feedback (Additional Scale for Detailed Video Analysis)		n.a.	Possible Score: 70 (subtract 5 points for each n.a. given)	Percentage Score				
		The teacher...							
	a.	... explicitly points out the content errors to the learners							
	b.	... recasts the learners' content errors							
	c.	... prompts learners to self-correct their content errors (super-category)							
	c1.	... requests a clarification concerning the learners' content errors (e.g. Excuse me?, Sorry?)							
	c2.	... repeats the learners' content errors							
	c3.	... elicits a reformulation after learners' content errors (e.g. How do we say that in English?, It's a...)							
	c4.	... gives a metalinguistic clue concerning the learners' content errors							
	d.	... explicitly points out the language errors to the learners							
	e.	... recasts the learners' language errors							
	f.	... prompts learners to self-correct their language errors (super-category)							
	f1.	... requests a clarification concerning the learners' language errors (e.g. Excuse me?, Sorry?)							
	f2.	... repeats the learners' language errors							
	f3.	... elicits a reformulation after learners' language errors (e.g. How do we say that in English?, It's a...)							
	f4.	... gives a metalinguistic clue concerning the learners' language errors							
		Score Earned:							

* / = and / or

MANUAL

The Teacher Input Observation Scheme (TIOS) aims to capture the use of L2¹ input and instructional techniques provided by the L2 teacher during a lesson in the foreign language in the primary school context. The TIOS is a quantitative observation instrument divided into three parts. The first part consists of low-inference categories² which request general information about the observer, the date of rating, and the program. This general information has to be completed before the rating. The second part of the TIOS serves as an overview on the class arrangements and the four language skills involved during the lesson. The third part contains four high-inference scales with 41 items in total: Characteristics of Tasks / Activities (Item 1.-13.), Verbal Input (Item 14.-25.), Non-Verbal Input (Item 26.-30.) and Support of Learners' Output (Item 31.-41.). For a detailed analysis on error correction, the TIOS includes an additional section on Corrective Feedback. This section is not obligatory, and is not part of the Total Score since a detailed video analysis is needed for this purpose.

This manual contains explanations and guiding questions for the rating of each category, as well as directions for calculating scores for each part of the TIOS.

The TIOS ratings refer to the use of instructional techniques throughout the full lesson, but the instrument can also be used to rate shorter sequences or phases of a lesson. It is recommended to rely on video recordings for the rating. Lessons should be watched first and graded subsequently. Therefore, it is recommended to take notes while watching the lesson.

PART II

Calculating the Scores of Part II

The numbers should be given in percentages with respect to the full lesson or to the phase/s observed; the rating of each scale has to amount to 100 percent. Generally, it is sufficient to estimate the percentages. However, if the class arrangement or the focus on language skills is of greater importance for the observation, the percentages can be calculated more precisely by taking the exact periods of time.

Class Arrangement

To what extent does the teacher integrate activities catering to different class arrangements such as individual/ pair / group work, plenary (teacher-centred teaching), or other arrangements?

Focus on Language Skills

To what extent does the teacher integrate activities catering to the different language skills of reading, writing, listening and speaking?

¹ In this manual, no distinction will be made between the terms 'second' (L2) and 'foreign' language (FL). L2 refers to the medium of instruction in the classroom.

² Observational items range from "low-inference" to "high-inference" categories (Long 1980). While low-inference categories do not require the observer's judgement but are verifiable in the data, high-inference categories call for some judgement and interpretation during the rating (Bailey 2006:112).

Directions

The four scales of Part III contain 41 items which are rated with regard to the entire lesson or to the phase/s chosen for observation ranging on a Likert scale from 0 to 5 (**0 = not present at all, 1 = present to a low degree, 2 = partly present, 3 = present, 4 = present to a high degree and 5 = present to a very high degree**). All ratings refer to the *highest amount of use of this technique* which would *theoretically have been possible* during the respective lesson – according to this, a rating of 5 means that the teaching technique is present to a very high degree in all activities during which this technique could have been used. For example, a rating of 5 of “uses comprehension checks” (Item 25) indicates the constant use of the technique when addressing the learners during all different activities, while a rating of 0 would mean that the teacher would have had the opportunity to implement the technique, but did not check for comprehension at all throughout the sequence which was rated.

The **option “not applicable” (n.a.)** can / should be used for items which cannot possibly occur for reasons of the teaching approach chosen for the lesson, or because they cannot be interpreted during the lesson: If, for example, learners are constantly using the L2, the technique “The teacher allows learners to code mix / use the L1 to compensate for gaps in the L2” (Item 34) is not applicable. Likewise, if the classroom is not entirely visible in a video and no further information is accessible, the display of words, phrases and materials within the classroom (Item 30) cannot be interpreted, and the category is, thus, not applicable.³

In this manual, **the slash (/)** within an item serves as shorthand for “and / or”, as in:

Tasks and Activities are based on authentic materials / realia / texts / auditory displays. (*authentic materials and / or realia and / or texts and / or auditory displays*).

Calculating the scores of Part III

After scoring all 41 items, the observer tallies all numeric scores (“Total Scores Earned”) and creates a ratio with the total possible score: The total score is 205 (41 items multiplied by a score of 5), except when “n.a.” is applied. For each “n.a.” item 5 points are subtracted from 205 to calculate the “Total Possible Score”. If a teacher, for example, receives a “n.a.” for three items, 15 points are subtracted from the total score of 205 (i.e., 5 points for each item with “n.a.”), leaving 190 as the “Total Possible Score”. The “Percentage Score” is then calculated using $(\text{Total Score Earned} / \text{Total Possible Score}) * 100$. The “Percentage Score” is used for further calculations, e.g. the comparison of different teachers, or the correlation with the L2 proficiency of the learners.

Step-by-step guide:

1. Calculate “Total Score Earned”: Sum up all ratings of Part III (max. 205, if every item has a rating of 5 and no item is rated as n.a.).
2. Calculate “Total Possible Score”: For each “n.a.” item, 5 points are subtracted from 205 to calculate the “Total Possible Score”. If a teacher, for example, receives a “n.a.” for three items, 15 points are subtracted from the total score of 205 (i.e., 5 points for each item with “n.a.”), leaving 190 as the “Total Possible Score”.
3. Calculate the “Percentage Score”: Divide the “Total Score Earned” by “Total Possible Score” and multiply the sum by 100. If, for example, the “Total Score Earned” is 190 and the “Total Possible Score” is 205, the “Percentage Score” would be 92.68%.

For the scores of the four individual scales of Part III, a similar calculation applies; except that for the “Total Possible Score” the maximum score is no longer 205, but the sum of the number of items the scale comprises multiplied by 5 (Keep in mind: For each “n.a.” item 5 points are subtracted).

³ The distinction between a score of “0” and “n.a.” is important because a score of 0 affects the total score of the lesson, whereas a score of “n.a.” does not, since it reduces the total score for the calculation of the percentages.

CHARACTERISTICS OF TASKS / ACTIVITIES:

COGNITIVE STIMULATION OF LEARNERS' REALM OF EXPERIENCE

The TIOS refers to theoretical approaches within a cognitive-interactionist framework (Long 2015). A number of items aim at the difference between “tasks” and “exercises”, and “Focus on Meaning”, “Focus on Form”, “Focus on Forms”. The TIOS refers to tasks as activities which have a meaningful content goal and require genuine language use (Focus on Meaning), and which draw attention to specific linguistic elements required for or appearing during the activity (Focus on Form). It refers to exercises as activities which have a purely linguistic focus and require language for purposes of practice, training, display-questions, and drill (Focus on Forms), and do not allow for genuine language use.

Cognitively Stimulating Tasks / Activities (1.-13.)

1. Tasks focus on meaningful content goals

Are the tasks and activities carried out in the classroom based on meaningful content? Are they embedded in purposeful and genuine and relevant learning contexts? Are the goals / outcomes of the tasks and activities independent of purely linguistic goals? (*Focus on Meaning*).

Note that “meaningful” in this context does not mean “significant” or “important”, but “related to a topic or content which is not purely linguistic”.

2. Tasks focus on meaningful language use / meaningful conversational goals

Do the tasks and activities elicit meaningful language from the learners? Do they have an open conversational goal that goes beyond closed questions, display questions, or language drills (the latter being referred to as *Focus on Forms*)? Do the learners need to use their own language knowledge creatively and productively (instead of exclusively reproducing and practicing linguistic items which are modelled by the teacher)?

As it is the aim of foreign language teaching to enable the learners to speak the respective language similarly to the way in which a native speaker would, classroom language should represent how language is used naturally in everyday life situations (e.g. at the supermarket, at the doctor, in a restaurant).

3. Tasks are clearly introduced / explained

Are the activities clearly introduced and verbally explained?

4. Tasks are modelled / demonstrated

Are the activities introduced at the beginning with the help of modelling or demonstration, either by the teacher or with the help of (one of the) learners?

5. Tasks are explicitly linked to their specific learning goals / learning objectives

Are language and content goals of the lesson / tasks / activities introduced and explained by the teacher?

6. Tasks require specific linguistic elements

Are tasks and activities created such that they require target linguistic items? Are they geared at specific grammatical forms, i.e. do the learners need to use specific grammatical forms to solve the task? (This is true for grammatical exercises and language drills in general. An example of a genuine, open-ended task, however, which requires the use of different structures, would be, for instance, last week's weather report and next week's weather forecast, where different tenses need to be distinguished. A picture difference task, on the other hand, requires the use of questions, prepositions and descriptions of location.)

7. Tasks require active problem-solving by the learners

Do the tasks and activities lead the learners to think about problems and their solutions on their own? Do they present puzzling or complex information beyond the learners' realm of experiences, so that they have to form their own ideas and find their own interpretations about a puzzling observation? Are the learners confronted with phenomena to which they do not yet have an answer, and do they have a chance to speculate, form hypotheses and assumptions, and try out

solutions by themselves? Are they encouraged to talk about their own ideas and beliefs? Does the teacher only act as a facilitator in this process, instead of directing each step of the process towards a required answer? (*Construction of Knowledge*).

A strong example of problem-solving may be the exploration of a topic such as floating and sinking by formulating and verifying hypotheses that the learners established on their own. Creating a shopping list for a party or special event (and stay within a budget) may be a weaker example for a problem-solving activity in the EFL classroom.

(This category does not mean that the learners answer questions asked by the teacher, to which the teacher immediately provides or approves of the correct answer. Neither does it refer to the prior knowledge of the learners, which is covered in item 5; however, it is often connected with it.)

8. Tasks are based on the prior world knowledge of the learners (i.e., their everyday experiences)

Does the teacher elicit the learners' prior world knowledge? Does s/he refer to the learners' existing knowledge base and their current level of understanding? Are the learners able to talk about their own previous experiences related to the topic? Does the teacher connect new input with something that is already known, and refers to experiences that link to the learners' life?

This item refers to the cognitive stimulation of the general knowledge base of the learners from their everyday life, and not to the review of information presented in the previous lesson. It becomes obvious during observation if learners are able to talk about their personal experiences, thoughts and assumptions, and give examples deriving from their personal lives. (Often, the L1 has to be allowed in these situations, cf. Item 33).

It would be graded as 1 (present to a low degree) if the topic only draws on the learners' everyday life experiences (e.g. the topic breakfast), but no further personal experiences of the learners are elicited. If the teacher implements a topic referring to a concrete situation that is related to their everyday life, this would be graded as 2 (partly present) or 3 (present). 4 (present to a high degree) or 5 (present to a very high degree) would be rated if the teacher explicitly elicits the prior knowledge of a new topic from the learners, i.e. their experiences with, and ideas about, the topic.

9. Tasks include all learners actively at all times

Are all learners involved actively and productively in all activities, instead of just receiving information from the teacher or answering questions one learner at a time? Do the tasks require all learners to focus their attention constantly on carrying out an activity? Do the activities involve learners cognitively at all times?

This item receives a high rating if tasks are used which technically include all learners actively at all times. Disruptions caused by the students or misbehaviour in terms of ignoring the teachers instruction should not affect the rating of this category.

An example could be the use of color-coded student response cards, such as green for "yes" and red for "no". The teacher poses a question to the class regarding information just covered in the lesson. Each student holds up a card with the corresponding answer to the question. Further examples would be group or station work including collaborative learning formats, think-pair-share, information / opinion-gap tasks, while-listening/reading activities, etc. A counter-example would be a traditional question-and-answer session with one learner at a time.

10. Tasks provide opportunities for genuine interactions between learners

Do the tasks and activities provide ample opportunities for open linguistic interactions between the learners, e.g. through interactive tasks (such as information gap tasks), role plays, open dialogues, etc.? Does it call for language interaction which has an open communicative purpose (as opposed to the use of given linguistic elements)?

Note that "genuine" in this context means productive, creative, authentic, i.e. open-ended and with a real communicative purpose.

11. Tasks provide opportunities for genuine output (language use) of the learners

Do the tasks and activities provide ample opportunities for genuine, authentic output by the learners, i.e. language production, during which they have to use their L2 knowledge productively and creatively, such as e.g. presentations on topics, quick-write activities, learner reports, etc.?

This category does not refer to answering practice questions during language exercises, or to choral speaking.

12. Tasks are based on authentic materials / realia / texts / auditory displays

Are the materials / realia (real objects), settings and texts (written, displayed on CD), which are used in the activities, authentic and natural? The term “authentic”, here, means that they are taken from a real-life context.

An example would be the use of real objects, photographs or videos instead of picture cards, drawings or labels, or the use of authentic English texts used in L1 contexts instead of translations.

The rating of this item should be adapted to the possibilities to use authentic materials during the respective lesson.

13. Tasks and materials differ with respect to the diverse abilities of the (groups of) learners (differentiation)

Groups of learners are heterogeneous in their individual skills. Do the tasks and activities respect the different individual skill levels of each learner? Do they include different roles, activities, materials or worksheets of varying complexity concerning both language and content to cater to the needs of the different skill levels?

SUPPORT OF COMPREHENSIBLE INPUT

Verbal Input (14.-25.)

14. The teacher has a high language proficiency in the L2

Does the teacher have a high proficiency in the target language (target-like pronunciation / grammar / idiomatic use, fluency)? Does the teacher model accurate use of the target language?

A rating of 5 is not necessarily attributed to a native speaker. A non-native teacher who shows a near-native proficiency can also be rated with a score of 5.

15. The teacher exclusively uses the L2 in class

Does the teacher only use the L2 in class instead of switching to the L1 and / or translating into the L1?

This category would be graded as 5 (present to a very high degree) if the teacher addresses the learners in the L2 during the entire lesson and does not switch back to the L1, even if the learners use the L1 (cf. Item 33), nor does the teacher translate into the L1. Instead, s/he uses a variety of techniques during negotiation of meaning and form in the interaction with the learners to clarify issues of comprehension.

16. The teacher provides a high amount of L2 input (i.e., uses L2 a lot to accompany all actions)

Does the teacher provide as much linguistic input in the L2 for the learners as possible throughout the lesson? Does the teacher accompany each activity using the L2? Does the teacher exploit every opportunity to provide input in the L2?

This category refers to the question of how much linguistic input the children receive in the L2 during class depending on how much use the teacher makes of opportunities for his or her own language production.

17. The teacher uses varied L2 input

Does the teacher offer L2 input to the learners which is complex and rich, i.e. which includes a wide range of vocabulary and varying grammatical structure (e.g. active vs. passive constructions; past, present and future vocabulary and language structures)? Does the teacher use different ways of explanation, summaries, paraphrases, synonyms and antonyms?

18. The teacher uses recurring verbal routines / rituals

Does the teacher use recurring language elements which refer to classroom routines and classroom management which occur across different lessons? Does the teacher use rhymes and songs routinely in the classroom?

“Not applicable” should be used if the routines are not obvious to the rater. If, on the other hand, the teacher uses songs or rhymes, etc., in which all children participate, it can be assumed that they are routinely used.

19. The teacher uses repetitions of key words and phrases

Does the teacher build redundancy into the lesson by offering L2 input with repetitions of key words, phrases, or short sentences, which refer to the content of the lesson or unit?

20. The teacher adapts the L2 input to different (groups of) learners

Does the teacher change his or her input techniques with regard to different learners?

For example, the teacher gives different verbal support to particular learners during phases of individual work. Another example could be the use of different verbal instructions when explaining a task with regard to the learners' language level.

21. The teacher articulates and enunciates clearly

Does the teacher pronounce words clearly to ensure comprehension?

22. The teacher slows down speech rate for selected contents

Does the teacher slow down speech rate to ensure comprehension of the L2 when focussing on important content?

For example, especially for learners in the beginning stages of L2 acquisition, a slow speech rate is appropriate when explaining a task or giving instructions.

23. The teacher uses intonation to stress key words / phrases

Does the teacher use a higher pitch, stress and intonation to highlight important key elements?

24. The teacher uses pauses to indicate key words / phrases

Does the teacher deliberately insert pauses before and after key words to draw attention to their boundaries?

This item refers to speech segmentation. In normal speech, one typically finds many consecutive words being said with no pauses between them, and often the final sounds of one word blend smoothly or fuse with the initial sounds of the next word. Hence, without pausing, it might be difficult for second language learners to recognise that although the words "the" and "cat" occur together frequently, "the" and "cat" are individual words (instead of the interpretation "thecat").

25. The teacher uses comprehension checks

Does the teacher regularly check on the learners' comprehension of a task / of the L2 input?

For example, the teacher can explicitly ask for the student's understanding, use quick checking activities (e.g. a quiz) or the teacher can ask a student to explain or model the task. With the help of self-assessment strategies, such as "Thumbs Up / Down" or "Fist to Five" learners' comprehension can also be checked non-verbally.

Non-Verbal Input (26.-30.)

26. The teacher uses body language

Does the teacher use gestures, pantomime, facial expressions and others forms of body language to accompany L2 input and activities?

27. The teacher uses visual illustrations

Does the teacher use visualization techniques such as pictures, symbols, graphs, picture stories, figures, paintings, flashcards, mind maps, videos, etc., to accompany L2 input / activities? Does the teacher use visual means to contextualize the content, i.e. to refer to concrete objects/concepts and relations between objects/concepts?

28. The teacher uses manipulatives (hands-on materials)

Does the teacher use manipulatives / hands-on materials / realia to accompany L2 input / activities? Does the teacher use hands-on materials to contextualize the content, i.e. to refer to concrete objects/concepts and relations between objects/concepts?

29. The teacher uses written labels / phrases / texts in the L2

Does the teacher use any kind of written form to accompany L2 input / activities? Does the teacher use written materials to contextualize the content, i.e. to refer to concrete objects / concepts and relations between objects/concepts?

For example, when introducing new vocabulary or giving instructions, the written form is used as visual input / support on the board. In contrast to 30, the written form is used temporarily and is not displayed permanently in the classroom.

30. The teacher provides displays (words / phrases / materials) in the L2 within the classroom

Are key vocabulary and phrases displayed throughout classroom?

This category would be graded as very high if keywords of the target language are presented on posters, as labels on furniture or on the board (permanently). The words and phrases on display may relate to various units and / or rituals and routines which reoccur over several units.

These displays do not necessarily need to be in the target language only; this item also applies if bilingual technical terms are displayed (drey (the nest of a squirrel) – Kobel (*german*)).

To rate this item, it is important to include the displays in the videography and / or the documentation and notes of the observation. If the classroom is not entirely visible in a video and no further information is accessible, the display of words and phrases in the classroom cannot be interpreted, and the item is, thus, rated as not applicable.

SUPPORT OF COMPREHENSIBLE OUTPUT:

PROMOTING AND REACTING TO THE LEARNERS' L2 PRODUCTION

Support of Learners' Output (31.-41.)

31. The teacher asks questions which promote open answers

Does the teacher ask questions in the classroom discourse which go beyond yes / no or one-word utterances, but require genuine answers from the learners? Does the teacher ask questions to which s/he does not know the answer, but which depend on the learners' own knowledge, i.e. questions which cannot be judged as correct / incorrect by the teacher? This item might refer to learners relating their own experiences, talk about events, make assumptions, give opinions, etc.

32. The teacher waits for learners' reactions / answers

Does the teacher leave enough waiting time for learners' understanding and reactions? Do the learners have enough time to consider more complex answers? Is the waiting time sufficient for all different (groups of) learners?

33. The teacher encourages the learners to use the L2

Does the teacher encourage the learners to express what they want to say in their L2, when learners use their L1? Does the teacher use choral speaking for learners at beginning levels? This item refers to positive encouragement within the realm of the learners' abilities, but without forcing the learners or pressure them to use the L2.

"Not applicable" should be used if the learners are constantly using the L2 and there is no need for the teacher to use this technique.

34. The teacher allows learners to code mix / use the L1 to compensate for gaps in the L2

Does the teacher allow learners to use their L1 to compensate for gaps or express complex thoughts which go beyond their L2 competence?

This becomes particularly necessary for the beginning stages of L2 acquisition when learners are asked to express their thoughts and prior knowledge on meaningful content for which output scaffolds cannot be provided.

"Not applicable" should be used if the learners are constantly using the L2 and there is no need for the teacher to use this technique.

35. The teacher allows learners to use alternative non-verbal ways of expression

Does the teacher allow learners to use non-verbal forms of expressing themselves, e.g. through miming responses, using gestures (e.g., “Thumbs Up”, “Fist to Five”), TPR activities, or the use of symbols (e.g., color-coded cards), etc.?

In order to compensate language limitations, students could be allowed to demonstrate their understanding by using symbolic representations found in charts or pictures. If the students are for example not yet able to verbally explain how the process of an experiment works, arranging pictures of a model at the blackboard using a little L2 might be an alternative to demonstrate understanding.

“Not applicable” should be used if the learners are able to express everything in the L2 and do not need to express themselves non-verbally.

36. The teacher provides prepared key vocabulary and phrases in the L2 for learners' utterances

Does the teacher provide prepared output scaffolds such as key vocabulary, phrases (e.g., the beginning of a sentence), and formulaic language orally or in written form to support L2 production?

37. The teacher appreciates the learner's L2 output (i.e., their L2 language use)

Does the teacher appreciate both the learners' content-related and language-related L2 output by praising the learners' utterances verbally (e.g. “Well done!”, “Good job!”)? Does the teacher appreciate the learners' utterances nonverbally using mime and gestures (e.g. looking at the learners and nodding, thumbs up, etc.)?

38. The teacher corrects the learners' content errors

Does the teacher correct errors made by the learners which refer to the content of the lesson?

This category would be graded as “not applicable” if no content errors are produced by the learners. If all content errors produced by the learners are corrected by the teacher this category would be rated as 5 (present to a very high degree). On the contrary, a 0 (not present at all) would be given if none of the produced errors are corrected by the teacher.

(Corrections can take place in various forms. For a more detailed rating of these different forms, the TIOS includes an additional section on error correction. This section is not part of the Total Score since a detailed video analysis is needed for this purpose).

39. The teacher corrects the learners' language errors by providing the correct form

Does the teacher correct learners' language errors referring to the linguistic correctness (e.g., lexicon, pronunciation, grammar, idiomatic language use, etc.) by providing the correct forms him / herself? (input-providing)

This category would be graded as “not applicable” if learners do not produce any language errors. If all language errors produced by the learners are corrected by the teacher this category would be rated as 5 (present to a very high degree). In contrast to that a 0 (not present at all) would be given if none of the produced errors are corrected by the teacher.

(For a more detailed rating of these different forms, the TIOS includes an additional section on error correction. This section is not obligatory, and is not part of the Total Score since a detailed video analysis is needed for this purpose.)

40. The teacher prompts learners' self-correction during interaction (i.e., encourages them to correct themselves)

Does the teacher correct children's utterances (e.g., lexicon, pronunciation, grammar, idiomatic language use, etc.) by using prompts in order to push learners to self-repair or modify their output (e.g. by using clarification requests, metalinguistic clues, elicitation, repetition, or non-verbal cues)?

Prompts (output-oriented scaffolds) elicit the learner's (oral) self-correction. They include a range of feedback types, such as clarification requests (e.g. ‘Pardon?’ or ‘I don't understand’), metalinguistic clues (e.g. ‘We don't say it like that in English’), elicitation (e.g. ‘How do we say that in English?’ or ‘pausing’) or repetition (teacher repeats the learner's ill-formed utterance, adjusting intonation to highlight the error) (*Negotiation of Form*).

**41. The teacher reacts to errors by focusing on linguistic form within a meaningful context
(i.e., at the moment the error occurs in a meaningful interaction)**

Does the teacher draw attention to a linguistic element when, during a meaningful interaction, there is the need or the opportunity to clarify a linguistic problem (Focus on Form)?

For example, in a lesson about firefighters, the teacher directs learners' attention to the difference between "one fireman" and "two firemen" in order to highlight the singular and plural form and different pronunciation.

Another example would be an intervention when to say "a" or "an", when playing the game "I packed my bag and in it I put..." ("... an apple, a banana ...").

Additional Scale for Detailed Video Analysis on Error Correction

**SUPPORT OF COMPREHENSIBLE OUTPUT:
REACTING TO THE LEARNERS' L2 PRODUCTION**

Corrective Feedback

Errors can derive from two different sources – **content** and **language**. Content errors refer to the content of the lesson whereas language errors refer to the linguistic correctness (e.g. pronunciation, grammar ...). That is why the following scale on Corrective Feedback is divided into these two forms of errors.

a. The teacher explicitly points out the content errors to the learners

Does the teacher explicitly correct learners' utterances indicating that the utterance was incorrect?

For explicit correction, the teacher explicitly supplies the correct form and clearly indicates that the learner's utterance was incorrect (e.g. "No, that is wrong. It is ... and not ...").

b. The teacher recasts the learners' content errors

Does the teacher correct all or part of learners' utterances by reformulating or paraphrasing the utterance correctly (minus the error)?

In the case of recasts, the teacher provides the correct form without drawing explicit attention to the error and interrupting the conversation.

c. The teacher prompts learners to self-correct their content errors (super-category)

Does the teacher correct children's utterances by using prompts in order to push learners to self-repair or modify their output (e.g. by using clarification requests, metalinguistic clues, elicitation, repetition, or non-verbal cues)?

For a more detailed rating on different types of prompts, the following items c1-c4 could be rated additionally.

c1. The teacher requests a clarification concerning the learners' content errors (e.g. Excuse me?, Sorry?)

Does the teacher use clarification requests to indicate to learners that either their utterance has been misunderstood or is incorrect in some way in order to push them to self-repair or modify their output?

Phrases like "Pardon me", "Excuse me", "What do you mean by...?" may be used to indicate the presence of an error.

c2. The teacher repeats the learners' content errors

Does the teacher repeat the learners' incorrect utterance (generally with a change in intonation) in order to push the learners to self-repair or modify their output?

c3. The teacher elicits a reformulation after learners' content errors (e.g. How do we say that in English?, It's a ...)

Does the teacher elicit the correct form from the learners by using strategies such as pausing (e.g., "It's a ..."), asking questions, and asking learners to reformulate their own utterances?

c4. The teacher gives a metalinguistic clue concerning the learners' content errors

Does the teacher give metalinguistic clues such as posing questions or providing comments or information related to the formation of the student's utterance, without explicitly providing the correct form?

d. The teacher explicitly points out the language errors to the learners

Does the teacher explicitly correct learners' utterances indicating that the utterance was incorrect?

For explicit correction, the teacher explicitly supplies the correct form and clearly indicates that the learner's utterance was incorrect (e.g. "No, that is wrong. It is ... and not ...").

- L: *The rabbit ran fastly.
- T: "Fastly" does not exist. "Fast" does not take -ly. You should say "quickly".

e. The teacher recasts the learners' language errors

Does the teacher correct all or part of learners' utterances by reformulating or paraphrasing the utterance correctly (minus the error)?

In the case of recasts, the teacher provides the correct form without drawing explicit attention to the error and interrupting the conversation.

- L: * Why you don't like Jane?
- T: Why don't you like Jane?

f. The teacher prompts learners to self-correct their language errors (super-category)

Does the teacher correct children's utterances (e.g., lexicon, pronunciation, grammar, idiomatic language use, etc.) by using prompts in order to push learners to self-repair or modify their output (e.g. by using clarification requests, metalinguistic clues, elicitation, repetition, or non-verbal cues)?

Prompts (output-oriented scaffolds) elicit the learner's (oral) self-correction. They include a range of feedback types, such as clarification requests (e.g. 'Pardon?' or 'I don't understand'), metalinguistic clues (e.g. 'We don't say it like that in English'), elicitation (e.g. 'How do we say that in English?' or 'pausing') or repetition (teacher repeats the learner's ill-formed utterance, adjusting intonation to highlight the error) (Negotiation of Form).

For a more detailed rating on different types of prompts, the following items f1-f4 could be rated additionally.

f1. The teacher requests a clarification concerning the learners' language errors (e.g. Excuse me?, Sorry?)

Does the teacher use clarification requests to indicate to learners that either their utterance has been misunderstood or is incorrect in some way in order to push them to self-repair or modify their output?

Phrases like "Pardon me", "Excuse me", "What do you mean by...?" may be used to indicate the presence of an error.

- T: How often do you tidy your room?
- L: Twice.
- T: Excuse me. (*Clarification Request*)
- L: Twice.
- T: Twice what? (*Clarification Request*)
- L: Twice a month.

f2. The teacher repeats the learners' language errors

Does the teacher repeat the learners' incorrect utterance (generally with a change in intonation) in order to push the learners to self-repair or modify their output?

- L: *I bought three banana.
- T: Three banana?
- L: Three bananas.

f3. The teacher elicits a reformulation after learners' language errors (e.g. How do we say that in English?, It's a...)

Does the teacher elicit the correct form from the learners by using strategies such as pausing (e.g., "It's a ..."), asking questions (e.g., "How do we say X in English?"), and asking learners to reformulate their own utterances?

- L: *I picked many apple.
- T: (Excuse me), you picked many _____?
- L: apples?

f4. The teacher gives a metalinguistic clue concerning the learners' language errors

Does the teacher give metalinguistic clues such as posing questions or providing comments or information related to the formation of the student's utterance, without explicitly providing the correct form?

- L: *I watch TV yesterday.
- T: What's the ending we put on verbs when we talk about the past?
- L: /e-d/

Selected Bibliography

- Bailey, K. M. (2006). *Language Teacher Supervision: A Case-based Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Böttger, H. (2014). Grundsulgerechte Englischhausaufgaben. In H. Böttger (Ed.), *Englisch Didaktik für die Grundschule*, (pp. 194-197). Berlin: Cornelsen.
- Böttger, H. (2010). *Englisch lernen in der Grundschule* (2nd ed.). Bad Heilbrunn: Klinkhardt.
- Brewster, J., Ellis, G. (2008). *The Primary English Teacher's Guide*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Brewster, J., Ellis, G, Girard, D. (2002). *The Primary English Teacher's Guide*. Hampshire: Penguin English.
- Burmeister, P., Ewig, M. (2010). Integrating science and foreign language learning. In U. Massler, P. Burmeister (Eds.), *CLIL und Immersion: Fremdsprachlicher Sachfachunterricht in der Grundschule*, (pp. 61-75). Braunschweig: Westermann.
- Doms, C. (2014). Differenzieren und Individualisieren. In H. Böttger (Ed.), *Englisch Didaktik für die Grundschule*, (pp. 60-77). Berlin: Cornelsen.
- Dreßler, C. (2014). Elementares Sprechen: Vom Imitativem zum ersten freien Minivortrag. In H. Böttger (Ed.), *Englisch Didaktik für die Grundschule*, (pp. 123-131). Berlin: Cornelsen.
- Echevarría, J., Vogt, M. E., Short, D. J. (2010). *Making Content Comprehensible for English Learners. The SIOP Model*. Boston: Pearson Education.
- Ellis, R., Shintani, N. (2014). *Exploring Language Pedagogy through Second Language Acquisition Research*. London: Routledge.
- Fortune, Tara (2000). Immersion Teaching Strategies Observation Checklist. *ACIE Newsletter*, 4(1), 1-4.
- Fortune, Tara (2014). *Immersion Teaching Strategies Observation Checklist (rev.)*. Minneapolis: Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition. Retrieved December 4th, 2018, from <http://carla.umn.edu/immersion/checklist.pdf>
- Gower, R., Phillips, D., Walters, S. (2005). *Teaching Practice: A Handbook for Teacher in Training*. Oxford: Macmillan.
- Kersten, K., Steinlen, A. K., Tiefenthal, C., Wippermann, I. (2010). Guidelines for language use in bilingual preschools. In K. Kersten, A. Rohde, C. Schellert, A. K. Steinlen (Eds.), *Bilingual Preschools: Best Practices (Vol. 2)*, (pp.103-116). Trier: WVT.
- Kieweg, W. (2004). Der Übergang: Zäsur oder Kontinuität? Vorschläge zur Leistungsstanderhebung. *Der fremdsprachliche Unterricht Englisch*, 69, 34-41.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Krashen, S. (1985). *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications*. Harlow: Longman.
- Lawson, A. (2003). *The Neurological Basis of Learning, Development and Discovery*. New York: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Lehnhard, S. (2016). *Fehlerkorrekturen und Rückmeldungen im Englischunterricht*. Münster, New York: Waxmann.
- Loewen, S. (2015). *Introduction to Instructed Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Routledge.
- Loewen, S., Sato, M. (2018). Interaction and instructed second language acquisition. *Language Teaching*, 51(3), 285-329.
- Long, M. H. (1980). Inside the "black box": Methodological issues in classroom research on language learning. *Language Learning*, 30(1), 1-42.
- Long, M. H. (1981). Input, interaction and second language acquisition. *Native Language and Foreign Language Acquisition. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 379(1), 259-278.
- Long, M. H. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg, C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign Language Research in Cross-cultural Perspective*, (pp. 39-52). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Long, M. H. (2015). *Second Language Acquisition and Task-Based Language Teaching*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Lyster, Roy (2007). *Learning and Teaching Languages through Content: A Counterbalanced Approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lyster, R., Mori, H. (2006). Interactional Feedback and Instructional Counterbalance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28(2), 269-300.
- Lyster, R., Saito, K. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(2), 265-302.
- Maier, E. (2013). *The Quality of Teacher Input in Different Classroom Settings*. Hildesheim University: Unpublished Masters Dissertation.
- Massler, U., Ioannou-Georgiou, S. (2010). Best practice: How CLIL works. In U. Massler, P. Burmeister (Eds.), *CLIL und Immersion: Fremdsprachlicher Sachfachunterricht in der Grundschule*, (pp. 61-75). Hannover: Westermann.
- Mehisto, P., Marsh, D., Frigols, M. J. (2008). *Uncovering CLIL. Content and Language Integrated Learning in Bilingual and Multilingual Education*. Oxford: Macmillan.
- Mielke, L. (2013). *Assessing Teacher Input in Primary School*. Hildesheim University: Unpublished Masters Dissertation.
- Murphy, V. (2014). *Second Language Learning in the Early School Years: Trends and Contexts*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

- Nicoladis, E., Montanari, S. (2016). *Bilingualism across the Lifespan: Factors Moderating Language Proficiency*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Peregoy, S. F. (1991). Environmental scaffolds and learner responses in a two-way Spanish immersion kindergarten. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 47(3), 463-476.
- Pianta, Robert C., Howes, C., Burchinal, M., Bryant, D., Clifford, R., Early, D., Barbarin, O. (2005). Features of pre-kindergarten programs, classrooms, and teachers: Do they predict observed classroom quality and child-teacher interactions? *Applied Developmental Science*, 9, 144-159.
- Pianta, R. C., LaParo, K. M., Hamre, B. K. (2008). *Classroom Assessment Scoring System Manual: Pre- K*. Baltimore: Brookes.
- Pica, T. (1994). Research on negotiation: What does it reveal about second-language learning conditions, processes, and outcomes? *Language Learning*, 44, 493-527.
- Richards, J. C., Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching (3rd ed.)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schäfer, U. (2015). Inklusives Lehren und Lernen im Englischunterricht. In C. M. Bongartz, A. Rohde (Eds.) *Inklusion im Englischunterricht*, (pp. 57-69). Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Schmid-Schönbein, G. (2010). Vorhersagbar und Lustbetont. Rituale als sichere Inseln. *Grundschulmagazin Englisch*, 3, 6-8.
- Sheen, R. (2002). 'Focus on form' and 'focus on forms'. *ELT Journal*, 56(3), 303-305.
- Snow, M. A. (1990). Instructional methodology in immersion foreign language education. In A. M. Padilla, H. H. Fairchild, C. M. Valadez (Eds.), *Foreign Language Education: Issues and Strategies*, (pp.156-171). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Spada, N., Fröhlich, M. (1995). *COLT - Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching Observation Scheme: Coding Conventions and Applications*. Sidney: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. M. Gass, C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in Second Language Acquisition*, (pp. 235-253). Rowley: Newbury House.
- Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook, B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principle and Practice in Applied Linguistics. Studies in Honor of H. G. Widdowson*, (pp. 125-144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sylva, K., Siraj-Blatchford, I., Taggart, B. (2003). *Assessing Quality in the Early Years: Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale-Extension (ECERS-E), Four Curricular Subscales*. Stoke-on Trent: Trentham Books.
- Ullmann, R., Geva, E. (1982). *The Target Language Observation Scheme (TALOS)*. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- 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.
- Weitz, M. (2015). *Die Rolle des L2-Inputs in bilingualen Kindergärten*. Frankfurt a.M: Peter Lang.
- Weitz, M., Pahl, S., Flyman Mattsson, A., Buyl, A., Kalbe, E. (2010). The Input Quality Observation Scheme (IQOS): The nature of L2 input and its influence on L2 development in bilingual preschools. In K. Kersten, A. Rohde, C. Schelletter, A. K. Steinlen (Eds.), *Bilingual Preschools. Vol. I. Learning and Development*, (pp. 5-44). Trier: WVT.
- Wiater, W. (2001). *Unterrichtsprinzipien*. Donauwörth: Auer Verlag.
- Zaade, S. (2014). Multisensorisch Englisch lernen. In H. Böttger (Ed.), *Englisch Didaktik für die Grundschule*, (pp. 40-48). Berlin: Cornelsen.

Kersten, Kristin, Bruhn, Ann-Christin, Ponto, Katharina, Böhnke, Julia, Greve, Werner (2018). Teacher Input Observation Scheme (TIOS). *Studies on Multilingualism in Language Education 4*, Hildesheim University.

© Prof. Dr. Kristin Kersten
 Institut für englische Sprache und Literatur, Stiftung Universität Hildesheim
www.uni-hildesheim.de/kristin-kersten/