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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

Introduction

What do students of French say when given the opportunity to speak French with one another? In the last decade, researchers have documented what teachers say to students (Dunkin and Biddle, 1974; Flanders, 1970; Wing, 1980). The content of student responses to teacher questions has also been the subject of investigation. To date, however, research includes very few studies on student-student interaction in the foreign language classroom. This study proposes to explore how students use French to interact in a classroom setting. Because this investigator recognizes the complexities of human behavior and the negotiating role of participants in a language learning setting, the research is conducted in the natural setting. The negotiating role consists of defining and redefining the realities of the classroom (Delamont, 1976). Participant observation and ethnographic interviews are the primary tools of this research.

Educational research of the 1960s and 1970s has indicated that large quantities of class time are spent in verbal interaction (Flanders, 1970; Bellack et al., 1966; Adams and Biddle, 1970). Most of this verbal interaction is dominated by the classroom teacher (Adams and Biddle, 1970; Schmuck, 1979; Wade, 1980; Sharan and Sharan, 1976). Flanders (1970) found that in most classrooms two-thirds of total class time is devoted to verbal interaction, and of that fraction, two-thirds of the talking is done by the teacher. According to Sharan and Sharan, (1976) constant teacher control prevents the learning of social skills needed for productive group functioning.

In a study focusing specifically on foreign language learning, Wragg (1970) found that 82% of a lesson at the beginning level consisted of verbal interaction, 59% of the total talk was in the foreign language, and teachers tended to talk in greater amounts when English was the language of instruction. Arriving at a similar assessment based on personal experiences through classroom visitations and a consensus of foreign language supervisors, Grittner (1977) concluded that 80% of the total foreign language class activities involves teacher talk, much of which is in English. In related research, Nerenz (1979) determined that teachers were responsible for more than two-thirds of the utterances regardless of whether they were expressed in the target or native tongue. The target language was used during 79% of total class talk and the remaining 21% was in English. From this research, Nerenz concluded that "teachers, who have mastered the fundamental language skills, spent more time practicing them than do students who have not
yet attained such competencies" (p. 80). According to Nerenz, the teacher role of modeling, cueing, explaining, and providing feedback interferes with student involvement in verbal activity and could, consequently, be the reason for minimal competency among many students of foreign languages.

These studies on classroom interaction have revealed some very surprising information, or the lack of it, and raised some interesting questions:

1. Why are students not more actively engaged in verbal interaction?
2. Does all classroom behavior exist solely between the teacher and students?
3. If students have the opportunity to interact with one another, what information is exchanged and how is it exchanged?

Primary educational relationships exist between teacher and students and among students themselves. Teacher-student interaction, however, continues to be the preponderant pattern of interaction in many classrooms while student-student interaction has been discouraged (Johnson, 1981a; Sharan and Sharan, 1976).

To understand fully the reasons for the lack of student-student interaction, it is necessary to examine concepts of communication, interaction, and language. As stated previously, observation in the classroom does reveal that most activities take place through use of verbal interaction. In many studies investigating interaction in the classroom, the focus is on language as the main instrument of communication in the teaching-learning process. Communication, one of the most complex concepts created by human beings (Jarvis, 1974), occurs as a result of some action by a speaker and creates a new concept for the listener (Hurt et al., 1978). Upshur (1973) maintains that "successful communication implies a correspondence between the intentions of a speaker and the concept created by his audience" (p. 179). Communication, therefore, is an interaction, requiring at least two communicators: a sender and a receiver. Within an interactional exchange, communication occurs on two levels: interpersonal and intrapersonal. The interpersonal level exists between two individuals or more whereas the intrapersonal level occurs as the message is given meaning within the individual receiving the message and causes the receiver to produce a response behavior (Hurt et al., 1978). To illustrate these levels, one can imagine the following interaction between two individuals:

**Interpersonal:**
A: Boy, it's cold.
B: Yeah, it really is cold.

**Intrapersonal:**
A: Boy, it's cold.
B: Sure is. (Maybe I should turn up the heat.)

In addition, Hurt et al. cite four characteristics of human communication that make it a complex phenomenon. To begin with, it is an on-going, cyclical process of encoding and decoding with neither beginning nor end. Even after the termination of a conversation, the meanings of the utterances continue to be decoded in the minds of the participants. Secondly, communication is transactional in nature, meaning that "people adapt and change their own communication behavior in nature as participants bring to the conversation previous knowledge and background, expectations, "on-the-spot" summaries, and their reaction to those summaries. A third characteristic of communication is its symbolic means of interpreting and relating one's experience. Thus, communication is dependent upon symbols whose meaning is arbitrarily agreed upon by the communicators. Lastly, communication is multidimensional and operates simultaneously on at least three levels: cultural, sociological, and psychological.

Steps in human communication, according to Hurt et al., are organized according to two primary activities: encoding and decoding. Encoding involves the formulation of the message and adaptation of the message to the intended receiver. It also involves the transmission of the message to the receiver. Decoding consists of four phases: the first is sensory involvement; the second, interpretation; the third, evaluation; and, the last, feedback. Feedback as part of the communication process is important because it allows the communicators to know if the message was appropriate and accurate. It also provides training for encoding and decoding, and it can increase the confidence of the individual supplying the feedback.

The complexities of communication in the classroom are as diverse as the concept itself. Harral (1976) views the classroom first as a communication system and second as a learning situation. According to Harral, the four primary goals for students are:

1 to produce communication with emotional and intellectual content in an environment that allows for free interchange of ideas among peers and teacher.
2 to play the role of second speaker who willingly listens and responds with appropriate feedback.
3 to monitor, analyze, and evaluate their own communicative behavior and that of other speakers.
4 to control and improve their own
communication within the communication system of which they are a part (p. 4).

Evertson and Mehan (1978) share a similar perspective on communication in the classroom. Pointing to the fact that individuals in a school group do not behave in isolation, they believe that students need to know how to relate to others in a variety of situations. Verbal behavior is context bound and varies greatly according to each specific situation. Evertson and her colleagues feel, therefore, that students need to learn how to get involved in classroom participation in order to be successful contributors.

Another dimension of communication in the classroom comes from the question raised by British educators, Barnes et al., (1971) concerning the role of language: is it an instrument of teaching or learning? Barnes feels strongly that "to study the language of the classroom is to study both the learning processes and some of the internal and external constraints upon it" (p. 11). Among factors that make the study of classroom language important are the social microcosm formed by the teacher and students, the interaction of the microcosm with the social macrocosm (society) of which it is a part, and the communication made through language within and between the two environments. Barnes concludes that "through language . . . society explicitly or covertly defines and limits the activities of the group" (p. 11). His colleague, Britton, advocates using a method that consists of "talking to learn." Britton defines "talking to learn" as using language in the classroom to acquire the ability to perform mental operations. In the process of meeting new demands, a student's "language takes on new forms that correspond to the new powers as he achieves them" (p. 115).

The study of talk consists traditionally of grammatical analysis, but must also include an assessment of semantic, communicative, and pragmatic elements of language. The emphasis is not on what is said so much as on what is accomplished by the utterance. Discourse analysis can be instrumental in determining the relationship between the form and function of language. As such, discourse analysis examines the relationship of an utterance with preceding and succeeding talk, takes into consideration the notion of the "speech act" and functions of language, and studies the rules governing discourse such as "turn-taking" and "attention-getting."

Language becomes doubly important in the foreign language classroom where, in addition to its role in the thought and communication processes, it is also the subject matter to be studied. There are other factors that explain the complex nature of learning in the foreign language classroom. Wing (1980) cited three factors that contribute to the uniqueness of the learning situation in the foreign language classroom:

1. the presence and use of two languages, native and target.

2. the dual nature of language instruction expressed in terms of linguistic and
communicative objectives.

3 the patterns of verbal behavior used by
teacher and students in classroom situations.

Because the primary goal for many students of foreign languages is to achieve
language competency, an assessment of the amount and variety of practice in the
foreign language is paramount to understanding the acquisition of language and
communication skills. A frequently forgotten variable in assessing the quantity
and variety of practice is the interaction that takes place among peers. With
educational researchers indicating that it is likely that more than "80-95% of
school learning is attributable to factors other than teacher behavior"
(Jarvis, 1979, p. 82), it is perhaps time to examine at least one of those factors,
student-student interaction.

Statement of the Problem

Student-student interaction, which is defined for the purpose of this study
as verbal behavior or "student talk" among students, has been labeled "the
neglected variable" (Johnson, 1981a). In fact, there is some doubt as to whether
this form of interaction actually takes place in most classrooms. Because of the
prevailent attitude that equates good teaching with classroom control and
teacher-directed activities, student-student interaction is frequently discouraged.
Birkmaier (1971) expressed concern for this lack of student talk noting that in the
foreign language learning situation, students sit next to other students without
having the opportunity to communicate using the newly-presented verbal
structures. More typically, verbal interaction consists of student responses to
teacher questions. As a consequence, peer interaction, limited in the classroom,
occurs primarily outside the academic framework and frequently during
extra-curricular events (Johnson, 1981a). The resulting problem is two-fold:
student needs for social development are not met in the academic setting and
student language development is limited to responses to questions asked. To
resolve this dilemma, the teacher could incorporate into activities the variety of
language uses needed to function in normal discourse.

Johnson's research constitutes the primary source of available literature on
in its scope. The studies are concerned with the comparison of the effect of
coopeative goal structures with competitive and individualistic goal structures.
Of the 122 studies included in his meta-analysis, which substantiates the
effectiveness of cooperative goal structures in promoting achievement (1981b),
none were conducted in the field of foreign languages. Consequently, educators
do not know the extent of student-student interaction in the foreign language
classroom, its components, or whether it enhances or impedes the learning of a
foreign language.

The research question in the proposed study is to determine 1) what
student-student interaction occurs in an intermediate French class, 2) what characterizes student-student interaction, 3) if students benefit from peer interaction, and 4) what are student attitudes toward talking in French with their peers. This study consists of the descriptive elements of student talk. Within that dimension, student verbal behavior is examined using a system of analysis that emerges from the data. Such a system considers student knowledge of syntactic, semantic, pragmatic, social and communicative elements. The development of the system to analyze student talk is devised according to the findings and needs of the research itself, following a naturalistic approach.

Selected A Priori Dimensions of Student-Student Interaction

The primary purpose of the study is to examine the role of student-student interaction as it occurs in a French classroom. Constituting a preliminary investigation into peer interaction in a foreign language classroom, the study focuses on:

1 discovering the nature of student-student interaction as it occurs, its principal characteristics, and frequency of occurrence.

2 describing observed activities that provide the opportunity for student-student interaction, that is, the conditions under which it takes place.

3 assessing levels of student participation, determining who is involved and to what extent, and evaluating the impact of this involvement on others.

4 analyzing student-student talk with regard to language functions used: social, cognitive, and communicative skills.

In this study, as in the Wing (1980) study on teacher talk, questions guiding the research can be addressed to either native or target language usage. Because total student-student interaction comprises talk in both target and native languages, the analysis of language use in this study considers both.

General Questions Guiding the Study

The concern of the study is to increase understanding of the complex topic of student-student interaction. Major emphasis is on the discovery of ideas and insights. The following questions will serve as guidelines for the research:
1 What are the characteristics of student verbal behavior when interacting with peers?

2 What are the varieties of language functions that students use when interacting with their peers in the target language.

3 Under what conditions does student-student interaction take place in the foreign language classroom?

4 What attitudes do French language students hold relative to the use of student-student interaction in the classroom?

**Key Terms**

The explanations below are provided to give a clear understanding of the meaning of specific terms used in this research.

1 "Interaction" is verbal behavior that involves two or more individuals in a communicative effort.

2 "Student-student interaction" or "student talk" is verbal behavior that involves only students and excludes verbal exchange in which the instructor participates.

3 "Participant observation" is a research technique that uses the investigator (participant observer) as the instrument of research in a social situation where the objectives, according to Spradley (1980), are "to engage in activities appropriate to the situation and to observe activities, people, and physical aspects of the situation" (p. 54). The results are analyzed by comparing the findings with previous observations, organizing them into classifications, making interpretations, verifying those interpretations with participants, and writing the theory.

4 "Ethnographic interviewing" refers to the procedure of interviewing participants of a study (informants) for the purpose
of producing a description of the social situation being studied. The procedure consists of interrogation that first has a wide focus and, then, narrows in focus after subsequent questioning.

5 "Constant comparative method" provides for the analysis of data collected by delineating the following four steps: 1) comparing incidents applicable to each category assigned, 2) integrating these categories and their properties, 3) delimiting the theory, and 4) writing the theory (Glaser and Strauss, 1967, p. 105).

6 "Member check" is a technique that allows the investigator to verify specific interpretations by asking various participants to comment on data collected.

7 "Cross check" is a technique used by the researcher to verify information obtained from participants using different methods of data collection. In this study, it refers to the use of attitude questionnaires and ethnographic interviewing.

8 "Triangulation" involves the use of three major methods of data collection from which the investigator's interpretations are corroborated and hypotheses are derived. This study used participant observation during class meetings, ethnographic interviewing, and tape-recordings of student-student interaction. Triangulation also results when data is viewed from three different perspectives such as time (several months), space (different vantage points in the classroom and different classrooms) and different types of participants (students and instructor).

9 "Systematic observation" refers to the procedure of observing student behavior through the use of an instrument that allows the researcher to focus on certain aspects of that interaction and includes a framework for the analysis of those observations. This can be accomplished by using a device known as an interaction
analysis system and/or by employing participant observation.

10 "Thick description" refers to the interpretive process of sorting out the multiplicity of complex conceptual structures in the study of a social setting and assessing their social basis and importance in written form (Geertz, 1973).
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this study is to examine student-student interaction and to describe that phenomenon as it occurs in an Intermediate French classroom. In order to consider all pertinent information, a review of the literature in each of the following areas is presented in this chapter: classroom interaction, student-student interaction, and discourse analysis.

Classroom Interaction

This review first examines studies in classroom interaction and the instruments developed for that research. Observation techniques have been used as a key method for data collecting in educational research. These techniques have provided greater insight into teacher-student roles, teaching behaviors, characteristics of good teachers, varieties of student participation, group dynamics, and teacher-student interaction. The development of special tools, called systems of interaction analysis, has greatly aided data collection in the last two decades (Simon and Boyer, 1974).

Although numerous systems have been devised for analyzing classroom behavior, only those that are pertinent to this study are reviewed here. These systems of analysis, devised prior to actual observation, have helped the researcher in a variety of ways: to focus attention, to quantify information, and to reduce the complexity of data gathering during instructional events in the teaching-learning process. The assumption of these quantified analyses is that "different durations and frequencies of particular behaviors affect the kinds and amounts of learning that occur" (Lightbown and Barkman, 1977-78, p. 71).

One of the earliest studies to use observation techniques, and one to contribute much to classroom research, was that of Bellack et al. (1966). In a study of the teaching process through analysis of teacher and student linguistic behavior in the classroom, Bellack and his colleagues focused on language as the primary instrument of communication. The Bellack study consisted of fifteen high school social science teachers and their students who were assigned a special unit of instruction. Pre- and post-measures of knowledge and attitude were taken. The coding of 60 protocols recorded during four successive class sessions was followed by statistical methods for analyzing the results. Bellack et al.
developed a system for analyzing meanings conveyed by linguistic behavior in terms of pedagogical significance and substantive content. This system has had considerable influence in subsequent research on interaction. Along with the discovery of underlying rules that govern classroom behavior, the system itself was one of the most significant contributions of the Bellack study.

In focusing on language, Bellack et al. described patterns of verbal interaction that characterized classroom behavior and studied linguistic variables of classroom discourse that related to learning. Verbal activities involved in teaching were found to be reciprocal affairs involving both teacher and students. The role of the teacher, therefore, could be most adequately described in relation to the student's role. There was also a need to know the content of each participant's utterance because the primary function of language was the communication of meaning. The search for the meaning of each utterance led to a linguistic description of classroom behavior in terms of pedagogical significance and topic of the communication. The Bellack study investigated both the function of classroom discourse and the meanings that are communicated.

Characterizing these verbal interactions as a social game consisting of various verbal behaviors or "moves," Bellack et al. identified the "moves" used by teacher and students in the teaching-learning process. Interactions were categorized into four "moves": structuring, soliciting, responding, and reacting. "Structuring" refers to the pedagogical function of beginning or ending an interaction and can be employed by both teacher and students alike. "Soliciting" is a move that serves to elicit either a verbal, cognitive, or physical response. "Responding" occurs in relation to a solicitation whereas "reacting" tends to modify, clarify, or evaluate the preceding move.

In the following example of interaction in an English as a Second Language (ESL) classroom, the teacher's second utterance contains two moves. The first part of the utterance restates the student's response, acknowledging the use of correct grammatical structure, reacting to the response; the second part asks for additional information, a solicitation for another response.

T: Did you have your car repaired?
S: Yes, I had my car repaired.
T: You had your car repaired. Did the mechanic do a good job?

Moves that occur in the classroom in cyclical patterns or various combinations are referred to as teaching cycles. One of the more common cycles consists of structuring, soliciting, and responding; that is, the teacher structures, then solicits an answer, and a student responds. Patterns such as the teaching cycle emerged from observational studies, causing researchers to conclude that underlying rules, which are not always obvious to the teacher or students, govern classroom behavior.

The second major system of interaction analysis was developed by Flanders (1970), who created the Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC) to
measure teacher and student verbal behavior in the classroom. This instrument, which has become the most widely used and adapted system consists of seven categories for teacher behavior (accepts feelings, praises or encourages, clarifies or develops student's ideas, asks questions about content, lectures, gives directions, and criticizes or justifies authority), two categories for student talk (student talk- response and student talk- initiation) and a tenth general category for silence and confusion. The system also allowed for subcategories to indicate the teacher's tendency to limit or maximize student participation. According to Wing (1980), the outstanding contributions of the system are its characterization of teacher in terms of direct (first four categories of teacher behavior) and indirect (last three categories of teacher behavior) influence, and the system's simplicity, elements which have spurred its widespread incorporation into teacher preparation programs.

The Observational System for Instructional Analysis (OSIA) developed by Hough (1980), combined elements of the Bellack and Flanders system. The final version of the OSIA is organized according to three types of behavior: substantive, appraisal and managerial. These behaviors are then categorized into 13 instructional events (thinking, senses, manipulating artifacts, initiates, responds, solicits clarification, solicits, judges correctness, personal positive judgment, acknowledgement, judges incorrectness, personal negative judgment, and instructionally non-functional behavior). These categories are then subdivided into additional subfunctions, arranged so that one event can be coded on nine dimensions. Coding typically takes place every five seconds whether the behavior is observed in the classroom or video-taped. The coded data is then entered into a matrix whose four quadrants permit a visual interpretation of classroom interaction with the source of verbal behavior indicated. A variety of analyses are also possible using the data collected. These include the frequency of a specific behavior (a pool) and the occurrence of several behaviors repeated in sequence during the session (a chain).

Jarvis (1968) was one of the first to adapt a major analysis system to the peculiarities of foreign language teaching. He devised a framework based on a sign system for observing and measuring language skills for the foreign language classroom. Focusing on the use of two kinds of speech, drill and real communication, the research differentiated between these two kinds of language behavior typical of the foreign language classroom. In addition, the system included a means to indicate whether or not the utterance was in the native or target language.

In her adaptation of Flander's system to the foreign language classroom, Moskowitz (1968, 1971) created another instrument: the Foreign Language INTeraction analysis system (FLINT). The new system was modified in such a way as to allow for notations on error-correction, teacher criticism, amounts of choral work, and laughter. This system has been widely used in teacher preparation, pre-service and in-service levels, because it allows one to obtain specific and objective data of a non-evaluative nature on student and teacher classroom behavior.

Because of the emphasis on oral skills and communications and the need to
understand what happens in the foreign language classroom, Wragg (1970) adapted Flanders' FIAC to study classroom interaction. He used categories #1-10 in the native language (teacher accepts feelings, teacher praises or encourages, teacher clarifies or develops student's ideas, teacher asks questions about content, teacher lectures, teacher gives directions, teacher criticizes or justifies authority, student responds, student initiates, and silence or confusion) and added categories #11-20 for the target language.

Wragg employed the dual category system in research on interaction in the foreign language classroom. In the first, second, and third year of study in French and German classes, one-time observations were made of ten students in each class, ranging in age from 11-13 years. The data were collected during the last two weeks of a three month teaching period. Of the lessons observed, 82% of class instruction involved talk, and of the total talk tallied, 59% was in the foreign language. Wragg noted that teachers talked more when English was the language of instruction. Another interesting finding was that "almost all (student) responses in the foreign language were in reply to the teacher's questions or commands" (p. 118).

In another study investigating learning in the foreign language classroom, Nerenz (1979) examined the use of classroom time in French, Spanish, and German classes, grades 7-12. Observing 20 teachers during 16 weeks of activities, Nerenz based her results on 864 class sessions. She found that teacher talk occupied 70% of class time. In addition, she tallied talk according to skill activity defined by the following categories: "listening comprehension," "speaking," "reading," "writing," "grammar," "culture," and "other." The largest portion of classroom talk was devoted to "grammar" (33%) with the teacher doing most of the talking (63%). The second largest portion was devoted to "other" uses of class time which included language for activities such as organizational purposes, assigning and correcting homework, testing, and other miscellaneous events (28%). In this category, teacher talk comprised 70% of all interaction. The third largest portion of class time was "speaking" which occupied only 24% of total class time and was dominated by teacher talk (54%). Next was "culture" with 7% of total class time and in which the teacher was responsible for 71% of the talking, followed by "reading" (8%) with the teacher responsible for 60% of all verbal behavior. "Writing" and "listening comprehension" both occupied 2% each of instructional time with 84% and 78% respectively of all talk conducted by the teacher.

Studying interaction from a different perspective, Seliger (1977) examined two types of language learners as characterized by the amount of practice in which the student engaged. Defining practice as any verbal interaction that requires the use of the second language, Seliger grouped students as "low-input generators" or "high-input generators" based on a quantitative measure of verbal interaction observed during class activities. Student achievement on language tests was then compared to student performance in verbal interaction. Also included in the study were field sensitivity tests, cloze tests, and questionnaires devised to assess language contact outside the classroom. The study tested the hypothesis that students, who utilize all language environments for practice by initiating and involving other students in interaction, benefit more from these
practice opportunities than those students who play a relatively passive role.

Like Nerenz, Seliger suggested that students would benefit from greater opportunity to use the foreign language by initiating language moves. In many instances, Seliger found that "low-input generators" interacted only with the teacher. Based on the results of his observations, Seliger concluded that exposure to language is "neutral" in the language acquisition process: "Being exposed to language is not like being exposed to a virus. One doesn't catch it automatically" (p. 275).

Interested in the effect of real communication on student attitude and achievement, Omaggio (1982) devised an instrument of observation to measure the degree of personalization in classroom language. Somewhat similar to the Jarvis (1968) instrument, which focused on differentiating drill from real communication, this instrument differentiates between personal and impersonal communication. Omaggio defines personalized communication as "a verbal exchange" that consists of requesting or sharing personal information, concerns, feelings, opinions, and judgments. Impersonal exchanges involve soliciting or giving a correct response as in mechanical drills, grammar lectures, or repetitions. Of the eight categories defined for teacher and students, two were common for both:

Teacher categories:
1. Expresses feelings, opinions, judgment, or gives factual information (private knowledge).
2. Requests feelings, opinions, judgments, factual information (private knowledge).
3. Prompts, encourages, facilitates responses.
4. Pattern drilling, manipulative language practice, dictation: focus on language forms.
5. Lecturing, explaining.
6. Requests information about lesson content - not private knowledge.
7. Repetition, restatement of response, or correction.
8. Classroom management.

Student Categories:
1. Same as Teacher Category #1.
2. Same as Teacher Category #2.
3. Paired/or group activity - communicative focus.
4. Requests clarification, explanation.
5. Drilling, manipulative practice, dictation, focus on form, individual or choral response.
6. Paired/or group activity - linguistic forms are focus.
7. Demonstrates knowledge of factual information about lesson content.
8. Silence, confusion.
The instrument was used in two studies whose results indicated that 1) the personalization of classroom communication can be objectively measured, 2) personalization does occur in differing degrees in the foreign language classroom, 3) students and teachers maintain their separate roles as revealed by classroom interaction (e.g., students ask few questions, teachers do not give much personal information), and 4) there was a high positive correlation between teacher effectiveness and the degree of personalization in classroom communication. The results suggest, according to Omaggio, "that the more effective teacher, in the eyes of both supervisors and students, is one who tries to incorporate such personalized language practice into daily lesson plans" (p. 266).

Another study valuable to the present research is Wing's (1980) investigation on teacher talk. Wing examined teacher use of language for linguistic and communicative functions in the foreign language classroom. Definitions of linguistic and communicative functions, identification of teacher verbal behaviors, and examination of the relationship between individual teacher differences and teaching behaviors constituted the primary focus of the investigation. The principal question dealt with the manner in which teachers use their linguistic and communicative competence while teaching. In addition, the study examined the specific functions in which teachers used native and target language.

The study, which used an ex post facto design, assessed the extent and type of teacher target language use and related those findings to specific variables of teacher preparation, experience, and characteristics. Teacher classroom behavior was examined from video-tapes made in the classroom of 15 high school Spanish teachers who volunteered to participate. This was done using a system of analysis for communicative and linguistic functions designed for the study. An additional 27 teachers completed a questionnaire on educational background, teacher preparation, and related experiences.

Research findings indicated that teachers spent 46% of their time using the native language and the remaining 54% in the target language. Of language used for communicative purposes, 52% was in the native tongue, while 48% was in the target language. Wing also found that about one quarter of total teacher talk was for linguistic functions compared to 74% for communicative functions. From that she concluded that teachers were modeling, cueing, and reinforcing for one-quarter of their total talk and structuring, soliciting, responding, and reacting for three quarters. The ratio of teacher talk in the target language for linguistic purposes to communicative purposes was 37 to 63; that is, two-thirds of the talk carried meaningful messages and the remaining one-third was communication about language itself.

Knowing how teachers use language is essential in examining the various aspects of student language. Bellack et al. (1966) indicated in their study of the teaching process that teacher and student roles involved reciprocal verbal behavior. The role of the teacher, therefore, is best described in relation to the students' role. The reverse may also be true; that is, the students' role will take into consideration teacher behavior. Wragg (1970) pointed out that student response in the classroom was almost always in response to the teacher's
questions. Nerenz (1979) suggested that the teacher's role of modeling, cueing, explaining, and providing feedback occupied time that students might spend attaining language competency.

Longitudinal research conducted in the natural setting (Lightbown, 1977; Lightbown, 1979; Lightbown and Barkman, 1977-78) is also important to the scope of this study for two reasons. First, in conducting a naturalistic study, collection of data from a variety of sources is essential, and the timing of that collection is vital to the integrity of the study. The research included data from a wide variety of sources collected over a one-year time period in the studies. Second, the model that was developed for analyzing interaction is relevant to the present study, and, therefore, is included in this review.

The first report reviewed here (Lightbown and Barkman, 1977-78) described 1) interaction in ESL classes, 2) the language used both by the teachers and the teaching materials, and 3) the relationship between classroom interaction and learning. This description was presented in the first year progress report on a three-year study of interaction among learners, teachers, and texts. The subsequent reports, however, were not available at the time this investigator reviewed literature for the present study. Data were collected early in Lightbown study to help researchers formulate specific questions about student language and language use. The following were included in the data collection: a picture description task, grammaticality judgment lists (for the evaluation of grammar recognition), an oral interview, the Comprehensive English Language Test (CELT), and a questionnaire on language use. Preliminary observation indicated that the patterns of student language ("foreigner talk") were complex and subject to great variations. Common to all interviewees was a slowness in the rate of speech, a need to verify questions and statements, and the repair of wh-questions as yes/no or choice questions.

In the first year of the study, audio-taping of 6th, 7th, and 8th grade classes was done once a week during the first semester and twice a week during the second semester, representing 15%-20% of ESL class time. Two researchers were present at each recording session to identify students as they participated. Seventy hours of classroom data were recorded. The system of analysis used to describe this classroom interaction was based on aspects of the following: 1) language and language related behavior of teachers and students, 2) what language was used, 3) how much language was used, 4) by whom, and 5) under what circumstances it was produced. The assumption of such a system is that conditions and quantity of exposure to a second language result in different kinds of student performance. For this reason, it was necessary to distinguish between such language elements as student responses to pattern drill and to spontaneous speech. The use of qualitative measures, thus, seemed appropriate for the analysis of the data obtained from the foreign language learning situation.

To establish the categories used in the system for analysis, certain strategies were exercised. First, categories were recognized as arbitrary and not mutually exclusive as was the case in many interaction analysis systems. Second, categories were not defined by the source as in the Flanders system since the same discourse functions were believed to be produced by both teacher and
student. High-inference categories that required knowledge of intentions or perceptions of participants were avoided. The number of categories was limited to make their use feasible without making generalities too broad. Categories for all utterances were defined explicitly to avoid problems of overlapping, thus insuring greater interrater reliability. The model for analysis of interaction established for this research consisted of five "axis" or primary categories: 1) sources (by whom), 2) language events and language related behavior (what language and how much), 3) immediate discourse functions (acts), 4) mid-level discourse functions (moves), and 5) high-level discourse functions (pedagogical terms).

In the second report, Lightbown (1977) describes the encoding of certain semantic relations in speech and second language development of two five-year old children. These French language learners, who had had no formal second language training, were submersed in a classroom situation where other children and the teacher were native French speakers. Utterances, taken from tapes of the children, were grouped into categories of semantic relations: existence or naming (C'est Papa), recurrence (encore boire thé), negation (pas doc. bébé), action (manger tout), locative state (lunettes tête), possession (bebe à moi), attribution (est gros), and notice (regarde ça). Lightbown concluded from analysis of eleven language samples that second language learners, like first language learners, named things, talked about people doing things to objects, about recurrence and disappearance of objects, called for the attention of others to what they heard, saw and did. There was no evidence of a sequence of acquisition, however, among second language learners. Also, utterances of the second language learners depended less on what they knew how to say, and more on what they wanted to say. Because of their cognitive maturity, they were able to use pivotal expression to convey meaning: "(they) simply borrowed forms learned for other uses and used them to express a wider variety of semantic relations than first language learners with similar linguistic skills" (p. 144).

The third report (Lightbown, 1979) focused on the development of form-meaning relationships in information gathering. This time, a sequence emerged to the acquisition of interrogative forms: 1) 'qu'est-ce que,' 'quoi' and 'où,' 2) 'qui,' 3) 'pourquoi,' 4) 'quand,' and 'comment.' As second language learners, they were able to "stretch their old forms further than first language learners do because of the relatively greater gap between cognitive and linguistic development" (p. 108).

In summary of the aforementioned reports, Lightbown conducted a series of longitudinal studies. The information here was based on reports available. The first report, which comprised the first year summary of a three-year project, dealt with interaction in an ESL classroom and offered a qualitative system of analysis of student language and language use. While determining the sequence of acquisition of linguistic features in English as a second language was among the primary goals of the second and third studies reported here, data collection and the development of the instrument for analysis of classroom interaction are bearers of pertinent information to the present research.

Following the same naturalistic mode of investigation, Delamont (1976) presented a comprehensive work on observations in the general classroom, using
first-hand accounts of interaction. From her observations, Delamont analyzed classroom behavior using contemporary sociological theory. In her study, she provides a theoretical framework for understanding classroom interaction based on symbolic interactionist theory which adheres to the naturalistic paradigm. According to Delamont, we use symbolic interaction each time we enter a new social setting by watching, asking, and learning how to behave. The theory states specifically that:

all humans are possessed of a self, and that they are reflexive, of self-interacting. That, simply, means that we think about what we are doing and what goes on inside our heads is crucial element in how we act (p. 23).

The "self" is viewed throughout as a dynamic, ever changing process. Moreover, much of human interaction is symbolic, involving interpretation on the part of the individuals interacting. For example, in a typical interaction, one individual interprets and reacts while the other continues the same cycle: interprets, reacts, reinterprets, and so forth. Successful interaction, viewed as the "give-and-take" between teachers and students, is a process of negotiation "by which everyday realities are constantly defined and redefined" (p. 25). The notion that "changing patterns of classroom life are socially constructed over time and are constantly subject to negotiation and renegotiation" is basic to symbolic interactionist theory (p. 26).

The setting, a key to research, consists of temporal, physical, institutional, and educational aspects of the classroom (Delamont, 1976; Evertson and Mehan, 1978). Temporal elements reflect the view that each day's interactions build upon the interactions of previous days and are perceived as intersections of the teacher's and students' "personal status and identity over time" (Delamont, 1976, p. 27). In other words, temporal elements are neither static nor ahistorical. The physical setting of any classroom studied consists of location, spatial relationships, layout, and decor. The institutional setting refers to the whole school or university and deserves consideration because the organization of each class is closely tied to the organization of the whole institution. Educational aspects deal with policies that relate to curriculum, evaluation, text selection, and staff recruitment. In considering the temporal, physical, institutional, and educational features of classroom life, a better understanding of the interactional events can be reached.

In addition to these features, data collection in Delamont's research consists of case studies, interviews, and systematic observation. The analysis of such data is accomplished by transcribing records and, then, describing the phenomenon, a technique that involves high-inferences. Using such techniques, Delamont and colleagues have defined the following characteristics of the student role in the classroom:

1 The student is usually "subservient" because of the
"socially accepted dominance" of the teacher.

2 Student status lies with both teacher and peers.

3 There is a certain fluidity, or dynamic quality, to student status as it changes according to the situation.

4 There is a relationship between one's status as it changes according to the situation.

5 Student perceptions of a "good student" usually match those of the teaching staff.

6 Students possess a basic concept of what the role of the teacher should be. Any violation of that norm will result in a loss of respect.

7 The daily behavior patterns and relationships that are established are a result of the manner in which students organize themselves to figure out both the teacher's expectations and the participation required.

The uncovering of patterns of behavior reveals the part students play in the negotiating process. Student strategies involve determining what the teacher wants and expects and giving what is wanted. As Delamont indicates, in most cases "playing the teacher's game" means finding the right or most likely answers, and responding correctly to the teacher's question.

Results from interactional studies (Flanders, 1970; Wregg, 1970; Nerenz, 1979) indicate that two thirds of classroom talk is the teacher's. In fact, Delamont (1978), noting that talking and teaching are bound together almost synonymously in Western culture, suggested that we imagine the silent teacher in order to assess the importance talk occupies in the teacher role. Delamont gave the account of one classroom experience, in which the teacher remained silent, resulting in excessive student anger because of the abrupt change in accepted classroom patterns. Of the two-thirds teacher talk, very little is genuine request for information according to Delamont. Classroom speech, where the teacher knows the answers to questions being asked, is not like ordinary conversation. Questioning strategies depend primarily on the source of knowledge. When that source lies with the teacher, then, classroom interaction consists of cross-questioning, checking-up, and interrogation (Delamont, 1976:102). Because of the student role in providing the correct answer, verbal ping-pong results. For the discussion to resemble more closely normal conversation, knowledge must be located elsewhere than with the teacher. It is only in the latter condition that students are genuinely engaged in negotiating knowledge. If the teacher dispenses the knowledge, then, the "content is organized into tight, logical steps over which the pupil has no control" (p. 104).

Delamont draws a parallel between the teacher's role in controlling knowledge in the classroom and in controlling verbal behavior. If the content of
activities is organized in such a manner that the teacher controls the verbal behavior of students through the use of cues and questions, then, students can only respond. If, however, the activities involve students in situations where interaction is not predetermined, but is like normal conversation, the negotiation process is enacted, setting into play the use of different language functions, not just information giving.

**Student-Student Interaction**

Research on student-student interaction is a recent phenomenon. In experimental research, the following studies outside the field of foreign languages bring relevant information to the phenomenon under study. These studies support the belief that student-student interaction generally enhances student achievement. Two non-experimental studies whose research techniques and findings are relevant to the present study will also be examined. The first of these two studies deals with interaction between 13-14 year olds in several subject areas and the second study examines interaction between English as a Second Language (ESL) students at the college level.

The research of Johnson et al. (1981b) represents one of the most significant bodies of research on student-student interaction. Because previous studies offered contradictory conclusions that resulted in major controversies, Johnson et al. responded to the need for a comprehensive review by using a meta-analysis of studies on student-student interaction. A meta-analysis integrates findings of studies that share common conceptual hypotheses, usually resulting in statements that are more precise and express greater confidence than the individual studies (Johnson et al., 1981b). The meta-analysis reviewed 122 studies, including studies conducted by Johnson and his associates, investigating the effects of cooperative, competitive, and individualistic goal structures on achievement in most academic areas. Student-student interaction is an inherent part of cooperative goal structures because in small group task work, the goals of separate individuals are linked together in a manner that requires all individuals to put forth a cooperative effort to attain their individual goals: "goals of separate individuals are so linked together that there is a positive correlation among their goal attainment" (p. 47).

The Johnson study used three meta-analysis procedures: voting, effect size, and z-score methods. In comparing cooperation to competition, the researchers arrived at the following results for each procedure:

- **Voting method** - cooperation promoted higher achievement
  65 to 8 with 36 no difference

- **Effect size** - .78 favoring cooperation, which means that the average person in the cooperation condition performed .75 SD above the average individual in the competition condition
z-score - 16.00 favoring cooperation, which means that the probability this is due to chance is less than .00001

In comparing cooperation to individualistic effort, these findings were revealed:

voting method - 108 to 6 in favor of cooperation with 42 no difference

effect size - .78 favoring cooperation (the same as in cooperation vs. competition)

z-score - 24.01 favoring cooperation (probability is less than .00001) (p. 51).

From these results, researchers concluded that cooperation is considerably more effective than interpersonal competition and individualistic efforts for all subject areas and all ages for promoting achievement and productivity. Studies in foreign languages, however, were not included in the 122 studies pooled.

In a study that also examined the cooperative effort in learning versus the individual effort, Peterson and Janicki (1979) investigated aptitude-treatment interactions in elementary school children. Students were placed in two different learning situations: large group and small group. For a two-week instruction period covering a unit of study, each of two elementary teachers taught two classes of randomly assigned students with each class using a different approach. A pretest consisted of aptitude measures; posttests assessed achievement, attitude, and retention measures. Using regression analysis, the researchers found significant aptitude treatment interaction for both preference of approach and ability. Students who favored small group learning actually did worse in that learning situation than in the large group approach. High ability students did better in small-group learning, whereas low ability students performed best in the large-group approach. According to the researchers, this was most likely due to the fact that high ability students benefited from teaching their peers. Low ability students appeared to gain more from teacher directed instruction than group interaction. Although this study examined the behavior of only two ability levels, it provided information on the relationship of individual characteristic and group process variables to learning in small and large groups. The study suggests that, since no one teaching approach was found best for all students, student achievement can be improved by adapting instruction to the needs of individual students.

A second study by Peterson et al. (1981), which focused on three ability levels, supported these earlier findings. This study examined ability X treatment interaction effects on student learning in large-group and small-group teaching approaches. Using similar aptitude measures as the Peterson and Janicki (1979) study, elementary students in math were assigned to classes by stratified random assignment, receiving one of the two teaching approaches. Previous studies
(Webb, 1977; Peterson and Janicki, 1979) indicated the existence of a curvilinear aptitude-treatment interaction for ability. Supporting these earlier findings, researchers found that high ability students and low ability students did better in small group tasks than in large group learning because of the amount of time spent on-task (the high ability student did the explaining and the low ability student was attentive to the explanation). The average ability student excelled in the large-group situation.

A later study (Swing and Peterson, 1982), also directed at elementary school children, examined student ability and student behaviors during small group interaction in an effort to determine the relationship between those variables and small-group learning. Groups of four students each were randomly assigned to either control or treatment condition. Students in the treatment condition were trained in small-group interaction. During a four week period, students received regular instruction in math followed by work on assignments in small-groups of mixed ability. Pretesting consisted of aptitude tests and questionnaires directed at assessing student attitude toward math. Assessments on achievement, retention, and attitude toward math were made by posttests. The following two hypotheses were tested:

1) The effects of small group learning on student achievement are produced by students' participation in small group interaction.

2) High and low ability students are more often involved in this process than are medium ability students (p. 260)

The researchers found that "trained" students, that is, students who had been instructed in and had practiced small group work, were more involved in task-related interaction than "untrained" students. The results also supported the belief that learning in high ability and low ability students was facilitated by task-related interaction, whereas medium ability student learning was not.

In summarizing empirical evidence from the experimental studies cited, research supports peer interaction as a facilitator in academic performance. In the form of cooperation as it occurs in small groups, peer interaction is suggested to be more effective than both competition between individuals and efforts of a single individual in promoting achievement and productivity. In studies that grouped students according to ability, high and low ability students were found to benefit from peer interaction.

Most valuable to the present research are those findings that investigate how students interact with one another, how they use language to accomplish different tasks. Two non-experimental studies whose contributions are outstanding in regards to understanding interaction and language functions are also representative of another research technique (Barnes and Todd, 1977; Long et al., 1976). This research comes under the rubric of anthropological, naturalistic, or ecological research and involves a type of systematic observation that has been used by anthropologists for decades. In such research the investigator is
responsible for the on-going process of structuring the observations rather than imposing a system of analysis selected prior to observation for collecting data. Evertson and Mehan (1978) suggest that statements resulting from a single occurrence about a student's performance, such as a test, may not accurately represent the observed phenomenon because "behavior is context bound and varies from situation to situation" (p. 15). They propose a system that allows data to be gathered from several perspectives and from "naturally occurring situations." It is this natural element that is of importance to the present study as well as the findings on how students use language with one another.

In the first study to be considered, Barnes and Todd (1977) examined the social interaction of small groups and cognitive strategies that are produced by such interaction. These researchers presented not only the findings of the study, but their research strategies at all stages. These research strategies are of great interest to the present study because of the non-experimental nature of final interpretations and the focus on student-student interaction. One of the primary purposes of the study was to determine the relationship between cognitive and communicative functions in speech. In order to determine this, the researchers made the following assumptions:

1) Speech functions as a means by which people construct and reconstruct views of the world about them.

2) Formal operations result from integrating others' viewpoints and are expressed through articulation as the product of this integration during interaction with peers (p. 1).

The study involved 13 year-olds for whom the research team constructed problem-like tasks. Students were assigned to small groups and interaction was recorded as the students worked through the task. This was done in the absence of the teacher. The researchers expected to see a wider range of speech roles on the part of the students because of the change in control over the discussion from the teacher to the students. They also expected to develop a system for analyzing interaction that would, among other things, relate each utterance to the previous one, indicate the level of modality, specify the speech-role being used, and indicate the verbal forms used to carry out functions. The researchers were unable to put into effect all intended aspects of the system. In fact, there was a great deal of difficulty in developing an analytic system that was "moderately reliable, inclusive, and meaningful" (p. 8).

The study extended over a period of twelve months. The 56 students participating were "average" students as determined by teacher ratings, school records, and aptitude tests, and were assigned groups according to existing friendships. For reasons of a technical nature, the researchers traded naturalness for an audible volume on the recordings; that is, students were taken out of the classroom for recording purposes. Even with the use of stereo recorder equipment in an isolated setting, transcription of the tapes was very time consuming. The eleven hours of taped discussions required approximately 10 hours
of transcribing for each one hour of talk.

An attempt was made to use quantitative analysis on the recorded interaction, but this was abandoned for several reasons. First of all, there was only a minimal difference between the two conditions being compared: assess and non-assess. "Assess" referred to the group's discussion that the teacher would evaluate; "non-assess" was, of course, the group that would not be heard or evaluated. The differences that did occur seemed to be related to sex. For that and other reasons, it was felt that statistical analysis required making "unreasonable assumptions" (p. 12). Furthermore, there was no allowance in the quantitative system for the negotiating aspect of interaction. Barnes and Todd maintained that negotiation is involved in how subject matter is treated and in the social relationships arrived at between students. There were also difficulties in categorizing talk because 1) the informal situation lacked the evidence of structure that is common in most situations (such as teacher-student classroom talk where discourse rules already exist), and 2) the meanings students gave each utterance were not stable, but "fluid and changing, built up out of the existing knowledge and expectations which they brought to the situation, along with their own implicit summary of what went on in the conversation, and their reaction to that summary" (p. 17).

For reasons previously mentioned, Barnes and Todd took the approach of drawing out the more obvious phenomena from the complex meanings that were negotiated in the interaction and made assumptions based on these meanings. The researchers justified this procedure by claiming that the participants themselves used a certain degree of intuition in trying to interpret talk during the interaction process itself. One way to avoid making totally wrong assumptions is to check out the meaning of an utterance with the participants (Guba, 1981; Spradley, 1979; Barnes and Todd, 1977). This is no guarantee, however, because "even for the participants in a conversation, meaning is not static" (Barnes and Todd, 1977, p. 18).

Researchers arrived at a final interpretation by "grounding" the data. In other words, categories were developed from "successive approximations," not an a priori established system imposed on the data. An informal description was presented of what the students were able to achieve in small group, task-oriented session. In examining collaborative skills, researchers organized four categories (initiating, eliciting, extending, and qualifying) from the following descriptions of student talk:

- initiating discussion of a new issue
- qualifying another person's contribution
- implicitly accepting a qualification
- extending a previous contribution
- asking for an illustration to test a generalization
- providing an example
- using evidence to challenge an assertion
- reformulating one's own previous assertion
- obtaining information from others
-completing an unfinished utterance
-encouraging others to continue
-repeating with modifications
-supporting another's assertion with evidence (p. 27).

In examining social skills of group members, Barnes and Todd were concerned primarily with a) how the given tasks were controlled and carried out, b) how disagreement and conflict were handled, c) how support and encouragement was expressed, and d) how behavior differed between the various interaction groups. The focus of the study, however, was concerned with the extent to which these social skills contributed to the group's ability to learn from the discussion. Analysis of the data, expressed in descriptive, rather than categorical terms, revealed pertinent information about student-student interaction. The following findings are considered essential to the present study:

1) Categories such as proposing a topic, redirecting the discussion, and modifying the topic were not as useful in determining the structure of the discussion. Rather, it was found that the discussion was most frequently shaped, in a tacit manner, through moves that initiated, elicited, extended, and qualified.

2) Students did not play the 'role of the teacher' since they were not asking questions of another to which they knew the answer.

3) The students participating in the study were capable of holding the group together in spite of differences of opinion. They challenged one another, but in a manner that implied that the opinion of the other counted.

4) Contributions were solicited for the purpose of "spurring" the participation of particular members.

5) Supportive behavior was expressed through agreement, praise, explicit reference to the contribution of another, positive feelings about the interaction, and naming one another.

6) In comparing the various groups, it was found that distrust among group members affected the ability of the group to work together.

In order to establish how the group's thinking developed, Barnes and Todd created categories of logical relationships which linked one utterance to another as they appeared in the data. These categories, however, were not found to be useful. Consequently, the researchers used a descriptive approach to explain how group members 1) constructed questions that they, in turn, answered, 2) raised new questions, 3) made hypotheses, 4) presented evidence, and 5) expressed
feelings that recreated personal experiences.

The following is a brief summary of the cognitive strategies used by the students in the Barnes study. In reconstructing the questions, students made use of what they already knew; that is, they attempted to understand the questions by building up a frame of reference to which they could all relate. They also demonstrated an ability to move outside the given framework (a series of questions in the task) to ask useful questions on their own. In constructing hypothetical cases, the students' efforts were somewhat "piece-meal," rather than deliberate, but resulted in significant contributions. As a result, Barnes and Todd felt that most of the 13 year-olds were "quite capable of improvising ideas and strategies once they realized that these were acceptable" (p. 56). In the samples of students' discussion, evidence was presented informally from their knowledge outside the classroom. Yet, they expressed the ability to present arguments to support or disprove a general assertion. Also contained in the students repertoire were expressions of personal feelings. These feelings emerged when the discussion touched on the students' own immediate concerns, such as the association of death in a reading with the loss of a family member or of war with the possibility of being drafted. Barnes and Todd stressed the fact that "knowledge which bears on children's daily lives, and on which they base their action, has its own part to play in school learning" (p. 60). In all areas, individuals interpret the world around them in terms of what they already know.

The Barnes-Todd study examined student talk for the purpose of recognizing structures in the conversation that contributed to learning. In doing so, they examined discourse moves in group collaboration, social skills, and cognitive strategies. Findings suggest that 13 year-old students can work together in the absence of teacher-directed interaction, and are able to collaborate in discussing a topic, clarifying their own as well as another's understanding of that topic. The implications of these findings to students in a second language learning situation is significant. Actual student talk in the second language, however, must be examined and analyzed since interacting in one's own native language is very different from that in a foreign tongue.

The second study whose findings are invaluable to the present research is in the field of second language acquisition (Long et al., 1976). This research, which examined student-student interaction in a university ESL class, has revealed some insights on student talk in a second language. Long et al. explored the difference between student language in a teacher-directed learning situation and student language in a small group (pairs) learning situation. Procedures were set up according to the following:

1) Students met with the teacher and began the usual class activity of discussing the reading assignment.

2) A pair of students selected randomly were excused from the large group and continued the discussion independently with only questions to serve as a guide. Meanwhile, the teacher and remaining members of the
class continued with the teacher-directed discussion.

3) After ten minutes, the small group rejoined the larger group.

4) The recordings of the small group and the large group discussions were compared and analyzed according to the variety of language functions used by the students in the two conditions.

The researchers were looking for the communicative acts that students performed with language such as initiating discussion, interrupting, providing an example, negating, and extending another's contribution. Language functions were classified into three categories: pedagogical moves, social skills, and rhetorical acts. Findings of the study indicated that the quantities and varieties of these language functions employed by students working in pairs were significantly higher than students in the teacher-directed condition (p. 148). This difference between the two conditions is felt to be a function of greater opportunity to use the language.

The Long study raises a question essential to the present research: What varieties of language functions exist in the French classroom when students are given the opportunity to use French to accomplish specific tasks that involve peer interaction? The Barnes-Todd study also presented concerns that relate directly to the present study. They were interested in examining student cognitive, social, and communicative strategies during interaction with peers. Having attempted to use an interaction analysis system whose categories were determined a priori, the researchers turned to an alternative method - description - for the analysis of student talk. The final interpretations of the data emerged from the data itself as an example of "grounding the theory." In a conclusion similar to Bellack et al. (1966), Barnes and Todd found that interaction is shaped tacitly by moves of initiation, elicitation, extension, and qualification. They also concluded that students do not move into the teacher role when a teacher is not present, but, rather, employ social skills that allow them to keep the group as a cohesive unit, encourage the contribution of others, challenge peers without exhibiting lack of respect for the idea presented, and give praise and positive feedback. In addition, students were indeed found capable of using their knowledge of the world to construct hypotheses, raise new questions, and present evidence. The study supports the belief that students who are allowed to work together on a task can use time constructively in the attainment of academic goals.

Long's study of student use of language functions in a second language indicated in the same manner as the Barnes-Todd study that students, when given the opportunity to interact with each other, are capable of expressing themselves using a variety of language functions. The problem remains, however, for the foreign language educator to examine student talk with the double perspective on language for communication and thinking, and language as the subject of instruction. Much more research on student interaction in foreign languages is necessary to reach an understanding of how students can use a second language. In the examination of student talk, distinguishing the functional use of language
from the literal meaning of language permits one to arrive at an understanding of the meaning of an utterance. To accomplish this task, the investigation into the functions of language in the French classroom must include the study of discourse analysis, a technique that enables one to determine the difference between form and function of language. This technique is the subject of the next section of this chapter.

Discourse Analysis

In past years linguistic research in second language learning had focused primarily on acquisition of syntactic structures (Coulthard, 1977). This focus was directed to the learner's performance. Stages of development were derived and inferences were made from the student's performance about the strategies adopted in the acquisition process (Larsen-Freeman, 1980). Only recently have linguists and foreign language educators raised questions about the limitations of research that focuses solely on grammatical forms. Using the example of the simple expression "How are you?" Larsen-Freeman demonstrates student knowledge on three levels: syntactic, semantic, and communicative. On the syntactic level, the expression demonstrates knowledge of wh- questions; on the semantic level, it demonstrates knowledge of information gathering; and on the communicative level, it shows knowledge of the ability to initiate conversation. To overlook semantic and communicative levels, as do many studies that examine syntactic structures alone, is to produce an over-simplification of the language acquisition process. An additional feature of communication can be gleaned from the same examples: "How are you?" used instead of "How's it going?" in the appropriate context demonstrates a knowledge of pragmatics of the language, that is, the ability to use appropriate language for a particular context.

Discourse analysis is defined as a technique for determining the relationship between form and function of language (Coulthard, 1977). Coulthard maintains that the most important step in discourse analysis is distinguishing "what is said" from "what is done." Doing this places emphasis on the functional use of language, which is the concern of discourse analysis. The following question, if raised while riding in a car in December, is not requesting information, but, more likely, pleading to have a service rendered: "Does your heater work?" meaning "Could you please turn on your heater? I'm freezing!" Ervin-Tripp (1976) used the following examples of directives to demonstrate how form has little application to the function of language:

1. Is Sybil there? (Get Sybil for me!)
2. I see someone chewing gum! (Stop chewing gum!)
3. What's that on the table? (Take that off the table!)
4. Clean-up time! (Clean-up!)
5. Where do your shoes belong? (Put your shoes away!)
6. Could we have that garbage can over here?
Let's get this thing run off before the faculty meeting starts. (Run off this ditto before the faculty meeting starts!)

The speaker of these various utterances is telling someone else to do or not do something; yet, the imperative, the grammatical form whose purpose is to accomplish these functions, is not used.

Because discourse analysis is used to determine the relationship between form and function of language, in research it can aid in 1) the study of the acquisition syntactic, semantic, communicative and pragmatic functions of language, 2) input to the learner, and 3) the relationship of input to the utterance (Hatch, 1978). It is a technique that recognizes that communication occurs in contexts where utterances are contiguous with preceding and succeeding utterances (Coulthard, 1977). It is rare that communication takes place in isolated or individual utterances. The following examples demonstrate a rather curious conversation:

A: Hi, old buddy. How's it going?
B: On the contrary, it doesn't bother me at all.
A: If I'm not mistaken, Tuesday nights you always go to bed too late.
B: Who's always doing the yakking at your house.

B's utterances are in violation of discourse rules; that is, they do not relate to what was said before. As Coulthard (1977) points out, a string of grammatically correct sentences does not become discourse unless there is also coherence. Natural discourse and grammatical concerns differ in construction. Whereas grammar requires cohesion (the relationship between parts of a sentence that forms texts), discourse requires coherence (a logical sequence of utterances). Below is a chart adapted from Coulthard's comparison of grammar and natural discourse that can clarify this difference:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammar is concerned with:</th>
<th>Natural Discourse is concerned with:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rules of usage in sentences</td>
<td>rules of use describing how utterances perform social acts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sentences that combine to form texts</td>
<td>utterances which combine to form discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the relationship between</td>
<td>the relationship between rules</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following examples (Kramsch, 1981) are both coherent discourse, but the second is the only example of a cohesive text:

1 A: Can you go to Frankfurt tomorrow?  
   B: Lufthansa pilots are on strike.

2 A: Can you call me tomorrow?  
   B: No, I can't (p. 2).

According to Kramsch, rules of discourse cannot be expressed in grammatical terms. In order to understand what takes place between speaker and listener, Kramsch believes it is necessary to examine the functional level of discourse existing between grammar and content that regulates verbal interaction. The search to bring understanding to the relationship between form and function has lead to studies of "speaker intent." As an explanation of the relationship, "speaker intent" has not been totally satisfactory, but it has steered researchers to the notion of the "speech act."

Based on Austin's study of meaning, a speech act or utterance can do three things simultaneously (Austin, 1962). It is the act of "saying" something; it is also the act "performed" in saying something: and it is also the act performed "by or as a result of" saying something. Kramsch (1981) uses the example, "The ice over there is thin," to demonstrate how these different levels are expressed (p. 3). "The ice over there is thin" is what is said. Austin (1965) refers to this as an locutionary act. When meaning goes beyond the statement, however, to "warn" the listener, this is called an illocutionary act. When the purpose of the speaker is to change the listener's intended behavior (to keep the listener away from the thin ice), then, this is referred to as a perlocutionary act. The listener will most likely not try out the ice.

Using the term "function" to denote the purposive nature of communication, conversational analyst and linguist Halliday (1973) defined the following functions that speech acts or utterances achieve:

1 instrumental  - manipulates the environment, causes events to happen.

2 regulatory  - controls events via approval, disapproval, behavior control, etc.

3 representational  - uses language to make statements.
4 interactional - ensures social maintenance via use of slang, jargon, politeness, etc.

5 personal - expresses feelings, emotions, personality, "gut-level" reactions, etc.

6 heuristic - acquires knowledge ("why" questions).

7 imaginative - creates imaginary systems or ideas such as poetry, puns, etc.

The following varieties of speech, then, according to Brown (1980), fall into one of several of Halliday's functions: greeting, parting, inviting, complimenting, interrupting, requesting, evading, criticizing, accusing, agreeing, persuading, reporting, commanding, questioning, sympathizing, apologizing, and so forth.

Searle (1969) differentiated between five kinds of speech acts whose characteristics or sub-categories are listed below:

1 representative (suggesting, hinting, denying, swearing, etc.).

2 commissive (promising, pledging - usually involving future action).

3 declarative (stating in a way to bring about new conditions).

4 expressive (expressing speaker's feelings).

5 directive (getting listener to do or not to do something).

This reorganization of language according to speech acts represents a shift away from sentence grammar toward an understanding of how meaning is given to utterances and how certain syntactic forms are chosen over others (Hatch and Long, 1980).

In addition to the functions of language, rules that govern conversation must be considered. The following aspects of conversation influence general discourse: attention getting, topic nomination, topic development, topic clarification, topic shifting, avoidance, interruption, turn-taking, correcting, topic termination, and so on.

Theories to bring understanding to the relationship between the form and function of language, such as Austin's speech act, have greatly influenced research in linguistics, and, according to Kramsch (1981), have placed high
interest in pragmatics, sociolinguistics, and applied logic. Kramsch defines pragmatics as:

the study of the relationship between sentence meaning (what is literally said), manner of speaking (intonation, pauses, fluency), context of speaking (who, to whom, where, when, and utterance meaning (intended illocutionary act) (p. 40).

According to Kramsch, applying pragmatics to language learning helps identify illocutionary acts that exist in the language, strategies required by each illocutionary act, and the contexts appropriate for each strategy.

In the 1960s the need to understand language as it is used rather than in its abstract forms brought together three disciplines (linguistics, anthropology, and sociology) under one label: sociolinguistics. One of the most prominent sociolinguists, Hymes (1972), maintains that in order to explain the meaning of language, it is necessary to describe the rules of speaking used by members of a specific speech community: "Rules of speaking are the ways in which speakers associate particular modes of speaking, topics or message forms, with particular settings and activities (p. 36)." Thus, Hymes introduced an approach called the "ethnography of speaking" to indicate "a description that is a theory - a theory of speech as a system of cultural behavior" (1974, p. 340) and proposed a model for examining language. For each speech event, data are gathered on message form (structure), message content (topic), setting, participants, purposes (functions and goals), tone, channels of communication, norms of interpretation, and genres.

This approach to the study of "speech" or language has influenced perspectives in other disciplines and current research reflects this impact. Two studies in English as a Second Language (ESL) with implications for the present research deal with turn-taking in a conversational situation and with the propositional content of discourse during interaction. Each study will be examined briefly for its relevance to the present study.

One investigator, Allwright (1980), used a case study approach in a turn-taking activity that allowed him to focus on the behavior of individual students. To observe classroom behavior specific to turn-taking, Allwright devised an instrument that used high inference categories. Although coding was somewhat difficult, he preferred using analytical categories because "they capture things that are interesting" as opposed to the "trivia" gathered by simpler, low-inference classifications (p. 169). In turn-getting, eight categories emerged (e.g. accepting to respond, stealing a turn, taking an unsolicited turn when available); in turn-giving, four different behaviors were identified (e.g. fading out, nominating the next speaker, making a general solicitation and concluding with terminal intonation markers.)

The turn-taking analysis was then applied to a university level ESL class. During a ten-week period tape-recordings were made of two of the twenty hours of
weekly instruction. The teacher, of course, had a disproportionate number of turns over all (42%). Many of these turns were in the category of discourse maintenance, that is, taking an unsolicited turn when available. Another voice, that of a student, emerged as also having a disproportionate number of turns. The turn-taking analysis then permitted the researcher to test out preliminary hypotheses about this "active" student and to establish the pattern of his participation. Although questions concerning the "why" of disproportionate activity for this student remained unanswered, questions about "how" this occurred were answered by the research technique itself. Analysis of turn-taking, which allowed the researcher to focus on an individual student, indicated that he got more than his share of turns by being asked more often, by responding more frequently to general solicitation, and by taking greater advantage of opportunities for discourse maintenance, not by interrupting or stealing turns.

The role of turn-taking in classroom discourse is a contributing element to understanding language as a system of cultural behavior in the classroom setting. The examination of turn-taking in a language classroom where practice is important to language learning can provide a better understanding of what actually occurs in classroom discourse. In the Allwright study, the focus on participants allowed the researcher to establish the pattern of individual participation.

Riley (1976) developed a research instrument for analyzing discourse for the purpose of assisting students of English in preparation of the highly competitive oral examination, the French C.A.P.E.S. Video-tape recordings were made of five simulated examination situations composed of candidates with their juries. The simulations were then analyzed according to a theoretical model based on discourse analysis and communicative competence. The analysis indicated that the organizational effect of propositional content of discourse increased as interaction decreased, that is, the candidate's discourse had greater organizational structure when jury members were not interacting with the candidate by making comments or asking questions. The final product of the research was a proposed course of study to more effectively prepare students for the French C.A.P.E.S examination.

The theoretical model of Riley's instrument of analysis is of interest to the present study. Riley analyzed simulations according to a theoretical model that consisted of three stages: the textual (linguistic behavior and syntax), the communicative (functions or illocutionary acts), and the discursive (interactional tactics and content). Riley found that many students described their problems as weaknesses in vocabulary, idiomatic expressions, and grammar when, in fact, they were problems on the discursive and communicative levels. At the communicative level, an examination task might consist of "reporting" and "criticizing." Under "reporting" fall such language functions as "explaining," "paraphrasing," "recounting," and "summarizing." Under "criticizing," language functions might include "suggesting," "affirming," "persuading," "expressing personal opinions," and "comparing." Examining the same content at the discursive level, the labels "summary" and "discussion" would replace "reporting" and "criticizing." Discourse acts, described in terms of both interactional tactics and content categories, are usually dominant in one of the two. In the study, discourse acts included "salutation," "elicitation," "response," and "presentation." Content categories were literary in nature: plot, theme, narrative, character, setting, and so forth. The
purpose of the Riley study was to analyze discourse in an oral examination setting to determine student language deficiencies and needs for effective preparation. The inclusion of discursive and communicative levels with the linguistic acknowledges the importance of these aspect of language at the French national level (in the C.A.P.E.S.). Riley's theoretical model is similar to that of Barnes and Todd (1977). His discursive and communicative levels correspond loosely with their content and interaction frames. The contrast, however, is in the examination setting. Riley's model expresses a greater concern for evaluating the organizational structure and the propositional content whereas Barnes and Todd are interested in social interaction in small groups and the cognitive strategies that result from interaction.

Another perspective, that of establishing discourse topic, comes from studies which examined video tapes of child-child interaction and adult-child interaction. Keenan and Schieffelin (1976), focused on the manner in which topics in child-adult and adult-adult conversation are initiated, maintained and terminated. This study presented a dynamic model of interaction that delineated moves required for successful discourse. In this model "topic" or "discourse topic" is defined as a "proposition or set of propositions expressing a concern or set of concerns the speaker is addressing (p.337)." To establish a discourse topic, the following steps are required of each participant indicated:

Listener:
1 Must be attentive to speaker's utterance.
2 Has to decipher the message.
3 Must locate persons, objects, ideas and events, (referents) that are contained in the topic.
4 Needs to identify the relationships between referents in the topic (p. 349).

Speaker:
1 Must gain the listener's attention.
2 Needs to articulate distinctly.
3 Must help inform the listener about the identity of referents.
4 Should provide information to enable listener to construct semantic relationships between referents (p. 350).

These requirements form the basis of the interactional model described by Keenan and Schieffelin (p. 353) to establish discourse topic which he has depicted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker elicits attention of listener</th>
<th>negative feedback</th>
<th>positive feedback</th>
<th>discourse topic dropped</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
When the speaker elicits the attention of the listener as a first step, negative feedback leads to another attempt at securing the attention or to dropping the topic. Positive feedback leads to the second step, that of speaking audibly and clearly for the listener's benefit. If this step is met with negative feedback, again a second attempt is made or the topic is dropped. Positive feedback conducts the speaker to the third step, which consists of identifying referents in the discourse topic. If met with negative feedback, as in the two previous steps, this step must be repeated or the topic dropped. Positive feedback leads to the fourth and final step that Keenan labels as "identifies semantic relations obtaining between referents in discourse topic." Negative feedback produces the same results as previously mentioned, but positive feedback at this juncture establishes the discourse topic (p. 353).

Keenan and Schieffelin also describe two distinct types of discourse: continuous and non-continuous. Continuous discourse links new information to a previously established topic, whereas discontinuous discourse involves an utterance that is unrelated to the established topic. Two moves occur in each type of discourse to traverse conversational space. In continuous discourse, "collaboration" of the topic occurs as the listener, becoming speaker, repeats the exact topic of the immediately preceding utterance. "Incorporation" of the topic during continuous discourse takes place when the speaker "integrates a claim or presupposition of an immediately prior utterance" (p. 341). Discontinuous discourse consists of either re-introducing a previously mentioned discourse topic or introducing a new one. In adult conversation, discontinuous discourse requires an identification by use of linguistic devices such as "Well, not to change the subject, but..." or a "Do you know that..."

Referring primarily to child language ability, Keenan and Schieffelin suggested that such a model can be used in determining the notion of competence. By examining the steps taken to establish a discourse topic, determining the amount of conversational space required to satisfy each step, and documenting the means used for implementing each step, it should be possible to evaluate an individual's language competence.

To summarize, recent developments in discourse analysis have revealed that examination of language cannot be limited to syntactical skills, but must include communicative skills, functional uses of language, language in context, pragmatics, and rules that govern discourse. Meaning derived from language
during interaction depends upon a variety of other factors such as setting, purpose, participants, topic, structure, and atmosphere. These additional considerations have had an impact on the manner in which discourse is interpreted in the classroom and on speech effectiveness. Language cannot be analyzed out of context, out of its environment. Interaction that produces language must also be examined in its own environment.

From the review of recent literature on classroom interaction, student-student interaction, and discourse analysis, it is evident that very little is known about what happens in the classroom when students converse with other students in a foreign language and how they use that language to communicate. Since teacher-student interaction is limited by time and numbers in a class setting and because language is a tool for communication, the study of student-student interaction for foreign language educators not only appears justified, but indispensable.

The complexities of human behavior in communication require that the initial study of student-student interaction be conducted in context, in its natural setting. The research paradigm that lends itself to this approach and is compatible with discourse analysis is naturalistic research. Chapter Three contains an explanation of that paradigm and presents procedures employed in this study on student-student interaction.
CHAPTER III

Research Design and Procedures

Naturalistic Research

In the last decade there has been a great deal of interest in uncovering what actually goes on in the classroom during the teaching-learning process. Earlier studies and much present-day research have controlled variables, as in experimental research, for either student, teacher or teaching method. By assessing student achievement, researchers were able to deduce what occurred during treatment. Today's researchers, however, view the classroom as an indispensable setting for investigating the teaching-learning process. A growing body of research now includes the examination of actual classroom behavior. Data to describe natural classroom processes are usually obtained from either observation or measurement of teachers' or students' performance in classroom activities (Long, 1980).

An inquiry conducted within the naturalistic paradigm provides a means to describe and explain the natural situation of the classroom. Tikunoff and Ward (1980) have defined the term "naturalistic" as "delimiting the focus of inquiry to the natural way in which an organism interacts with other organisms and with its environment naturally, in its own niche, in its natural setting" (p. 265). Evertson and Mehan (1978) refer to the approach using ecological terms when insisting upon the need to develop strategies that "focus on the sociological nature of human interaction in light of total classroom ecology" (p. 13). The emphasis is upon the whole setting in its natural environment.

Guba (1981) refers to the approach as a naturalistic "paradigm" rather than a "method" to avoid confusing the fact that a particular method (qualitative or quantitative) can be used in support of either a naturalistic or rationalistic approach. Other adjectives used to refer to an investigation employing the same criteria as the naturalistic paradigm are phenomenological, inductive, holistic, subjective, process-oriented, ecological, anthropological, or ethnographic. These procedures, which have long been accepted modes of investigation for the social sciences, are becoming useful tools for the trained investigator in educational research.

As research that occurs in the field, naturalistic inquiry is based on the assumption that there are multiple realities. Each participant has a different perspective or interpretation of an event. In conventional research, a single or separate reality, known as a variable and defined by the investigator, can be independently manipulated. Such a narrow focus, however, sets up a filtering system that acts as a barrier between the researcher and the phenomenon being
examined (Rist, 1977). Therefore, the recognition of multiple realities leads the naturalistic investigator to search for an understanding of the interrelatedness of those realities. Through a naturalistic paradigm, the researcher perceives "social life as the shared creativity of individuals" and views the social world as a shifting, dynamic phenomenon (Filstead, 1979, p. 35). Thus, participants of a naturalistic study are conceptualized as active agents, negotiating, interpreting, and agreeing upon patterns of interaction.

A second assumption of naturalistic research is that the researcher "can maintain a discrete (and discreet) distance from the objects of the inquiry" (Guba, 1981, p. 4). The researcher, who becomes the instrument of research in order to gain greater flexibility and insight into the situation being examined, must maintain an independence from the participants. Guba contends that objectivity traditionally gained from paper-and-pencil or physical instruments is possible and can be achieved by confirming the data produced.

In addition to a sense of detachment or objectivity, attributes of a naturalistic investigator consist of 1) a sense of perspective which allows the researcher to distinguish the important from the unimportant or a part from the whole, 2) a sense of humor and humility which allows one to reposition emotion in order to get to the level of the informants, and 3) empathy or the ability to put oneself in the place of others (Arewa, 1981). A good investigator must also be able to record, categorize, and code data, and most importantly, make decisions on how to organize fieldnotes and data, a process that has been refined and labeled "theoretical sampling" (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). This process of data collection generates theory, allowing the researcher to develop the theory during the collection and analysis cycle as it emerges from the data.

In naturalistic research, the source of theory emerges from the data themselves rather than from an a priori statement of hypotheses. Whereas a rationalistic approach evolved for verifying or confirming theories, the naturalistic approach evolved to discover or generate theories (Reichardt and Cook, 1979; Filstead, 1979). Glaser and Strauss (1967) provide a careful framework through which researchers can ground their theory in the reality they are examining. In the grounding of the theory, researchers make use of theories, concepts, and categories suggested by the data themselves (Filstead, 1979). Grounding of the theory allows investigators to build upon and expand the less obvious or tacit knowledge, enhancing the ability to comprehend and devise an explanation consistent with the occurrence of the phenomenon in social reality. Prior to actual research, time is spent in the study of theory and related research in much the same manner as traditional researchers, but this knowledge is purposely suspended until experience with the research project suggests its relevance (Wilson, 1977).

The method of analysis to which naturalistic researchers subscribe is the constant comparative method. For Glaser and Strauss (1967), this method is at the core of the discovery of grounded theory. The four key steps in the constant comparative method consist of 1) comparing incidents applicable to each category, 2) integrating categories and their properties, 3) delimiting the theory, and 4) writing the theory (p. 105). Briefly, the analyst codes each incident into as many
existent categories as possible while comparing it with previous incidents in the same and different groups. The purpose of this procedure is to start the analyst's thinking process to include "the full range of types or continua of the category, its dimensions, the conditions under which it is pronounced or minimized, its major consequences, its relation to other categories, and its other properties." (p. 106).

Studying a phenomenon such as human behavior involved in social interaction is a complex task for several reasons. Previously mentioned is the fact that the number of realities varies with the number of individuals participating. Additionally, naturalistic research focuses on human behavior as idiographic, that is, with differences as important as similarities between individuals functioning in different situations. Since "human behavior is rarely context free" (Guba, 1981, p. 5), generalizations are not possible when adhering to a naturalistic paradigm. In place of generalizations, Guba proposes "working hypotheses." These are considered appropriate because such hypotheses relate to a specific context and are considered "hopeful conclusions" to research efforts.

The emerging, unfolding nature that characterizes the design of naturalistic research does not end until the investigation is arbitrarily concluded. Glaser and Strauss (1967) refer to the termination of an investigation as "a pause in the process of theory development" (p. 63). The flexibility inherent in such an investigation encourages multiple realities to unfold, and allows interaction between the researcher and participants to take place and change over time. Inferences are made from what happens in the "real" world rather than in a laboratory setting. The rationale for using a naturalistic paradigm to study student-student interaction is perhaps best summarized by Wilson (1977) in the following hypotheses:

a) Human behavior is complexly influenced by the context in which it occurs.

b) Human behavior often has more meaning than observable "facts" (p. 253).

The Participants

A. Students

In this study on student-student interaction, participants consisted of students enrolled in French 211, a third semester French class at the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs, Colorado (U.C.C.S.). As a branch of the University of Colorado offering both undergraduate and graduate degrees, this institution serves a commuter population and has no dormitory facilities. Most of the students live at home, hold part-time or full-time jobs and attend classes at the university. Some students have returned to the academic setting after several years in the pursuit of other goals.
The Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures offers classes in Spanish, French and German. A program for majors and minors, however, is available only in Spanish. Students wishing to continue in French or German must transfer to the main campus. Although there is no university language requirement for graduation, students intending to enter the graduate school are encouraged to complete a four-semester language program or its equivalent. Students at U.C.C.S. seemed intrinsically motivated language learners. With the exception maybe of a few fulfilling graduate school requirements, students enrolled in French enjoy studying the language and are eager to learn to speak the language.

In the study that began in September, 1982, there were 18 students (13 female, 5 male) enrolled in French 211, the first semester of intermediate French at U.C.C.S. Of these 18 students, eleven had experience in at least two foreign languages (Latin included). Eleven also had studied French in high school: one had five years, three had four years, two had three years, three had two years, and one student had just one year. Several of these students with previous experience in French had not recently studied the language. Three students had limited experience with another foreign language: one had studied one year of Spanish at the secondary level, another had studied three years of English (ESL) at the secondary level, and one student studied one year of German and one year of Spanish, also at the high school level. Three had had no previous experience in second language learning.

The ages of these students ranged as follows: seven were between the ages of 18-21; five were between the ages of 23-26; four were between the ages of 29-31; one was forty-five and one was seventy years old.

According to the registration form, students enrolled in French 211 because they liked the language, would like to speak it fluently one day, needed the course for their major or career (e.g., international affairs), were interested in learning other languages, wanted knowledge of the language for travel purposes, and/or needed language credit to fulfill the graduate school requirement.

At the beginning and during the course of the second semester, seven (6 females, 1 male) of the original 18 students enrolled in French 211 decided to discontinue their study of French. One student with whom I remained in contact was unable to continue because of course requirements for her major. Others also mentioned that they were not able to meet the demands of French 212 because of other priorities and commitments. In addition to these changes, four students (all females) who had previous French study elsewhere added the course. These students also expressed the wish to continue French because they liked the language, wanted to "keep up" their language knowledge, and/or felt compelled to study it for career purposes.

The students who transferred into the course Spring semester had the following previous language experience. One was fluent in Spanish, had four and a half year of German and one and a half year of Spanish in high school. Another had taken three years of French and one year of Spanish in high school,
and two French courses and one Spanish course at the university level. Another had studied three years of French and one year of Latin at the high school level, and had two French courses in college. The other had one year of French in high school, two French courses at the college level and had just spent two months in France the previous summer. Three of these students were between the ages of 18-21, and the fourth was 24 years old.

Two students, one who began the course in the fall and a second who enrolled in the Spring semester, stopped attending classes in the early spring. The reason for their absence was unknown.

B. Cooperating Instructor

The selection of the instructor was based on her willingness to participate in such a comprehensive study and the fact that her classroom activities permitted student-student interaction to occur. Consultation with the instructor began prior to the actual study and continued throughout and after the duration of two semesters.

The instructor's educational background and philosophy were explored at the onset of the study. With only two years of high school French, the instructor began an intensive study of the language at the college level as a result of a film-text method then employed at Otterbein College, a small liberal arts school in Ohio. In the course of her college education, this instructor assumed the responsibility of organizing a junior-year abroad program for the purpose of spending her junior year in France. Others students (and the French department) benefited from the program as well. Then, after graduation from Otterbein College, she successfully completed a graduate degree in French literature at Ohio State University where she was employed as a French teaching assistant. She acquired additional teaching experience at Ohio Wesleyan (2 years), University of Maryland (2 years), and Stephens College (1 year). She also completed substantial course work in a doctoral program at the University of Maryland. After taking a few years off from teaching to raise a family, she began instructing French at U.C.C.S. where she has been employed part-time since 1980.

The film-text method served as the basis of language instruction for this instructor and also as an inspiration for her philosophy of teaching later. This method, which required laboratory time listening to and attempting to understand specially prepared films in French, forced students to begin to think in French. Because of her experience with the film-text method, the instructor uses the direct method, that is, she conducts the class in French, and builds on what the students already know. She admits that she is not strict, meaning that she will use English when necessary but prefers to use French. Although, according to the instructor, the use of French for instruction is not efficient, she uses French to "get students away from thinking in English."

To achieve the goal of facilitating the process of thinking in French, the instructor selected the following textbooks for use in French 211 and 212:
The Setting

French 211, awarding three semester hours of credit, met the first semester twice a week (Tuesdays and Thursdays) from 10:15 until 11:30 for 14 weeks. The classroom was located in the science building, one of the major edifices of the U.C.C.S. campus. The room was a moderate size, rectangular with greater width than length. All students could comfortably see the blackboard located in front of the room. The entrance was to the right in the rear of the room. A table, which stood between the rows of movable armchairs and the blackboard, served as a materials center and focus area for students since the instructor was often stationed between the table and the board or nearby. There were no windows in the room and the walls were bare of decoration.

During the second semester, French 212 met also twice a week (Tuesdays and Thursdays from 11:40 to 12:55) for three hours credit. The classroom, a windowless rectangular shape with greater length than width, was located in the library building, had movable tables that were usually in a U-shape, and could accommodate small group activities. The entrance was located in the back of the room to the left. Again, the room was bare of decoration.

Because U.C.C.S. is a branch campus with no dormitory facilities, students attend classes and then leave campus without much opportunity to socialize with peers. Consequently, students generally do not know fellow classmates well. Students in French 211 were different in this respect from those in other classes because eleven had been in class together since French 111 and/or 112, the preceding year. Students new to the university and/or to the course sequence experienced some anticipation until they became more comfortable with other members of the class and the instructor's expectations.

Design of the Study

The design of the study is non-experimental and descriptive which, as Kerlinger (1979) specifies, entails no manipulation of variables. The design follows the criteria for naturalistic research (Guba, 1981) or anthropological research (Long, 1980). The design selection was based on the rationale, presented earlier in the study, that research on student-student interaction is concerned with communication and language, and, therefore, is directed more toward meaning than form. Form alone does not determine meaning according to Barnes and Todd (1977); rather, "meaning is determined by the bodies of knowledge brought to the understanding of those forms" (p. 5). The naturalistic or anthropological approach
is primarily a hypothesis-generating enterprise that, used to examine the complexities of human behavior as in the teaching-learning situation, yields greater information in the form of detailed and comprehensive descriptions of human interaction.

Student-student interaction has been examined in the following manner. This researcher observed the entire class throughout the first semester and frequently attended class during the second semester. Observations were conducted using participant observation and ethnographic interviews. Initially, the researcher used an interaction analysis system, but that system was later abandoned because it did not provide the information needed. In such a system each student utterance had to be coded instantaneously, a formidable task for analyzing the meanings and functions of discourse.

Procedures for Data Collection

Data were collected by a variety of different methods. Each method is briefly explained in the following paragraphs.

1 Classroom Registration Form. Demographic information was obtained through the use of registration forms requesting name, previous language study, travel abroad, other experiences related to foreign language study, and reason for enrollment in French. This form appears in Appendix A.

2 Student Questionnaire Form. This form was used to obtain student attitudes toward various learning activities, some of which involved interaction in the classroom, and their effectiveness in the learning process. This form, which was administered at the end of both the first and second semesters, appears also in Appendix B. The information obtained by this form overlapped and collaborated information revealed through interviews.

3 Participant Observation. Data collection heavily involved the use of participant observation whereby the researcher engaged in systematic observation while participating in activities appropriate to the situation. In this research, the participant observer:

- was present when student-student interaction occurred.
- noted verbal and non-verbal behavior related to the event.
- was present when the instructor and students discussed events that occurred.
- noted the time, place, and situations in which student-student interaction was likely to occur.
was open, available, and receptive so that students felt comfortable discussing and sharing their reactions.

- interviewed participants to confirm emergent theory.

- refined and developed theory through continued interviews and observations.

- created a role of total involvement that allowed new information from participants to go directly to the investigator.

Data gathered through the method of participant observation were recorded as fieldnotes, ethnographic interviews, and tape recordings of student-student interaction. Information from classroom observations and informal discussions with participants was entered as fieldnotes. The researcher scheduled appointments with the various participants to carry out the ethnographic interviews. Interview questions that were both relevant to the study and made sense to the participants were formulated to "reveal concepts, categories, comparisons, contrasts, and the organization of the informants knowledge" (Hinman, 1980, p. 10). The responses to these questions were used to validate and build the meaning of what Spradley (1979) calls the "participants' cultural scene." By repeating the same question with the same informant during different interviews, data were cross-checked. The questions used during the initial interview appear in Appendix C. In situations where informant response led to other areas of investigative interest, the researcher did not adhere to a strict use of the questions listed. In such a situation, the researcher formulated new questions to explore the area of interest. Tape recording were made of these interviews to insure accuracy of reporting this information. Tape recordings were also made of large group and small group discussions, to enable the researcher to review and analyze student discourse.

Through the use of such strategies, the researcher was able to accumulate an understanding of human action being studied. According to Rist (1980), theory begins with an extrapolation of grounded events; that is, theory is extended beyond its established ranges to reveal greater comprehension of human behavior.

**Problems**

This research is concerned with limiting observers' biases since Bogdan and Biklen (1982) insist that it is impossible to eliminate them: "All researchers are affected by observers' bias. Questions or questionnaires, for example, reflect the interests of those who construct them, as do experimental studies" (p. 43). Areas of concern are explained and the manner in which this researcher dealt with them are specified in the sub-categories that follow.

1 Educator's bias. According to Hinman (1980), educator's bias results
from the change of role from an educator to a researcher. In the classroom setting, this bias may manifest itself for a variety of reasons. First, a former educator, used to the teacher's viewpoint, may have difficulty obtaining students' perspectives. Second, in the presence of another educator, the new researcher may experience differences in class standards and methods or conflict in educational philosophy. Third, a former educator also possesses the tendency to be obtrusive and to intervene in classroom activities. Last, the tendency to miss an event because of the former educator's familiarity with the classroom setting is also present.

It is this researcher's belief that, because of the amount of time this educator-turned-researcher spent in the classroom in the role of graduate student, there is little difficulty in identifying with the student role. In order to eliminate any possibility of obtrusiveness and/or intervention, an interview with the cooperating teacher was held prior to the study to determine that class standards, methods, and educational philosophy were compatible.

2 Investigator's bias. To insure impartiality, neutrality, and unobtrusive behavior, Hinman (1980) suggested that "the investigator should attend to all members of the group, preserve a non-judgmental role, expect to be taught by respondents, and try to minimize the impact of his presence" (p. 6). All members of the group of student participants were interviewed at least once except for one whose attendance was sporadic at the time interviews were scheduled. All students enrolled in both semesters of French were interviewed twice with the exception of one. All students participated at various times in the tape recording of student-student interaction. To minimize judgmental interpretations, the investigator was not involved in any type of evaluation of students and, for the duration of the study, did not use the instructor's assessment of individual students except for information given during periodic interviews. During and after interviews, the investigator frequently made the informants aware that the information they revealed was new, informative, and important to the investigation. The researcher continued her investigation of the study throughout a two-semester period, from September to May to minimize the impact of her presence on the classroom. As a consequence of this effort, her presence was characterized by participants as like a "wallflower" at the beginning of the study. Later, most students considered her more as "just another student" or as an extra instructor, the way one might view a student-teacher.

3 Sampling bias. According to Rohner (1973), sampling bias refers to "a systematic error in the sample selection process" (p. 23) and could result in generalizations that may be misleading. To avoid sampling error, all participants, students and instructor, were interviewed during the course of the study with the exception of the one individual previously mentioned. The findings of this study are not generalized to a population, but rather depicted, using a technique that involves "thick description." "Thick description," as defined by Geertz (1973) refers to the process of sorting out the multiplicity of complex conceptual structures and assessing their social basis and importance in written form. It is an interpretive process that involves making inferences, an intellectual effort, or a venture in elaboration. As a descriptive process, it results in a "stratified hierarchy of meaningful structures" or a taxonomy (p. 7).
4 Coder bias. Rohner (1973) also indicated another source of error in research, coder bias, which results when the investigator intentionally or unintentionally makes interpretations that favor the researcher's hypothesis. To avoid this type of error, the investigator has employed cross-checks in the forms of questionnaires, triangulation, and peer debriefing (see the section "Trustworthiness" in this chapter for further explanations).

Analysis of Data

There are three bodies of data whose analyses constitute the primary source of information in this research: student registration forms, fieldnotes consisting of ethnographic interviews and observations, and tape recordings of student-student interaction.

The researcher used the constant comparative method to assess data collected. This method refers to the procedure that consisted of the following four stages: 1) comparing incidents applicable to each category, 2) integrating categories and their properties, 3) delimiting the theory, and 4) writing the theory (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). This method was used with all three primary sources of information in the study to arrive at "working hypotheses" (Guba, 1981).

Trustworthiness

Methods recommended by Guba (1981) to test the trustworthiness of the findings were employed in this study. By using theoretical sampling, this researcher has insured a limited degree of transferability (external validity). Theoretical sampling is the process of data collection in which this researcher jointly collected, coded, and analyzed data in order to decide what data to collect next and how to locate them (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). As a result, the data generated theory, theory that emerged from the data. Guba (1981) recommended the use of theoretical sampling "to maximize the range of information uncovered." In addition, the researcher employed "thick" descriptive data to allow the comparison of this context to contexts with similarities in a way that others can assess "the degree of fittingness" (p. 23).

To insure credibility (internal validity), the investigator took the following steps. She prolonged the study, engaged in persistent observation, set up and participated in peer debriefing, incorporated triangulation in the design of the research, collected tape recordings of interactions, and employed "member checks," a technique used to verify data by asking two or more participants the same question.

The study was extended to a period lasting two semesters. This extension was made to overcome possible distortions produced by the presence of a researcher in the classroom setting. By the second semester, students were so
accustomed to the presence of an observer and to recording equipment that the researcher and equipment made no or little impact on classroom interaction. In addition to the prolongation of the study, the researcher was persistent in observing classroom interaction. She never missed a class meeting during the first semester after the onset of the study. During the second semester, however, the researcher felt that, because she could predict events and activities, an absence from class proceedings would accomplish two goals: 1) allow informants, due to the absence of the researcher, to give their interpretations of interactions and proceedings, and 2) keep the researcher from over-involvement with informants and the setting. The researcher engaged in peer debriefing, that is, discussions with several individuals whose participation was sought for the purpose of testing insights and soliciting critiques of these interpretations.

The researcher also employed triangulation, which involved the use of three major methods of data collection in the research project. In this study, participant observation during class meetings, ethnographic interviews with both students and instructor, and the collection of tapes of student-student interaction constituted the corroborative effort called triangulation that is important for validity. According to Denzin (1978), triangulation also results when data are viewed from three various and different perspectives. For example, by viewing data through time (several months), space (different vantage points in the classroom and different rooms), and various participants (students and instructor), the researcher obtained data from which interpretations were corroborated and derived.

The collection of various types of materials, such as tape recordings and other data, insure that interpretations and assertions can be verified by reference to these documents. During interviews, specific interpretations were continuously tested by asking the various participants, students and instructor, to comment on collected data, a technique known as "member check." In addition, as the final stage of the research, various participants were asked to verify the conclusions or "working hypotheses."

To establish investigator objectivity (confirmability), the researcher incorporated triangulation in data collection and practiced reflexivity, meeting periodically with peers for debriefing and including introspective observations in fieldnotes. The researcher has made all data available for examination to guarantee dependability (reliability).

Hypotheses

In this study the following hypotheses were examined as they emerged from the data:

1 Classroom interaction among students in the foreign language is possible.
2 Information exchanged during student-student interaction in the foreign language is similar to that of normal conversation in the native language.

3 Students use the foreign language to accomplish specific functions or moves much in the same manner their native language is used.

4 Students monitor, analyze and evaluate their own communicative behavior during the interactive process.

5 Student-student interaction occurs primarily as a result of the instructor's desire to have students interact and creating tasks to accomplish that goal.

6 Student attitudes toward using the foreign language with their classmates is positive.

7 Students express less anxiety toward speaking French in small groups of peers.
CHAPTER IV

DESCRIPTIVE DATA

Introduction

The researcher examined the total environment in this study to determine what factors established an atmosphere conducive to student-student interaction. As a result, she has delineated the following areas of consideration as important to understanding the complex phenomenon under study: 1) the classroom with its physical setting and participants, 2) activities that helped define strategies for processing language and interacting with others, and 3) events in communication that resulted in student satisfaction.

Data in this chapter came from three primary sources: classroom registration forms, interviews with participants, and fieldnotes from classroom observations. All sources, forms, interviews and fieldnotes, provided descriptive information for characteristics of the class and of student-student interaction. Student interviews and other data frequently confirmed teacher expectations. All interviews, with the exception of three, were tape recorded. Transcripts of tapes from these interviews provided much of the information from which the descriptions and theories have emerged.

The Setting

The classroom constituted an informal situation in a formal environment. 'Formal environment' refers specifically to the classroom setting with tables, chairs, blackboard and chalk on a university campus. 'Informal situation' applies to the manner in which the class was conducted; for example, many students were on a first-name basis with the instructor. In addition, verbal interaction in French consisting of informal conversation, personal questions and responses began as soon as the instructor entered the classroom. Daily events, activities, and conversations were often centered around classroom events and participants. Observations during class further revealed that the instructor teased and joked with students in a warm, friendly, and open manner. Students listened to lengthy explanations of French terms and appeared intrigued by the language itself and the personality of the instructor. Student comments and responses were frequently accepted without the traditional raising of the hand for recognition. The immediate engagement of students in conversation and the fact that the class was conducted in French produced a setting that provided students with linguistic input essential for the acquisition of a new language.
According to information gathered through interviews, students found three characteristics of this class appealing: the instructor, the atmosphere, and the structure. In spite of a certain amount of overlap of these categories, since the instructor is responsible for creating the atmosphere and establishing class structure, these three categories were clearly delineated by the data from student interviews. The difference between "atmosphere" and "structure" was determined by the degree of intangibility or concreteness of the event. "Structure" consisted of concrete events whereas "atmosphere" was the result of intangible elements.

The instructor's qualities that students singled out were personality, manner of dealing with students and presentation of course content. Described as "animated," "helpful," "not intimidating or domineering," students liked their instructor because she was "so patient, and always up, willing to explain, always bubbly." According to students, she involved them in discussion, encouraging participation by being neither "judgmental" nor "critical." One student praised the manner in which she treated students as individuals; that is, she met individual students at their own level to help them attain higher goals. Even the simple event of listening to the instructor was valuable, as one student indicated, because "we hear a lot of phrases from her. She doesn't answer in just simple sentences". In the words of another student who summarized the relationship of the teacher to the class, "the whole class personality evolves around the teacher. She is not afraid to make mistakes, she is not embarrassed, she sang songs to us without knowing us...students come in here and they can see...that she's not afraid to make mistakes, that she laughs with you, not at you." These characteristics helped establish the atmosphere that was "comfortable," "open," and "relaxed."

The classroom atmosphere also contributed to student satisfaction with the class. Some social relationships had been established over several semesters since six students had been in the instructor's first semester course and 12 were in the second semester of beginning French just a year ago. Students felt comfortable because the class was small and they knew their fellow students: "Everyone is pretty friendly, not intellectual snobs. (The class) is pretty much down to earth." Although both the instructor and students took the class seriously, there was a lighter side with personal communication, "off-the-wall comments, and jokes that made class more enjoyable." Students also noted that small-group activities helped eliminate the fear of participating, a subject discussed in depth later in this chapter. Another aspect of classroom behavior that relieved anxiety was the fact that students "allow[ed] each other to make mistakes when asking questions."

Class structure was flexible and included activities that encouraged discussions and extemporaneous speaking. One aspect of class structure that appealed to students was that all discourse was in French, thereby challenging them to think in French. According to one student, there was:

...more vocalization in this class on the part of the students, and they are not just repeating things, they are forming things...I remember passing the French room
in high school at the time and you could hear them repeating things, and that's what they were doing, just repeating. I couldn't see where they would learn anything from that except for pronunciation.

Class never had a formal starting time because the instructor's "before class chit-chat" flowed into announcements which were the first item on the class agenda. Sometimes this was followed by a newspaper article, a song, a poem, a story or an anecdote that led to some discussion. Other times, announcements were immediately followed by grammar exercises. These exercises were read in class by the students themselves who took turns giving their answers, which were corrected by the instructor when necessary. Although class assignments followed a syllabus created before the semesters began, there was a certain amount of flexibility in what took place during each class period. The instructor explained that class members were often responsible for the discussion that occurred:

I don't plan out my classes for every detail. I have basic ideas about what's going to happen in class and I say what comes to my mind. And people in front of me at the time trigger quite a bit what kinds of things I talk about.

Correction of grammar exercises was always followed by an activity that involved student interaction which lasted until the end of the period. (Activities are listed and described under the sub-heading "Activities" on page 59 in this section). Most frequently, this activity consisted of student formulation of questions over the reading text. Other times, it involved creating situational dialogues. During Spring Semester, the instructor organized discussion activities in small group format more frequently than in large group settings. This conversational format gave students greater liberty in language use since their role was not limited to just giving information when answering the instructor's questions.

Students found that the conversational format, executed in small groups, provided an increased opportunity to talk. According to one student, in unsupervised discussion an individual can "interject more as in real conversation." It also eliminated the feeling of being "on stage in front of the whole class," the feeling of being "put on the spot." Consequently, students found that participation was easier because the instructor encouraged them by non-verbally indicating "come on" and "pull[ed] it out of them." Students also acknowledged a diversity of topics: stories, anecdotes, contemporary issues, the French themselves, "not something canned." Interesting subjects "you can toss back and forth" and the relaxed atmosphere facilitated student contributions to discussion. Students commented that when they felt relaxed, they were less concerned with inhibitions.

Physical arrangements
The physical set-up of the classroom provided the opportunity for everyone to see all class members by using a circle (Fall Semester) and a U-shape arrangement (Spring Semester). Many students, recognizing the effect of such an arrangement on participation, found that they 1) could speak with other students, not just the instructor, 2) became more easily engaged in extemporaneous speaking, and 3) were forced into participating because "hiding" was impossible with constant eye contact with all class members. Students expressed greater satisfaction with this arrangement, which was a change from the initial seating by rows, because of eye contact with class participants and the inability to "hide" or not participate in the discussion. Eye contact and "forced" participation brought about a more interesting discussion of reading material. Speaking French constantly also challenged students to think in another language while communicating with each other.

Seating Patterns

After an extended period of time, observations indicated that most students had their own classroom territory or, more specifically, their own place. In both the Fall and Spring Semesters, students were seated on their "side of the room," a pattern that rarely changed. In fact, the side of the room a student occupied Spring Semester was consistent with the side on which he or she sat Fall Semester in seven out of eleven cases, with one apparent floater, in spite of the rooms being different. Certain students had their own seat, "give or take a seat or two." Student remarks revealed three elements that governed the seating pattern in this French intermediate class: relationship to instructor, relationship to peers, relationship to arrival time. These remarks were substantiated by the investigator's observation.

Student comments clearly documented the fact that student relationship to the instructor influenced the seating pattern in this classroom. One student differentiated between two types of students. The difference between the two was in the distance a student wanted to maintain between herself or himself and the instructor. Sometimes a "back rower" lacked self-confidence and was more a spectator than a "participator."

I think there are front rowers and back rowers. And people tend to stake out their territory. Some people like to sit closer to the professor. I have a seat within one or two places.

Although it was impossible to "hide" in this class, given the exposure a circle or U-shape assured, distance from the instructor seemed to be an indication of participation preference in several cases. Several students who considered themselves shy and who did not often volunteer, sat at the greatest distance from the instructor. In some cases, "front rowers" also seemed less concerned with what others thought of their participation. The following comments from two
students verified this theory:

Some people sit in back because they want to feel out the class before they say anything.

{I sit} right there. I enjoy having my back to the wall!!! It's a seat further away from the teacher.

Relationships to peers also proved to be an important factor in seat selection. All indications revealed that "good friends {would usually} sit together." They often talked about the assignment, other classes, problems, and other topics of mutual interest. Conversations between neighbors began frequently before class started, were rekindled briefly (and unofficially) during class, and ended for some students at the close of class "sometimes in English, sometimes in French," as they hurried on to their next course. Others, particularly those who had been together for several semesters, continued their discussion as they left together for the Student Union. One student justified these "unofficial" interactions in French with: "every second you are trying to talk in French is good." The same rationale explained seat selection:

I like to sit next to someone who I know so I can talk with them sometimes.

I just usually sit with people I want to sit with, people - that I have been with the last couple of semesters. Every person has a place. People gravitate to people they know better.

I tend to sit by Barb, because we have other classes together and we tend to discuss what we are taking. And we've been partners on a project. She tends to sit in the same place."

(The girl right next to me helped in making me feel comfortable) because I was the only new person in here (along with her).

I talk to the girl right next to me who has about the same problem with conversation.

Seating frequently depended on the relationship between seats available and the time one arrived in class. One student commented that she would sit "wherever there {was} an open place." Another student was often late to class and, for that reason, usually sat near the door. There were seats that "belonged" to certain students and others that were not always occupied. "Floaters," students without their own seat, stayed within a certain range, again, often marked by a "side" of the classroom, and usually nearest the door. Two
students, categorized as "floaters" were also among those who arrived late to class.

Making oneself more comfortable by finding an appropriate distance from the instructor and surrounding oneself with friends with whom one could converse appeared to guide most students in this class in regard to their personal seating arrangement.

The Instructor

Because the instructor's intention was "to get them away from thinking in English," she felt it was better not to use English in the classroom. At the end of the first class, she talked of the importance of conducting the class in French, of each student's participation, and of preparing exercises assigned. She also gave them examples of how to do the exercises. She encouraged them to identify the various objects in the room. In addition, she asked them to "get up out of the chair" and "move around," rather than to maintain "a rigid posture in front of the book." She also suggested that they "talk to the wall, invent a hypothetical person, and make a conversation." She firmly believes that students need to move when talking because "it triggers more synapses in the brain."

In this intermediate French class, the instructor used complex structures while interacting with students and reverted to simpler explanations when students indicated a lack of understanding. Her level of communication was just a little ahead of the comprehension level of most students at the beginning of the year, but several students, according to their own testimony, caught up to her level of discourse and understood "practically everything." She also engaged students in interaction as soon as she arrived in the classroom. About conversations before and after class, the instructor stated that she liked to give students every opportunity to speak French as well as take advantage herself of speaking French. Thus, she created what Krashen (1981) calls a "linguistically enriched" setting in which French was used at every opportunity. Describing the work effort involved in learning French herself, the instructor characterized the learning process of this classroom as "requiring a lot of attention, a being alert attitude and being relaxed at the same time, and playing along with it."

In her beginning classes (French 101), she would introduce new vocabulary and structure in an "expository manner," that is, by saying it and then asking questions about it. To teach verb conjugations, she would make a statement in the first person, ask another individual in the second person, then ask the class the question using the third person. Thus, students would both hear and use verb conjugations. Because she felt that it was important for students at the beginning as well as advanced levels to ask questions, she had them interview her. Other activities described by the instructor to involve students in conversation at the elementary level included identifying objects around the room, singing songs and reading poems, and, in a small group format, having students interview a fellow student who was often referred to as "a victim." Many of these activities were also employed at the intermediate level.
In treating errors, the instructor operated from a viewpoint that "it's important to learn to talk, so it's better to have tried to talk and say it wrong than not think about having to put it together." Consequently, to maximize participation from all class members, she was selective with her correction:

If they've been hesitating quite a bit and what they come out with is slightly off, I let it go on by, if they have been more or less understood. They've already been interrupted enough whether they've interrupted themselves or [been interrupted] by me. A person who has reached a higher level of refinement can have some smaller details corrected. Different people are at different levels where they have different needs for being corrected, so I try to adjust to that. If it's a real communication problem, however, then maybe I haven't understood. Sometimes, other students will understand before I will, sometimes it seems as if I'm the last one to understand.

The instructor was most satisfied with an activity when students were engaged in "lively conversation," involved in responding to one another, or stimulated by other students.

The Students.

Based on observations made in the Fall Semester and confirmed by subsequent data, three types of students emerged from the interviews, the "active participants" who maximized the opportunity to speak French, the "non-active participants" who appeared shy and lacking in confidence to participate in discussions, and those who fell somewhere in between, the "moderately active." The "active participant" group operated on the philosophy that: "the more I speak the better I get, so I force myself to volunteer for an answer..." and "if I have a chance, I jump at every question and answer it..." One student was dedicated to learning to speak at all costs:

I decided that if I was going to learn to speak the language, I was going to make a fool out of myself. By saying something and being corrected, you get something out of it.

The "non-active" group members were inhibited by the following characteristics which fell into three categories: personality, anxiety, and self-image.

Personality:
-a timidness exhibited in most classes.

Anxiety:
-"a personal tenseness associated with standing up in front of the class."
-a hesitancy "in speaking if the answer can't be perfect."
-a concentration on having to participate rather than on what one is going to say (a mental block of sorts).

Self-image and performance level:
an over-concern with self-image and grade: "I always felt like my GPA were on the line."
-a low skill level.
a lack of confidence in skill level.

One student who moved between the "active participants" and the middle group admitted that if she was "uptight," even if she knew the language, she couldn't say anything. More typical of the "moderately-active" participants was that they operated at different levels of participation at different times, but were usually capable of answering when called on.

Personality was one factor that determined the student's level of participation. Students who were "out-going" or "shy" identified that characteristic within themselves, a characteristic also identified by their peers. Shy students rarely volunteered and answered often with difficulty when called on to respond to questions. Many of them cited the correction of grammar exercises as their preferred activity or the one from which they benefitted the most. Out-going students, in contrast, were frequent participants, sometimes tending to dominate the discussion. They tended to prefer activities requiring spontaneous output.

Anxiety was another factor that influenced student participation. Although the instructor worked toward minimizing student fears, a few students experienced great difficulty when speaking French because of mental blocking. They wanted the response to be acceptable, but were incapable of uttering the appropriate words in spite of great effort on their part. Students who experienced high anxiety in interaction generally preferred to have time to prepare their role, at least, the night before. Working with other students in groups helped to reduce anxiety in situations where the task did not require a presentation in front of the class. Even students who did not appear to be bothered by the big stage of the classroom floor expressed greater ease in interacting with a small group format. Student preference of sitting both with friends and at appropriate distance from the instructor indicated student effort at minimizing anxiety.

Student self-image of oral ability in French also related to student participation in discussions. Those students who expressed concern over grades or low-skill levels were less confident about their ability to express their ideas in French. Less confidence brought about less participation which, in turn, assured less confidence in self-expression and produced a situation that promised not to improve. Obviously, self-image is related to anxiety. Students whose
self-images in French oral production were not good appeared more anxious than those who maintained a good self-image.

Because motivational factors also have a great impact on foreign language learning, this investigator felt it was important to know what motivated students to register for this French class. Generally, two types of motivation are recognized in foreign language study: integrative, in which the foreign language student emulates members of the culture under study; and instrumental, the desire to achieve language mastery for utilitarian or practical purposes (Gardner and Lambert). During interviews and on the Student Registration Form, however, students in this class acknowledged reasons that fit into two categories, the esthetic and the practical.

Eight students indicated they were studying French for such esthetic reasons as 1) a love of languages in general and French in particular and 2) a desire to learn more about the English language by studying a foreign language. Five students listed practical reasons for taking French such as 1) its usefulness in future studies or professions, 2) a requirement to fulfill for admission to graduate school, 3) a facilitator of travel abroad, 4) a bridge to communication with native speakers of French, and 5) a vehicle for reading French literature in the original version. Seven students listed reasons that combined both the esthetic and practical spheres. One student, who had always been interested in speaking a different language and learning about different people, said:

I hated not knowing there's a whole 'nother world and you really don't know anything about them, you've never been there. And language is one way to figure it out.

There were also several students who had started French in high school and, because of a successful learning experience or good teachers, wanted to continue at the university level. This study did not, however, examine to what extent either type of motivation affected peer interaction.

The Investigator.

The presence of an investigator produced a wide range of effects, on students and their classroom behavior, and ones that changed through time. At the beginning, student reactions varied from being encouraged to be more talkative to not contributing as much at first because of concern over what the recording might sound like. Another student felt the presence of an investigator "might put some people off," but he was not certain. Another said that the presence did not bother anyone, but maybe added "a communal effect." Another student confessed that the greatest effect the presence of this investigator produced was the added task of getting used to a new voice speaking French:

It wasn't your presence, but it was hearing a new French
voice and adjusting to it.

Having a researcher present during classroom interaction does have an impact on individuals who are being observed. Certainly, this impact was measured by one student's comment that it was exciting to be part of a class "that was worthwhile studying." The initial impact is important, but, over time, loses some significance. This study continued throughout the entire school year. Consequently, most students acknowledged a change in their perception of the presence of an investigator similar to the following:

Initially, I thought it (the presence of a researcher) was (influencing classroom behavior) when I saw you last semester for the first time. I saw people going about correcting other people. Once they knew how you were taping them or what you were looking for... correcting other people, humor. Initially, I saw a change in the class. People who were trying to correct or be funny, people I hadn't noticed before. I don't think anymore that it's that way. I think everyone is comfortable with your presence and they look at you just like another teacher and ask you questions. In that much it changes, but it's no more than a teacher changes it. In that way, it's not detrimental.

At first, I thought you were another student. And then, I kinda looked at you like a teacher's aid, or a second teacher.

In the beginning, I just thought you were one of us. It doesn't bother me. To me it's almost like having a student teacher; they're trying to learn something from us. You're trying to learn something.

Concerns about the tape recording also varied. At the beginning, one student was concerned about the use of tape recorders, but grew accustomed to them:

But now them (the tape recorders) don't bother me. I'm sitting beside on at the table and there's no problem. But at the beginning, it was kind of scary because my voice was on tape and you were listening to all my mistakes. I was real nervous, but now it doesn't bother me at all.

At the very beginning, according to one student, the presence of a researcher was very unobtrusive except for the use of tape recorders which made her apprehensive. She confessed, however, that time made a difference: "But after awhile you just get use to it. Now, you are more noticeable. You've
become our friend."

Students were frequently left alone with the recording equipment. On one such occasion, members of group recorded their discussion by passing around the microphone, an action that one of them initiated. One student who participated in that recording commented on the fact that she "was put off" by having the microphone passed around. Passing around the microphone was discouraged in subsequent recordings.

Most students found that recording interaction did not affect their behavior. The following comment was typical of students remarks toward the recording equipment: "It hasn't altered the class at all." Another student appeared indifferent to the use of the tape recorder:

I really didn't care about the recording. I spoke just as bad with the tape recorder.

Another student found the tape recorder innocuous and felt it had little effect on classroom behavior: "You kinda forget that it's there." Another opinion echoing this lack of concern for the recording equipment came from one of the graduate students:

I 've seen people talk up, but I haven't seen anyone not say something because it was going on the machine. It's not the same thing. This is very impersonal as opposed to saying it out there in class. If you make a mistake and someone sees your mistake, it's not as bad as when they see you make it. (Seeing the mistake is not as bad as seeing you make the mistake.) It may be that I'm so used to machines.

At the point in time after which recording was no longer a regular activity, one student noticed the absence of the tape recorder, not because it changed classroom behavior, but because of the absence of having to plug it in and operate it. One student's comment was perhaps a key to understanding the influence of the presence of a researcher and taping equipment on student: "It has less effect because it's not connected to a grade."

Activities

As for class structure, activities remained flexible throughout the year, but, at the same time, followed a prescribed format and syllabus. There were essentially two types of activities: communication and grammar. Although managerial activities, such as getting orders for French magazines and other announcements, constituted a sizable amount of class time, managerial activities have been grouped with communication because all such events were carried out in
French, providing linguistic input or the opportunity to listen to and speak French. Consequently, communication activities occupied the greatest amount of classroom time and have been sub-divided into "official communication activities" and "unofficial communication activities." "Unofficial communication" activities refer to such events as teacher announcements, discussions of songs and poems, and remarks about events in France or articles in the French newspaper. "Official communication activities" are specific activities that were created or implemented by the instructor for the purpose of engaging students in conversation. Specific activities organized for their communicative purposes that were observed in this class were:

1 Question formulation in large group format. Students were asked to formulate questions over a portion of the text they were individually assigned. Each student assigned to a paragraph then interrogated classmates. When questions over one paragraph had been asked, another student formulated questions from the following paragraph. This was done until the entire reading selection had been discussed. The total time spent on this activity was 30-45 minutes. This activity occurred in about three out of four class meetings.

2 Question formulation in small group format. This was the same activity as previously mentioned, but occurred in small groups, usually when the class was divided in half or thirds. This activity was first incorporated into class meetings at the very end of Fall Semester, and eventually replaced the large group format for the most part.

3 Situational dialogues. The text contained "situations" for a role play activity. Small groups (2-3) were assigned a situation in class, given time to prepare an impromptu dialogue, then asked to make a presentation to the class. The total time spent on this activity in a given class was 30-45 minutes. During Fall Semester, situational dialogues occurred about every fourth or fifth class meeting. Spring Semester, however, they occurred less frequently.

4 Individual interviews in small group format. All students in the group were instructed to direct questions to one individual. The individual could respond truthfully, as a fictional figure or as an assigned personality. The usual total time spent on this activity was 30-45 minutes.

5 Group interviews in small group format. All students in a group were instructed to interview one another, usually on a specific topic (trips for example) or using a grammar point (future). The total time spent was 30-45 minutes.

Students expressed a preference for activities that emphasized specific skills because of their usefulness in learning or because they just found them pleasurable. Listening to others and to the instructor speak were frequently mentioned: "It's really exciting to feel like I'm following along." Communication also rated very high with students: "It's wonderful to be in a situation where the reality is using conversation." Spontaneous conversation was a favorite with out-going students because "you don't have time to translate." Writing was mentioned by several who found satisfaction in using new vocabulary and structures in compositions.
Participants found most activities useful to their learning. A few, however, questioned the efficiency of the large group format for question formulation. Students, who expressed dissatisfaction with formulating questions, felt that "a lot of time [was] burned up" asking questions in large group format and some questions asked were "dumb." "Good" questions took more thought and would allow students to answer in a variety of ways. Students, who objected to creating situational dialogues, said they preferred preparing ahead because the time limitations were too confining and "put them on the spot." Often, these were students who fell into the category of "non-active participant." They also felt the effect of being on stage when the final presentation was made in the class. In talking about one experience in which students were asked to create a situational dialogue, one student remarked:

...we were so self-conscious of our own limitations that we wanted everything perfect for when we did it for the class. Just between me and the other person, it's more free-wheeling and more spontaneous, and there are mistakes, but you know that you have to say it to the class. You are so aware of your own deficiencies and abilities that you don't want to say something that's very bad. You sit there and it's robotic: you say this and I'm going to ask you that, you say this and I'm going to ask you that. That's what was bad about that particular situation. We were both not secure and we knew we had to say it to the class. Now it wouldn't have been so bad if we wouldn't have had to say it to the class. It would have been more spontaneous as we tried to help each other out.

All students, with one exception, were more satisfied with small group activities than with large group activities. They found that working in groups of fewer individuals was less anxiety-producing and provided them greater opportunity to interact. The following remarks were typical responses of students:

I like the ones (activities) where you break up into two groups because then that forces me to speak more and puts everyone at ease...I think it's hard for a person to talk in front of everyone. But, if there aren't as many people, it's easier.

In small groups, people get to talk for a larger period of time and still get the benefit of correction with the instructors circulating.

The way this class is set up, in a smaller group, you tend to talk to other people; where the other way around (in large groups), you tend to talk to the professor. It's
not as intimate, and you're not as close to the people
(you're sitting across the room from classmates, not next
to them).

**Processing Language**

Because the instructor's goal was to be instrumental in helping students
become more fluent in French, activities that provided the opportunity for students
to interact with one another were purposefully and regularly enacted. One
activity that led to student-student interaction was the previously mentioned
formulation of questions based on the reading text. This activity provided a
foundation for student-student interaction by requiring students to formulate
questions, an integral part of the interactive process. At first, it was somewhat
mechanical. Later in the year, this task took on a more spontaneous nature in
other types of interactive activities.

Formulating questions required all students to engage in listening to and
speaking French. Interview questions on language processing that occurred during
this activity revealed some interesting perspectives on both the cognitive and
social levels. The technical element of constructing utterances and strategies
guiding that construction indicated a social dimension in the French classroom,
ways in which peers conceptualize the communication process in a foreign
language.

According to students, the technique for formulating questions on a given
text consisted of three steps: reading the paragraph, determining the content of
the question, and formulating the question. Some students translated as they
read the text for comprehension purposes. Others, who could read and
comprehend, needed only to translate or seek the meaning of a word or two. In
the case of one student who could easily guess the meaning from the context,
looking up all new words was standard procedure because she wanted to know the
definition of every word in order to "use it later."

Students accomplished the next step, deciding the content of the question,
in a variety of ways. Some students sought out general questions, ones that had
more than one answer. One student remembered information from the reading to
use for formulating questions. Another student looked at sentences after reading
and translating them to see which ones she could "turn into questions." One
student admitted that the content of her questions was limited by her
comprehension of the material; that is, she made questions only from the content
she understood in the paragraph.

Formulation of the question constituted the next step. Two students
reported that they usually wrote down the questions they formulated, at least, in
the beginning of the semester. Sometimes the length of the question determined
whether or not it was written. Another student described the process as thinking
of what he wanted to say and then how to say it in French, going from English to
French. Students described the effect of going from French to English or
visa-versa as "cross-overs." One student described what it was like to finally ask the question she had been formulating:

It's kind of scary because, you know, you've got that whole class around you and you're trying to formulate a sentence. I always end up saying "Répétez" because I know when I've finally gotten the sentence together, they (the students) have forgotten what I've asked anyway. You have to repeat it again and go through that process of putting it carefully together and having to repeat it again. You want to get it out, and say, "...somebody answer quick," so you don't have to repeat it. It's painstaking.

The strategies students used to formulate questions depended on their awareness of communication needs and fluency level. Those who had reached a certain level of fluency were usually less concerned with language accuracy and self-image, and focused on group needs. The intention of many students was to produce communication that would engage their peers in an exchange of ideas. This intention, reflected in the following rationale given by students, indicated student consciousness of getting others involved in the communication exercise:

...if you have a question where only one person can answer then the others can say, "Well the question's been answered, I don't have to participate!"

I try not to make yes/no answers because if you are going to take that long to make questions, I think it's important that the class say more.

The questions I don't like to formulate in class are ones that are the one-word answer...I'll try to ask "what," ask "why" questions, and "what are the reasons for" questions...{because answering questions is a} process of the learning experience. And anybody can read that paragraph and find one-word answers like "How old is somebody?" or "What was the color of their house?" I think the class is above that.

First I think of what I want to say in English and then how to say it in French. I might repeat it a couple of times to the class because I know how hard it is for me to understand others. I also speak slowly and think that helps others comprehend what I say.

Another student, who avoided using the inversion method of formulating questions from the text, did so to make the questions "more interesting." By "interesting," the student meant involving "personal challenge." She expressed the
belief that if students "take the easy way out," they don't get the benefit of actually learning the language so that they can use it in situations when in France.

These reflections also revealed a tendency to evaluate one's own questions as well as those of classmates. Monitoring, analyzing and evaluating communication in an exchange appeared to be a natural part of the process for the participants of this class.

Answering their peers' questions also involved a variety of strategies and processes, indicating the different levels of language mastery and learning preferences. For one student, the response would "just come to mind" whereas another usually had to "construct the answer." Another strategy involved two steps. First, the student might think, "What do I think about this?" Second, the student wondered, "How do I go about saying it in French?" Another student said she volunteered when she knew the answer in English although she did not always have the answer grammatically straight in her head in French. For personal challenge and satisfaction, this same student preferred to paraphrase answers that appeared in the text rather than read them as printed. One student who responded only when she knew the answer said she preferred general questions that eliminated the need for verification of details in the text.

Students who did not usually volunteer to respond expressed a lack of self-confidence in using the language or were very shy and self-conscious about speaking French. This lack of self-confidence and timidity became obvious through interviews and observations. One student whose participation was minimal admitted that responding to questions was very arduous, "I have a tough time, I become very nervous when I do. I mean, if the question is directed at me and I have to answer it." This feeling of difficulty was acknowledged by another fellow student who expressed his dilemma in learning French as follows:

One of my problems in learning French is that someone will ask me a question on the text. I can't sit there and look at her and repeat what she said. I can't put it all together unless I read it out of the book. Then, I'm not thinking, I'm not saying it on my own. I found I have to quit looking at what's there and listen to her so I can try to understand what the phrase is. Otherwise, I just read it.

It is important to note that responding to questions occurred more frequently than audibly noted because numerous students formed the answer in their head even when not called on to respond as the following student acknowledged:

I always [answered] whatever questions are asked, I think in my head. In my head, I have a lot more to say because I know a lot more words. I can 'Franglais it.'
One student admitted that he continued to form answers in his head inspite of the fact that his answer was corrected only if he was called on. Another student reported that she compared her formulated answer with the answer given to evaluate her response.

**Personal Satisfactions**

Students categorized their personal satisfactions or breakthroughs in the study of French in a variety of ways, ranging from "things are beginning to make sense" to "vocabulary is jumping out of the textbook and into you." A breakthrough, as defined through student interviews, referred to a positive change in a one's ability to comprehend or express one's self in French. Because communication involves sending and receiving a message, comprehension and self-expression are important elements of interaction. In some instances, breakthroughs resulted from a concerted effort in a given skill area. In others, they were part of a gradual process. A feeling of comfort or ease was often attributed to making a difference in listening comprehension. Reading comprehension as well as listening comprehension were also skills frequently mentioned when talking of breakthroughs.

Frequently, a breakthrough was a synonym for getting "over the hump," that is, finally being able to think in French. One student found that "comments in class flash[ed] into his mind;" they were not in English, but "just pop[ped] out." One student used an exercise book during the summer between the beginning and intermediate courses to "get over the hump." Another student forced herself to think in French when she was running errands about town. For example, in a grocery store, she would say to herself, "Now, how would you say that in French?" She further explained the result of this forced action:

> Sometimes it will come to me first in French, then in English. Sometimes French will seem like a better way to say it. It's really exciting that way.

Another student characterized this effort to think in French from her first encounter with it in secondary education:

> From the very first time I ever took French in high school, I felt that I could really think in French. I dreamt in French. I dreamed a lot in French and it was so fluent. I'd wake up and it showed me that I had the capabilities. I'm aware of that and I try not to translate when I'm reading. Like in activities, I like to look at objects and say them in French without translating.
Gradual progress was typical of most students. Often, they were unconscious of steady progress until a specific event occurred that awakened their awareness of reaching a higher level. This awareness surfaced in the following cases:

I'm picking up more and more. I'm trying not to translate word for word. It's hard for me to do because I don't have a very large vocabulary. I can pick up some French when I read it and not translate it and understand it. And it really sort of struck me a couple of days ago...as I was reading something that she handed out in the other class. And it dawned on me that I was not translating word for word. It had a different feel about it. I was thinking the way the author was saying as opposed to trying to translate it and look at the way I would have said it. It's very subtle.

If I'm writing along, there will be words that start coming to me in French instead of in English. So I guess I'm starting to think in French a little bit more. I'll get phrases and stuff coming at me in French.

I can read those (texts) almost like reading... something in English, but they usually throw in words that you don't know, and you look up the new words, but I feel comfortable reading that. It makes you feel like you've really accomplished something when you can read a couple pages without stopping and think: 'I understood that.'

One student expressed an understanding of the learning process involved in composing a thought in French:

I found that that (composing a thought) is a big step there. If you can show somebody something, they are going to forget it. If I show someone on the board how to do something, they'll just forget it. It's the same way. Just show me how to do an exercise, and I'll just forget it. But if you involve me in doing those, I don't mean by making me look at it in a book, but by making me compose a similar situation then I'm going to understand it, I'm not going to forget it. Not being just able to do it, I really understand what happened. That's what was happening today.

Other moments of satisfaction were characterized by gradual progress in grammar usage, composition writing and/or listening comprehension. One student, who at the beginning of the year felt lucky if she "could get the present tense," expressed greater confidence using different tenses. This confidence she
attributed to her efforts of using different tenses in composition writing. In fact, she described this breakthrough as "having my imparfait down." For this same student, comprehension was good to begin with, but by the end of Spring Semester, she understood almost everything and was satisfied with that progress. Using a lecture by the French Consulat and a French movie, Hiroshima, Mon Amour, as a measuring stick for comprehension, she estimated that she understood 75%-80% of the verbal presentations. She considered "listening to her instructor" as "instant comprehension." She used her own technique of "picturing words" in the comprehension process. While listening to the lecture and movie, she engaged in this visual activity more than usual, an effort she attributed to being unaccustomed to the voices.

Disappointments, expressed at various moments in the two semester study, were usually characterized as a personal aspect of learning such as 1) dissatisfaction in self-expression, 2) frustration with the rate of grammar mastery, or 3) lack of self-motivation. For example, one student was frequently frustrated because students with greater language facility would answer the question for which she had been formulating a response before she could finish. Another student was disappointed she had not reached the point where she could avoid floundering and translating back into English. One avid language enthusiast, who was, interestingly enough, a non-active participant reached a "dead point" toward the end of the year and felt "burned out on everything." She experienced the need to "push [her]self to keep going." These personal disappointments were more often characteristic of the "non-active participant" than of the other type of participants.

A few students voiced their opinions on the structure of class activities. At times, these opinions presented conflicting views. A few expressed the desire to have had more practice in speaking. Echoing this wish, others said they were expecting more conversation and less grammar in class. In contrast, another would have preferred spending more time on grammar rules. Yet, another opinion was voiced, that of wishing for a paragraph explanation in English of a grammatical point, and another would have liked more drill in pronunciation. These differing opinions are typical of any situation where student needs and levels vary.

Because many students were familiar with the basics of language from high school experience, work came very easily for them during the first year of study at the university level. Toward the end of Spring semester of the second year, work, in the words of one individual, became more of "a grind." This student expressed a sentiment of dissatisfaction with the difficulty of course content that was also felt by other participants, including the instructor:

I sense more frustration in class this semester. It's harder to get everything under one's belt.

The instructor, who was not completely satisfied with the content of the last semester of the intermediate French course, also expressed a concern for what seemed to be a heavy dose of sophisticated grammatical structures and
idioms that were introduced in the text at this point in the course. This has been a concern of hers for the last couple of years because it is usually at this juncture that the program seemed to become less effective. To a certain degree, mastery of new grammatical structures and vocabulary seemed to interfere with students demonstrating mastery of previous learning. This was certainly a concern of the instructor's when evaluating oral and written production.

In spite of these few disappointments, students stressed their satisfaction and enthusiasm for both the instructor and the course in all interviews. In fact, students enrolled in this course acquired or maintained a positive attitude toward language learning in general. The students initially enrolled to fulfill a requirement were among those supportive of language study. One such student felt strongly that Americans "should be made to realize that being bilingual has a benefit." This support was echoed by another student's view that "not enough Americans are bilingual." In fencing club, she encountered many foreigners who spoke English and yet, "we don't speak their language." One student who had enrolled for the pleasure of learning French said he felt "dumb" when unable to speak another language. Another student working toward fulfilling graduate school requirements offered the following viewpoint:

I have since found there is a legitimate reason for taking a foreign language. I have found...it is my opinion that language restrains how you think about a problem. I didn't realize that before and nobody's ever told me that, but it came to me. When I read French that I don't try to translate word for word, it's different than if I translated word for word, you know, it has a different meaning about it. It has a different aesthetic feeling about what's coming across. So it may be of value I didn't realize. So, I don't feel it's a waste now whereas I originally did.

Conclusion.

Data from interviews with participants of the study have established the setting for this French class as a relatively relaxed atmosphere, in a linguistically enriched environment, conducive to peer interaction. Characteristics of 1) the instructor, (personality, sensitivity to students, and manner of presenting course content), 2) students (anxiety, self-image, and personality), and 3) classroom structure and atmosphere were found to have an influence on student behaviors and attitudes toward participation. Small group activities, preferred by most students to large group activities because they were less anxiety-producing, were also deemed important for their role in providing opportunities for students to talk to one another. Activities that led to student-student interaction were the formulation of questions and situational dialogues. Both of these activities provided an opportunity for students to practice formulating questions, to play the role of "second speaker" as one who listens responsively and provides appropriate
feedback, and to develop strategies required for successful social interaction.

Satisfaction with the course came in the form of "breakthroughs" that students associated with thinking in French, making progress in oral and written forms of self-expression, and comprehension. There was an association between students who periodically had feelings of dissatisfaction and levels of anxiety and low self-esteem. Greater difficulty in course content toward the end of the year increased some feelings of frustration. Students, nevertheless, expressed high satisfaction and enthusiasm for the course and instructor, and maintained a highly positive attitude toward French and language learning in general throughout the two semester study.
CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS OF STUDENT-STUDENT INTERACTION

Introduction

Understanding the complex phenomenon of student-student interaction was made possible by examining concepts of classroom interaction, communication, and language functions. In this section, the analysis was based on data about student-student interaction from interviews, observations, and transcripts of small group activities. Examination of the data indicated that class members considered the participation of their peers to be an essential part of the learning process. Several general statements about the comprehension of peers, sensitivity to peer interaction, and peer correction grew from the data and serve as background to the study.

First, it is important to know that the majority of students understood one another with a few exceptions. For example, non-native American speakers speaking French were more difficult for students to understand than native American speakers. Students found that they understood each other because they were "at the same level," "[used] simple structures," and knew what they were trying to say and how to say it. Students felt that listening to classmates use French was good preparation for understanding French speakers other than the instructor. In addition, students benefited from listening to their peers. One student's comment was echoed by others:

They are struggling with the same kind of thing that I'm struggling with and I see that their thought process is the same as mine.

Some students found their peers easier to understand than their instructor. Students noted also that it was interesting to listen to their class members "because they [had] different ideas." Classmates also used expressions that were new to the others. Hearing such expressions helped other students assimilate new vocabulary and language structures.

Students did exhibit, however, signs of frustration with comprehension. At the beginning of Fall Semester, some students expressed difficulty with understanding questions formulated by their peers. This difficulty was resolved in the course of the year as various students made progress in communication skills. In the early stages of comprehending other speakers of French, however,
students had to listen closely to understand. Sometimes, when other students were talking, comprehension was "too difficult" for a few students who then resorted to "not listening" to their peers. One student found that listening to questions from her peers directed to the instructor was sometimes "distressing" because it interrupted a delicate train of thought and concentration. According to the student:

Sometimes I'm lost in my own train of thought if there's too much else going on in class. For example, if there are a lot of questions that seem to be on different tangents, then it's better for me to follow whatever train I came into class with than to try to pay attention to every thing that's going on in class.

Second, students were very much aware of the differences in skill level of their peers. After remarking that for some, comprehension was better than their speaking, and for others the reverse was true, one student concluded that there was a distribution of talents in the class. This student, who attached a great importance to each member's contributions, felt that class was better "if everyone [put] in their talents and their views in the exchange." Students also noted that working with a classmate who was more fluent helped their interaction. Several of them compared this phenomenon to playing tennis, as one student explained:

If...like in tennis, I play with someone who is better than I am, it helps my game. In French, it's the same way. There's more spontaneity if you're not constrained by each others limitations. Somebody is so secure in what they are doing that they bring you up to their level, you know, it makes you more spontaneous and free-wheeling as opposed to watching every article. But if you put both on the same level, we're both struggling and it's very uncomfortable, it's not very spontaneous.

Third, students were usually sensitive toward peer group members and their needs. This sensitivity was expressed in the interaction itself as students helped others students launch a topic by asking appropriate questions and supplied needed vocabulary. Believing that everyone should have an opportunity to participate, students objected to the "monopolizing" of class discussion by any one individual and took note of it when it occurred. Most of them looked forward to contributions of other class members. In some cases, students who were new to the class were recognized as needing more time to fit into the group and feel comfortable about participating in front of classmates. In another case, a student was caught in the dilemma of wanting to participate in teacher-student interaction, but not wanting to dominate the discussion:

I feel badly if I participate too much...at the risk of
totally hurting someone else in the class. You see, I'm in conflict. I'm not sure to what extent I should interact with the teacher. So, I'm a bit confused as to what my role is.

Students also took notice of others and formed impressions of student behaviors such as: "Everyone is opening up now."

Fourth, students recognized the need for correction, as one explicit comment indicates: "By saying something and being corrected, you get something out of it." Students were, therefore, open to correction and expressed a positive attitude toward being corrected:

Others don't make fun of you. There's a snicker here and there, but you don't feel the pressure. You're not afraid to make mistakes.

Another student said she did not mind being corrected, but felt self-conscious about speaking French.

It is important to note, however, that students gave the role of corrective agent to the instructor as indicated by interviews with students and patterns of classroom interaction. The following comment demonstrates how one student felt:

For the most part, I sit and think. Well...I know what they are getting at and I test myself silently because when (the instructor) goes to correct them, she'll really know what track they are on (what they are trying to ask).

Upon hearing a fellow student experiencing difficulty, another student saw her role as specifically different from that of the instructor:

I think, "Oh, this person is in agony. It's not my place to help her out."

Consequently, the instructor made decisions as to the need for correction, the amount of correction, who to correct, and how to correct him or her. These decisions laid the groundwork for student attitude and behavior in small group settings when the instructor was not present. The instructor provided a model for correcting behavior that students interpreted as follows: correction was not necessary if the message was communicated.

One student who felt the tacit structure within the class said that she was unable to correct other students because she sensed the instructor's emphasis on building skills. The student saw that not all errors were corrected; therefore, she hesitated to correct in order to be consistent with classroom "rules."
small group situations, she did not feel that correcting was "worthwhile" when communication was successful. She strongly believed that this pattern of not correcting everything encouraged students to participate more so that "they {were} not afraid that the instructor {was} going to jump all over them."

When interacting in small groups without the instructor, students stated they were often able to supply appropriate words to assist their peers, but rarely engaged in correcting syntax. In most instances when a student corrected or assisted another, the manipulation involved semantics, that is, the student supplied the needed vocabulary word in French as one student explained:

If they can't think of a word, I'll know what they're talking about. I'll just add the word they are looking for.

Observations and interviews indicated that students avoided correcting the syntax of their peers. One student explained that the problem was a lack of self-confidence in using the language: "It's more doubting whether or not you're wrong." Another student echoed that she did not correct others when it was a matter of structure because she was never sure that she was right. In some cases, she would look up the correct answer, but she wouldn't correct someone unless she was "positive." Another student did not attempt to restructure her peers' syntax because she basically understood "what they {were} saying."

Evidence of peer support in the form of vocabulary assists, contributions of encouragement, and finishing another's utterances surfaced in notes from observations of student talk. According to student interviews, most students were appreciative of help coming from their peers. One student, in particular, felt that she remembered more easily when the "correction" came from one of her peers: "And what they say sticks in my mind more." When the instructor was present, however, students took a less active role in encouraging and assisting their peers because they gave her the primary role of language and discourse specialist.

In summary, students of this class were capable of understanding each other when speaking French, assessed the skills levels of other students, were sensitive to the needs of their peers in social situations, and maintained a positive attitude about being corrected, although they did not usually correct syntax. This conclusion is based on descriptive data produced by interviews and fieldnotes and provides the necessary background information necessary for focusing on the more technical aspect of student-student interaction, transcripts of actual student talk.

**Discourse Moves**

Examination of the transcripts of students interacting indicated that students do, indeed, use the discourse moves of "initiating," "eliciting,"
"responding" and "extending" to structure interaction. These discourse moves respond to the question one might ask: "What is happening in this conversation?" They do not necessarily answer the question: "Why did that individual utter those words?" nor "What role does this individual have in this conversation?" The level of analysis is such, however, that one can easily document discourse in terms of the questioning, answering, and extending that occurred in a conversation. It is interesting to note that the variety of student moves decreased when the instructor participated as students deferred to her for initiating, selecting a speaker, supporting, correcting, prompting, and extending the conversation. Close examination of utterances revealed the following sub-categories of "elicits," "initiates," and "responds" or "extends" by which students negotiate roles and establish the structure of discourse:

ELICITS: to elicit a reply
- Agreement
- Assistance (searches)
- Assurance
- Clarification
- Confirmation (truth)
- Disagreement
- Information
- Participation of others
- Personal response
- Qualification
- Verification (proof)

INITIATES: to begin, originate, instruct in the fundamentals
- Ends turn
- Focuses discussion
- Introduces topic
- Makes an assertion
- Makes an observation
- Qualifies
- Refocuses discussion
- Selects speaker
- Takes turn

RESPONS (to act in reply) or EXTENDS (to stretch out, prolong, broaden meaning or scope)
- Accepts
- Acknowledges another's contribution
- Acknowledges confusion
- Acknowledges understanding
- Agrees
- Apologizes
- Assists
- Challenges
- Clarifies
The following student exchange revealed some of the strategies of discourse and demonstrated the role of initiating and eliciting as students shaped the discussion. This extract comes from a small group interview in which the seven participants, interacting without the instructor, were instructed to interrogate one another about future plans. Practice in use of the future tense was the purpose of this exercise. In this transcript, as in all transcripts, the analysis followed each utterance, set off in capitals and parentheses. In addition, individual speakers were indicated by names that did not reveal their personal identity, but served to differentiate roles among the participants. Utterances were written as they were heard on the tape. Errors were not corrected, and hesitations were depicted as they occurred.

Cary: J'ai une question. (INITIATES: TAKES THE FLOOR)

Female: Pour qui? [ELICITS QUALIFICATION]

Cary: Qui veut être la victime? [ELICITS PARTICIPATION]

Lana: Qui voudrait répondre à votre question? [ELICITS
This conversation demonstrates that the students in this college French class were capable of taking the floor, and structuring the conversation. Verbal interaction is initiated by Cary who announces that he has a question to ask. Who will answer the question is a point of negotiation since he, by not assuming a direct role, chooses to leave it open. Looking for the meaning of his utterance, Lana paraphrases his question to see if she has understood and receives a confirmation.

Lana, then, volunteers, but qualifies this acceptance by putting a condition on it, that of answering if it is only one question. Cary assures her that the effort is worthwhile by telling her that it's his best question. Cary's question, however, becomes an extraordinary one, as he enumerates three verbs in the future tense. He has attended to the task of interviewing his peers using the future. The length and complexity of the question provokes laughter from other class members. Lana then asks for clarification since there was something she did not understand. In her last response, which interrupts Cary's clarification, she indicates the point of incomprehension, "planets," and asks for a confirmation of her understanding by offering an example of a planet, "la terre."

In this excerpt, students were successful in attending to the task assigned by initiating, negotiating for the floor, eliciting clarification, and clarifying meaning. Through various such moves, discourse is structured and maintained, and meaning is established.
Social Skills.

A second level of understanding centers on social skills in which students control discourse, agree, disagree, resolve conflict, support and assist one another. In reviewing the transcripts of student-student interaction, it became evident that students used social skills in their interaction to create a supportive atmosphere which, in turn, allowed other students to assist, agree and disagree with one another, and collaborate in the communicative effort.

In the following interaction, students demonstrate how they begin the discussion, support one another, and agree. The excerpt is taken from a discussion in which six participants (instructor absent) were instructed to interview one another about past or future trips.

Vicki: Commencez. [CONTROLS SELECTION OF SPEAKER]

Tammy: Moi? [EXPRESSES SURPRISE / ELICITS CONFIRMATION]

Vicki: Oui. [CONFIRMS]

Tammy: Mon frère et moi nous ferons un voyage au Europe cet été. [ACCEPTS ELICITATION]

Group: Ah! [GROUP DEMONSTRATES RESPONSIVE LISTENING / ENCOURAGES CONTINUATION]

Tammy: C'est pour deux mois et nous sommes...voyagerons en tous les... tous les pays.

Lana: Est-ce que il est...il est dans un groupe de personnes ou "just" tout le monde...[TAKES THE FLOOR / ATTEMPTS TO SUPPORT WITH AN EXAMPLE]

Tammy: Non, mon frère et moi. C'est trop cher. [SUBSTANTIATES WITH A REASON]

Group member: Oui. [AGREES WITH T'S PREVIOUS CONTRIBUTION]

Lana: Mais, [BEGINS ALTERNATIVE] il y a beaucoup... il n'est pas très, très cher, [PROVIDES AN EXAMPLE] especialmente les...les hôtels...

Tammy: C'est le billet d'avion qui est très cher. [SUPPORTS L'S ASSERTION WITH EVIDENCE]

Lana: Oui. [AGREES]
Vicki immediately takes control of the discussion by selecting Tammy as the speaker. Tammy complies with the imperative (Commencez!) and initiates the task at hand, that of talking about a trip. Other group members appear supportive of the initial selection of the speaker by not voicing any objection. They further support this choice by demonstrating responsive listening with "Ah," a remark that serves to support the continuation of Tammy's trip account.

Lana assists Tammy in her continuation by raising the first question, a question that is not totally correct in its grammar structure, nor semantic selection, but, is understood. In fact, Tammy responds before Lana has completed the question. Tammy demonstrates total comprehension of Lana's interrogation by supplying the reason that explains why she and her brother are not traveling in a group: "It's too expensive." Another group member supports Tammy's reason by agreeing with a simple, "Yes."

Although she does not really disagree with the previous contributions, Lana begins an alternative approach with a weak objection expressed by, "But." At this point, it is impossible to know if Lana's remark that "there's a lot that is not expensive" refers to traveling (in Europe) in general or traveling in a group, her original question. By looking at the example she gives, "hotels," as inexpensive items, one would assume she was referring to travel in general. At this point, however, knowing the referent is not that important. Rather, it is more relevant to this study to follow the development of the discourse. Lana's statement has provoked another assertion on Tammy's part, the fact that the flight is the expensive item. Here, Tammy's assertion assumes agreement or support of Lana's statement that hotels are inexpensive, and raises the next issue that air travel is costly. Lana shows her support of Tammy's contribution by agreeing, "Oui."

This excerpt clearly indicates the manner in which students control, agree, and support one another in discourse. Initial control was taken by one group member, which was accepted by all. From that point on, control became a shared experience for those involved in the interaction. It is interesting to note that, in this class, agreement and peer support were frequently signaled by the use of "Oui / Yes," or in an extention of what was said that also implied agreement. Students displayed support of peer contributions through verbal responses such as, "Ah," agreement with what was said, and extensions of these contributions.

Another example of student-student interaction involving elements of support, assistance, disagreement, and collaboration has been taken from the same discussion on trips.

Eva: Quelle sorte de...quelle sorte d'aventure veux-tu à l'Europe? [ASKS FOR PERSONAL INFORMATION]

Tammy: Je ne sais pas. [RESPONDS]

Eva: Ce n'est pas important? [ELICITS CONFIRMATION OF ASSUMPTION]
Tammy: Non. [CONFIRMS]

Eva: Tu veux visiter des monuments ou des...[EXTENDS Tammy's CONTRIBUTION / PROVIDES SOME EXAMPLES]

Tammy: Des monuments, des châteaux, des...uh..des...les Alpes. [INCORPORATES Eva'S EXAMPLE AND EXTENDS]

Group member: Des Alpes? [PROVIDES ANOTHER EXAMPLE]

Tammy: Des Alpes. [CONFIRMS]

Group member: (inaudible)

Vicki: Et des repas? [EXTENDS / PROVIDES ANOTHER EXAMPLE]

Tammy: Ne pas dans les restaurants. [QUALIFIES]

Group member: Non, non. [EXPRESSES AGREEMENT]

Tammy: Dans la rue. [GIVES EXAMPLE]

Vicki: Dans la rue. [ECHOES Tammy'S CONTRIBUTION, SHOWING AGREEMENT] C'est moins cher. [STATES REASON]

Tammy: Umh.

Vicki: Beaucoup de bratwurst. (laugh) [GIVES AN EXAMPLE]

Tammy: ...fromage. [CONTINUES SEQUENCE OF EXAMPLE GIVING]

Lana: Vin? [CONTINUES / MISPRONOUNCED BUT UNDERSTOOD]

Here, Eva is probing Tammy to get some insight on Tammy's expectations for her trip. At the point at which Eva begins to enumerate possible sites to visit, the effort becomes an event in collaboration as Tammy incorporates Eva's suggestions and extends these suggestions to ideas of her own. Other members of the group are inspired to add their ideas to the trip, ideas that are echoed by other members and eventually incorporated into the discourse. This particular collaborative event begins with Eva's inquiry about things Terry would like to visit. Eva makes a suggestion ("monuments") that Tammy incorporates. Tammy, then, extends the list by adding "châteaux and the Alps." An inaudible utterance changes the topic of the list from what one might visit to a more basic survival element, food. As soon as "repas / meal" is mentioned, and the fact established that eating "in the street" is less expensive than "in a restaurant," members contribute various versions of what one might possibly eat or drink. Again, contributions are echoed by other members and expanded upon in a collaborative effort this seems typical of this group of participants.
As the conversation continues (the following is a direct continuation of the preceding conversation), students demonstrate another example of collaboration in which the main speaker, Vicki, incorporates the contribution of another into her story. The collaborative effort in this particular excerpt reveals a harmonious atmosphere that exists in this small group interaction.

Vicki: J'ai des amis qui ont fait un voyage similaire et quand ils va à un pays, ils ne sait pas où ils vont. [USES AN EXAMPLE TO TIE INTO SUBJECT OF DISCUSSION, THEREBY EXTENDING THE DISCUSSION]

Tammy: Vraiment? Oh, bon co...[REFLECTS AND REPAIRS / EXPRESSES DIFFICULTY IN EMITTING THE WORDS] bon comme ca...bon comme ça...[EVALUATES] "Good." [CLARIFIES] Je n'ai pas de temps...de...de....

Vicki: ... de faire un...

Tammy: ...voyage comme ça. [VICKI ASSISTS TAMMY IN COMPOSING THE SENTENCE. THEY STATE THE UTTERANCE IN SYNCHRONY]

Vicki: Un, deux mois, il est possible. [CONTRACTS SLIGHTLY]

Eva: Vous avez besoin de beaucoup d'argent de faire un voyage comme ça. [GIVES A SUPPORTING ARGUMENT]

Vicki: Non, ils n'ont pas beaucoup argent. Ils ont...[CONTRACTS PREVIOUS ASSERTION WITH EXAMPLE]

Group member: ...dorment...

Vicki: ...dorment dans les...dans les trains...

Group: (laugh)

Eva: ...dorment dans les trains

Vicki: ...dans la rue...

Group member: ...dans la rue...

Vicki: Ils dorment dans le train et dans les rues quand ils se lever, ils ont des paquets sur le "back"....[USES ENGLISH WORD TO CONVEY MEANING]

Group member: ...dos?

Vicki: Oui. Dos. [ACKNOWLEDGES CORRECT WORD, AND INCORPORATES
Vicki uses an example with which she is familiar to introduce a sub-topic, her friends' trip. By relating this to previous utterances about trips, she is able to extend the discussion and take the floor from Tammy. Tammy accepts this sub-topic, and tries to express her sentiment, but has difficulty finding the right cliche. She uses the English, "good," to clarify her position, but then wishes to justify that she will not make a similar trip because there is not enough time.

As she begins the next utterance, "Je n'ai pas de temps...," Vicki offers her assistance as she hesitates. Tammy, accepting Vicki's help, then finishes her utterance. Both Tammy and Vicki collaborate to make this sentence. The assist does not interfere with the logical progression of the conversation, nor the role that Vicki plays in it. Vicki quickly counters Tammy's rationale by saying that such a trip is possible in one or two months. Eva, then, gives an argument in semi-support of Tammy, who doubts its possibility, that such a trip requires lots of money. Again, Vicki counters that assertion with the statement that her friends did not have much money. At this point, Vicki attempts to substantiate this counter attack with "ils ont," but is interrupted by a peer who makes a suggestion. Accepting the suggestion, Vicki changes verbs, "ont" to "dorment," thus incorporating this assist into the discourse. Vicki's utterance is echoed by another peer before Vicki can finish her thought. In fact, there is an echoing effort as these peers support and confirm the utterances of one another.

Immediately following this shared effort to convey a message, Vicki restates the jointly created utterance in its entirety: "Ils dorment dans le train et dans les rues quand ils se lever, ils ont des paquets sur le 'back'..." It is at this point that another assist is requested and given, and the discourse continues.

This excerpt is an excellent example of student-student interaction where collaborative effort is evident. In the absence of the instructor, students work together in a communicative endeavor. They resolve conflict and disagreement, give support, and assist one another. All utterances are accepted as long as the communication is successful. The resulting discourse is derived from collaborative efforts whereby students incorporate suggestions, prompts, and other assists into the communication.

**Reflexive Strategies**

Reflexive strategies is a term best defined as the manner in which students repair their own utterances or errors, correct others, search for the appropriate word or language form, evaluate their own utterances or that of their peers, and predict what their peers will say (finish utterances for them). More precisely, reflexive strategies refer to the ways students monitor their own and others' speech. Analysis of student-student interaction revealed several sub-categories of reflexivity: reflection, search, reparation, correction, prediction, and
The following definitions serve to clarify the sub-categories of reflexive strategies. "reflection" refers specifically to the event that occurs when a student reflects upon what he or she is saying, and in doing so, hesitates. "Reflection" does not involve a change from what the speaker originally said. Rather, it assumes an assurance of the appropriateness and correctness of what was said.

"Search" refers to the overt sign of looking for a word or structure to complete the meaning of a message. An overt sign may consist of a student asking for assistance or hesitating because he or she is unable to find the appropriate words.

"Reparation" involves a change from what a student said to what he or she intended to say. In most error correction in student-student interaction, a student "repairs" his or her own utterance, rarely another's. Sometimes, a correct utterance may be "repaired" incorrectly, or the change may focus on the form of the language used, as in transforming "vous" to "tu."

"Correction" refers to an individual correcting another's utterance. This rarely occurs in student-student interaction, but occurs in discussions where the instructor is present, in which case, the instructor does the correcting.

"Prediction" is a category that consists of a listener guessing the message of the speaker. In doing so, the listener will probably interrupt the speaker at the point where she or he hesitates, and will complete the speaker's utterance. This phenomenon occurred repeatedly in the samples of student-student interaction from this class and was an accepted method for becoming involved in the discussion. In most instances, the predictions were correct, indicating, most likely, that students shared a similar background upon which they based their interpretations of messages and, therefore, predictions.

The following examples of reflection are taken out of context from preceding excerpts. As stated previously, these examples do not involve a change in the speaker's utterance, but indicate a hesitation, then, assume an assurance on the part of the speaker that the utterance is appropriate because it is repeated.

Example #1
Lana: Mais, il y a beaucoup... il n'est pas très, très cher, espécalement les...[REFLECTS]...les hôtels...

Example #2
Lana: Est-ce que il est...[REFLECTS]...il est dans un groupe de personnes ou "just" tout le monde...

Example #3
Group member: Comment est-ce que vous...[REFLECTS] Comment est-ce que vous décidez de faire le voyage?

Example #4
Eva: Quelle sorte de...[REFLECTS]...quelle sorte d'aventure veux-tu à l'Europe?

Example #5
Tammy: Vraiment? Oh, bon co...[REFLECTS] bon comme ça....bon comme ça...

In these examples of "reflection," students are in the middle of forming their utterance, and stop to verify the appropriateness or correctness of what they have said or are about to say. The fact that students reflect during the interaction process is one indication that they are also monitoring their output. In Example #5, there is an indication that the student must also listen to how her utterance sounds, as she says it once in a very attentive manner, and pronounces, then, the final version: "bon comme ça."

The following examples of reparation are also drawn out of their context from previous discourse, but still demonstrate how students make changes while interacting.

Example #1
Tammy: C'est pour deux mois et nous sommes...[REPAIRS] voyagerons en tous les... tous les pays.

Example #2
Vicki: Est-ce que vous...[REPAIRS] Est-ce que tu parles des autres langues?

Example #3
Tammy: Non, je...je suggererais à ma...[REPAIRS] suggerera... [REPAIRS] suggererais à mama de...[REPAIRS] que je voulais faire un voyage au France et mama...[REPAIRS] je... je... je... je... je souhaiterais de faire un voyage, n'est-ce pas?

Example #4
Female: Oui, vous êtes le victime.... [R: CONTRADICTS BY RESTATING CR'S UTTERANCE]
Cary: Non. [R: CONFIRMS FIRST RESPONSE]
Female: ...Vous serez le victime. [SELF CORRECTS]

Example #5
Lana: Pas...encore (almost inaudible). Pas encore. [SELF CORRECTS: PRONUNCIATION]
Example #6
Eva: C'est l'answer. [RESPONDS: USES ENGLISH UNCONSCIOUSLY]
C'est la réponse. [SELF CORRECTS & ENDS TURN]

Example #7
Cary: Je veux aller en Québec, au Québec. [SELF CORRECTS] J'ai un peu peur parce que je suis, j'avais ici pour dix ans, dix années [SELF CORRECTS] et je suis comme un arbre, je suis comme un arbre et...

Example #8
Winston: L'intention, l'intention - idée dans votre tête.
[RESPONS WITH CLARIFICATION BY REPEATING MISUNDERSTOOD WORD AND GIVES A DEFINITION]

Cary: Ah, oui. [ACKNOWLEDGES UNDERSTANDING] C'est idée de votre tête, de ma tête. [RESTATES & SELF CORRECTS].

Example #9
Est-ce que les planètes...excusez-moi. [APOLOGIZES FOR REPAIR] Est-ce que vous croyez que les planètes elles détermineront, elles causeront, elles décideront votre avenir?

These examples of "reparations" indicate student attention to semantic and syntactic elements during the interaction itself. This attention is perhaps more typical of students functioning in a foreign language than in their own language, although false starts and self-corrections are also part of verbal interaction in own's native language. This effort in "repairing" or editing is another indication of the existence of a monitoring system that was evident for all students who participated in this study. No effort was made in this research to determine which students were frequent or infrequent users of this monitoring feature.

Students also appeared to be searching for the right utterance in many conversational situations.

Example #1
Tammy: Umh...je parle ne pas bien... et je parle...(SEARCHES)...allemande? Non.

Example #2
Vicki: Oui. Parce que tu peux parler avec une autre et "to share"? [SEARCHES]

Example #3
Group member: Avez-vous un billet de...(SEARCHES FOR VOCAB WORD)
Tammy: Eurail...
Group member: Eurail.
These searches are initiated in several ways. Each of the examples given is indicative of a different method of searching for the appropriate semantic or syntactical element. In the first example, the student is looking for a word, finds one that is close, but judges it to be incorrect. The entire process is carried out orally, and could be labelled as "thinking aloud." In the second example, the student requests help in her search by stating the English equivalent with an interrogative intonation. The third example shows a student who hesitates at the point at which the word is needed. Another student supplies the vocabulary word sought, which the original speaker then incorporates into the utterance. Examples #1 and #2 were the most frequently used methods of "searching" found in the transcripts of student-student interaction in this class.

The following examples demonstrate the characteristics of prediction in student assists that occurred throughout student-student interaction.

Example #1
Winston: Quelle est votre idée? [ELICITS CONTINUED PARTICIPATION: ENCOURAGES]
Eva: Je ne sais...je n'sais pas [ACKNOWLEDGES CONFUSION]
Winston: Voudriez-vous être...[ELICITS PARTICIPATION BY GIVING EXAMPLE FOR PROFESSIONAL CHOICE: ATTEMPTS TO PREDICT]
Lana: ... La victime? [PREDICTS: FINISHES ANOTHER'S UTTERANCE; INTERRUPTS]
Winston:... actrice? [FINISHES EXAMPLE] peut-être [QUALIFIES].

Example #2
Lana: Connaissez-vous...[ELICITS ADDITIONAL PERSONAL INFORMATION]
Tammy: Non. [RESPONDS TO HALF-STATED QUESTION PREDICTS L'S THOUGHT OR UTTERANCE]
Lana: ... quelqu'un en France? [FINISHES QUESTION]
Tammy: Non. [RESPONDS TO COMPLETED QUESTION]

Example #3
Eva: Tu veux visiter des monuments ou des...[EXTENDS-ELICITS INFORMATION / PROVIDES SOME EXAMPLES]
Tammy: Des monuments, des châteaux, des...uh..des...les Alpes.

Example #4
Tammy: Je n'ai pas de temps...de...de....
In Example #1, Winston is trying to help Eva focus on what she would like to become. At the point in which Eva says she doesn't know what she wants, Winston assists by making a suggestion, a type of prediction, "actrice." Before Winston can finish, however, Lana predicts how Winston will finish the sentence with "victime," which is not correct.

In Example #2, Lana begins an elicitation whose content Tammy predicts as she interrupts the elicitation to answer. Lana finishes the question, and Tammy repeats her response. Evidently, Tammy was able to predict Lana's utterance from the context of the preceding discourse.

In Example #3, Eva is assisting Tammy by listing suggestions of a possible visit. In a sense, she is predicting what Tammy might visit on her trip to France. Eva is successful in her suggestion as Tammy incorporates it and continues to list other possibilities.

In Example #4, Tammy begins an utterance, and as she begins to search for the appropriate word, Vicki successfully predicts it. Tammy, then, incorporates the assist into her utterance by continuing and finishing her thought.

Evaluation of one's utterance also occurred during discourse as the following examples demonstrate. This process was less apparent than other forms of self-monitoring, but were nonetheless crucial to the interaction.

Example #1
Tammy: Uhm... je parle ne pas bien... et je parle... allemagne?
Non. [JUDGES INCORRECT]

Example #2
Tammy: Vraiment? Oh, bon co... bon comme ça....bon comme ça...[EVALUATES]..."Good."

Inherent in any type of monitoring feature is that of evaluation. Reflection, reparation, and prediction involve an element of evaluation that accompany the utterance. A student judges components of an utterance to be correct or incorrect, appropriate or inappropriate. This judgment is not often evident at the first analysis, but is inherent in the context of the utterances. The preceding examples have been selected because of their concrete demonstration of the evaluative process. In Example #1, Tammy judges, her utterance "allemagne" to be in correct in a "think aloud" process. She utters in a questioning tone, "Allemagne?" and follows it with, "Non." She has judged that utterance to be incorrect, a process normally done in one's head, not in a manner that is public. In Example #2, Tammy also judges her preceding utterance, but finds it lacking in clarity. She, therefore, translates the meaning for her peers in saying, "Good."
Students monitor and analyze their own and other's speech through events that show evidence of reflection, search, reparation, prediction, and evaluation. Transcripts of student-student interaction revealed that students do hesitate during the formation of utterances to verify the appropriateness or correctness of what they are saying. Students also make changes after having begun an utterance in an effort to repair it themselves. When faced with the absence of an appropriate word or form, students send signals of a search by hesitating, guessing and, then, evaluating the find themselves, or by requesting assistance in the form of a definition or translation. Predictions are one method by which students can enter the conversation. This method is accomplished by interrupting a speaker and finishing the utterance, by assisting a peer who is searching, or by suggesting a possible solution when appropriate. Evaluating the correctness or appropriateness of one's contribution is inherent in the communicative process as students reflect, repair, and predict.

In summary, the ways in which students exchange information have been examined and three levels of interpretation emerged from transcripts of student-student interaction. Discourse moves, such as initiating, eliciting, responding, and extending, appear to structure the discourse. At the same time, there are elements of social skills present, indicating that students also control discourse by creating a supportive environment in which ideas are then exchanged, agreed to or disagreed upon, and in which collaboration occurs. Evidence of reflexivity also became apparent as students monitored their contributions by reflecting upon their utterances, repairing them, and predicting utterances for their peers.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY

The Problem of the Study

How students communicate with each other in the classroom has been very much a mystery because of the complex nature of human communication and the lack of documentation of student-student interaction. Studies in the last decade have revealed an abundance of knowledge on teacher-student communication, particularly the fact that as much as two-thirds of classroom talk originates with the teacher. The remaining third is occupied by teacher-student interaction. Only in classes where the teacher's objective is to have students working and talking together in task oriented activities does student-student interaction take place.

The enigma is even greater when the area is further delimited as student-student interaction in the foreign language classroom. In addition, beginning and intermediate language courses are such that most all communication is directed by the teacher to the student. Although activities, such as directed dialogues, engage students in conversation with one another, the content of what is said is manipulated by the teacher.

Although research is needed on student-student interaction in foreign languages in general, the scope of such a study is too great. This study, consequently, limited itself to research on student talk in a French class at the college level. The research question in the study focused on the characteristics of student-student interaction in the French classroom that was selected for the study. With this focus, the researcher examined 1) the type of activities that produced student-student interaction, 2) how students interacted verbally with one another, 3) what characterized student-student interaction, 4) whether or not students benefited from student-student interaction, and 5) student attitudes toward interacting with their peers.

Recent findings in the area of discourse analysis have shown that elements of language usage consist not only of syntactical skills, but communicative skills, functional uses of language, pragmatics, language in context, and discourse rules. These considerations have a definite impact on the way in which interaction in a classroom setting should be analyzed. It is not possible to analyze language out of its context, out of its environment. The interaction that is responsible for producing language must also be included in the examination.
Procedures

The naturalistic paradigm was best suited for examining and analyzing student-student interaction in the French classroom at the college level. This research paradigm permitted student-student interaction to be observed and analyzed in its natural setting and in a holistic manner. As research occurring in the field, there was the assumption that the findings of this study should be based upon multiple realities, that all individual participants contributed their own perspective or interpretation of events that occurred. In addition to observations, students were interviewed at various times about different aspects of verbal behavior in the classroom, their interpretation of classroom events, and other areas that related to the study. The study is a synthesis of the combined realities of the participants of this study, and presents a close examination of actual student-student interaction from which working hypotheses were based. True of naturalistic research, the theory emerged from the data rather than from an a priori statements of hypotheses.

In order to conduct naturalistic research, the investigator attended classes throughout the entire year with the objective of being present when student-student interaction occurred. The second objective of this researcher was to become an accepted member of the class. This was accomplished through faithful attendance and open sensitivity to the participants of the study. As an accepted class member, the researcher pursued a role of total involvement that facilitated the flow of information from participants to the investigator. Thus, the investigator was able to interview participants in order to confirm emergent theory. This theory was refined and developed through continued interviews and observations. By repeating the same or similar questions to multiple participants, data were cross-checked.

Data collection came from three sources: classroom registration forms, participant observation, and audio-recordings of student-student interaction. Participant observation consisted of both systematic observation during the course of the study and ethnographic interviews conducted with all participants of the study, students and the instructor.

The researcher analyzed the data using the constant comparative method, a method that consists of four stages. First, she compared events and assigned categories; second, she defined those categories, integrating them and their properties; third, she delimited the theory; and, fourth, she wrote the theory. Data from all sources were submitted to this analysis, resulting in a comprehensive study on student-student interaction in a college French class.

To insure the internal validity of the study and limit observer's biases, the researcher prolonged the study to one school year's duration, engaged in persistent observation, undertook peer debriefings, incorporated triangulation into the design, accurately documented interviews and interaction by making audio-recordings of the events, and employed member check throughout the study to verify data. For the purpose of identifying the impact of the research on
participants, the study incorporated testimonies of student reaction to the investigator's presence into its findings.

Findings and Working Hypotheses

As stated earlier, previous studies on classroom interaction raised some questions from which general questions to guide the study were formulated. These initial queries were addressed and answered in this study:

1 Why are students not more actively engaged in verbal interaction?

Students spent a certain amount of time actively listening to the instructor speak French and to their peers. It is evident, therefore, that students were more actively engaged in interaction than is apparent on the surface. Students did, however, give up the role of correcting, encouraging, and praising their peers to the instructor. Consequently, typical classroom interaction in large group format moved from the instructor to student and back again, with the instructor at the apex of most interaction. This movement was not typical of small group interaction when the instructor was absent.

2 Does all classroom communication exist solely between the teacher and students?

In large group format, most classroom interaction occurred between the instructor and students, but classroom interaction among students in this Intermediate French class did take place. It is important to note, however, that student-student interaction occurred primarily as a result of the instructor's desire to have students interact, and, consequently, as a result of the instructor's creating specific tasks to accomplish that goal. In this classroom setting, the instructor incorporated activities into the class schedule that required students to work with other students in a communicative effort. Formulating questions on the text, situational dialogues, and group interviews were among those activities.

3 If students have the opportunity to interact with one another what information is exchanged and how is it exchanged?

This question provided the focus for examining the role of interaction in the French classroom and produced investigations from which working hypotheses emanated. Three hypotheses concerning the characteristics of student verbal behavior emerged from the analysis of transcripts of student talk and observations.
Hypothesis #1. Student-student interaction in French, consists of discourse moves that initiate conversation or a specific topic, elicit a reply, respond to peer utterances, and extend the discussion.

The manner in which students interacted with one another in French when given the opportunity appeared to be similar to the way interaction in the native language has been documented. Discourse moves shaped the conversation. Interaction was facilitated by the manner in which the class was conducted. Specific activities created for practicing interaction, the model presented by the instructor, and the time spent in the course on communication activities were responsible for students acquiring the conventions of discourse, feeling comfortable with them and with each other, and implementing the conventions. Students learned to formulate questions and respond to the questions of others. Role playing called on the inventive element of student discourse. When students did not know a certain expression, they substituted an equivalent one based on what they knew in the language. Expressions, such as "S'il vous plaît" and "Je ne sais pas," were used in place of more appropriate French expressions simply because they were part of students' working vocabulary. Students were very creative and used what they knew of both communication systems to exchange ideas. They also relied on one another for assistance in making the communication complete.

Hypothesis #2. Social skills are also an integral element of peer interaction. In the absence of the instructor, students resolve conflict, give each other support and assistance, and work in a collaborative effort to communicate with one another.

Although students generally gave the role of supporter, referee, aid, and clarifier to the instructor, they were capable of taking on this role in her absence. A supportive atmosphere, established early in the course, inspired students to assist one another as they worked together by providing them with the model of acceptable patterns for doing so. In small group activities where the instructor was not present, peer support and assistance was very apparent. The collaborative effort of students to establish meaning that was understood by all members was remarkable.

Hypothesis #3. Students monitor, analyze and evaluate their own communicative behavior during the interactive process. Student behaviors that supported this hypothesis were 1) reflecting upon what one is saying (sometimes evident when a student hesitates), 2) searching for the appropriate word or form to end an utterance, 3) repairing one's own utterance subsequent to being judged incorrect, 4) correcting another's utterance, and 5) predicting utterances or finishing another student's utterance.

Evidence of a monitoring system was established by the analysis of the transcripts of the study. In one's native tongue, there are many false starts,
corrections, and changes. These characteristics appeared to be intensified in student talk by the newness of the French language to the student and, therefore, the need to verify the correctness of one's utterance. There was also documentation of students analyzing and evaluating the utterances of their peers. Rarely, however, did one student correct another's syntactical errors.

Hypothesis #4. Student attitudes toward using French with their peers is positive.

This hypothesis about attitude toward student-student is based on findings from interviews with students. In fact, most students felt more comfortable using French in the presence of their peers than when their instructor was there. They expressed less anxiety toward speaking French in small groups of peers. The lack of grammatically perfect language models was offset by the fact that students became aware that interacting with their peers caused them to be more spontaneous and to think more in French.

Limitations

This study was conducted for the purpose of examining characteristics of student-student interaction, for generating hypotheses, not for testing them. Theories emerged from the data in the form of working hypotheses that were confirmed by additional analyses of the data. These hypotheses should, however, be subsequently tested by other measures, other research. In addition, it is important to remember that this research is a case study of one Intermediate French class at the college level. In examining the findings of this study, a reader must take into consideration the characteristics of this particular classroom setting and its participants.

Implications

There are several implications that can be drawn from this research. All of these implications are related to one another and, therefore, difficult to isolate. They deal with minimizing anxiety, building on what students already know about discourse strategies, and providing students greater opportunity to use the language they are learning.

The role played by the foreign language instructor is a critical factor in the teaching-learning process. The importance of establishing an empathic relationship between teacher and students, a relationship that helps to minimize the anxiety of language learners, is obvious. The instructor must be flexible enough to adapt to the needs of individual students, in spite of variations of class size, the wide range in students skill levels, and the variety of interests that individual students bring to the class. Allowing students to make mistakes also seems critical in view of the effect it has on student anxiety levels. Fear of making an error can augment anxiety to the point of seriously blocking the
Transcripts revealed that students speaking French interacted using discourse moves much as they do when speaking English. Student demonstration of knowledge of discourse moves, using appropriate or sometimes inappropriate expressions in French, emphasized the fact that students make hypotheses about language usage based on what they already know, their own native tongue. Often ignored, this fact can eliminate educators concerns that students have not mastered enough French to be able to communicate. It is also possible to conclude that students might benefit from learning French expressions that accompany discourse moves.

Activities created by the instructor for the purpose of engendering student-student interaction can be a successful and should be an integral part of classroom activities. To avoid the negative "on the spot" and "in front of the whole class" experiences, the instructor might consider the use of small groups to accomplish specific tasks. These experiences in peer interaction increase the opportunity for students to speak. Because of the indirect role the instructor plays, student-student interaction activities also provide students with the experience of supporting, assisting, and collaborating with others.

Student-student interaction produces what has been called interlanguage by foreign language educators (Brown, 1981). Others might call it survival French. It is an intermediary language that is in the process of becoming French, but still retains elements of the native language. Grammatical structures are not always complete and vocabulary may also be borrowed from the native language. Student-student interaction, however, does provide students the opportunity for realistic practice in understanding the basic linguistic system. This practice is a process in establishing meaning and communication between individuals and is possible because of both the stability and instability of language. The stability of language is the general or accepted meaning of an utterance. The instability of language enables a speaker by some means, such as inflection, to give an utterance a different meaning. The actual power of language is dynamic as it is constantly in negotiation, requiring participants to agree with and accept meaning, and to clarify and justify specific meaning. Successful communication for students learning French requires not only practice in syntactical and semantic expression, but experience in the negotiatory process of the language. Because native speakers are not available in the numbers required to work with individual students to achieve this experience, student-student interaction is an appropriate means by which an instructor can attain that goal.

Recommendations

Because the scope of this study of student-student interaction was descriptive in nature, the findings raise perhaps more questions than they answer. The investigator feels that more research is merited in specific areas of student-student interaction in foreign languages and areas related to it. The most obvious is a duplication of this study to compare findings in as much as
duplication of a naturalistic study is possible. A second possible focus is a study in the same language, but, at other levels of language mastery, and with other age groups. A third possibility is a study in other languages at various levels. A fourth study might examine non-verbal communication in student-student interaction.

In addition, the following concerns that deal with related areas (the environment, methodology, interaction patterns of native language speakers, and student types) should be the focus of further related research.

1. What environmental factors encourage and optimize the opportunity for student-student interaction?

2. What physical arrangements optimize student-student interaction in a structured classroom?

3. What role does monitoring, analyzing and evaluating communication play in student-student interaction?

4. What activities engender student-student interaction? How effective is each in involving students interactively? What activities are appropriate and effective for learners of different ages?

5. Large group format vs. small group format: what is the role of each in augmenting student-student interaction?

6. What is the effect of unstructured language practice in conversational format on language learning compared to structured practice?

7. How does interaction between language learners of French differ from interaction between native French speakers in a similar situation discussing the same topic?

8. What is the effect of student-student interaction on the learning of different student types that exist in the foreign language classroom?

In conclusion, this study recognizes that further research in the area of student-student interaction is necessary, valid, warranted, and meaningful for advancing knowledge of the language learning process. Student-student interaction has a serious role to play in the foreign language classroom, but more research is required to fully understand the scope and complexity of the phenomenon examined in this study.
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CLAS SRO O M  REGISTRATION F O R M  (optional)

Last name ___________________________ First name ___________________________ 1 2 3 4 SP (Circle one) Rank in years

High school attended ___________________________ location ___________________________ Year of graduation

Languages studied in high school
Spanish ________ yrs. Spanish ________ courses
French ________ yrs. French ________ courses
German ________ yrs. German ________ courses
other ________ yrs. other ________ courses

Major field of study__________________________

Experience in living and travelling outside the U. S. A.:
Countries __________ Time spent __________

Other experiences related to foreign language study:

Reason(s) for taking French:

Present opportunity for using French (circle one):

1 limited to in-class activities
2 periodic use outside of class
3 frequent use outside of class

Additional comments that might be of use:
APPENDIX B

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE
QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Working in small groups helps my learning.
   ___ALWAYS___OFTEN___SOMETIMES___RARELY___NEVER

2. Listening to tapes in the language laboratory helps my learning.
   ___ALWAYS___OFTEN___SOMETIMES___RARELY___NEVER

3. Answering my classmates' questions helps my learning.
   ___ALWAYS___OFTEN___SOMETIMES___RARELY___NEVER

4. Large group discussions help my learning.
   ___ALWAYS___OFTEN___SOMETIMES___RARELY___NEVER

5. Correcting grammar exercises helps my learning.
   ___ALWAYS___OFTEN___SOMETIMES___RARELY___NEVER

   ___ALWAYS___OFTEN___SOMETIMES___RARELY___NEVER

7. Drills on specific grammatical structures help my learning.
   ___ALWAYS___OFTEN___SOMETIMES___RARELY___NEVER

8. Speaking French with my classmates helps my learning.
   ___ALWAYS___OFTEN___SOMETIMES___RARELY___NEVER

9. Making questions from the texts helps my learning.
   ___ALWAYS___OFTEN___SOMETIMES___RARELY___NEVER

10. Working on my own helps my learning.
    ___ALWAYS___OFTEN___SOMETIMES___RARELY___NEVER

11. Formulating questions to stimulate conversation helps my learning.
    ___ALWAYS___OFTEN___SOMETIMES___RARELY___NEVER

12. Helping a classmate with a French word or expression helps my learning.
    ___ALWAYS___OFTEN___SOMETIMES___RARELY___NEVER

    ___ALWAYS___OFTEN___SOMETIMES___RARELY___NEVER

14. Preparing prior to class helps my learning.
    ___ALWAYS___OFTEN___SOMETIMES___RARELY___NEVER

15. Making presentations to the class that I created on my own helps my learning.
    ___ALWAYS___OFTEN___SOMETIMES___RARELY___NEVER
___ALWAYS ___OFTEN ___SOMETIMES ___RARELY ___NEVER

17. Everyone contributing ideas to class discussion helps my learning.
___ALWAYS ___OFTEN ___SOMETIMES ___RARELY ___NEVER

___ALWAYS ___OFTEN ___SOMETIMES ___RARELY ___NEVER
QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSIS

RESULTS: SEMESTER 1 - French 211

1. Working in small groups helps my learning.
   41% Seven ALWAYS learn from working in small groups.
   53% Nine OFTEN learn from working in small groups.
   6% One marked both OFTEN and ALWAYS.

2. Listening to tapes in the language laboratory helps my learning.
   29% Five ALWAYS learn from listening to lab tapes.
   29% Five OFTEN learn from listening to lab tapes.
   18% Three SOMETIMES learn from listening to lab tapes.
   24% Four RARELY learn from listening to lab tapes.

3. Answering my classmates' questions helps my learning.
   29% Five ALWAYS learn from answering classmates' questions.
   41% Seven OFTEN learn from answering classmates' questions.
   24% Four SOMETIMES learn from answering classmates' questions.
   6% One marked both SOMETIMES and OFTEN.

4. Large group discussions help my learning.
   6% One ALWAYS learns from large group discussion.
   53% Nine OFTEN learn from large group discussion.
   35% Six SOMETIMES learn from large group discussion.
   6% One RARELY learns from large group discussion.

5. Correcting grammar exercises helps my learning.
   53% Nine ALWAYS learn from correcting grammar exercises.
   24% Four OFTEN learn from correcting grammar exercises.
   18% Three SOMETIMES learn from correcting grammar exercises.
   6% Unanswered.

   24% Four ALWAYS learn from listening to classmates speak French.
   41% Seven OFTEN learn from listening to classmates speak French.
   29% Five SOMETIMES learn from listening to classmates speak French.
   6% One RARELY learns from listening to classmates speak French.

7. Drills on specific grammatical structures.
   59% Ten ALWAYS learn from drills on specific grammatical structures.
   29% Five OFTEN learn from drills on specific grammatical structures.
   6% One SOMETIMES learns from drills on specific grammatical structures.
   6% Unanswered.

8. Speaking French with my classmates helps my learning.
41% Seven ALWAYS learn from speaking French with classmates.
47% Eight OFTEN learn from speaking French with classmates.
6% One SOMETIMES learn from speaking French with classmates.
6% Unanswered.

9. Making questions from the texts helps my learning.
41% Seven ALWAYS learn from making questions from texts.
35% Six OFTEN learn from making questions from texts.
24% Four SOMETIMES learn from making questions from texts.

10. Working on my own helps my learning.
41% Seven ALWAYS learn from working on their own.
35% Six OFTEN learn from working on their own.
18% Three SOMETIMES learn from working on their own.
6% One NEVER learns from working on their own.

11. Formulating questions to stimulate conversation helps my learning.
53% Nine ALWAYS learn from formulating questions to stimulate conversation.
29% Five OFTEN learn from formulating questions to stimulate conversation.
18% Three SOMETIMES learn from formulating questions to stimulate conversation.

12. Helping a classmate with a French word or expression helps my learning.
24% Four ALWAYS learn from helping a classmate with a French word or expression.
41% Seven OFTEN learn from helping a classmate with a French word or expression.
29% Five SOMETIMES learn from helping a classmate with a French word or expression.
6% Unanswered.

47% Eight ALWAYS learn from creating situational dialogues.
47% Eight OFTEN learn from creating situational dialogues.
6% One SOMETIMES learns from creating situational dialogues.

14. Preparing prior to class helps my learning.
65% Eleven ALWAYS learn from preparing prior to class.
29% Five OFTEN learn from preparing prior to class.
6% One SOMETIMES learns from preparing prior to class.

15. Making presentations to the class that I created on my own helps my learning.
41% Seven ALWAYS learn from making independently created presentations.
41% Seven OFTEN learn from making independently created presentations.
6% One RARELY learn from making independently created presentations.
6% One checked both SOMETIMES and OFTEN.
6% Unanswered.

41% Seven ALWAYS learn better by knowing their classmates.
41% Seven OFTEN learn better by knowing their classmates.
6% One check both OFTEN and ALWAYS.
12% Two SOMETIMES learn better by knowing their classmates.
6% One NEVER learns better by knowing their classmates.
6% Marked two answers.

17. Everyone contributing ideas to class discussion helps my learning.
24% Four ALWAYS learn from everyone contributing ideas to class discussion.
71% Twelve OFTEN learn from everyone contributing ideas to class discussion.
6% One SOMETIMES learn from everyone contributing ideas to class discussion.

18. Classmates correcting my French helps my learning.
18% Three ALWAYS learn from classmates correcting their French.
71% Twelve OFTEN learn from classmates correcting their French.
6% One SOMETIMES learn from classmates correcting their French.
6% One RARELY learn from classmates correcting their French.
SAMPLE: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

What languages have you studied? Have you lived outside the USA? Why are you enrolled in this course?

What are your favorite characteristics of this class? or What do you like best about this class?

What would you change in this class to make learning better for you?

What do you think encourages people to participate? or What makes the class have an atmosphere that's comfortable for speaking? What makes you want to participate?

What do you think keeps people from participating? What keeps you from participating?

What activities do you like least? or What class activities help you the least in your learning French?

What activities do you like most?

What activities are most conducive to speaking French?

Do you think other student's contributions are important? Why? Can you understand the contributions of others? What benefit do you get from other students talking French? Do you ever find that their contributions get in the way?

What mental processes do you go through to formulate questions on the text during large groups discussions? What's the first thing you do when you been assigned a paragraph on which to ask questions?

What mental processes do you go through when you answer questions? Do you usually think in French or English?

In general what changes have you noticed in classroom participation since September? in your participation?

How much time do you spend on preparation for each class?

Does my presence have an effect other class members? on you?

Do you think the presence of the tape recorders have an effect on classroom participation?

Did my presence in the class or the use of tape recorders have an effect on normal class proceedings at the beginning of the
semester? now? What might explain the change?

Do you have a special seat? Where is it? What do you like to sit there? Do you think others have a special seat? Can you explain why?

Have you noticed any changes since the beginning of the semester? since last semester?

Which classroom do you prefer? Why?
APPENDIX D

TRANSCRIPT OF STUDENT DISCUSSIONS
STUDENT DISCUSSION

February 24, 1983

Assignment: Interview group members about future plans
Participants: Cary, Stan, Lana, Eva, Winston, Pam, Tammy, and the researcher

(Laughter)

Student: Ça marche...[MAKES OBSERVATION THAT RECORDER IS ON]

Winston: You get the mike. You’re the victim. [SELECTS SPEAKER]

(Laughter)

Cary: J’ai beaucoup de questions. [JUSTIFIES NOT ACCEPTING THE FLOOR]. Je ne suis pas un victime. [REFUSES THE FLOOR]

(Laughter)

Cary: I don’t wanta be it. [GIVES REASON]

Student: Oui, vous êtes le vic... [CONTRADICTS BY RESTATING Cary’s UTTERANCE]

Cary: Non. [CONFIRMS FIRST RESPONSE]

Student: ...Vous serez le victime. [SELF CORRECTS]

Cary: Non..

Student: C’est différent.

Student: Oui.

Student: (inaudible)

Eva: Ah, non,non,non, Un bon discussion.

Student: (inaudible)

Lana: Qui avez un bon idée de, devenir...quelques professions. [ELICITS PARTICIPATION OF OTHERS] Rien? Personne? [SELF-CORRECTS]

Student: Vous? [RETURNS INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE]

Lana: Non, c’est pourquoi j’ai demandé. [REFUSES FLOOR; Explains]
WITH REASON]

Winston: Vous n'avez pas une idée pour votre avenir? [VERIFIES]

Lana: Pas...encore (almost inaudible). Pas encore. [SELF CORRECTS: PRONUNCIATION]

Eva: Un jour, un fois... [INITIATES: BEGINS TURN]

Lana: Un jour, une fois [DEMONSTRATES RESPONSIVE LISTENING BY ECHOING Eva]

(laugh)

Winston: Quelle est votre idée? [ELICITS CONTINUED PARTICIPATION: ENCOURAGES]

Eva: Je ne sais...je n'sais pas [R: ACKNOWLEDGES CONFUSION]

Winston: Voudriez-vous être...[ELICITS PARTICIPATION BY GIVING EXAMPLE FOR PROFESSIONAL CHOICE: ATTEMPTS TO PREDICT]

Lana: ... La victime? [PREDICTS: FINISHES ANOTHER'S UTTERANCE; INTERRUPTS]

Winston: ... actrice? [FINISHES EXAMPLE] peut-être [QUALIFIES].

Eva: Peut-être. [RESPONDS] Je ne pense pas. [QUALIFIES] Parce que je pense qu'un jour je... je serai un in...st...tu...trice. [GIVES REASON; DEMONSTRATES DIFFICULTY WITH PRONUNCIATION]

Lana: Actrice? [HELPS; ELICITS CLARIFICATION]

Eva: In...st...tu...trice. [RESPONS NEGATIVELY BY GIVING ALTERNATIVE]

Lana: Institutrice? [ELICITS CLARIFICATION BY REPEATING; INADVERTENTLY ASSISTS WITH PRONUNCIATION] [OH, DO YOU MEAN......?]

Eva: Institutrice. [REPEATS WITH CORRECT PRONUNCIATION] Pour le drama, pour le théâtre, parce que j'ai étudié le "acting." [QUALIFIES AND EXPLAINS]

Lana: Oh. Je ne sais pas. [DEMONSTRATES RESPONSIVE LISTENING] [OH, I DIDN'T KNOW]

Eva: C'est l'answer. [RESPONDS: USES ENGLISH UNCONSCIOUSLY] C'est la réponse. [SELF CORRECTS & ENDS TURN]
Cary: J'ai une question. [INITIATES: TAKES THE FLOOR]

Student: Pour qui? [ELICITS QUALIFICATION]

Cary: Qui veut être la victime? [ELICITS PARTICIPATION]

La: Qui voudrait répondre à votre question? [ELICITS CLARIFICATION]

Cr: Oui. [CLARIFIES]

La: Un question? [ELICITS QUALIFICATION: "IF YOU MEAN 'ANSWER JUST 1 QUESTION,' I'LL DO IT"]

(Laughter)

Cary: C'est ma meilleure question. [COUNTER-QUALIFIES]. Est-ce que les planètes...excusez-moi. [APOLOGIZES FOR REPAIR] Est-ce que vous croyez que les planètes elles détermineront, elles causeront, elles décideront votre avenir? [ELICITS A PERSONAL RESPONSE: PRESENTED WITH A VARIETY OF VERBS; Cary IS SENSITIVE TO THE NEED TO BE CLEAR WHEN SPEAKING FRENCH]

(Laughter)

Lana: Je ne comprends le. [ACKNOWLEDGES CONFUSION] Pouvez-vous le répéter? [ELICITS CLARIFICATION]

Cary: Croyez-vous que les planètes,...[REPEATS TO CLARIFY]

Lana: Terre? [ACKNOWLEDGES UNDERSTANDING BY GIVING EXAMPLE: ELICITS CONFIRMATION]

Cary: C'est Mars. [GIVES AN EXAMPLES] Mention a planet. [USES ENGLISH TO ASKS FOR ADDITIONAL EXAMPLES; HADN'T HEARD Lana's PREVIOUS UTTERANCE]

Lana: La Terre? [STILL ELICITING CONFIRMATION BY REPEATING FIRST UTTERANCE]

Researcher: Mercure, Mars, Jupiter...[GIVES EXAMPLES TO CLARIFY]

Cary: Presque anglais. [MAKES THE OBSERVATION] C'est presque anglais. C'est presque anglais. [REPEATS OBSERVATION 3 TIMES, INDICATING SURPRISE] Croyez-vous que les planètes détermineront votre avenir? [CLARIFIES BY RESTATING WITH GREATER SIMPLICITY; DROPS TWO PREVIOUSLY USED VERBS]

(Laughter)
Lana: Non, je ne le crois pas. [GIVES PERSONAL RESPONSE]

Cary: Serez-vous la maîtresse de votre avenir? [ELICITS A SECOND PERSONAL RESPONSE]

Lana: Maître? [ELICITS CLARIFICATION]

Cary: La maîtresse. [CLARIFIES BY REPEATING]

Lana: Oui. [GIVES PERSONAL RESPONSE]

(Silence)

Cary: Je serai le victime pour un fois. [INITIATES: OFFERS FLOOR TO OTHERS] Un prix. [QUALIFIES]

Student: D'accord. [ACKNOWLEDGES AGREEMENT]

Lana: C'est un populaire. [MAKES AN OBSERVATION]

(Laughter)

Students: (As the microphone is being passed to Eva) Chanson...Chanson! [INITIATE: INVITE Eva TO SING]

Eva: Avez-vous...avez-vous...[BEGINNS TURN BUT IS DISTRACTED BY PREVIOUS INITIATION] (laughter)...oui.....je ne sais pas je ne sais pas de jouer d'un piano ou de chanter le chanson. [RESPONDS: OFFERS REASON] Quel dommage. Oh, la, la. [APOLOGIZES]

Winston: Un prix. [JOKES]

Eva: Maintenant, ma question, s'il vous plaît. [INITIATES: REFOCUSES DISCUSSION] Avez-vous un peu de peur pour votre avenir? [ELICITS PERSONAL RESPONSE]

Cary: Un peu de peur. J'ai un peu de peur. [REPEATS SELF TO CLARIFY] J'ai un peu de peur pour mon avenir parce que je veux aller à un autre pays différent comme...comme les États-Unis. [EXPLAINS WITH REASON] Je veux aller en Québec, au Québec. [GIVES EXAMPLE; SELF CORRECTS] J'ai un peu peur parce que je suis, j'avais ici pour dix ans, dix années [SELF CORRECTS] et je suis comme un arbre, je suis comme un arbre et...[EXTENDS PREVIOUS STATEMENT: REPEATS TO CLARIFY]

(Laughter)

Tammy: Dix années? [CHALLENGES BY REPEATING Cary's UTTERANCE]

Cary: Pardon. [ELICITS CLARIFICATION]
Tammy: Dix années? [CLARIFIES BY REPEATING]

Cary. Oui [CONFIRMS], dix années, oui.[VERIFIES]

Tammy: Et vous êtes comme un arbre? [CHALLENGES BY RESTATING Cary's UTTERANCE]

Cary: Oui, je suis comme un arbre parce que j'ai peur de partirai. [DEFENDS BY EXTENDING PREVIOUS CONTRIBUTION]

Tammy: Je suis ici pour ah, ah tout ma vie, mais je ne suis pas comme un arbre. [CHALLENGES Cary's CONTRIBUTION BY USING SELF AS AN EXAMPLE]

(Laugh)

Cary: inaudible

Tammy: Taisez, s'il vous plaît. [TEASES: TELLS HIM TO BE QUIET; THEN LESSENS IMPACT BY USING EXPRESSION FOR POLITENESS]

Lana: Vous irez travaillez au Québec? [ELICITS PERSONAL RESPONSE TO REFOCUS DISCUSSION] ou vous voudrez allez au Québec pour... [GIVES CHOICE]

Cary: Je ne sais pas mais je pense que j'irai... ah... à une ville près de Québec, peut-être que j'irai au Vermont, c'est près de Québec et tandis... après... après un temps [REPAIRS], peut-être que je peux aller au Québec. [GIVES PERSONAL RESPONSE]

Winston: As-tu l'intention de te marier? [INITIATES: ELICITS A PERSONAL RESPONSE BUT CHANGES SUBJECT]

Cary: Je ne comprends pas. [ACKNOWLEDGES CONFUSION BROUGHT ON BY CHANGE OF SUBJECT: ELICITS CLARIFICATION]

Winston: Avez-vous l'intention de vous marier? [ATTEMPTS TO CLARIFY BY RESTATEING, CHANGES PRONOUN TO MORE FORMAL VERSION]

Cary: Chance? Que veut dire: chance? [ELICITS CLARIFICATION BY ASKING FOR A DEFINITION; ACKNOWLEDGES LACK OF UNDERSTANDING OF UTTERANCE]

Researcher: L'intention [ATTEMPTS TO CLARIFY BY REPEATING]

Winston: L'intention, l'intention - idée dans votre tête. [RESPONS WITH CLARIFICATION BY REPEATING MISUNDERSTAOOD WORD AND GIVES A DEFINITION]
Cary: Ah, oui. [ACKNOWLEDGES UNDERSTANDING] C'est idée de votre tête, de ma tête. [RESTATES & SELF CORRECTS]. Aller au Québec, cette idée? [ELICITS CONFIRMATION]

Eva: Non, de vous marier!

Cary: Ah!

Winston: De te marier.

Eva: Si vous avez l'intention de vous...[ASSISTS BY RESTATETING Winston's QUESTION]

Cary: Un de ces jours, un de ces jours. [COMPREHENDS AND GIVES PERSONAL RESPONSE] Et vous? [RETURNS ELICITATION]

Winston: Peut-être. Peut-être si, peut-être non. Je ne sais pas. Pas bientôt. [RESPONDS]


Winston: Zéro. [RESPONDS]

Cary: Zéro? [DEMONSTRATES RESPONSIVE LISTENING BY REPEATING]

Researcher: Quatre. [RESPONDS]

Cary: Quatre? [DEMONSTRATE RESPONSIVE LISTENING BY REPEATING]

Pam: Il dépend chaque jour pour moi. Quelques jours, je ne travaille pas. Et des autres, je travaille jusqu'à huit heures. Ça dépend.

Cary: Jusqu'à huit heures. C'est...

Pam: Jusqu'à huit heures.

Cary: Jusqu'à huit heures. Quel ah. Quelle heure commencez-vous?

Pam: Ah...

Cary: Quand...

Pam: Il y a quelques jours que je travaille pour quatre heures et (incompréhensible).
Lana: Et pour l'école?

Pam: Non, le samedi et dimanche seulement.

Cary: Est-ce le idéale?

Pam: Non, parce que... je ne travaille pas (laugh).

Lana: Vous travaillez beaucoup de des heures parce que vous avez besoin de l'argent? N'est-ce pas? Ce n'est pas votre oh choice?

Cary and others: Choix.

Lana: Choix? (laughter)

Stan: Un, deux, trois.

Cary: Un, deux, trois, choix.

Stan: Un, deux, trois, choix.

Cary: A mes heures (incomprehensible) Je voudrais travaillerez pour dix, dix heures, onze heure par jours pour trois ou quatre jours par semaine. Cet moyen je voudrais, ou, j'aurai trois ou quatre jours pour moi-même.

Lana: Quelle sorte de profession...ah...

Cary: Je ne sais pas. Un peu tôt.

(Silence)

Lana: Est-ce que vous a....est-ce que vous êtes ... à la biologie? ou ...

Winston: J'espère être médecin un jour.

Lana: Beaucoup d'argent.

Winston: Oui.

Cary: Oui. Gagnerez-vous beaucoup d'argent?

(no recognition) Gagnerez-vous beaucoup d'argent?

Winston: Pardon? Je ne comprends pas.

Cary: Oh. Voulez-vous gagnez beaucoup d'argent?
Winston: Peut-être. Peut-être. Ce n'est pas le raison pour que je choisis ce profession.

Cary: Je comprends.

(Laughter)

Stan: Que pensez-vous de...

Cary: Voulez-vous gagner beaucoup d'argent?

Stan: Non, non, je préfère rester obscure tout le temps.

Cary: Solitaire?

Stan: Solitaire

Cary: Dans la forêt? (laughter) Dans le cave?


Cary: Avez-vous une grande famille?

Stan: Oui.

Cary: Avez-vous un?

Stan: Oui, j'ai une grande famille.

Cary: Combien de ....combien de (laughter)

Stan: J'ai un..

Cary: Combien de femmes avez-vous? (laughter)

Stan: Une et trois enfants.

Cary: C'est grande. C'est chaude.

Stan: Ma petite fils, il a... broke...

Researcher: ...s'est cassé...

Stan: ...le bras. (laughter)

Eva: Serez-vous un professeur un jour?

Stan: Oui, je serai un professeur mais j'espère un jour, ah, je serai un auteur, auteur? auteur? Et je donnerai ma livre avec
Winston.

Cary: De quel livre écrivez-vous?

Stan: Oh, il serait possible, une romane de la vie, de la vie, de la vie...

Cary: étudiant?

Stan: D'un, d'un, non, en le monde de blancs. What's a caucasian?

Researcher: Les Blancs

Stan: Blancs.

Lana: Est-ce que vous, est-ce que vous voudrez écrit un sujet... d'Africain quand vous verrez un (incomprehensible).

Stan: Non, j'espère écrit à la sujet de ma vie.

(Silence)
STUDENT DISCUSSION
April 7, 1983

TRANSCRIPT OF DISCOURSE MOVES

Assignment: Interview class members about "Le Voyage-Past and Future"
Participants: Eva, Beth, Vicki, Tammy, Lana, and Sharon

Vicki: Commencez [INJATES SELECTION OF SPEAKER]
Tammy: Moi? [RESPONDS / EXPRESSES SURPRISE / ELICITS CONFIRMATION]
Vicki: Oui. [CONFIRMS]
Tammy: Mon frère et moi nous ferons un voyage au Europe cet été. [RESPONDS / ACCEPTS ELICITATION / INITIATES]
Students: Ah! [GROUP DEMONSTRATES RESPONSIVE LISTENING / RESPONDS IN SUPPORTING MANNER: ENCOURAGES CONTINUATION]
Lana: Est-ce que il est..il est dans un groupe de personnes ou "just" tout le monde...[ELICITS INFORMATION / REFLECTS / BEGINS TO PROVIDE AN EXAMPLE]
Tammy: Non, mon frère et moi. [INFORMS] C'est trop cher. [SUBSTITIATES WITH A REASON]
Student: Oui. [AGREES WITH T'S PREVIOUS CONTRIBUTION]
Lana: Mais, [BEGINS ALTERNATIVE] il y a beaucoup...[REPAIRS] il n'est pas très, très cher, [PROVIDES AN EXAMPLE] spécialement les...les hôtels...[REFLECTS]
Tammy: C'est le billet d'avion qui est très cher. [SUPPORTS L'S ASSERTION WITH EVIDENCE]
Lana: Oui. [AGREES]
Vicki: Est-ce que sa frère parle des langues aussi? [ELICITS PERSONAL INFORMATION]
Tammy: Non. [INFORMS]
Vicki: Est-ce que vous...[REPAIRS] Est-ce que tu parles des autres langues? [ELICITS INFORMATION]

Tammy: Umh...je parle ne pas bien...[INFORMS / QUALIFIES] et je parle...allemande? Non. [SEARCHES / JUDGES INCORRECT - THINKS ALOUD]

Student: Allemand. [SUPPLIES CORRECT VOCAB WORD]
Lana: De l'allemand? [SUPPLIES VOCABULARY WORD]

Tammy: Pardon? [REQUESTS CLARIFICATION]
Lana: De l'allemand? [RESPONDS]

Tammy: Oui. [AFFIRMS VALUE OF ANOTHER'S CONTRIBUTION]

Vicki: Et d'Angleterre? [PROPOSES ANOTHER EXAMPLE - STRUCTURE PARALLEL TO L'S]

Tammy: Oui. [EXPRESSES AGREEMENT] Et le français. [PROPOSES ANOTHER EXAMPLE - THE MOST OBVIOUS FOR FUN]

Beth: Bon chance. [TEASES] (laughter)

Eva: Bon courage. [EXTENDS TEASING]

Student: Oui, courage. [ACCEPTS / CONFIRMS]

Student: Comment est-ce que vous...[REFLECTS / REPEATS SELF] Comment est-ce que vous décidez de faire le voyage? [ELICITS INFORMATION]

Tammy: Je ne sais pas? [INFORMS]
Lana: Vous avez besoin d'un aventure? [PROPOSES POSSIBLE REASON]

Tammy: Non, je...je suggesterait à ma...[RESPONDS / REFLECTS] suggesterait...[REPAIRS] suggesterait à mama de...[REPAIRS / SWITCHES BACK TO FIRST TRY] que je voulait faire un voyage au France et mama...je...je...je..je souhaiterais de faire un voyage, n'est-ce pas, et mama suggesterait de faire un voyage avec mon frère, et ne pas seule [INFORMS / REPAIRS].

Vicki: C'est une bonne idée. [EVALUATES CONTENT, NOT CONTRIBUTION]

Tammy: Oui. [AGREES]

Vicki: Oui. Parce que tu peux parler avec une autre et "to share" ? [JUSTIFIES WITH A REASON] [SEARCHES FOR VOCABULARY WORD/ ELICITS FRENCH EQUIVALENT]

Eva: Partigere. [ASSISTS WITH VOCABULARY PROMPT] Pardonnez-moi. ?
Vicki: Tu peux partager... partager les aventures. [INTEGRATES / RESTATE WITH PROMPTED VOCABULARY]

Tammy: Et aussi pour le protection. [GIVES AN ADDITIONAL REASON] (laugh)

Beth: Oui, Kung Fu! (laugh) [INTEGRATES / GIVES AN EXAMPLE THAT RESULTS IN HUMOR]

Students: (laughs) [REACTS]

Lana: Connaissez-vous... [ELICITS ADDITIONAL PERSONAL INFORMATION]

Tammy: Non. [RESPONDS TO HALF-STATED QUESTION PREDICTS L'S THOUGHT OR UTTERANCE]

Lana: ... quelqu'un en France? [FINISHES QUESTION]

Tammy: Non. [RESPONDS TO COMPLETED QUESTION]

Lana: Il est bon quand vous connaissez les personnes qui habitent à l'Europe parce que vous pouvez visiter et la personne... pouvait...

[TAKES AN OBSERVATION: SEARCHES]

Tammy: Oh, mon frère connaissez un personne en allemagne. [INTERRUPTS / EXTENDS L'S OBSERVATION BY GIVING AN EXAMPLE]

Sharon: Uh...Vous logerez en hôtels pour l'été entière? entière? [ELICITS ADDITIONAL INFORMATION]

Tammy: Non. [INFORMS]

Lana: Deux mois est suffisant, je crois. [MAKES JUDGMENT THAT IS SUPPORTIVE OF T'S PLANNING]

Student: Avez-vous un billet de... [ELICITS INFORMATION / SEARCHES FOR VOCAB WORD]

Tammy: Eurail... [SUPPLIES WORD / PREDICTS NEXT UTTERANCE]

Student: Eurail... [REPEATS FURNISHED WORD]

T: Oui et [INFORMS] ...j'ai recevoir mon passeport et il est dit que je...le lieu de naissance de moi est chinois et je écrire en la ...le... le formule que le lieu de naissance est Taiwan. Je ne comprends pas. [EXPANDS / TELLS ABOUT A RELATED EVENT]

Vicki: Chine. [REFLECTS]

Tammy: Je ne sais pas si il y est... "it makes a difference."
Vicki: Peut-être que...

Tammy: Peut-être que...

Vicki: ...il y a une différence si tu veux aller au Chine.

(laugh) [HYPOTHESIS BECOMES JOKE]

Eva: Quelle sorte de...quelle sorte d'aventure veux-tu à l'Europe? [ASKS FOR PERSONAL INFORMATION / QUALIFIES]

Tammy: Je ne sais pas. [RESPONDS]

Eva: Ce n'est pas important? [ELICITS CLARIFICATION]

Tammy: Non. [CLARIFIES]

Eva: Tu veux visiter des monuments ou des... [EXTENDS-ELICITS CLARIFICATION / PROVIDES SOME EXAMPLES]

Tammy: Des monuments, des châteaux, des...uh...des...les Alpes. [INCORPORATES E'S EXAMPLE AND EXTENDS]

Student: Des Alpes? [ELICITS CONFIRMATION]

Tammy: Des Alpes. [CONFIRMS]

Student: (inaudible)

Vicki: Et des repas? [EXTENDS / PROVIDES ANOTHER EXAMPLE]

Tammy: Ne pas dans les restaurants. [QUALIFIES]

Student: Non, non. [EXPRESSES AGREEMENT]

Tammy: Dans la rue. [GIVES EXAMPLE]

Vicki: Dans la rue. [ECHOES T'S CONTRIBUTION, SHOWING AGREEMENT] C'est moins cher. [STATES REASON]

Tammy: Umh.

Vicki: Beaucoup de bratwurst. (laugh) [GIVES AN EXAMPLE]

Tammy: ...fromage. [CONTINUES SEQUENCE OF EXAMPLE GIVING]

Lana: Vin? [CONTINUES / MISPRONOUNCED BUT UNDERSTOOD]
Vicki: J'ai des amis qui ont fait un voyage similaire et quand ils vont à un pays, ils ne savent pas où ils vont. [USES AN EXAMPLE TO TIE INTO SUBJECT OF DISCUSSION, THEREBY EXTENDING THE DISCUSSION]

Tammy: Vraiment? Oh, bon co...[REFLECTS AND REPAIRS / EXPRESSES DIFFICULTY IN GETTING WORDS OUT] bon comme ça...bon comme ça...[EVALUATES]

Tammy: "Good." [CLARIFIES] Je n'ai pas de temps...de...de....

Vicki: ...de faire un...

Tammy: ...voyage comme ça. [Tammy AND Vicki COMPOSE AND STATE THE SAME SENTENCE IN SYNCHRONY]

Vicki: Un, deux mois, il est possible. [CONTRADICTS SLIGHTLY]

Eva: Vous avez besoin de beaucoup d'argent de faire un voyage comme ça. [GIVES A SUPPORTING ARGUMENT]

Vicki: Non, ils n'ont pas beaucoup argent. Ils ont...[CONTRADICTS PREVIOUS ASSERTION WITH EXAMPLE]

Student: ...dorment...

Vicki: ...dorment dans les...dans les trains...

Students: (laugh)

Eva: ...dorment dans les trains

Vicki: ...dans la rue...

Student: ...dans la rue...

Student: Ils dorment dans le train et dans les rues quand ils se lèvent, ils ont des paquets sur le "back"....[USES ENGLISH WORD TO CONVEY MEANING]

Student: ...dos?

Vicki: Oui. Dos. [ACKNOWLEDGES CORRECT VOCAB WORD, AND INCORPORATES WORD SUPPLIED] et quand il on...arriveront dans une ville, ils chercheront un...quel est le mot pour "hotel"? [THIS TIME, ASKS FOR TRANSLATION] Mais pas un grand "hotel." [SPECIFIES MEANING]

Student: Youth hostel? [GUESSES VOCAB WORD NEEDED]
Vicki: Youth hostel. [AFFIRMS CORRECTNESS BY REPEATING WORD] Et c'est moins cher. [GIVES REASON]

*INSTRUCTOR ARRIVES*

Student: Quand arrivez-vous?
Tammy: ...c'est deux jours après mon anniversaire.
Student: ...anniversaire?
Tammy: Oui, anniversaire.
Student: Espérez-vous acheter beaucoup de souvenirs?
Tammy: Oui...oui. Pour ma famille et mes amis.
Student: (Inaudible)
Tammy: Et pour moi aussi.
Student: De quelles sortes.
Beth: Vêtements?
Terri: (Inaudible)
Eva: Combien d'ans avez-vous?
Tammy: Oh! Moi?
Student: Vous avez votre anniversaire.
Instructor: (CORRECTING) Quel âge avez-vous?
Eva: Quel âge aurez-vous?
Instructor: Oui, quel âge aurez-vous?
STUDENT DISCUSSION

April 7, 1983

Participants: Instructor, Winston, Dana, Sandy, Evelyn, and Pam

Assignment: Interview class members about "Le Voyage-Passé and Futur"

Notes: Students were interviewed about trips they had made or trips they were going to make. The instructor participated in this group for the first fifteen minutes. Because of the nature of the interaction with primary communications links going between the instructor and the student being interviewed, a transcription of the first ten minutes of the tape seemed unnecessary. Instead, notes on the types of communication were compiled.

First speaker: Evelyn spoke about the trip to Europe she planned to take this summer. Primary communication was between her and the instructor with the instructor introducing the speaker, correcting, supplying needed vocabulary and structure, and asking questions (interpreting: "c'est-à-dire") to get basic information on the trip. The first four and one half minutes were solely between the instructor and student. Then another student, Winston, asked a question, followed by other instructor prompts, and, a minute later, another question by the same student. The conversation stayed predominately between the instructor and student with a third question two minutes later from Winston. Evelyn had the floor for approximately 10 minutes which were interrupted only by the instructor's comments and by questions from Winston.

At the end of 10 minutes the instructor asked if others had questions. A third student asked a question that prompted a little discussion. There was also some silence. Students were waiting for the next move. This researcher felt that students gave all the "initiation privileges" to the instructor. It was also the instructor who eventually initiated the selection of another student to discuss her trip.

A second student, Sandy, was selected by the instructor. She had greater difficulty in self-expression than Evelyn, but worked at it. Again, the primary communication links were between the instructor and Sandy. Students started sooner than in the first interview to ask questions and more students were involved in this interview. Increased student-student interaction was in evidence after the departure of the instructor.
During this interview, the researcher arrived on the scene and the instructor left. The following interpretation was made of what appeared to have taken place. Students noticed the lack of support with the instructor absent and became involved in supporting the speaker. They responded to each statement with "oui," asked for verification, finished the statement for Sandy, and asked questions for clarification. Questions directed to the investigator for correction of vocabulary or structure were not really answered in effort to induce student dependence on each other.

Second Speaker: Transcription of Sandy's Interview

Instructor: De quel autre voyage allez-vous parler ou faire? (Time.) Sandy.
Sandy: Mes amis et moi nous avons aux Bahamas pour l'été.
Instructor: Pour tout l'été?
Sandy: Oui. Juste. (laughter)
Instructor: Ces pauvres étudiants. (Laugh)
Sandy: Mon amiea un château dans ...
Instructor: Dans les îles?
Sandy: Oui. Et (whispering going on) (laughter)
Instructor: Un château?
Sandy: Oui.
Instructor: Un vrai château?
Sandy: Oui. (Laughter.) Et (laugh) en juin... ou juillet.
Instructor: Oui.
Sandy: ...Nous, nous partirons pour les Bahamas.
Student: (In a whisper) Oh, la la. C'est formidable.
Student: Où dans les Bahamas? Comme...Quelle île?
Sandy: Jamaica.
Instructor: (whisper) Jamaïque.
Sandy: Nous voyons...verrons
Instructor: Nous verrons.
Sandy: Nous verrons tous les îles. Jamaïque, Tai...
Instructor: (in a whisper) Toutes les îles.
Student: Taihiti?
Instructor: Haïti? Haïti.
Student: Où est le château?
Sandy: Jamaïque.
Student: Oh.
Sandy: Mon ami, son père est très riche.
Instructor: Apparemment!
Sandy: (laugh)
Student: Comment visiterez-vous les îles? par bateau? par avion?
Sandy: Nous irons...eh... avion et en bateau...bateau. Premi...
premier...première, nous irons en Floride.
Instructor: Vous allez par avion en Floride.
Sandy: Oui.
Instructor: Jusqu'à la Floride?
Student: ...et puis, le bateau?
Sandy: Oui.
Student: Le bateau est de le...
Sandy: Je ne sais pas.
Student: le parent de vos amis...
Sandy: Je ne sais pas.
Student: le parent de vos amis...
Student: ...de la famille (laugh).

Instructor: On voyage beaucoup en...en hydro... hydro... hydro-avion? Je ne sais pas comment on appelle ça en français.
(in English) Hydroplane. (in French) Hydroplane?

Researcher: Oui, je crois.

Student: Hydro-plane, peut-être.

Instructor: Je...

Student: Savez-vous, know, la ville dans Jamaïque?

Sandy: Qu'est-ce que c'est la capitale de Jamaïque?

Student: Kingston.

Sandy: Oui. It's around there. I don't know.

Student & Sandy: Je ne sais pas.

Sandy: Je ne sais pas. I just go like...

Winston: Travaillez-vous beaucoup maintenant ...

Sandy: Non...

Winston: Pour les économies?

INSTRUCTOR LEAVES ROOM

Sandy: Maintenant je travaille pour faire des économies. Je travaille Long John Silver's. Mon amie, elle est... elle habite à New York et elle téléphone moi. Et elle a dit si je veux aller les Bahamas. J'ai dit "oui." Et son père ... comment dit-on "give" ? lui a...donné les clefs ...

Student: ...pour le château.

Sandy: Pour le château.

Dans: Mais vous achèterez vos billets, non?

Sandy: Oui. C'est très cher.

Dans: Oui.

Sandy: J'adore Jamaïque parce que j'adore le Reggae par les Whalers?
Student: Oui.

Sandy: (gives an incomprehensible name)

Student: (incomprehensible)

Sandy: Oui, les Whalers. Et...

Dana: Et le rhum jamaïque.

Sandy: Oui (laughter).

Pam: Et le soleil. Beaucoup de soleil.

Dana: La plage est...

Sandy: La plage.

Dana: ...est blanc.

Sandy: Blanche et les gens...

Dana: Aujourd'hui est-ce qu'il y a beaucoup de problèmes politiques dans Jamaïque?

Sandy: Je pense entre les...Rathstanians...

Dana: Rasfarians.

Sandy: Oui, et les...what's white? Caucasians?

Researcher: Les blancs.

Sandy: Les Blancs. Parce que les Rathstanians...

Dana: Les Rasfarians?

Sandy: Oui, ils fument le marijuana et le marijuana, c'est religi...religion...pour ...pour ce. Et les Blancs, ils n'aiment pas les plantes de marijuana. Les enfants en France...ils fument.

Student: Oui.

Dana: Vous...What is "be careful"...Faites attention?...

Parce que vous avez le cheveux blond et je tente que les Rasfarians n'aiment pas l'Amerique aujourd'hui et ils n'aiment
pas les blonds.
Sandy: Oui.
Student: Tirez-vous vos cheveux. (laugh)
Student: Portez un chapeau. (laugh)
Student: (incomprehensible)
Researcher: Une perruque, c'est...(incomprehensible)
Sandy: Les autres amis, il est noir et son petite amie est noire et elle habite, elle habitait au Jamaique.
Student: Vous avez des amis que... qu'habitent là?
Sandy: Comment?
Student: Vous avez des amis qui habitent là?
Winston: Quelle langue parlait...parlent-ils là?
Student: Pardon?
Sandy: Je ne sais pas.
Dana: Dans le Haïti, ils parlent le français...
Sandy: le français. Mais à Jamaique, vous connaissez le commercial, 7UP?
Student: Oui.
Sophie: Ah, ah, ah.
Dana: Oui, ils parlent...
Student: Il parle la bretagne.
Sandy: Oui, mais à Jamaique.
Student: Je crois que l'anglais...
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SOCIAL SKILLS

Assignment: Interview class members about "Le Voyage-Past and Future"
Participants: Eva, Beth, Vicki, Tammy, Lana and Sharon

Vicki: Commencez. [ATTENDS TO TASK OF INTERVIEWING /MANAGES IN DIRECT MANNER]

Tammy: Moi?

Vicki: Oui. [MANAGES]

Tammy: Mon frère et moi nous ferons un voyage au Europe cet été. [ACCEPTS ROLE / INITIATES]

Student: Ah! [SUPPORTS SPEAKER WHO CONTINUES]

Tammy: C'est pour deux mois et nous sommes...voyagerons en tous les...tous les pays. [CONTINUES EXPLANATION]

Lana: Est-ce que il est...il est dans un groupe de personnes ou "just" tout le monde.. [INITIATES 1ST INTERVIEW QUESTION]

Tammy: Non, mon frère et moi. C'est trop cher.

Student: Oui. [AGREES]

Lana: Mais, il y a beaucoup...il n'est pas très, très cher, especialmente les...les hôtels...[OFFERS ALTERNATIVE POINT OF VIEW - SOFTLY, WITHOUT CONFLICT]

Tammy: C'est le billet d'avion qui est très cher. [INTERRUPTS WITH OPINION]

Lana: Oui.[AGREES]

Vicki: Est-ce que sa frère parle des langues aussi? [CONTROLS: RETURNS TO TASK ASSIGNED]

Tammy: Non.

Vicki: Est-ce que vous... Est-ce que tu parles des autres langues? [CONTINUES CONTROLLING WITH ADDITIONAL QUESTION]
Tammy: Umh... je parle ne pas bien... et je parle .... allemagne?
Non. [EXPRESSES UNCERTAINTY]

Student: Allemand. [SUPPLIES CORRECT FORM]

Lana: De l'allemand? [OFFERS ANOTHER FORM]

Tammy: Pardon? [ELICITS A REPEATION]

Lana: De l'allemand? [REPEATS]

Tammy: Oui. [ACCEPTS]

Vicki: Et d'Angleterre? [SUGGESTS THE OBVIOUS FOR A CHUCKLE]

Tammy: Oui. Et le français. [RETURNS ANOTHER EXAMPLE FOR A CHUCKLE]

Beth: Bon chance. ["I'M GLAD I'M NOT IN YOUR SHOES" BUT SYMPATHIC REMARK FROM AN INACTIVE PARTICIPANT]

Eva: Bon courage. [ANOTHER SUPPORTIVE COMMENT]

Student: Oui, courage. [AGREES/ REPEATS]

Student: Comment est-ce que vous... Comment est-ce que vous décidez de faire le voyage? [TAKES TURN]

Tammy: Je ne sais pas?

Lana: Vous avez besoin d'un aventure? [TAKES TURN]

Tammy: Non, je... je suggesterais à ma... suggestera... suggesterait à mama de... que je voulais faire un voyage au France et mama... je... je... je... je... suggesterais de faire un voyage, n'est-ce pas, et mama suggesterait de faire un voyage avec mon frère, et ne pas seule.

Vicki: C'est une bonne idée. [GIVES POSITIVE FEEDBACK]

Tammy: Oui. [AGREES]

Vicki: Oui. Parce que tu peux parler avec une autre et "to share" ? [SUPPORTS: OFFERS REASON]

Eva: Partigier. Pardonnez-moi.? [HELPS; APOLOGIZES FOR INTERRUPTING]

Vicki: Tu peux partige... partige les aventures. [ACCEPTS HELP AND INCORPORATES]
Tammy: Et aussi pour le protection. [ADDS ANOTHER REASON, SUPPORTING Vicki's CONTRIBUTION] (laugh)

Beth: Oui, Kung Fu! (laugh) [SUPPORTS WITH CONCRETE EXAMPLE]

CLASS: (laughs)

Lana: Connaissez-vous...[TAKES FLOOR]

Tammy: Non. [INTERRUPTS]

Lana: ... quelqu'un en France?

Tammy: Non. [REPEATS ANSWERS]

Lana: Il est bon quand vous connaissez les personnes qui habitent à l'Europe parce que vous pouvez visiter et la personne...pouvait...
[JUSTIFIES OWN QUESTION WITH REASON]

Tammy: Oh, mon frère connaissez un personne en allemagne.
[ACKNOWLEDGES Lana's CONTRIBUTION WITH A CONCRETE EXAMPLE]

Eva: Uh... Vous logerez en vous pour l'été entière? entière?
[TAKES FLOOR]
Tammy: Non.

Lana: Deux mois est suffisant, je crois. [JUSTIFIES Tammy's RESPONSE]

Vicki: Avez-vous un billet de...[SEARCHES FOR VOCAB WORD]

Tammy: Eurail...[SUPPLIES APPROPRIATE WORD]

Student: Eurail...[ALSO SUPPLIES WORD]

Tammy: Oui et ...J'ai recevoir mon passeport et il est dit que je...le lieu de naissance de moi est chinois et je écrire en la ...le ...le formula que le lieu de naissance est Taiwan. Je ne comprends pas. [RELATES AN AMUSING EVENT]

Vicki: Chine. [OFFERS ALTERNATIVE WORD CHOICE FOR Tammy]

Tammy: Je ne sais pas si il y est..."it makes a difference."

Vicki: Peut-être que...[BEGINS ALTERNATIVE]

Tammy: Peut-être que...[ACCEPTS ALTERNATIVE WITHOUT KNOWING WHAT IT IS...!]

Vicki: ...il y a une différence si tu veux aller au Chine.
[laugh] [MAKES A JOKE]
Eva: Quelle sorte de...quelle sorte d'aventure veux-tu à l'Europe? [TAKES FLOOR]
Tammy: Je ne sais pas.
Eva: Ce n'est pas important? [WANTS TAMMY TO ELABORATE]
Tammy: Non.
Eva: Tu veux visiter des monuments ou des...[OFFERS A SECOND CHANCE BY PROVIDING EXAMPLES]
Tammy: Des monuments, des châteaux, des...uh..des...les Alpes. [ACCEPTS EXAMPLES]
Student: Des Alpes? [ACKNOWLEDGES INTEREST]
Tammy: Des Alpes.
Student: (inaudible)
Vicki: Et des repas. [OFFERS ANOTHER TOPIC COMMON TO TRAVEL IN EUROPE]
Tammy: Ne pas dans les restaurants. [DISAGREES]
Student: Non, non. [AGREES]
Tammy: Dans la rue.
Vicki: Dans la rue. C'est moins cher. [AGREES & JUSTIFIES]
Tammy: Umh.
Vicki: Beaucoup de bratwurst. (laugh) [SECONDS JUSTIFICATION]
Tammy: ...fromage. [GIVES ANOTHER REASON]
Lana: Vin? [ADDS ANOTHER CATEGORY]
Vicki: J'ai des amis qui ont fait un voyage similaire et quand ils va à un pays, ils ne sait pas où ils vont. [SUMMARIZES AND SUPPORTS]
Tammy: Vraiment? Oh, bon co...bon comme ça....bon comme ça... "Good." [ACKNOWLEDGES SUPPORT] Je n'ai pas de temps..de...de....[BUT JUSTIFIES DISAGREEMENT]
Vicki: ... de faire un... [ASSISTS]
Tammy: ... voyage comme ça. [COLLABORATES]
Vicki: Un, deux mois, il est possible. [DISAGREES]
Eva: Vous avez besoin de beaucoup d'argent de faire un voyage comme ça. [OFFERS ANOTHER VIEWPOINT]
Vicki: Non, ils n'ont pas beaucoup argent. Ils ont... [DISAGREES]
Student: ... dorment... [ASSISTS]
Vicki: ... dorment dans les... dans les trains... [ACCEPTS CONTRIBUTION]
Students: (laugh)
Eva: ... dorment dans les trains [AGREES]
Vicki: ... dans la rue... [OFFERS ANOTHER SOLUTION]
Student: ... dans la rue... [ACCEPTS]
Student: Ils dorment dans le train et dans les rues quand ils se lever, ils ont des paquets sur le "back"... [RESTATES COLLABORATIVE EFFORT]
Student: ... dos? [ASSISTS]
Vicki: Oui. Dos. Et quand il ont... arriveront dans une ville, ils chercheront un... quel est le mot pour "hotel"? Mais pas un grand "hotel." [SEEKS ASSISTANCE]
Student: Youth hostel? [ASSISTS]
Vicki: Youth hostel. Et c'est moins cher. [ACCEPTS ENGLISH VERSION; GIVES REASON]
Student: Quand arrivez-vous? [TAKES FLOOR]
Tammy: ... c'est deux jours après mon
Student: ... anniversaire? [ASSISTS]
Tammy: Oui, anniversaire. [ACCEPTS ASSISTANCE]
Student: Espérez-vous acheter beaucoup de souvenirs?
Tammy: Oui...oui. Pour ma famille et mes amis.
Student: Inaudible
Tammy: Et pour moi aussi.
Student: De quelles sortes.
Beth: Vêtements?
Tammy: Inaudible
Eva: Combien d'ans avez-vous?
Tammy: Oh! Moi?
Student: Vous avez votre anniversaire.
Instructor: Quel âge avez-vous?
Eva: Quel âge aurez-vous?
Instructor: Oui, quel âge aurez-vous?