Analysis of Linguistic Complexity of Output:
Teacher vs Learner Generated Questions

Michael GREISAMER

Analysis of Linguistic Complexity of Output: Teacher vs Learner Generated Questions

Michael GREISAMER

Introduction

This study is a continuation of a previous case study conducted by the author in which complexity was analyzed. The task-set has been modified and given a to a new set of participants. This enables a direct comparison and contrast in order to analyze differences between the 2 sets of learners. The expectation is that with the new task-set and a closer examination of the constructs will yield congruent results that concur with the hypothesis. The analysis of spoken language requires a principled way of dividing transcribed data into units to assess features such as complexity (Foster 2000, p. 354). This paper will analyze the results of the two task sets and attempt to answer the following research questions in the following section:

Research Questions

1. What effect do the teacher-generated (TG) questions have on learners spoken production, compared to the effect of learner-generated (LG) questions on spoken production?

2. How will the variables of complexity and learner engagement compare when the order of the task-set is reversed? (See table 1)

Table 1 *Order of task-sets*

Study	Task 1	Task 2
Greisamer, M., 2019 (J&M)	TGP	LGP
Current (S&W)	LGP	TGP

TGP-Teacher-generated prompts   *LGP-Learner-generated prompts*

Hypothesis

1. Participants will produce more overall task-oriented communication in the personal investment condition (LG questions) than in the control condition (TG questions) when the task order is reversed.

Literature Review

The construct or aspect of language that will be considered is complexity. The most cited theoretical definition of complexity was originally proposed by Skehan (1996), distinguishing complexity as "concerning the elaboration or ambition of the language which is produced" (p. 22). According to Ellis and Barkhuizen, (2005) complexity is the extent to which learners produce elaborated language. What enables learners to advance and produce more complex language is their willingness and preparedness to take risks and experiment linguistically (Skehan and Foster, 1999).

The idea of learner engagement has traditionally been examined in the field of education and has been found to be associated with positive educational outcomes (Larson-Freeman et al. 2021). Student engagement as Bond et al. (2020) posits, is the drive and determination given by students, shaped by a variety of structural and internal influences. These include their learning community and environment which if engaged will direct positively on their learning.

The usage of engagement is broadly expressed and intuitively comprehended within the ESL field, it is often misrepresented in the focus information. This confusion is partly owing to the plethora of meanings, terms and along with different goals of researchers (Reschly and Wylie, 2012). Fredricks et al. (2004) after reviewing 50 papers on student engagement, they classified it into three major dimensions: behavioral, emotional and cognitive. This paper is concerned with cognitive dealing with students' personal investment, agency and learning strategies. And will be defined as active, meaningful student involvement throughout the learning environment, behaviors exhibited by learners such as compliance, willingness and motivation to participate in the learning process. (Bond et al. 2020). According to research by Karabiyik (2019) engagement is connected to achievement in English in Turkish foreign language learners. The results demonstrate that learner engagement is a significant component in learning a foreign language.

Learner agency refers to the feeling of ownership and control that learners have over their own learning. (Philp & Duchesne, 2016). When students believe their actions

can make a difference, they become more confident, engaged, and effective learners. This framework is necessary for building responsible successful people that can take them far beyond the classroom into society. Every student can develop their agency but they must be supported by their teachers and learning community to do so.

There are various meanings of learner agency from researchers grounded in their own investigations. For example, learner create/design materials (Matsumoto, 2021) or goal building and learning strategies (Jin and Wang, 2021). The common factor is giving responsibility and control to the learner over task content (LG content). Findings revealed that learners are prone to be more engaged and invested in task under the learner-generated content conditions (Lambert and Minn 2007; Lambert et al. 2017) as seen in this study with the LG tasks.

Participants

In this study a new set of participants are added to compare task-sets. The new set of participants are two Japanese females third year students at Himeji Dokkyo University. Both are in the Faculty of International Languages and Cultures majoring in English and agreed to participate in this research. Both agreed to participate for this study and will be called "S" and "W".

The previous set of participants included two Japanese female English learners called "M" and "J" in the study. M is a second year high school student who has been studying English for about four years and has passed the second level of the Japanese Eiken proficiency test. J is a housewife in her mid-thirties, who studied abroad 15 years ago and enjoys maintaining her English.

Data Collection (material / procedures)

The tasks have been modified to promote personal investment and learner engagement. The four changes made are:

- The note making (comment space) was eliminated.
- The instructions were simplified to generate a more genuine conversation.
- An additional prompt was added. This brings the total amount of prompts to six for task 1 and six for task 2. (See Appendix I).
- For the second set of participants Task 1 and Task 2 are switched.

Similarly, with the previous study, (Greisamer, M., 2019) there is no practice or

previous knowledge about the tasks ahead before the start. The new pair (S & W) is given the worksheet (See Appendix I) and asked to read the instructions for Task 1. It was explained that they could use any means at their disposal to complete that tasks. There was no time limit or pressure restraint to these tasks.

Task 1 is a planned condition task in which they are asked to make their own prompts. Time is given to think and prepare the prompts then ask their partner and find out if they can perform the activities. They are informed that they do not have to write down anything but may take notes for their own reference.

The participants are then asked to complete the two-way questions/answer worksheet in Task 2. There are no actual questions written on the worksheet. It consist of a list of teacher generated activities or prompts. They are permitted to use the prompts to help form the question to ask their partner. The teacher-generated prompts are different for S and W than for M and J.

From the recording of the participant's oral tasks, the data is transcribed by the instructor and checked by another native speaker for inter-rater agreement at .94. For transcription purposes conventions from Atkinson and Heritage (1984) were abridged and adapted. (See Appendix II). To measure complexity, the data is divided into AS-units. By adopting the following procedure when each unit is put on a separate line into a corresponding table, and sequentially numbered. This enables the level of complexity to be observed in each subject's conversation. (See Appendix III).

Analysis

This study focuses on the construct of complexity and is measured by the following means:

    a. Number of words

    b. Number of AS-units

    c. Number of independent clauses

    d. Number of subordinate clauses

    e. Amount of subordination

    f. Mean turn length

Ellis and Barkhuizen, (2005) describe the AS-unit as a measure of subordination that effectively indicates complexity for intermediate or above learners. (p.155). The measure for the AS-unit (clauses) is calculated by counting the total number of units in

each subject's production. In order to measure the AS-units length, Foster (2000) guidelines are followed. Thus false starts, self-repairs and repetitions are excluded from the total word count. Listing the number of words, independent clauses and subordinate clauses followed this methodology for each AS-unit. (See Appendix III & IV). It should be noted that there is a difference between AS-unit and independent clauses. Foster (2000), defines AS-unit as; "a single speaker's utterance consisting of an independent clause, or sub-clausal unit, together with any subordinate clause(s) associated with either." (p. 365).

The amount of subordination is calculated by the total number of separate clauses divided by the total number of AS-units (Ellis and Barkhuizen 2005, p. 153). The final measurement, the mean turn length is calculated by dividing the total number of words by the number of turns taken by that speaker. As Robinson (2001) points out, "this might mitigate speakers' attempts to produce complex syntax and subordination" (p. 36). This could result in greater interaction (e. g. negotiation, request or conformation checks). The type-token ratio was not examined in the version of the task-set as it is high dependent on the length of the text being the same.

Results

In this study the LG task is completed first followed by the TG task to determine if practice would make a difference in the data.

A summary of the data is displayed in tables 2 & 3 and indicates two main findings of mixed results. The first is an increase in the amount of subordination and mean turn length from task 1 to task 2. This correlation would suggest an increase in interaction and grammar complexity. However, this increase is contrary to the idea that strategic planning leads to more complex language (Ellis 2009). As no planning time is given preceding the TG task 2. The second finding is a decrease in the amount of words and AS-units. This would suggest a loss of interest or more attention to form rather than communication.

In both this study and the previous (Greisamer, M. 2019) when the first task is taken it yields more words and AS-units, (See tables 2-5) than the second task. One contributing factor for the higher figures in this study is the change made to the task-set that encourages more learner engagement and agency. When the LG task is taken first it produced higher results than the previous study (Greisamer, M. 2019) in which the LG task is given second.

Table 2 *Task 1 LG questions*

Measurements	Participant S	Participant W
Number of words	172	137
Number of AS-units	27	27
Number of independent clauses	28	20
Number of sub. clauses	5	4
Amount of subordination	33/27=1.22	24/27=.9
Mean turn length	172/25=6.9	137/28=4.9

Table 3 *Task 2 TG questions*

Measurements	Participant S	Participant W
Number of words	164	125
Number of AS-units	21	21
Number of independent clauses	24	19
Number of sub. clauses	9	5
Amount of subordination	33/21=1.6	24/21=1.1
Mean turn length	146/16=9.1	125/17=7.4

Table 4 *Task 1 TG questions* (previous study)

Measurements	Participant J	Participant M
Number of words	113	131
Number of AS-units	24	27
Number of independent clauses	19	29
Number of sub. clauses	2	9
Amount of subordination	21/24=.9	38/27=1.4
Mean turn length	113/17=6.6	131/16=8.2

Table 5 *Task 2 LG questions* (previous study)

Measurements	Participant J	Participant M
Number of words	99	69
Number of AS-units	22	18
Number of independent clauses	18	13
Number of sub. clauses	3	2
Amount of subordination	21/22=.95	15/18=.83
Mean turn length	99/20=5	69/19=3.6

Discussion / Implications

This study is designed to compare and analyze TG questions and LG questions. With the changes to the task-set of the previous study (Greisamer, M. 2019) to the current, the participants appear to speak more fluently and more relaxed. Participants appear to not write or take notes while concentrating more on communicating with each other. This, in spite of the fact that the order was reversed (LG/TG), the amount of learner engagement was higher for both tasks compared to the previous study.

Addressing the second research question that of the variables is task complexity. While this study concentrates on the linguistic form of complexity task complexity has also been considered in the design of the task. Robinson (2001) defined it as "the result of the attentional memory, reasoning, and other information processing demands imposed by the structure of the task on the language learner" (p. 29). After completing the first task participants appear to have a better understanding of what is expected of them and how to complete the second task. This is the case for the amount of subordination and mean turn length but not for number of words and AS-units in this study as indicated in Tables 2&3. This suggests that the learners are more concerned with form and consequently produced more complex syntax. This is contrary to what Sekhan (1996) has argued in his Trade-Off Hypothesis, that more complex tasks will force second language users to divert their attentional resources to meaning, and less to form.

Limitations & Future Research

There are a number of limitations to this study that need to be acknowledged and addressed in further research. Personal investment should result in learners producing voluntary elaboration of the content out of genuine interest and in their partner and the topic. In the classroom it is difficult to determine what is genuine interest and what is just to get the task done.

The general pattern of the learners' performance on these tasks is consistent with the idea that intermediate Japanese learners need support in order to produce complex utterances. Even with time to prepare and the ability to direct the conversation to their liking they did not produce more complex speech. As Crookes (1989) suggests, "giving Japanese learners the opportunity to plan may have only a limited effect, as they are culturally disinclined to speak spontaneously even after planning." (p. 380). The idea was that the variation and background knowledge of the question maker would enable more complex and longer utterances. Despite this idea voluntary elaboration did not

occur.

Secondly, only the linguistic construct of complexity was analyzed. In future research, it would be interesting to explore the other constructs of CAF.

Despite these limitations, the findings of the study yield interesting insights into TG vs LG tasks and how complexity is measured in spoken discourse.

References

Bardovi-Harlig, K., K. (1992). A second look at T-unit analysis: Reconsidering the sentence. *TESOL Quarterly*, 26, 390-395.

Bond, M., Buntins, K., Bedenlier, S., Zawacki- Richter, O., & Kerres, M. (2020). Mapping research in student engagement and educational technology in higher education: A systematic evidence map. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 17(1), 2.

Crookes, G. (1989). 'Planning and interlanguage variation'. Studies in Second Language Acquisition 11: pp.367-383.

Ellis, R., (2009). The Differential Effects of Three Types of Task Planning on the Fluency, Complexity, and Accuracy in L2 Oral Production. *Applied Linguistics*, 30 (4), 495. Retrieved April 20, 2015, from http: //applij. oxfordjournals. org/content/30/4/474.full.pdf

Ellis, R., & Barkhuizen, G. (2005). *Analysing learner language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. and F. Yuan. (2004). The effects of planning on fluency, complexity, and accuracy in second language narrative writing. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26, 59-84.

Fredricks, J., P. Blumenfeld and A. Paris. (2004). School engagement: potential of the concept, state of the evidence. Review of Educational Research 74, no. 1: 59–109.

Foster, P., Tonkyn, & Wigglesworth, G. (2000). Measuring Spoken Language: A Unit

Analysis of Linguistic Complexity of Output: Teacher vs Learner Generated Questions for All Reasons. *Applied Linguistics*, 23(3), 354-375.

Greisamer, M., (2019). *Analyzing Complexity*. Assignment 2, Research Tasks 713. Anaheim University.

Karabiyik, C., (2019). The Relationship between Student Engagement and Tertiary Level English Language Learners' Achievement. International Online Journal of Education and Teaching, 6(2), 281-293.

Lambert, Craig, Jenefer Philp, and Sachiko Nakamura. (2017). Learner-generated content and engagement in second language task performance. *Language Teaching Research* 21: 665–80.

Larsen-Freeman, D., Driver, P., Gao, X., & Mercer, S. (2021). *Learner Agency: Maximizing Learner Potential* [PDF]. www.oup.com/elt/expert

Philp, J., & Duchesne, S. (2016). Exploring engagement in tasks in the language Applied classroom. Annual Linguistics, 36, 50-72.

Reschly, A. L., & Christenson, S. L. (2012). Jingle, jangle, and conceptual haziness: Evolution and future directions of the engagement construct. In Christenson, S. L., Reschly, A. L., & Wylie, C. (Eds.), Handbook of research on student engagement (pp. 3–20). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-2018-7_1CrossRefGoogle Scholar

Robinson, P. (2001). Task complexity, task difficulty, and task production: Exploring interactions in a componential framework. *Applied Linguistics*, 22, 27-57.

Skehan, P. (1996). Second-language acquisition research and task-based instruction. In J. Willis and D. Willis (eds.), *Challenge and Change in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Heinemann, pp. 17-30.

Skehan, P. (1996b). A framework for the implementation of task-based instruction. Applied Linguistics, 17, 38-62.

Appendix I

—Speaker 1— Answer & Talk

TASK 1 *Write activities that you really enjoy doing and want to introduce to your partner and find out her opinion of them.*

Speaker 1 Activity Questions	
1.	4.
2.	5.
3.	6.

TASK 2 *Have a conversation and find out if your partner can do these activities.*

Speaker 1 Activities	Name of partner:
1. Play badminton	4. Speak Spanish
2. Ride a scooter	5. Make pizza
3. Laugh like a pig	6. Sing Kimigayo

<u>**Post-task Questions**</u>

1. Which task did you find more difficult to ask (1 or 2)? Why?

2. Which task did you find more difficult to answer? Why?

—Speaker 2-- Answer & Talk

TASK 1 *Write activities that you really enjoy doing and want to introduce to your partner and find out her opinion of them.*

Speaker 2 Activity Questions	
1.	4.
2.	5.
3.	6.

TASK 2 *Have a conversation and find out if your partner can do these activities.*

Speaker 2 Activities	Name of partner:
1. Ice skate	4. Cook Italian food
2. Play a musical instrument	5. Stand on your head
3. Eat liver	6. Sing a song in English

Post-task Questions

    1.   Which task did you find more difficult to ask (1 or 2)? Why?

    2.   Which task did you find more difficult to answer? Why?

APPENDIX II   Transcription conventions

Transcription conventions were abridged and adapted from Atkinson and Heritage (1984, pp. ix-xvi):

.	Descending tone sequence and a pause equal to or more than 0.5 sec. which indicate a 'natural' ending
,	Tone sequence with a comma-like pause
(.)	The shortest hearable pause, less than 0.2 sec.
(2'')	Exactly timed pause in seconds
＞fast＜＜slow＞	The talk produced is noticeably quicker or slower than the surrounding talk
$word % word	The talk produced is noticeably louder or quieter than the surrounding talk.
?word?	The transcriber's guess at an unclear part
<u>under</u>	Emphasis
↑word	A rising intonation shift
↓word	A falling intonation shift
lo::ng	The stretching of a sound or letter

Appendix III AS Unit for "S" & "W" Task 1

No.	AS Unit for "S" Task 1	Words	Cs	SCs
1.	Yes	1	0	0
2.	Yeah. What kind of books do you like?	8	1	0
3.	Fantasy. Yeah I like fantasy too.	6	1	0
4.	I like it ↑too.	4	1	0
5.	Uhm, (2''), I like playing video games.	5	1	0
6.	Especially I like playing ?alphia? games.	6	1	0
7.	Because (2'') I don't know why but my favorite game has very fantastic, umm, story.	13	1	1
8.	$I really love it.	4	1	
9.	Yes, I like dogs.	4	1	0
10.	Dogs, very much.	3	1	0
11.	Yeah.	1	0	0
12.	My parents have dog and I really love her too. She's very cute.	13	2	1
13.	Yeah, the black dog. She's very smart.	7	2	1

14.	I like cooking.	3	1	0
15.	Do you like?	3	1	0
16.	What kind of food do you like to eat?	9	1	0
17.	Sweets ah:h. I like to…	4	1	0
18.	I also like to bake like bake, those sweets.	9	1	0
19.	Okay. (10')	1	0	0
20.	What else do you like? I like ≫watching movies playing video games reading novels, cooking and dogs≪.	17	2	1
21.	↑Drawing?	1	0	0
22.	Me too. My works are not good very much.	9	2	1
23.	My sister has more good skills.	6	1	0
24.	She is a designer.	4	1	
25.	My mother also likes to draw and painting and she's a painter.	12	1	0
26.	She, paints portraits of me and my sister $also other person.	11	1	0
27.	She trying to get the job of painting.	8	1	0
	TOTAL	172	28	5
	Note: **C = clause; SC = subordinate clause**			

No.	AS Unit for "W" Task 1	Words	Cs	SCs
1.	Do you like reading books?	5	1	0
2.	Uh, I like reading books too because (3") if we read books we can get more ideas and for one thing.	19	2	2
3.	I can escape from reality.	5	1	0
4.	Especially fantasy.	2	0	0
5.	And in same reason I like watching movies.	7	1	0
6.	Especially fantasy one.	4	0	1
7.	What's your favorite activity?	4	1	0
8.	Yeah (2") What is the fun of it?	7	1	0
9.	Fantasy. (2") umm, Do you like ↑animals?	5	1	0
10.	Dogs.	1	0	0
11.	Like cute animals.	3	1	0
12.	Yeah, like cats and dogs.	5	1	0
13.	Ah yeah the black one.	5	1	0
14.	(3') What else do you like?	5	1	0
15.	Cooking?	1	0	0
16.	Yeah, ahh, I like eating. (both laughing)	4	1	0
17.	Mmm, some sweets.	2	0	0
18.	Chocolates or cake.	3	0	0

19.	So let me eat. (both laughing)	4	1	0
20.	What else?	2	0	0
21.	Now-a-days I like drawing	4	1	0
22.	Yes but my drawing skill is not so good so.	10	1	0
23.	↑Really?	1	0	0
24.	Designer. So. Yeah. The person in that way the drawing arts.	10	1	1
25.	Can you play the piano?	5	1	0
25.	That's great.	2	0	0
26.	Let me see.	3	1	0
27.	%Great. I have to skill up my drawing skill.	9	1	0
	TOTAL	**137**	**20**	**4**
	Note: **C = clause; SC = subordinate clause**			

Appendix IV   AS Unit for "S" & "W" Task 2

No.	AS Unit for "S" Task 2	Words	Cs	SCs
1.	M:m, yes, I think but I don't think I'm good at that.	11	1	0
2.	M:m, yeah I tried it once I, could do ↑it but I don't know I'm good at that. (both laughing).	16	2	2
3.	Do you play badminton?	4	1	0
4.	M:::m I, yeah, I think it's a fun activity but, I I'm not good at sports.	14	2	1
5.	So it's very tired and I (2") don't like much.	10	1	0
6.	Musical instrument? Yeah I play piano a bit,	8	1	1
7.	but (3") I'm not good player.	5	1	0
8.	Do you ride a scooter?	5	1	0
9.	I think so.	3	1	0
10.	Yeah me too.	3	1	0
11.	Liver?	1	0	0
12.	Yeah I eat but not that ↑often, so sometimes.	9	1	0
13.	Yes, I like to cook Italian food like spaghetti.	9	1	0
14.	Do you laugh like a pig?	6	1	0
15.	Pig.	1	0	0
16.	Me too.	2	1	0
17.	Stand on my head? No I can't. Do you speak Spanish?	11	3	2
18.	Yes I can. Sometimes I sing, sing Disney, musical song, like Let it go.	14	2	2
19.	Can you make pizza?	4	1	0
20.	Can you sing Kimigayo?	4	1	0
21.	Yes of course. I'm a Japanese.	6	1	0

	TOTAL	146	24	9
	*Note:*C = clause; SC = subordinate clause			

No.	AS Unit for "W" Task 2	Words	Cs	SCs
1.	Can you ↑do-play Ice skate?	6	1	0
2.	I like ice skating buy yeah, same as you, I'm not good, but I like it.	16	2	1
3.	↑Badminton?	1	0	0
4.	u:h. Yeah same as ice skating.	6	1	0
5.	I like it but I'm not good at it.	8	1	0
6.	So. Do you play a musical instrument?	7	1	0
7.	Well I <u>cannot</u> play any musical instrument.	7	1	0
8.	Scooter? Bike?	2	0	0
9.	No. I don't have license.	5	1	0
10.	So, Do you eat liver?	5	1	0
11.	I think it's, meat.	4	1	0
12.	Can you cook Italian food?	5	1	0
13.	Uh: mm. (2") Do you like speak. Do you like speaking foreign language?	11	1	1
14.	Pig?	1	0	0
15.	<u>I don't</u> think so.	4	1	0
16.	Can you stand on your head?	6	1	0
17.	I'm studying Spanish now, but I can't speak Spanish now.	10	1	1
18.	Do you-can you sing a song in English?	9	1	
19.	Pizza? Yes maybe (laughing).	3	1	0
20.	Yes of course. (laughing)	3	1	
21.	As a Japanese, citizen. Can you?	6	1	1
	TOTAL	125	19	5
	Note: C = clause; SC = subordinate clause			

Appendix V   Transcription for S & W

Task 1

W：Do you like reading books?

S：Yes.

W：Uh, I like reading books too because (3") if we read books we can get more ideas

and for one thing, I can escape from reality.

S：Yeah. What kind of books do you like?

W：Especially fantasy.

S：Fantasy. Yeah I like fantasy too.

W：And in same reason I like watching movies. Especially fantasy one.

S：I like it ↑too.　　　　　　　　　W：What's your favorite activity?

S：Uhm, (2"), I like playing video games.　　　W：mu-hum.

S：Especially I like playing? alphia? games.

W：Yeah (2") What is the fun of it?

S：Because (2") I don't know why but my favorite game has very fantastic, umm, story. $I really love it.

W：Fantasy. (2") umm, Do you like ↑animals?

S：Yes I like dogs.　　　　　　　W：Dogs.

S：Dogs, very much.　　　　　　　W：Like cute animals.

S：Yeah.　　　　　　　　　　　W：Yeah, like cats and dogs.

S：My parents have dog and I really love her too. She's very cute.

W：Ah-yeah the black one.

S：Yeah, the black dog. She's very smart.

W：(3') What else do you like?

S：I like cooking.　　　　　　W：Cooking?

S：Do you like?　　　　　　　W：Yeah, a::h, I like <u>eating</u>. (both laughing)

S：What kind of food do you like to eat?

W：M::m, some sweets.

S：Sweets ah:h. I like to…　　　W：Chocolates or cake.

S：I also like to bake like bake, those sweets.

W：So let me <u>eat</u>. (both laughing)　　　　S：Okay. (10')

W：What else?　　S：What else do you like. I like≫watching movies playing video games reading novels, cooking and dogs≪.

W：Now-a-days I like drawing.　　　　　S：↑Drawing?

W：Yes but my drawing skill is not so good so.

S：Me too. My works are not good very much.

W：↑Really?　　S：My sister has more good skills.

W：Ah:::h.　　　S：She is a designer.

W：Designer. So. Yeah. The person in that way the drawing arts.

S：My mother also likes to draw and painting and she's a painter.

W：That's <u>great</u>.

S：She, paints portraits of me and my sister \$also other person.

W：Let me see.　　　　　　　　　　　S：Yeah, maybe later.

S：She trying to get the job of painting.

W：%Great. I have to skill up my drawing skill.

Task 2

W：Can you ↑do-play Ice skate?

S：M:m, yes, I think but I don't think I'm good at that. M::m, yeah I tried it once I, could do ↑it but I don't know I'm good at that. (both laughing).

W：I like Ice skating buy yeah, same as you, I'm not good, but I like it.

S：Do you play badminton?

W：↑Badminton?　　　　　　　　　　S：Mmm.

W：u:h. Yeah same as ice skating, I like it but I'm not good at it.

S：M:::m I, yeah, I think it's a fun activity but, I I'm not good at sports. So its very tired and I (2") don't like much.

W：So. Do you play a musical instrument?

S：Musical instrument? Yeah I play piano a bit, but (3") I'm not good player.

W：Well I <u>cannot</u> play any musical instrument.

S：Do you ride a scooter?　　　　　　W：Scooter? Bike?

S：I think so.　　　W：No. I don't have license.　　　S：Yeah me too.

W：So, Do you eat liver?　　　　　　　S：Liver?

W：I think it's, meat.

S：Yeah I eat but not that ↑often, so sometimes.

W：Can you cook Italian food?

S：Yes, I like to cook Italian food like spaghetti. Do you laugh like a pig?

W：Pig?　　　S：Pig.　　　　W：<u>I don't</u> think so.

S：Me too.　　W：Can you stand on your head?

S：Stand on my head? No I can't. Do you speak Spanish?

W：I'm studying Spanish now, but I can't speak Spanish now. Do you-can you sing a song in English?

S：Yes I can. Sometimes I sing, sing Disney, musical song, like Let it go. Can you make pizza?

W：Pizza? Yes maybe (laughing).

S：Can you sing Kimigayo?

W：Yes of course. (laughing) As a Japanese, citizen. Can you?

S：Yes of course. I'm a Japanese.

Previous study

Appendix IV   AS Unit for "M" & "J" Task 1

No.	AS Unit for "M" Task 1	Words	Cs	SCs
27.	Ah:h, so, can you do ice-skate?	5	1	
28.	Okay. (4") And how, long do you, practice ice-skating?	8	1	
29.	How long.	2	1	
30.	↑Ten years! Wow. (3") Okay.	4		
31.	>Yes I do.<	3	1	
32.	Hu::m. When I was child I often play badminton with my mother, but now I'm not sure. ah:h, (4") I didn't do so %often.	21	3	2
33.	Yes. ah. No. Can you play a musical instrument?	7	1	
34.	No I can't.	3	1	
35.	Because. I can't (2") take (2") drive (3") like. U::h, how do you say?	10	2	1
36.	Yeah.	1		
37.	%I'm still young. (Laughing)	3	1	
38.	What (2") does that mean?	4	1	
39.	Can you eat liver?	4	1	
40.	I think so.	3	1	
41.	(making pig sound). (laughing).			
42.	>I can do it.< Can you cook Italian food?	9	2	1
43.	Spaghetti? Like, ?a little?? (both laughing)	3	1	
44.	Wow.	1		
45.	I think I can't do %it. I've never, make it before. So I'm not sure.	15	3	2
46.	Yes I do. Yes I ↑want.	6	2	1
47.	(4") Can you stand on your head?	6	1	
48.	Stand on your head. What does that mean?	8	2	1
49.	Ah::h. I see.	2	1	
50.	I see.	2	1	
51.	: I can't.	2	1	
	TOTAL	131	29	8
	Note: **C = clause; SC = subordinate clause**			

No.	AS Unit for "W" Task 1	Words	Cs	SCs
26.	Yeah sure I can.	4	1	
27.	↑How long?	2		
28.	I'm practicing ice-skating for about ten years.	7	1	
29.	Ahh, Can you play badminton?	4	1	
30.	And how often do you play?	6	1	
31.	Okay. So you aren't playing, now?	6	1	
32.	Instrument. Yes I can play drums and piano.	8	1	
33.	Can you ride a scooter?	4	1	
34.	No?	1		
35.	↑License?	1		
36.	Okay. You are still young?	5	1	
37.	Okay, uh, (2") It's your turn.	4	1	
38.	No. I don't like it. (4") Excuse me, I want to ask about this questions.	14	2	1
39.	Okay, okay. Can you laugh like a pig?	6	1	
40.	Try.	1		
41.	Italian? (3") Ye::ah. I can cook spaghetti.	6	1	
42.	hahaha. I can make tomato sauce and meat sauce.	8	1	
43.	Can you make pizza?	4	1	
44.	You want to try?	4		
45.	Okay.	1	1	
46.	Headstand?	1		
47.	If there is a wall (2") I can. (2") But I can't stand long.	11	2	1
48.	Can you play the piano?	5	1	
	TOTAL	113	19	2
	Note: **C = clause; SC = subordinate clause**			

Appendix VII   AS Unit for "M" & "J" Task 2

No.	AS Unit for "M" Task 2	Words	Cs	SCs
22.	Yes I do.	3	1	
23.	A::h. (3") I like small birds.	4	1	
24.	Do you like animal?	4	1	
25.	What kind of animal?	4		
26.	Ye::s. (2") Yes.	2		
27.	Thanks. (2") U:hh, Can you play volleyball?	5	1	
28.	Yes I like.	3	1	
29.	Can you speak French?	4	1	
30.	Yes. (2") I like.	3		

31.	I like to speak English. Because I, can only speak English.	10	2	1
32.	Hu::m. Cantonese.	1		
33.	Which do you like better, winter or summer?	8	1	
34.	My favorite food is, Takoyaki.	5	1	
35.	It's very delicious.	3	1	
36.	Ahh, (1") Can you stay up late?	5	1	
37.	You, you, like sleep?	3	1	
38.	Okay. Thank you.	2		
	TOTAL	69	13	1
	Note: C = clause; SC = subordinate clause			

No.	AS Unit for "J" Task 2	Words	Cs	SCs
22.	Do you like bird watching?	5	1	
23.	Which bird do you like best?	6	1	
24.	Small bird. Yeah, okay.	4	1	
25.	%Why, yeah of course.	4	1	
26.	I like cat.	3	1	
27.	Do you want to get married in the future?	9	1	
28.	↑Yeah? Yes? okay.	3		
29.	Good luck.	2	1	
30.	Volleyball. (2") N::o. Actually I %don't think so.	7	1	
31.	Do you like ↑traveling?	4	1	
32.	J̲ust few words. (Speaking French)	3	1	
33.	Uh: mm. (2") Do you like speak. Do you like speaking foreign language?	11	1	
34.	What language do you like to speak?	6	1	
35.	$What do you want to learn?	6	1	
36.	↓Cantonese. Okay.	2		
37.	A::h. (2") Now. summer, because it's really cold.	6	1	
38.	What is your favorite food?	4	1	
39.	↑Takoyaki? Okay. Takoyaki.	2		
40.	(2") %No. (3") No. I want to go to bed early.	8	1	
41.	Yes.	1		
42.	↑Finished?	1		
	TOTAL	99	16	0
	Note: C = clause; SC = subordinate clause			

Analysis of Linguistic Complexity of Output: Teacher vs Learner Generated Questions

Michael GREISAMER

Abstract

    This paper will analyze the linguistic complexity of language learner output in the performance of a task set. The tasks involve teacher-generated (TG) questions and learner-generated (LG) questions on two separate cases. The motivation for this study comes from the desire to justify a communicative classroom methodology in using question-based tasks and to demonstrate the principles behind it. The results demonstrate that with improvement in the LG questions there is more overall production and communication. Despite the swapping of task order the task done first produces more words spoken. The finding of this study suggest that the integration of learner agency and engagement is conducive to effective language learning.

Key words: task, complexity, personal investment, learner engagement & agency