

# *Using notions of scaffolding and intertextuality to understand the bilingual teaching of English in Thailand*

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

This paper focusses upon teacher talk produced in the university-level EFL context of Thailand, and explores the ways in which teachers' use of both L1 and L2 creates a distinctive bilingual pedagogy. The notion of *scaffolding* is an important part of sociocultural approaches to learning, but has only recently been applied to bilingual rather than monolingual microtexts. And while the concept of *intertextuality* is prominent in literary/cultural studies, its application to language has for the most part been confined to written rather than spoken texts. This study brings together these two notions in an analysis of the pedagogic and linguistic dimensions of bilingual talk in EFL classrooms.

## **2. BACKGROUND**

### ***2.1 L1 use in L2 learning***

The status quo remains overwhelmingly in favour of maximum, if not exclusive L2 use in ELT. Cook, for example, describes L1 use as 'a door that has been firmly shut in language teaching for over 100 years' (2001, p. 403 ff), and this view was apparent in my examination of ELT texts which include Gower, Phillips & Walters (1995), Johnson (1995), and Richards & Rodgers (2001). However, there has recently been evidence of changes in perception of the role played by the first language in learning a second (see Deller & Rinvolutri, 2002; Turnbull & Arnett, 2002; Swain & Lapkin, 2005; Forman, 2005, 2007). In particular, the role of L1 in L2 development has been supported by Cook's model of a *multi-competent* second language user (1991, 1992, 1998, 1999, 2001, 2003). 'Multicompetent' here refers to 'the

compound state of a mind with two grammars' (1991, p. 112), with Cook's model envisaging the psychological relationship between L1 and L2 as an 'integration continuum' (2003, p. 6). For teachers, L1 use has been a constant source of interest. Pica (1994, p. 51), in her list of the 'ten most wanted' questions posed by ESL teachers, places first: 'In what ways does knowing one language help or hinder the learning of a second?' The issue is frequently raised in various Internet discussion boards, and the TESL E-Journal in 2002 reproduced a series of such postings.

Nevertheless, it remains the case that the great majority of L2 classrooms aim to minimise or exclude the first language of students (Widdowson, 2001). Teachers who then make some use of students' L1 may do so with reluctance or misgivings. Indeed there is little guidance available regarding *how* L1 may best be used in bilingual EFL classrooms (although see Jacobson & Faltis, 1990; Butzkamm, 2000). Macaro (2001, p. 545) has called for a 'theory of optimality for the use of code-switching'; and Kim and Elder (2005, p. 378) urge the establishment of benchmarks which will enable 'optimal target language use, supported by judicious use of L1 as required'. In the related field of bilingual education, Leung has similarly called for empirical studies into 'the ways languages are actually used' in classrooms (2005, p. 250).

When describing how L1 and L2 are used in the language classrooms of the present study, I follow Gibbons' (2002) classification of pedagogy into three levels: *macro* (planning, or overview), *meso* (activity shape), and *micro* (moment to moment language use). Additionally, I propose that when some classroom activities (at *meso/micro* levels) occur monolingually and others bilingually, together their presence will render the lesson a **bilingual** one at the *macro* level. In describing such classrooms as bilingual, I wish to acknowledge the

psychological perspective of second language learners for whom, as Cook has pointed out, all classroom activities are ‘cross-lingual’, and for whom ‘the difference among activities is whether the L1 is visible or invisible, not whether it is present or altogether absent (1999, p. 202).

## **2.2 EFL pedagogic focus**

My research is located in Thailand, where English is generally taught as a subject rather than as a medium of instruction; and I focus principally upon literature relevant to the use of L1 and L2 in Thailand. The Thai EFL setting has more in common with EFL in countries such as China, Japan or Indonesia than it does with post-colonial contexts such as Hong Kong, Sri Lanka and much of Africa, where in general, English is, or is intended to be, a medium of instruction (for example, in four of the five settings investigated in the volume edited by Martin-Jones and Heller [1995] as well as in the Hong Kong literature [Lin, 1996, 2001]).

## **2.3 Code-switching**

The alternation of L1 and L2 in the classroom and elsewhere is generally known as code-switching (eg Milroy & Muysken, 1995; Martin-Jones, 1997). While the term is used in a range of ways, it does speak a certain position on language. Are meanings (semantics) communicated by being encoded and decoded through language? Or are meanings and language mutually constitutive? In adopting the second perspective, we may find ‘code-switching’ to be a potentially misleading term which could imply that it is form alone which changes with the selection of one language and then another. I propose the alternative of *Language Blending* for two reasons: first, to signify that *language* itself is being selected, rather than a surface *code*; and second, because the notion of *blending* avoids the senses of

suddenness/randomness connotable by ‘switching’, instead capturing something of the often seamless use of two languages observed in the present study.

## ***2.4 Scaffolding***

The metaphor of Scaffolding has become many things to many people in the years since its development in the mid-1970s (Bruner & Sherwood, 1975; Wood, Bruner & Ross, 1976). For example, Gibbons describes scaffolding as ‘the process by which a “mentor” helps a learner know how to do something, so that they will be able to do it alone in the future’ (1999, p. 26). Scaffolding has also been viewed as a form of explicit teaching: ‘a deliberate intention to teach’ (Wells, 1999, p. 346); or ‘assisted performance’ (Poehner & Lantolf, 2005, p. 259). The New London Group describes scaffolding as ‘all those active interventions ... [which] allow the learner to gain explicit information at times where it can most usefully organise and guide practice’ (Cope & Kalantzis, 1995, p. 28); and more linguistically-focussed scaffolding is a central part of the Sydney school’s genre pedagogy (Martin, 1999).

On the other hand, the term is sometimes used quite narrowly. The NSW state government, for example, in a current syllabus document for High School Certificate English, offers a formal definition of ‘a scaffold’ as:

A supporting organiser in the form of a proforma delineating the structural features of specific types of texts, which will assist students in their composing of oral and written texts. (NSW Board of Studies, 1999)

Again limiting its meaning, Kim and Elder combine the term Scaffold with two other processes to form a pedagogic function of ‘Model/Scaffold/Correct’ (2005, p. 367), which

they use to describe a teacher's provision of short oral texts where students are led to 'fill in the gaps'. Differently still, van Lier views scaffolding as *learner-driven* rather than *teacher-driven*, and occurring when the scaffolder responds to a learner's readiness to learn: 'in the interstices between the planned and the unpredictable .... when planned pedagogical action stops' (2004, p. 162).

The term has been broadly applied to bilingual ESL classrooms by Martin-Jones and Heller (1996), who see local teachers' use of L1 as scaffolding the building of knowledge: a means through which connections can be made between 'the knowledge acquired by students through the medium of their first language(s) and the knowledge of the school mediated through... the language of instruction' (p. 9). The scaffolding metaphor has also been used to describe the positive use of L1 by students during group work aimed at producing L2 texts (eg Brooks & Donato, 1994; Antón & DiCamilla, 1998).

A number of writers have attempted to narrow the scope of what constitutes scaffolding (Maybin, Mercer & Stierer, 1992; Webster, Beveridge & Reed, 1996). However, as may be seen, it is currently the case that the term has either been appropriated to fit a particular educational philosophy, as by the Sydney genre school or the New London group, or it has been applied so widely that it may cover most of what teaching entails.

In this paper, I would like to revisit the pedagogy of scaffolding in two ways: by confining the term to teachers' whole-class verbal interaction with students, and by extending its application to bilingual EFL contexts.

## ***2.5 Intertextuality***

Additionally, I would like to utilise the work of Bakhtin and Kristeva on intertextuality, in order to connect a scaffolding view of *pedagogy* with an intertextual approach to *language*.

Bakhtin (1981) described all language as *heteroglossic*, composed of ‘many tongues’ in the form of voices, registers, discourses. This notion of *heteroglossia* was developed by Kristeva into that of *intertextuality*, which asserts that ‘any text is constructed of a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another’ (1966/1980, p. 66). In recent years, intertextuality is said to have become ‘one of the most commonly used and misused terms in contemporary critical vocabulary’ (Allen, 2000, p. 2). Here, I follow Kristeva’s early view of intertextuality as resulting from the way in which a reader encounters a new text as a product of her/his experiences of previous texts. Or as Lemke puts it: ‘the intertexts of a text are all the other texts that we use to make sense of it’ (1992, p. 259). In this sense, Fairclough (1992, p. 85) makes a useful distinction between ‘manifest intertextuality’ and ‘interdiscursivity’, where the former term is applied to direct or indirect allusion to other texts, and the latter to discourses as forms of social practice which incorporate styles, genres and belief systems.

The notion of intertextuality is said to have crossed from literary studies to applied linguistics in 1981 by means of De Beaugrande and Dressler’s ‘standards of textuality’ (Holmes, 2004, p. 80). Intertextuality’s potential for textual analysis has resonated with critical discourse theory (Fairclough, 1992), systemic functional linguistics (both with Halliday’s ‘projection’ clause structure, 1994, and with genre theory’s development of appraisal systems – Martin, 2000), as well as with sociocultural theories of mind (see the special edition of *Linguistics and Education*, 1992). Most recently, the work of Bakhtin, along with that of Vygotsky, has

been integrated by Johnson (2003) in her creation of an alternative ‘dialogic’ framework of SLA theory.

Intertextual analysis may be applied to any semiotic system, including for example image (Kress & van Leeuwen, 1996), or music (Klein, 2005). In both literary and linguistic studies, however, such analysis has most often been applied to written texts, although interestingly, the notion has been less widely applied to EAP writing (Holmes, 2004, p. 60). Spoken discourse in classrooms has been the focus of few intertextual studies, but see Gutierrez, Rymes and Larson (1995), Kamberelis (2001) and Duff (2004), all of whose studies draw into the picture Goffman’s (1974) notions of ‘frames’ and/or ‘footing’. Duff’s study in particular reveals something of the intricacy and artfulness of intertextuality created by native speakers in the school context, as well as documenting the marginalisation of non-native speakers produced by students’ ‘textured, pop-culture-laden talk’ (2004 p. 253).

In sum, this paper seeks to bring together the notion of intertextuality – in both manifest and interdiscursive forms – with that of scaffolding, to illuminate *teachers’ classroom language* under the following conditions: it is spoken rather than written; bilingual rather than monolingual; is conducted with students learning English as a foreign rather than a second or native language; and is located in an Asian rather than Western setting.

### **3. METHOD**

#### ***3.1 Setting***

This paper forms part of a larger study located in a provincial Thai university, the former workplace of the researcher. Nine teachers from the English Department at what I will call

‘Isara’ volunteered to participate. Lessons were observed and audiotaped, producing a total of nineteen hours of classroom data; and teacher interviews produced a further twenty-four hours of interview data.

### ***3.2 Research question***

How may the notions of scaffolding and intertextuality contribute to a fresh understanding of the nature of bilingual pedagogy in EFL contexts?

### ***3.3 Participants***

Eight of the teachers in the study were native Thais, and one was Anglo-Australian. All Thai teachers were highly proficient in English and had undertaken postgraduate study overseas. In this respect, they were typical of Thai university lecturers, the majority of whom are reported by Bovonsiri, Uampuang and Fry to have undertaken study abroad (1996, p. 60-61), and who have thereby gained opportunities to develop not only English language proficiency, but also intercultural knowledge. The single Anglo-Australian teacher was ambilingual, that is, held equal and expert proficiency in both Thai and English (Halliday, Macintosh & Strevens, 1964). Each of the teachers was asked to select a pseudonym for the purpose of this study. I refer to teachers according to Thai convention, that is, by first name, preceded by the honorific *ajarn* (‘lecturer’); for example, *Ajarn Laksana*.

Participating teachers were presented with an outline of the purpose and nature of the research and were guaranteed anonymity and confidentiality. The project itself received approval by the Research Ethics Committee of the researcher’s university.

### ***3.4 Data collection and analysis***



Triangulation of data was achieved by establishing multiple sources of data (observation and interview), and in selecting multiple participants (nine teachers and ten classes). Moreover, member-checking occurred after my first visit to Isara in 2002, when an initial analysis of each lesson was mailed to the teacher of that class, and again during my second visit in 2004. At that later point, I was able to hold discussions with individual teachers which enabled their views on my views to feed back into the analysis.

When examining classroom and interview data, I made use of audio tapes, transcripts and my field notes, searching for themes of significance to participants and/or to me. Initial analysis provided some fifty-nine motifs, which could be grouped into nine thematic areas. One of these, that of teacher talk in L1 and L2, is the basis for the present paper.

#### **4. FINDINGS**

I will first analyse the pedagogy of teacher talk by means of the scaffolding metaphor. Later, when looking at particular microtexts, I will additionally draw upon the notion of intertextuality.

It was found that the scaffolding metaphor could be usefully applied to the teaching observed in the present study. However, as noted earlier, the term itself has suffered from its various denotations, and so I confine its application here to Gibbons' third, 'micro' level (2002), which I narrow further to mean *the ways in which teachers verbally interact with students in whole-class contexts for pedagogic purposes*. I will refer to this process as *Scaffolding Interaction*. It may be noted that although this kind of scaffolding is described as 'Interaction', in fact, overt contributions on the part of students in this study were brief. In this respect, my findings are similar to those of Pennington, who reported in her study of EL

learners in Hong Kong that no student produced an utterance of longer than a single clause (1995, p. 97). Similarly brief student L2 responses are reported in studies of FL classrooms undertaken by Butzkamm (1997) and Morgan (2003). While **overt** contributions on the part of Thai students here were indeed brief, however, I describe this process as *interaction* for two reasons. First, students are positioned by their teacher as respondents, albeit with varying degrees of freedom in their response. Thus the function/form of the teacher's language moves from declarative/statement to interrogative/question. Secondly, studies of inner speech and private speech have indicated that although in many cultural contexts, students' overt responses are minimal, and are considered to be acceptably so, such students may nevertheless mentally interact 'intensively' with the teacher's words (Jin & Cortazzi, 1998, p. 104; see also Ohta, 2001; de Guerrero, 2004, 2005).

When representing bilingual data in this study, a four-column grid is used which consists of, from left to right, Teacher's speech in either English or Thai, and Students' speech in either English or Thai. When teacher or students speak in English, the usual transcription of Roman script appears. When teacher or students speak in Thai, their words are represented first in Thai script, and then translated into English (underlined). Punctuation is used in a conventional way, except that explanatory comments by the researcher are enclosed in square brackets.

Three techniques of Scaffolding Interaction are described here, which I term *Priming*, *Prompting* and *Dialoguing*. The first, *Priming*, is dealt with relatively briefly; the second and third, *Prompting* and *Dialoguing*, are analysed at greater length because these processes are of greater cognitive depth and pedagogic interest. Both monolingual (English only) and bilingual (English and Thai) texts will be discussed.

#### 4.1 Priming

This technique covers the areas of ‘drilling’ and repetition of language, where students are, so to speak, primed by the teacher for more creative expression in the L2. The image is selected for its mechanical nature – as in priming a pump with water – because this kind of interaction is regarded as requiring little cognitive engagement on the part of the learner, and because it suggests the ‘readying’ function of some language work. *Priming* is thus the most directive and narrow kind of scaffold. In the present study it was infrequently met, being confined to a small amount of pronunciation teaching such as the following repetition drill taken from Ajarn Laksana’s post-beginner lesson.

Teacher	Students
a box [ə bɒks]	a box [ə bɒks]
a box of [ə bɒksəv]	a box of [ə bɒksəv]
a box of chocolates [ə bɒksəv tʃɒkələts]	a box of chocolates [ə bɒksəv tʃɒkələts]

Table I      Priming text: Ajarn Laksana

The technique of *Priming* was observed to occur only monolingually in English in these classes. That is, there were no bilingual ‘translation’ drills of grammar or vocabulary. As such, Priming constituted one monolingual element at the *micro/meso* level, which contributed nevertheless to a bilingual pedagogy at the *macro* level.

## 4.2 Prompting

Through the technique of *Prompting*, students are led to produce the response required by the teacher through her verbal cues. This is a form of scaffold which in some respects resembles the kind of teacher questioning associated with the Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) sequence. However, the *Prompting* descriptor allows for a repositioning of learners away from ‘responders’ and receivers of feedback’, and towards a broader role of ‘actors’ whose L2 ‘scripts’ can emerge with expert support or ‘direction’. This technique will be illustrated in monolingual and bilingual forms.

### 4.2.1 Prompting – monolingual

The following example occurs later in Ajarn Laksana’s lesson.

Teacher	Students
Where is the speaker now? [Repeat] She, is she at home?	
	No.
Is she at school?	
	No.
No. Where is she?	

	She is at shop.
She is at the shop. What is she doing at the shop? Talking to her friend?	

*Table II* Prompting text: Ajarn Laksana

Although the language of this episode is simple, in fact students' EL proficiency was low, and judging by their responses, the teacher's L2 seems to have been appropriately adjusted to students' level of understanding. This adjustment was achieved by confining *content* to the field of the textbook passage, and creating *language* in the form of questions which provided answer prompts within them, and which were confirmed by the teacher's 'echoing' (rather than 'elaborating' or 'evaluating') feedback. Clearly, the kind of *Prompting* operated in the present episode provided little opportunity for either critical thinking or creative output on the part of students; it represents the 'display' end of the technique. But at the same time, scaffolding of this type can offer a semantic framework and grammatical cueing which can support learners with limited language competence to participate gradually and securely.

#### *4.2.1 Prompting – bilingual*

More often, *Prompting* took place bilingually in these classes, typically when the teacher directed students to provide a translation from English into Thai (this sequence being more common than the reverse). An example follows from Ajarn Rajavadee's intermediate class.

Teacher		Students	
English	Thai	English	Thai

Okay, a little bit earlier than three o'clock. So that means you're punctual.			
	คืออะไรคะ <u>What is that?</u>		
What is that in Thai? Come on, speak. [Laugh]. What is it in Thai?			
			กำหนด- การ <u>schedule</u>
No,	ไม่ใช่หมายถึง- กำหนดการ <u>Not schedule</u>		
	คืออะไรคะ ถ้าเราพูดถึง เรื่องเวลา <u>What is it if we</u>		

	<u>are talking</u> <u>about time?</u>		
			ตรงต่อ- เวลา <u>punctual</u>
	ตรงต่อเวลาใช่ มั๊ยอะ <u>Ah, punctual,</u> <u>isn't it.</u>		
It means that if you are punctual, you come on time.			

*Table III* Bilingual Prompting text: Ajarn Rajavadee

The value of the L1 in scaffolding interaction is apparent in the above text, and exemplifies quite a different communication from that available monolingually. On the one hand, in monolingual teacher *Prompting*, it may be said that if a teacher uses only L2 to explain new L2 vocabulary, benefits may accrue as students are led to operate in the target language. Moreover, as they experience L2 exclusively, students can develop strategies for surviving in L2 on occasions when meanings are not known or not fully clear. On the other hand, such

exclusive use of L2 may not serve as the most effective and efficient means of rendering meaning. Moreover, a belief in the value of confining vocabulary explanation to L2 synonyms can also sometimes buttress an anti-bilingual dictionary stance. It appears that rather than offering potentially confusing synonyms in the target language, meaning can more accurately and swiftly be provided by translating into L1, as seen here, where the value of the bilingual support – only a few words – was striking.

It is notable that this second, *Prompting* type of Scaffolding Interaction is usually of significantly greater depth when carried out bilingually than when carried out monolingually. This is the case because the process of translation requires cognitive depth on the part of students, through the processes of first, identifying or approximating the meaning of L2 word(s), and then retrieving the closest L1 form. Such cognition is highly specific, however, being confined to a particular form/meaning, and in terms of student response, requiring what is usually a single ‘correct’ answer.

#### **4.3 Dialoguing**

This third kind of Scaffolding Interaction to be discussed is close to what Lemke calls ‘true dialogue’, (1990, p. 55), similar to Kramsch’s ‘dialogic pedagogy’, (1993, p. 30), or Gibbons’ ‘dialogic exchange’ (1999, p.189), where teacher-student interaction is still guided and monitored by the teacher, but where students’ speech is more open, varied and lies beyond what is ‘in the teacher’s head’. This technique may also extend to a kind of ‘problematizing’, where content may be of some depth cognitively or affectively. ‘Dialoguing’ may be shaped by hypothetical or speculative statements/questions, as well as by ‘real’ questions, that is, where the other party’s own ideas are genuinely sought. It may also include quite extended



discourse on the part of either teacher or students (although, as noted earlier, generally only produced by teachers in the present study). Analysis of three microtexts follows.

#### *4.3.1 Dialoguing - monolingual*

This example is taken from Dr Bua's English Major class.

<b>Teacher</b>	<b>Students</b>
Do you think, ah, these two alike, are alike? [George W Bush and Osama Bin Laden] Have something in common?	
	Yes
Yes, well what is that? [Laugh]	
	They love their countries.
Yes, they love their countries. And some other traits, some other characteristics...mm probably they are very much different, right.	

*Table IV* Monolingual Dialoguing text: Dr Bua

The scaffolding pedagogy seen here provided teacher talk which was within students' receptive capacities in English and probably beyond their productive capacities. The content of discussion had been contextualised both through the display of photos of the international

figures referred to, and by drawing upon students' world knowledge. Given this support, students were enabled to understand the teacher's talk, and to respond, albeit in relatively limited ways, within the target language. The teacher's questions were often open ones, which provided cognitive stimulus; and students' responses demonstrated a willingness to 'go for meaning' in the target language.

As for an interpretation of the text itself, I would like at this point to return to the notion of intertextuality. As indicated earlier, the term may be applied in a variety of ways, ranging from direct/indirect allusion, to genre, to discourse. Here I follow Fairclough (1992) and make a distinction between 'interdiscursivity', referring to the discourses or cultural voices shared by Thai students and their Thai teacher in this foreign language context, and 'manifest intertextuality', referring to direct allusion to other texts. At the same time, I would suggest that 'manifest' intertextuality may be seen as simply that – a more visible, more apparent form of the interdiscursivity which constitutes our understandings of the world.

As I observed the conduct of the microtext above in its provincial Thai setting, I was struck, as a Westerner, by the Thai teacher's question about a possible commonality between a Western leader and an Arabic leader; and note that while she carefully accepted the student's response *They both love their countries*, the teacher also observed that in other respects, the two leaders differed. This text may be seen to construe the world from a number of discourses operating within the Thai context (Fairclough's *interdiscursivity*), and I will briefly set out my understanding of those which relate to religion and socio-politics.

Firstly, it is important to note that the Buddhist religion/philosophy occupies a significant visible and invisible part of the Thai social fabric, with 93.6% of a large-scale survey self-

reporting Buddhism to be an important part of their lives (Komin, 1990, p. 208). And in the lesson observed, I suggest that this ‘unspoken voice’, with its non-evangelical, anti-violent foundation, constructs a particular perspective upon the two ‘foreign’ leaders under discussion, each of whom avowedly embraces either Christianity or Islam, and through whose leadership a global struggle has formed.

Secondly, Thai people frequently refer to the fact that their country alone in the SE Asian region was not colonised by Western powers through the adroit handling of first, Britain and France, and later, the USA. Today, while the Thai media is generally pro-Western and pro-American, there is also, as in many parts of the world, uneasiness at the extent and use of American power. A socio-political discourse of ‘Thai-ness’ enables in this context a solidarity between teacher and students which can observe and comment upon non-Thai ‘others’.

In short, these discourses shared by a Thai teacher and her students were those which I might as a Western ‘outsider’ observe but not easily enter. And in this specific instance, because I had not contemplated such a commonality between George Bush and Osama Bin Laden, I believe that my own world view was expanded by the Thai discourses which I met.

#### *4.3.2 Dialoguing - bilingual*

The advanced *Dialoguing* through English as seen in the last text was fairly unusual in the present study. More frequently, *Dialoguing* was seen to occur bilingually, with Thai supporting English, at key points of the lesson when teacher-student exchange took on breadth or depth. Two examples will provide the basis for a more extended discussion of this technique.

In the following lesson, conducted by Ajarn Laksana with post-beginners, the teacher was explaining a new vocabulary item 'best-seller' in a reading passage.

Teacher		Students	
English	Thai	English	Thai
	<p>ดูสิคะ</p> <p><u>Let's see!</u></p>		
What's the 'best seller'?			
<p>At the moment Harry Potter is the best-seller book. Everybody knows and reads it. The shop owner got a lot of money from selling this book.</p> <p>So, Harry Potter is the best seller at the moment.</p> <p>Understand this?</p>			
	เออ		

	<u>Mmm</u>		
			[inaudible]
	<p>โอะ! ไม่ต้องแปล อ้า ถ้าแปล          คุณจะแปลว่ายังไง</p> <p><u>Oh no need to translate. Ah – if</u>  <u>[you/we] translate, what will</u>  <u>you say?</u></p>		
			<p>หนังสือที่          ขายดี</p> <p><u>Book</u>  <u>[which]</u>  <u>sells the</u>  <u>most</u></p>
	<p>หนังสือที่ขายดีที่สุด</p> <p><u>Book [which] sells the most;</u>  <u>the most of all</u></p>		
	ภาษาไทย ขายดีเป็นเทน้ำ		

	<p>         เท้าไปหามาณะ          ทำไมต้องเทน้ำ เท้า  <u>In the Thai language, ‘best          seller’ is equivalent to          [literally] ‘pour water, pour at          the jetty’. [I would like you to]          go find out why we say ‘pour          water, pour at the jetty’.</u> </p>		
--	--	--	--

*Table V* Bilingual Dialoguing text: Ajarn Laksana

This brief interaction is rich both in scaffolding *pedagogy* and in the intertextual dimensions of its *language*.

In examining the *pedagogy* of this micro-text, we can say that Ajarn Laksana in her scaffolding moves from *Prompting*: If you translate, what will you say?, to *Dialoguing*: I’d like you to go find out why we say ‘Pour water, pour at the jetty’. Both forms of Scaffolding Interaction fulfil complementary purposes, with the *Prompting* providing a check of students’ L1-L2 comprehension of meaning, and the *Dialoguing* first positioning students as members of the wider shared culture, then inviting them to explore a linguistic artefact. Thus the teacher’s *Dialoguing* has taken a metalinguistic turn, as she draws upon both L1 and L2 in order to consider how to render meaning across languages/cultures.

In looking more closely at the *language* employed here, it may be seen that Ajarn Laksana illustrated the idiom ‘best-seller’ by a reference to *Harry Potter* – an instance of ‘manifest intertextuality’ which draws upon globalised English language/culture. The teacher prompts students to produce the Thai meaning, which they provide correctly, and which the teacher echoes. Ajarn Laksana relates a Thai idiom to the English idiom: เทน้ำ เทท่า, *tae nam, tae tha* meaning literally ‘pour water, pour [at the] jetty’ – a second instance of manifest intertextuality, but this time within the Thai language/culture. The teacher then indicates that students should find out where the expression comes from. I was interested to discover myself that in this idiom, ท่า *tha* has no equivalent in English. It glosses ‘the place on the river where people go to wash and bathe’. The ‘closest’ English word is ‘jetty’, in its identifying of a spot where humans leave land for water. But here is a world of difference, with the full Thai idiom interpretable as ‘selling like the water we pour over ourselves when we bathe on the bank of the river’, or less literally, ‘sales pouring [down/away] like water’.

In this ‘Harry Potter’ text, we can see that the teacher has translated an English idiom into Thai, and that she did so by incorporating another step – from idiomatic to congruent meaning – within each language (I follow Halliday’s 1985 identification of ‘congruence’ as the typical, or unmarked realisation of meaning). Thus:

(i)	best-seller	English	<i>idiomatic</i>
			↓
(ii)	book which sells the most	English	<i>congruent</i>
			↓
(iii)	หนังสือขายดี	Thai	<i>congruent</i>
	<u>book which sells the most</u>		↓

- (iv)      เหน้ํา เททํา                      Thai                      *idiomatic*  
sales pouring like water

*Fig 1*              Four steps of bilingual intertextuality: Ajarn Laksana

The effect of this interdiscursivity is both to clarify meaning and to enrich semantic links across L1 and L2, thereby serving to create depth in a learner's processing of text and to improve retention in the memory (Nation, 1990). Steps (iii) and (iv) above are also of interest because not only is the meaning of an English idiom clarified to Thai students, but the teacher can re-place the 'other' meaning into a Thai context which is semantically deep and culturally familiar. Such bilingual intertextuality provides a richness of semantic support which may be contrasted with the conventional monolingual provision of an English synonym or paraphrase to explain meaning, the latter process which would be limited to steps (i) and (ii) above.

#### 4.3.3 *Dialoguing - bilingual*

The last text is taken from Ajarn Murray's post-beginner class, at a point where the teacher was eliciting from students vocabulary related to rooms in dwellings. The lesson was conducted bilingually: students could provide an English term if it was known to them; if not, they offered Thai, which the teacher would then translate. At this point in the lesson, one student had suggested ห้องพระ *hong pra*, a room which exists in Thai culture but not normally in Western culture. The phrase ห้องพระ *hong pra* translates literally as 'room + Buddha image', and the teacher responded as follows:

<b>Teacher</b>		<b>Students</b>	
----------------	--	-----------------	--



<b>English</b>	<b>Thai</b>	<b>English</b>	<b>Thai</b>
			ห้องพระ <i>hong pra</i>
	ห้องพระ <i>hong pra</i>		
I don't know how to say that in English either. Maybe 'Buddha Image Room', 'Room for the Buddha Image'?			
	นะ [persuasive particle]		
		Monk room?	

*Table VI* Bilingual Dialoguing text: Ajarn Murray (i)

When a second student offered *Monk room* as a possible translation into English, the teacher explained why this would not be appropriate, and continued in Thai and English:

Teacher		Students	
English	Thai	English	Thai
	<p>คือว่าไม่มีในวัฒนธรรมตะวันตก</p> <p>ไม่มีห้องพระโดยเฉพาะนะ</p> <p>ดังนั้นก็ไม่ได้มีชื่อเฉพาะนะ</p> <p><u>In Western culture there is no Buddha Image Room, so there is not a specific name for it.</u></p>		
Buddha Image Room. It sounds a bit funny. But I don't think it's a 'monk's room'			

Table VII Bilingual Dialoguing text: Ajarn Murray (ii)

Pedagogically, the teacher again scaffolds interaction with students by means of *Dialoguing*.

In this example, his *Dialoguing* draws upon both L1 and L2 in order to consider how to render meaning interdiscursively across language/cultures. In this way, students are acknowledged as 'knowers' of a shared culture, and are enabled to extend their prior knowledge into another culture. That is, the Buddha Image Room is a focal part of Thai

people's lives, where it is the custom to pray and meditate. Students might or might not have been aware that neither the room nor the custom/religion is a part of most Westerners' lives. And so the learning was profound in terms of shifting students' awareness of 'other' perspectives: it enabled them to have an idea of how Thai culture may seem to non-Thais, and thus to better explain their own culture to foreigners. As Ajarn Murray put it at interview, Thai learners need to be able to:

... disseminate knowledge of Thailand and Thai culture to people who don't speak Thai...to talk about profoundly Thai things using English.

Such ability is a vital but neglected part of EFL, where course books and materials often assume that learners' L2 needs are confined to L2 culture (Cortazzi & Jin, 1999; Alptekin, 2002; Canagarajah, 2003).

The language of the above text again illustrates the semantic richness offered by bilingual intertextuality, this time in three rather than four steps:

- |       |                                       |         |
|-------|---------------------------------------|---------|
| (i)   | ห้องพระ <i>Hong pra</i>               | Thai    |
|       |                                       | ↓       |
| (ii)  | Buddha Image Room                     | English |
|       | [+ explanation in English]            | ↓       |
| (iii) | ห้องพระ <i>Hong pra</i>               | Thai    |
|       | [+ explanation in Thai about English] |         |

Thus for these students there comes learning about intercultural practices, and learning about the nature of language. As indicated above, students' interdiscursive meanings have deepened because a physical and symbolic object which is central to their own daily lives (the Buddha Image Room) has been identified as being absent from non-Buddhist discourse. That is, students are guided beyond their existing semantics to a place where they are able to see the familiar anew - to see a part of their culture from an outsider's perspective. And students' metalinguistic understandings have been developed as the teacher talks about the challenges of transposing the meaning of a culturally-embedded term from one language to another.

## 5. CONCLUSION

The question posed in this study was as follows: *How may the notions of scaffolding and intertextuality contribute to a fresh understanding of the nature of bilingual pedagogy in EFL contexts?*

The study confirms that the *scaffolding* metaphor can provide valuable insights into the pedagogy of bilingual classrooms – and that its value may be enhanced when linked, as here, to an *intertextual* view of language/culture. The significance of linking these two concepts is as follows. First, scaffolding provides a view of learning as contingent and afforded by teacher response to learner needs (van Lier, 2004). Scaffolding can thus reveal pedagogy in its interactive *moment*, as it were. Second, intertextuality provides a view of language as composed of many voices, accents, echoes. An intertextual analysis can thus reveal language

in its interactive *history*. In linking these two concepts, we reconnect ‘the dancer and the dance’, each co-construing the other momentarily and historically.

The notion of *scaffolding* itself, as noted earlier, has been utilised in a small number of studies which explore L1 use in L2 pedagogy. The present study has added to this literature in two ways. First, it was found that the wide range of existing notions of scaffolding could be productively constrained to three types, collectively termed *Scaffolding Interaction*, which are realised through the teacher’s *priming*, *prompting* and *dialoguing*; and that these new categories enabled a finer description of the pedagogy of bilingual teacher talk. Second, the scaffolding metaphor was usefully applied to an EFL context where English was taught as a subject, rather than as a medium of instruction; and by local teachers who shared a first language with their students.

*Intertextuality* was seen here in both manifest and interdiscursive forms, and across both monolingual and bilingual texts. An analysis of micro-texts such as the *Harry Potter/Thai proverb* and the *Buddha Image* was able to provide a fresh view of the intercultural dimension of second language learning, and could point to the semiotic restructuring which must accompany this process. Accordingly, the study confirms Halliday’s view of language and culture as co-constitutive – that there is an ‘essential dialectic relationship between language and the social semiotic systems within which language functions as a realisation’ (interviewed by Thibault, 1987, p. 617).

### ***Classroom implications***

Underlying both the scaffolding and intertextual perspectives taken here has been the psychological view of the bilingual learner proposed in Cook’s multi-competence model,

where two (or more) languages act in synergy, and where, as indicated earlier, because ‘L2 users have L1 permanently present in their minds... all teaching activities are cross lingual’ (1992, p. 202). Accordingly, I would like to briefly consider some implications for teaching and learning.

Overall, perhaps the most striking feature of the data has been the way in which the learning of L2 is *embedded* in L1; how the new meanings of the target language serve to expand and enrich the existing semantics of the first language. The study builds upon Lin’s (1999) research into a range of Hong Kong EFL classrooms, where students’ first language was seen to form a significant part of their cultural capital, and teachers’ capacity to exploit this capital found to strongly influence learning outcomes. The present study also supports Swain and Lapkin’s view of L1 as representing a learner’s ‘most formidable cognitive resource’ (2005, p. 181).

The embedding of L2 in L1 was apparent in the *blended* nature of much of the teacher talk of this study, which was seen to build up through intricate, sometimes rapid, moves between L1 and L2. Such interweaving of languages has traditionally been discouraged in L2 learning (Swain, 1986; Gibbons, White & Gibbons, 1994). But here, its effects appeared to be positive in maintaining and deepening student understanding and motivation. Further research is needed into how best to balance episodes of ‘bilingual blend’ with episodes of ‘exclusive L2’ use, and for that matter, episodes of ‘exclusive L1’ use.

The strengths of bilingual teaching as seen in the classrooms of the present study can be described in cognitive and affective terms. Cognitively, the use of L1 was able to uniquely explain various formal and contextual uses of L2 in ways which ensured comprehension on

the part of all students, and which appeared to make good use of limited classroom time. Affectively, the use of L2 enabled familiar, ‘natural’ communication amongst students and teacher, where existing interdiscursivity could be easily drawn upon, and through which foreign language anxiety might be diminished (Horwitz, Horwitz & Cope, 1986).

Possible implications for the development of bilingual pedagogy include the provision of bilingual dictionaries and other teaching resources, and the integration of L1 as a component of L2 task-focussed group work, which could include translation-type activities. Two publications of note here are those by Deller and Rinvulcri (2002), and, for the ESL context, Murray and Wigglesworth (2005). Additionally, recognition of the role of L1 in L2 learning has strong implications for the status and training of teachers. In many EFL contexts, including that of Thailand, most native speaking English teachers are expatriate and monolingual; most local teachers are bilingual, sharing L1 with their students. Each group has complementary strengths, and training programs need to be designed accordingly, in ways which meet the needs of all teachers.

Finally, in our teaching, Johnson has urged that ‘the learner’s “old voices”, the voices of his or her native-language culture be acknowledged and respected’ (2003, p. 174). In contexts such as Thailand, these voices are generally shared between learners and teachers. Recognition, and indeed celebration of their presence as illustrated in this study, affirm the rich possibilities inherent in a bilingual EFL pedagogy.

## **References**

- Allen, G. (2000). *Intertextuality*. London: Routledge.
- Alptekin, C. (2002). Towards intercultural communicative competence in ELT. *ELT Journal*, 56 (1), 57-64.
- Antón, M., & DiCamilla, F. (1998). Socio-cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interactions in the L2 classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 54 (3), 314-342.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination*. M. Holquist (Ed.), C. Emerson & M. Holquist (Trans.). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Bovonsiri, V., Uampuang, P., & Fry, G. (1996). Cultural influence on higher education in Thailand. In K. Kempner & W. G. Tierney (Eds.), *The social role of Higher Education: Comparative perspectives* (pp. 56-77). New York: Garland.
- Brooks, F. B., & Donato, R. (1994). Vygotskian approaches to understanding foreign language learner discourses during communicative tasks. *Hispania*, 77, 262-274.
- Bruner, J. S., & Sherwood, V. (1975). Peekaboo and the learning of rule structures. In J. S. Bruner, A. Jolly, & K. Sylva (Eds.), *Play: Its role in development and evolution* (pp. 277-285). Harmondsworth: Penguin.



- Butzkamm, W. (1997.) Communicative shifts in the regular FL classroom and in the bilingual content classroom. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, (IRAL)*, 35, 167-187.
- Butzkamm, W. (2000, July). Meaning conveyance through the mother tongue – the Dodson technique. *FIPLV Conference*, Paris. Retrieved December 26, 2004, from <http://www.rwth-aachen.de/lfed/Ww/paris2000.html>.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2003). Globalization, methods, and practice in periphery classrooms. In D. Block & D. Cameron (Eds.), *Globalization and language teaching* (pp. 134-141). London: Routledge.
- Cook, V. (1991). The poverty of the stimulus argument and multi-competence. *Second Language Research*, 7, 103-117.
- Cook, V. (1992.) Evidence for multicompetence. *Language Learning*, 42 (4), 557-591.
- Cook, V. (1998). Internal and external uses of a second language. *Essex Research Reports in Linguistics*, 100-110.
- Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33 (2), 185-209.
- Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57 (3), 402-423.

- Cook, V (2003). The changing first language in the L2 user's mind. In V. Cook (Ed.), *Effects of the second language on the first* (pp. 1-18). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (Eds.) (1995). *The "how" of a pedagogy of multiliteracies. Occasional paper No. 1*. Sydney: NLLIA Centre for Workplace Communication and Culture, University of Technology, Sydney.
- Cortazzi, M., & Jin, L. (1996). Cultures of learning: Language classrooms in China. In H. Coleman (Ed.), *Society and the language classroom* (pp. 169-206). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cortazzi, M., & Jin, L. (1999). Cultural mirrors: Materials and methods in the EFL classroom. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Culture and second language teaching and learning* (pp. 196-219). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Deller, S., & Rinvulcri, M. (2002). *Using the mother tongue: Making the most of the learner's language*. Surrey: Delta.
- Duff, P. (2004). Intertextuality and hybrid discourse: The infusion of pop culture in educational discourse. *Linguistics and Education*, 14, 231-276.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Oxford: Polity Press.

- Forman, R. (2005). *Teaching EFL in Thailand: A bilingual study*. Ph D thesis. Sydney: University of Technology, Sydney.
- Forman, R. (2007). Bilingual teaching in the Thai EFL context: One teacher's practice. *TESOL in Context*, 16, 2, 19-24.
- Gibbons, J., White, W., & Gibbons, P. (1994). Combating educational disadvantage among Lebanese Australian children. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas & R. Phillipson (Eds.) *Linguistic Human Rights: Overcoming Linguistic Discrimination* (pp. 253-262). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Gibbons, P. (1999). *Discourse contexts for second language development in the mainstream classroom*. Ph D thesis. Sydney: University of Technology, Sydney.
- Gibbons, P. (2002). *Scaffolding language, scaffolding learning: Teaching second language learners in the mainstream classroom*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Gower, R., Phillips, D., & Walters, S. (1995). *Teaching practice handbook*. Oxford: Heinemann.
- Guerrero, M. C. M. de (2004). Early stages of L2 inner speech development: What verbal reports suggest. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 14 (1), 90-112.

- Guerrero, M. C. M. de (2005). *Inner Speech – L2: Thinking Words in a Second Language*.  
New York: Springer.
- Gutierrez, K., Rymes, B., and Larson, J. (1995). Script, counterscript, and underlife in the classroom: James Brown versus Brown vs. Board of Education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 65 (3), 445-471.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). London: Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K., Macintosh, A., & Stevens, P. (1964). *The linguistic sciences and language teaching*. London: Longman.
- Holmes, J. (2004). Intertextuality in EAP in an African context. *Journal of EAP*, 3 (1), 73-88.
- Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *Modern Language Journal*, 70 (1), 125-132.
- Jacobson, R., & Faltis, C. (Eds.) (1990). *Language distribution issues in bilingual schooling*.  
Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Jin, L., & Cortazzi, M. (1998). The culture the learner brings: A bridge or a barrier?' In M. Byram & M. Fleming (Eds.), *Language learning from a cultural perspective* (pp. 98-117). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Johnson, K. E. (1995). *Understanding communication in second language classrooms*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Johnson, M. (2003). *A philosophy of second language acquisition*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Kamberelis, G. (2001). Producing heteroglossic classroom micro-cultures through hybrid discourse practice. *Linguistics and Education*, 12, 85-125.
- Kim, S. H., & Elder, C. (2005). Language choices and pedagogic functions in the foreign language classroom: A cross-linguistic functional analysis of teacher talk. *Language Teaching Research*, 9 (4), 355-380.
- Klein, M. L. (2005). *Intertextuality in Western art music*. Bloomington, IA: Indiana University Press.
- Komin, S. (1990). *Psychology of the Thai people: Values and behavioural patterns*. Bangkok: Research Centre for National Institute of Development Administration.
- Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kress, G., & van Leeuwen, T. (1996). *Reading images: The grammar of visual design*. London: Routledge.

- Kristeva, J. (1980). *Desire in language: A semiotic approach to literature and art*. New York: Columbia University Press. (Original work published 1966).
- Lemke, J. L. (1990). *Talking science: Language, learning and values*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Lemke, J. L. (1992). Intertextuality and educational research. *Linguistics and Education*, 4, 257-267.
- Leung, C. (2005). Language and content in bilingual education. *Linguistics and Education*, 16, 238-252.
- Lin, A. M. Y. (1996). Bilingualism or linguistic segregation: Symbolic domination, resistance and code-switching in Hong Kong schools. *Linguistics and Education*, 8 (1), 49-84.
- Lin, A. M. Y. (1999). Doing-English-lessons in the reproduction or transformation of social worlds? *TESOL Quarterly*, 33 (3), 393-412.
- Lin, A. M. Y. (2001). Symbolic domination and bilingual classroom practices in Hong Kong. In M. Heller & M. Martin-Jones (Eds.), *Voices of authority: Education and linguistic difference* (pp. 139-168). West Port, Connecticut: Ablex.
- Macaro, E. (2001). Analysing student teachers' codeswitching in foreign language classrooms: Theories and decision making. *Modern Language Journal*, 85 (4), 531-548.

- Martin, J. R. (1999). Mentoring semogenesis: Genre-based literacy pedagogy. In F. Christie (Ed.), *Pedagogy and the shaping of consciousness* (pp. 123-155). London: Cassell.
- Martin, J. R. (2000). Beyond exchange: Appraisal systems in English. In S. Hunston & G. Thompson (Eds.), *Evaluation in text* (pp. 142-175). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Martin-Jones, M. (1997). Bilingual classroom discourse: Changing research approaches and diversification of research sites. In N. H. Hornberger & D. Corson (Eds.), *Research methods in language and education* (pp. 249-258). Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Martin-Jones, M., & Heller, M. (1996). Introduction to the special issues on education in multilingual settings: Discourse, identities, and power. Part 1: Constructing legitimacy. *Linguistics and Education*, 8, 3-16.
- Maybin, J., Mercer, N., & Stierer, B. (1992). Scaffolding learning in the classroom. In K. Norman (Ed.), *Thinking voices: The work of the national oracy project* (pp. 186-195). London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Morgan, L. (2003). *Student target-language use in beginner classrooms*. Ed D thesis. Sydney: University of Sydney.
- Murray, D. E., & Wigglesworth, G. (Eds.) (2005). *First language support in adult ESL in Australia*. Sydney: NCELTR.
- Nation, I. S. P. (1990). *Teaching and learning vocabulary*. Boston, MA: Heinle.

NSW Board of Studies (1999). *Fundamentals of English, Stage 6 support document*.

Retrieved October 20, 2004, from <http://www.boardofstudies.nsw.edu.au>.

Ohta, A. S. (2001). *Second language acquisition processes in the classroom: Learning Japanese*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Pennington, M. (1995). Pattern and variation in the use of two languages in the Hong Kong secondary English class. *RELC Journal*, 26, 89-102.

Pica, T. (1994). Research on negotiation: What does it reveal about second language learning conditions, processes and outcomes? *Language Learning*, 44, 493-527.

Poehner, M. E., & Lantolf, J. P. (2005). Dynamic assessment in the language classroom. *Language Teaching Research*, 9 (3), 233-265.

Richards, J. C., & Rogers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching* (2<sup>nd</sup> edn). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Swain, M. 1986. Two ingredients to the successful use of a second language as a medium of instruction in Hong Kong. *Educational Research*, 1, 1-6.



Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2005). The evolving sociopolitical context of immersion education in Canada: Some implications for program development. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 15 (2), 169-186.

TESL-E Journal (2002). Retrieved March 2, 2003 from <http://www-writing.berkeley.edu/TESL-EJ/>.

Thibault, P. J. (1987). Interview with Michael Halliday. In R. Steele & T. Threadgold (Eds.), *Language topics: Essays in honour of Michael Halliday, Vol. III* (pp. 601-627). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Turnbull, M., & Arnett, K. (2002). Teachers' uses of the target and first languages in second and foreign language classrooms. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 204-218.

van Lier, L. (2004). *The ecology and semiotics of language learning: A sociocultural perspective*. Norwell, MA: Kluwer.

Webster, A., Beveridge, M., & Reed, M. (1996). *Managing the literacy curriculum*. London: Routledge.

Wells, G. (1999). *Dialogic inquiry: Towards a sociocultural practice and theory of education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Widdowson, H. (2001). The monolingual teaching and bilingual learning of English. In R. L. Cooper, E. Shohamy & J. Walters (Eds.), *New Perspectives and Issues in*

*Educational Language Policy: A Festschrift for Bernard Dov Spolsky* (pp. 7-18).

Amsterdam: Benjamins.

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