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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Most foreign language learning in the United States takes place in a formal classroom setting and for academic credit. To be sure, many thousands of students must take a required number of years or courses of a foreign language as a prerequisite for entering and/or graduating from both high schools and universities. Lambert (1987), however, has lamented that "while in our educational system we invest an immense amount of student and teacher time and huge amounts of money in foreign language teaching, survey after survey documents how inadequate our current foreign language capacity is" (1987, p. 1). Given the fact that foreign languages are taught primarily in formal academic settings for academic credit and that the language capability of the United States remains in a "scandalous" and "inadequate" state (which is seen by some [Simon, 1980] as threatening the national security of this country), it is incumbent upon the language teaching profession to come to understand better the complex factors involved in classroom foreign language teaching (Jarvis, 1980; Kramsch, in press; van Lier, 1988).

Jarvis (1980) first noted a serious void in research on classrooms in which foreign languages are taught. In the 1980 Proceedings of the National Conference on Professional Priorities of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages he observed that "we do not now have a single major
descriptive study of what actually happens in second-language classrooms during the teaching-learning process" (p. 61) and that the need for this kind of research "reflects a need to know rather than (or prior to) a need to change . . . [because] . . . we do not yet understand well enough all that happens when someone in a teacher role consorts with 25 or 30 other persons who are in student roles" (p. 61). This call for foreign-language classroom-oriented research has very recently been echoed by others in the field, such as Savignon (1987), who recommends "systematic observation of classroom learners" (p. 11) during the process of what Kramsch (in press) calls "the socially and instructionally mediated acquisition of a foreign language in a classroom setting" (p. 2).

Oddly enough, the second half of the 1980's sees foreign language educators, policy makers at local, state, and federal levels, as well as researchers struggling with the construct "proficiency," what it is, as well as how to go about teaching languages in classrooms with a so-called "proficiency orientation" (Omaggio, 1984, 1986). Countless hours have been spent at language teaching conferences and hundreds of pages in foreign language teaching and research journals and published volumes have been written on the issue. More importantly, a great deal of energy and many thousands of dollars have been spent on developing tests that purport to measure "proficiency" in the four language skills both reliably and validly. As a result, a significant polemic has grown within the profession with regard to "proficiency" and classroom language instruction. Luckily for the profession, however, the debate does not seem to be subsiding (e.g., Bernhardt, 1986; Jarvis, 1986; Kramsch, 1986, in press; Lantolf & Frawley, 1986; Lee, 1987; Savignon, 1987; VanPatten, 1987).

Yet, in spite of the growing interest in and concern for foreign language
instruction and "proficiency" in the 1980's, brought about mainly in response to such documents as the President's Commission Report (1979), among others, and most recently by a call for the establishment of a National Foreign Language Center (Lambert, 1987), there is still lacking any in depth, principled description of conditions and practices of traditional foreign language teaching and learning in high school and university classrooms in the United States in which the teacher is often times a non-native speaker of the language being taught. Nevertheless, language educators are still searching for the "holy grail," some way to improve language instruction and its outcomes without first trying to understand what actually does take place in the classroom in the light of the goals of second-language instruction as found in Lambert (1987) and Kramsch (1987), among others.

Part of the on-going problem for language educators and researchers lies in somehow coming to understand existing foreign language instructional practices in classrooms. Although a total lack of knowledge or understanding of classroom foreign language teaching and learning processes was noted at the beginning of this decade (Jarvis, 1980), we still know almost nothing in the latter half of the decade about the moment-to-moment and day-by-day processes that take place in the classroom setting, because most research in traditional foreign language learning has concentrated primarily on the manipulation of instruction and on the effects of a single variable upon learning and recall in controlled settings (Jarvis, 1980; VanPatten, 1987). Sadly enough, this is still true in spite of the continuing debate over "proficiency" and classroom foreign language instruction. Countless books, conference presentations, and journal entries have been devoted to prescribing what to do and what should be happening in foreign language classrooms. Unfortunately, it is still true that little if any
systematic research is being conducted to find out what actually takes place during foreign language instruction in public school and in university classrooms. Just what is it that students and teachers do in the foreign language classroom and for what purpose? Until more is known about these processes within the classroom setting, little can be done to improve foreign language instruction, and ultimately language learning.

Dealing with the Problem

In order to try to deal with this observed void in the knowledge base, "alternative ways of describing and analyzing [foreign language] classroom behavior" (Jarvis, 1980, p. 61) have been called for. Ellis (1986), however, has recently synthesized much of the research that has taken place in foreign language classrooms, which have been investigated primarily through three basic approaches: (1) interaction analysis, (2) the study of teacher talk, and (3) discourse analysis. Interaction analysis has relied heavily on category systems, rating scales, and check lists (Evertson & Green, 1986). From this research tradition numerous observation systems, some specifically designed for the foreign language classroom (See Allwright, 1988; Chaudron, 1988; Long, 1983a; van Lier, 1988), have been developed. A great deal of foreign language classroom research that has been conducted seems to have followed this general trend in classroom-oriented research (Long, 1983a), which Jarvis (1983) once described as "primitive for the 1980's" (p. 61).

Studies of teacher talk (e.g., Chaudron, 1983; Gaies, 1977, 1979; Henzl, 1973, 1979; Long, 1983b; Long & Sato, 1983; Schinke-Llano, 1983; Wesche & Ready, 1983) indicate that similar kinds of modifications occur in the teacher's language as those observed in foreigner talk (Ferguson, 1975). Discourse
analysis (e.g., Gremmo, Holec, & Riley, 1978; Riley, 1977) has revealed that many classroom interactions follow an IRF (initiation-response-feedback) pattern (Mehan, 1979; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). As a result, Kramsch (1981) has concluded that "the traditional patterns of classroom discourse are working against [language learners] as they try to develop conversational fluency" (p. 19) and that the foreign language to which language learners are exposed on a daily basis is composed of "deviant patterns that have nothing in common either with the discourse patterns of their mother tongue or with those of the foreign language culture" (p. 19). Kramsch (in press) further adds that "social competence [in another language] is so linked to the social contexts in which [human beings] acquired their native language that we cannot expect them to be automatically socially competent in another linguistic code learned in a classroom" (np).

In yet another research area in language learning, Doughty and Pica (1984), Gaskill (1980), Long, Adams, McLean, and Castanos (1976), Pica and Doughty (1984), Porter (1983), Schwartz (1980), and Varonis and Gass (1985), among others, have all concentrated their investigations on small-group interactions among learners of English as a second language, concentrating specifically on the conversational repair strategies that the students generate during different kinds of speaking tasks. The above studies were based on the hypothesis that when input in made comprehensible through conversational modification--the negotiation of meaning--between speakers during purposefully-designed speaking tasks, students can then develop better their communicative competence.

Interaction analysis, studies of teacher talk, discourse analysis, and studies of the conversational negotiations that ESL students produce during
teacher/researcher-designed-and-manipulated speaking tasks have been attempts to describe surface level features of interaction and the language of the language classroom without attempting to interpret the observed phenomena in light of the social context--primarily the academic setting--in which they were observed (Allwright, 1988; van Lier, 1988). While the resultant descriptions of classroom climate, of phonetic, lexical, and syntactic features of language, as well as the frequency, type, and length of interactions in the foreign language classroom are valuable, we still know very little about the processes through which language learners come to know another language in a classroom setting over time. (For notable exceptions, see Brooks, in press; Schrier, 1988; Welch, 1988.) Moreover, most classroom-oriented research that explores the nature of communication practices between and among language learners has been conducted in ESL classrooms in which the teacher is a native speaker of English (Kramsch, in press; VanPatten, in press). What is still lacking, however, is research on traditional foreign language classroom instruction in U. S. public schools, which have been largely ignored by the research community (Kramsch, in press; VanPatten, in press). What is missing is research into the recurring patterns of foreign-language classroom activity and how it contributes to socialization into a foreign language and culture (Kramsch, 1987).

The Foreign Language Classroom is a Complex Setting

The foreign language classroom, like any other classroom, is an extremely complex social setting. Jarvis (1980) succinctly describes the overwhelming complexity of life in a foreign language classroom by asserting that "there are probably tens of thousands of bits of behavior that can be
identified in language classrooms that are believed important by some educators" (p. 61). As a complex setting, the classroom is a place where people come together to learn, to interact both with other people and with instructional content. More importantly, people conduct their lives in this setting as in most other settings through the use of language. Moreover, as students and teachers work together they construct a pattern of life in the classroom that has multiple meanings comprehensible only to the participants. In the process, teachers and their students develop and share ways of communicating with one another. As a result, they develop and establish expectations for what is appropriate and inappropriate for any given event (Bloome, 1981, 1987; Green, 1983a, 1983b; Green & Harker, 1982; Green & Wallat, 1981; Green & Weade, 1985, 1987; Puro & Bloome 1987). In this way, the classroom can be characterized as an active and dynamic social environment, one in which many things become learned and shared through social interaction, including both academic and social information (Green & Weade, 1985, 1987; Hamilton, 1983).

The foreign language classroom, then, like other classrooms, is a socially organized place where people come together during face-to-face interaction and perform many different activities. Teaching and learning activities are, as a result, social activities conducted between and among people that are usually carried out through talk. Talk is an overwhelming characteristic of classrooms. Added to the already complex nature of the foreign language classroom, however, is the fact that the foreign language, which is the academic content of the classroom, is both the object of instruction as well as the vehicle through which, among other things, language is taught and learned (Hammadou & Bernhardt, 1987). In other words, language learning and teaching are
embedded in the instructional conversations that take place in the classroom between teacher and students. The interpersonal and conversational nature of foreign language learning in the classroom has largely been overlooked, especially by foreign language classroom researchers. In many ways, then, the instructional and communicative processes that take place over time during classroom foreign language learning and teaching influence not only what occurs in the classroom but also how it occurs and what is eventually learned by means of it (Green & Weade, 1985, 1987).

The task, then, for any researcher interested in investigating the processes that take place within foreign language classrooms must first come to terms with these complexities, and understand and accept them as a fact of life. Merely reducing classroom interactions to check marks made on a checksheet every three or four seconds or so by some outsider-researcher totally alien to the classroom setting being investigated is only paying lip service to coming to know more about these settings (Allwright, 1988; Erickson, 1986; Evertson & Green, 1986; Green & Mitchell, 1987; van Lier, 1988). What is needed is a way of conceptualizing the classroom as a complex and dynamic social environment in order to begin to investigate in any serious manner the process of teaching and learning other languages in a formal classroom setting.

In the sections that follow, a way of conceptualizing the foreign language classroom as a complex and dynamic environment will be offered. This conceptualization, which grows from the work of Green (1977, 1983a, 1983b) and others (e.g., Green & Harker, 1982; Green & Kantor-Martin, 1988; Green, Matheson, & Welch, 1987; Green & Smith, 1983; Green & Wallat, 1979, 1981, 1982; Green & Weade, 1985, 1987) plants a firm foundation upon which the foreign language classroom and the teaching-learning process that takes place
in it can be investigated. If we are to understand complex teaching and learning processes in a foreign language classroom and what is learned as a result, we must first have a theoretical orientation to investigate those processes.

An Approach to Coming to Understand Foreign Language Classroom Processes

The approach that Cooper (1980) and Jarvis (1980) suggested some nine years ago for foreign-language classroom-oriented research is often called the "anthropological" or "ethnographic" approach. The ethnographic approach, while not to be confused with "doing ethnography" (Green & Bloome, 1983), is used to uncover patterns of social interaction that take place in classrooms between teachers and students as they come together to teach and to learn academic materials. The ethnographic approach is consistent with a major emphasis in today's classroom-oriented research endeavors. In fact, Shulman (1986), in his chapter in the third edition of the Handbook for Research on Teaching, which presents the most recent synthesis on what is known about teachers, teaching, classrooms, and learning, recognizes this approach as one of several programs of research for investigating on-going classroom processes in order to "extend current understandings of the complexity of classroom processes, as well as create new understandings about life in classrooms" (Graham, 1986, p. 8). The anthropological and ethnographic approaches to investigating classroom processes fit within the "classroom ecology" program of research as described by Shulman (1986).

Within the classroom ecology program of research, Shulman (1986) identifies a field of research that investigates classroom processes from a sociolinguistic or social interaction perspective. The sociolinguistic or social interaction approach to investigating on-going classroom teaching and learning
processes has as its underlying assumption the conceptualization of teaching and learning as complex social and instructional processes. Shulman (1986) cites Green and Smith's (1983) review of this work:

Central to this conceptualization is the view of classrooms as communicative environments in which the events that make up everyday life are constructed as part of the interactions between teachers and students... From this perspective, events evolve during interactions as teacher and students work together to meet instructional goals. Therefore, classroom events... are dynamic activities constructed by teachers and students as they process, build on, and work with both their own and other's messages and behaviors...

The goal of this work is to understand the nature of teaching-learning processes from the perspective of the participants and to identify those factors that support learning (p. 355-356).

Although Shulman (1986) identifies the social interaction perspective as but one approach to coming to understand the complex nature of classroom life, he is quick to point out one central caveat: like any other approach or program of research, the social interaction perspective is also necessarily insufficient; that is, each approach or program will only shed light upon some aspects while at the same time ignoring others. This caveat notwithstanding, Shulman (1986) does suggest that the social interaction perspective can extend current understandings of classroom processes.

Yet, in spite of the limitations mentioned above, the sociolinguistic or social interaction perspective does provide a conceptually based theoretical and methodological approach to foreign-language classroom-oriented research that can increase current understandings of daily life during foreign language instruction by systematically capturing and "freezing" for reflection and systematic analysis as much as possible the complexity of life in the formal
classroom setting.

Three assumptions about teaching and learning central to studying the foreign language classroom from the social interaction perspective, however, need to be made. These assumptions will help formulate the rationale for the present study. The first assumption is that teaching and learning are complex, dynamic processes during which both instructional and social events co-occur and are interrelated. The second is that investigating classroom processes from the social interaction perspective is necessarily insufficient to capture "the whole" of life in the foreign language classroom. The third and final assumption is that the way in which these complex and dynamic processes are conceptualized will influence not only how the process is studied but also what can be learned about those processes (Green, 1983a, 1983b; Green & Smith, 1983).

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

With the assumptions identified above as a framework for research, the problem became the identification of a theoretical and methodological approach that would increase understandings of the nature of teaching and learning processes in a traditional foreign language classroom beyond "interaction analysis or analysis of surface features of discourse" (Kramsch, in press) devoid of their social context. The social interaction approach was selected for this study because it allowed for the systematic and principled exploration, investigation, and identification of patterns of language behavior as they were developed between and among the classroom participants over time. The main focus was on coming to understand better the complexities and subtleties of life in a particular foreign language classroom.

The social interaction approach selected for this study was one of several
approaches recognized in the third edition of the *Handbook for Research on Teaching* (Shulman, 1986). Other chapters in the Handbook, such as Cazden (1986) and Erickson (1986), as well as publications by Green (1983a, 1983b), Green and Wallat (1981), Green and Weade (1985, 1987) have also addressed research from this perspective. Within research in foreign language instruction, however, there exists little research on classroom processes from a social interaction perspective. (See Brooks, in press; Schrier, 1988; Welch, 1988).

The study described herein was undertaken to examine what could be learned about the nature of teaching and learning in a foreign language classroom in which the foreign language was both the content to be learned as well as the vehicle for learning the content from a social interaction perspective.

**Assumptions Underlying the Study of Teaching and Learning from a Social Interaction Perspective**

Of primary importance to the social interaction perspective is the view that classrooms are active and dynamic communicative environments in which both academic and social goals are pursued (Green, 1983a, 1983b; Green & Smith, 1983). This view of teaching and learning extends from the realization that throughout instruction teachers and students are engaged in social interaction of some kind or another. Instructional processes primarily take place through an “instructional conversation” (Green, 1977; Green & Wallat, 1981). It is during the on-going instructional conversations between teacher and students that the goals of instruction as well as the rules for social behavior within the classroom setting are transmitted (Green & Harker, 1982; Green & Wallat, 1981; Green & Weade, 1985, 1987).

The social interaction perspective is grounded in work on the ethnography of communication (Green, 1983a, 1983b) and views teaching and
learning as linguistic or communicative processes. This approach to studying life in classrooms provides a conceptually based view of the complexity of classroom life that can be used to guide observations and a principled, systematic way of collecting, interpreting, and communicating information. The roots of this conceptualization extend deep into anthropology and sociolinguistics. In general, it seeks to examine in detail the patterned ways in which people conduct their daily lives through language.

The teaching-learning process when viewed as a communicative process is based upon two major assumptions. These major assumptions provide a framework for understanding what is meant by a social interaction perspective. The first major assumption of the social interaction perspective is that the foreign language classroom is a dynamic communicative environment in which interactions between and among teacher and students, which are part of a dynamic process having both social and academic consequences, have multiple outcomes and meanings. The assumption of dual outcomes of instruction means that students are simultaneously engaged in acquiring an understanding about how to conduct themselves socially at the same time that they acquire and demonstrate knowledge about the academic content of instruction.

The second assumption of the social interaction perspective is that instruction is a goal-oriented process that can be observed through systematic exploration of the instructional conversation between and among teacher and students as well as the nonverbal actions of the participants. Observing both verbal and nonverbal actions allows for the description of the social and academic content of instructional activities. From this observation and exploration both teachers' and students' patterned ways of interacting can be
described to begin to understand the complex social and instructional events that occur both within a particular activity as well as across a number of different activities.

The preceding discussion presented two major assumptions of the study of teaching and learning from a social interaction perspective. These assumptions present an understanding of daily life in the foreign language classroom as an array of dynamic and complex processes that evolve while students are learning another communication system.

The Research Approach: An Overview

The goal of classroom-oriented research from a social interaction perspective is to understand the teaching-learning process from the perspective of the participants and to identify those factors that support and/or constrain academic achievement (Green & Smith, 1983). Arrival at this goal is achieved by looking within a particular language learning activity closely and in great detail and comparing it with other activities studied in equally great detail. This process involves the extraction of recurring patterns of action and interaction both verbal and nonverbal within the language classroom. In this way, variables of interest that were grounded in the observed patterns were constructed and then tested across other language learning activities following a type-case analytic system (Erickson, 1986; Green & Smith, 1983). In the process, initial questions posed at the outset of the study were further refined, which also led to additional questions about life in the foreign language classroom. Accordingly, new questions were raised and explored resulting in the extraction of new patterns of activity. It is in this way that the process was interactive and reactive, thus allowing for the creation of new questions and additional
exploration. Because video and audio records were made throughout the data collection phase of the project, it was possible to move between analysis and data, thus recontextualizing findings so that meaning, function, and occurrence could be determined.

Underlying this analytic process is the assumption that when one sees a particular instance of a behavior, some aspects of it are generic, some are specific to a particular event, and some are specific to the historical and cultural circumstances of that type of situation (Erickson, 1986). The researcher, then, must filter through the different layers and levels of complexity found in the particular instance under investigation and attempts to sort out what appears to be broadly universal, what is generic across cases, and what is unique to the present situation (Erickson, 1986). The end result is the extraction of different and related components that support and/or constrain academic achievement.

PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The purpose of this research project was twofold. First, the project attempted to discover what could be learned about complex teaching and learning processes from a social interaction perspective in a foreign language classroom in which the foreign language was both the object of instruction as well as the vehicle of instruction. Second, the research project attempted to increase understanding of those complex teaching and learning processes. Both the general purpose of the study and the resulting conceptualization of the foreign language classroom as a communicatively rich environment led to the primary goal of the study:
The identification of patterns of instruction and student participation during formal small-group learner-to-learner speaking opportunities in a Spanish conversation course at the college level

Three major research questions guided the process of observation and analysis of data:

1. When and under what circumstances do formal opportunities for speaking Spanish take place in the Spanish conversation course? The purpose of this question was to determine when during the course of instruction students had formal, that is, teacher-derived opportunities to speak Spanish the express purpose of which was to practice speaking in Spanish about a teacher-designated topic.

This major question consisted of the following subquestions:

1.1 What is the macrostructural pattern of events across the seven-day Spanish conversation course?

1.2 What is the pattern of events that took place during in-class times identified in Research Question 1.1?

This subquestion consisted of the following subquestions:

1.2.1 What is the nature of Administrative Content Activities?

1.2.2 What is the nature of Academic Content Activities?

2. What is the organizational structure of the selected formal, teacher-derived speaking activities in the Spanish conversation course? The purpose of this question was to determine the manner in which formal, teacher-derived speaking activities were organized and the influence of this organization on students' academic performance: speaking in Spanish.

This major question consisted of the following subquestion:

2.1 How is the organizational structure of formal, teacher derived
speaking activities both similar to and different from the organizational structure of other such speaking activities?

3. What is the academic structure of small-group learner-to-learner speaking tasks located within the 12 teacher-derived speaking activities? The purpose of this question, the foregrounded question in the study, was to obtain information about one of the primary academic activities of the course: small-group speaking activity. Specifically, the question sought an understanding of the nature of small-group speaking task presentation by the teacher and the subsequent participation of students in their small groups while speaking in Spanish about a teacher-designated task. This major question was further subdivided into the following subquestions:

3.1 What are the patterns of information communicated to students during Small-Group Speaking Task Presentation Phases of the 12 selected speaking activities?

3.2 What are recurring patterns of interaction during students' participation in small-group learner-to-learner speaking activity?

Limitations to the Study

The study was conducted within the framework of a specific perspective--the social interaction perspective. It is without choice, therefore, limiting (Shulman, 1986; Evertson & Green, 1986; Dunkin & Biddle, 1974) because any one perspective selected provides only a lens through which to investigate these processes (Evertson & Green, 1986). As Shulman writes, "it is unlikely that any single theoretical frame can encompass the diversity of sites, events, facts, and principles that cross all those levels" (p. 7). In other words, the descriptions and understandings obtained from this project are done so by
means of the application of this lens. It is, therefore, limited to the social interaction perspective.

There is no real world of the classroom, of learning and of teaching. There are many such worlds, perhaps nested within one another, perhaps occupying parallel universes, which frequently, albeit unpredictably, intrude on one another (Shulman, 1986, p. 7).

Acknowledging the fact that the study is limited to a single perspective is in concert with the basic rationale of the study: there is no one way of looking at classroom phenomena; no one program of research is able to encompass the whole complexity of life in the foreign language classroom. In addition to the limitation just described above, the following limitations are also recognized:

**Limitation #1**

The present study is a case study of a limited number of dimensions of daily life during an intact Spanish conversation course at the college level. It is, therefore, impossible to generalize beyond the boundaries of the seven-day course. In spite of the fact that non-generalizability is a limitation, the purpose of the study was to describe certain events idiosyncratic to the course, not to generate descriptions and to obtain findings that would be generalizable to other classes, contexts, age levels, etc.

Specifically, the purpose of the research project was to ascertain the kinds of understandings that could be gained by means of applying the theoretical and methodological framework of the social interaction perspective. Included in the purpose of the study is the description of recurring processes of teaching and learning activity as well as the identification of those factors that both supported and limited the academic performance of the students: speaking in Spanish between and among themselves about a
teacher-designated task. Beyond these purposes, however, it is hoped that the findings can be added to the growing body of research conducted from this perspective. As Fenstermacher (1986) argues, an important measure of the worth of research is the extent to which it allows any individual to reflect upon practice with an eye toward understanding and improving that practice.

**Limitation #2**

A second limitation to this study is that no attempt was made either to ascertain students' abilities in Spanish before the start of the course or at the end of the course. Furthermore, no attempt was made to rank-order students in terms of their abilities relative to one another. These kinds of measures might have provided a window to the kinds of learning that took place as a result of the course, assuming, of course, that scores on typical end-of-instruction product measures could measure exactly "what got learned."

**Limitation #3**

There was no overt attempt made by the researcher to influence in any way the events that transpired over the duration of the Spanish conversation course. The researcher, however, was asked by the teacher on several occasions to participate in small-group conversations along side the regular participants. It is impossible to judge the impact of the researcher's presence on what the other students did. Furthermore, the students, on several occasions, asked the researcher for help in finding lexical items or in tackling grammatical stumbling blocks while they were participating in small-group speaking activity. The researcher felt uneasy about denying them accessibility to a more proficient individual in Spanish and, as a result, provided the needed help. While these kinds of activities transpired, they were not unlike what the students did between and among themselves. In other words, the students
most probably would have asked someone else (e.g., the teacher or another member of the class) for the required grammatical help or, in the case of a needed lexical item, would have gone to a bilingual dictionary, which they did on several occasions.

SUMMARY OF CHAPTER

The purpose of this Chapter has been to provide the rationale for the study of an intact Spanish conversation course from a social interaction perspective. A general description of the research approach, the related research questions, and a discussion of the limitations of the study have also been provided. The Chapters that follow present a discussion of related literature, the methodology of the study, the findings from the study, and a discussion of the findings. They will be presented in this order.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Research related to the study encompasses three areas: (1) traditional approaches to the exploration of second language classrooms, (2) the study of teaching and learning from a social interaction perspective, and (3) the study of conversation as a social phenomenon, including studies of small-group speaking activity with a second-language acquisition framework. This Chapter is divided into three sections. Section One offers a look at different approaches to studying foreign language classrooms that have been employed. The different approaches examined are (a) Interaction Analysis, (b) studies of Teacher Talk, and (c) Discourse Analysis. Section Two presents research on the study of teaching and learning from a social interaction perspective, an emergent approach to studying foreign language classrooms. Finally, Section Three presents a discussion of the social phenomenon called conversation, with special attention paid to research into small-group speaking activity among second language learners.

This literature review is meant to be representative, not inclusive. The purpose of the review is to (1) illustrate various ways in which foreign language classrooms have traditionally been studied; (2) situate the study in an emergent program of educational research that has been identified by Shulman (1986) as adhering to "a different set of intellectual traditions" (p. 18) than the
process-product tradition; and (3) explore various aspects of conversation as a social phenomenon, which includes an investigation of small-group speaking opportunities among language learners.

SECTION ONE
EXPLORING FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSROOM LIFE

What goes on in classrooms where second languages are taught has always eluded even the most prudent researchers. Interest in life in classrooms has grown over the last twenty or so years and has been motivated by the recognition of the fact that successful outcomes in the language classroom "may depend on the type of language used by the teacher and the types of interactions occurring in the classroom" (Ellis, 1986, p. 143). This Section explores three different approaches to coming to understand what goes on in second and foreign language classrooms: Interaction Analysis, the study of Teacher Talk, and Discourse Analysis. The review of the literature does not attempt to be exhaustive but rather to present a view of the kinds of ways language classrooms have been investigated.

Interaction Analysis

Modern classroom research began in the 1950's when concern arose among teacher trainers for responding to the need to provide student teachers with feedback regarding their teaching. The interest during this time frame was arriving at some idea about what constituted "good" and "effective" teaching (Evertson & Green, 1986). As a result, Flanders (1970, c.f., Evertson & Green, 1986) conceptualized an observational system that has become known as the Flanders Interaction Analysis System whose goal was to help preservice teachers who were in training to ascertain just how well their teaching behaviors
matched those patterns of behaviors that were deemed "effective."

Out of this research in interaction analysis there have emerged some 200 different instruments for use in trying to describe classroom behaviors of both teachers and students. These systems fall within what have become known as category systems, sign systems, and rating scales (Evertson & Green, 1986; Rosenshine & Furst, 1973). They usually contain a finite number of categories, codes, and scales that have been arrived at through philosophical, theoretical, empirically driven, experience-based beliefs about the nature of the process, group, or event under study (Dunkin & Biddle, 1974; Erickson, 1986; Evertson & Green, 1986). With these systems, observations and recordings are confined only to those behaviors that are contained within the system. This provides only for an extremely narrow focus upon what goes on in classrooms. According to Evertson and Green (1986), these systems are further limited by the fact that they are "generally concerned with studying a wide range of classrooms in order to obtain normative data and to identify general laws for teaching" (p. 175). It was hoped that the results of these studies would be generalizable across classrooms and content areas. This conceptualization of classroom processes implies the assumption that "teaching is teaching and learning is learning." In other words, teaching and learning were assumed to be generic processes that were the same across contexts.

A great deal of research conducted in second-language classrooms has followed this approach to trying to understand what goes on in classrooms (Long, 1983a) where the second language is considered to be both the object of instruction as well as the means of instruction (Hammadou & Bernhardt, 1987). To be sure, investigators in second-language classrooms have also been concerned that research in second language learning must not ignore the
educational treatment factor.

An example of this approach being adopted by researchers in second-language classrooms is Moskowitz (1976), who attempted to describe events of the foreign language classrooms in a more "objective" fashion. Moskowitz adopted the Flanders Interaction Analysis System. In her study, the classroom interaction of ten foreign language teachers who were identified as "outstanding" as the result of a survey of former students, and a group of so-called "typical" teachers was compared. Data were collected using the FLint System (Moskowitz, 1967) of interaction analysis.

In her research report, Moskowitz (1976) identifies a number of ostensible differences between the two groups of teachers in her study. One difference noted was that the "outstanding" foreign language teachers used a number of indirect behaviors, such as praising, joking, and personalizing questions, significantly more than the "typical" teachers. Moreover, she found that the "outstanding" teachers used direct behaviors, such as direct drills, and criticizing student behaviors, significantly less than the "typical" teachers. While this research may seem valid on the surface, data collection procedures employed by the researcher make the results obtained subject to doubt thereby placing into question any attempts at generalizability. Those teachers who were identified as "outstanding" were identified as such by a group of former students. How "outstanding" is defined is a crucial question that can not be answered necessarily by people's opinions. The research project provides no indication regarding end-of-instruction achievement measures that may shed other light on the construct "outstanding." More importantly, the research project does not provide any detailed information regarding the different types of classroom activities the teacher used while teaching. In short, the project raises
more questions to be asked than were answered.

Other classroom category studies have been carried out by Long (1983) and by Shrum (1982). Long devised an observational system for recording what appeared to be time-on-task behaviors demonstrated by university-level beginning Spanish students. Her observation system called for observations to be recorded every fifteen seconds with verification by audiorecording. Her findings indicate that the student who appeared to be on-task the most was not the best student of the group in terms of academic performance. Recent work by Bloome (1981) from a social interaction perspective, however, has called into question the construct time-on-task by microanalyzing what took place during segments of classroom activity from a middle school language arts class. The microanalysis of these classroom segments demonstrated that much of what went on, although students "looked" like they were on-task, was mainly procedural elements and not actual learning activities. Bloome's study uncovered what students were really doing while ostensibly "on-task."

Shrum (1982) carried out a descriptive study of the variable "wait-time" in secondary foreign language (e.g., French and Spanish) classrooms. Her study utilized the Observational System for Instructional Analysis (OSIA) as devised by Hough (1980, c.f., Shrum, 1982). This observational system is essentially a coding category system that is composed of mutually exclusive and inclusive categories requiring a coded entry every five seconds, or whenever a new event is begun. Wait-time was defined at two levels: post-solicitation wait-time and post-response wait-time. In other words, this study attempted to measure the mean time length a teacher waited after asking a question and when a student responded to that question. Wait-time for differing types of questions was also analyzed. While this research endeavor does shed light upon certain aspects of
classroom processes, it does not give a picture of how teachers and students go about the daily routines of teaching and learning other languages in the formal classroom setting.

Other sophisticated systems for studying the language used in language classrooms have been developed by Fânselow (1977) and Allwright (1980). Allwright suggests that classroom interaction be studied in terms of three types of analysis: (1) a turn taking analysis, (2) topic analysis, and (3) task analysis. This system requires the researcher to code each utterance in the interactions sampled.

Long (1983a) has recently synthesized the work of some twenty different observational systems that have been designed for the second-language classroom. Although these systems do shed light upon foreign-language classrooms, they share the same limitations as the systems that were developed for content classrooms. They all belong to a set of "closed systems" (Evertson & Green, 1986, p. 175). They contain a finite number of preset units of observations or categories that are mutually exclusive. These observational systems designed for foreign language classrooms, like those for content classrooms, have also grown out of philosophical, theoretical, empirically driven, or experience-based beliefs about the nature of second-language classrooms. According to van Lier (1988), the attempts made "have been to measure classroom performance in quantitative terms... [so that] the results can be compared for several classrooms, correlated, and statistical tests of significance will support or reject claims that classroom A has a better climate or is more communicatively oriented than classroom B" (p. 43). More importantly, Long (1983a) has argued that "perhaps the most serious criticism of interaction analysis as currently practiced in classroom research on second-language
learning is that it assumes sufficient knowledge of the issues it purports to investigate. Adoption of [these] categories assumes that they are relevant for the study of second-language classrooms (p. 16).

Interaction analysis has relied on category systems, rating scales, and check lists (Evertson & Green, 1986; Long, 1983a). This research tradition has been accomplished with the help of systematic observation instruments with which researchers select a finite number of variables, which are considered *a priori* to be relevant one for investigation. These variables are then described in terms of surface features that can be easily coded by researchers. Once the variables of interest are decided upon, data are gathered by means of various data collection practices, such as the check list or rating scale. Measurement, then, consists of "tabulation and numerical comparison of the recorded instances of variables" (van Lier, 1988, p. 41). van Lier (1988) argues against the use of interaction analysis as a means of finding out what goes on in foreign language classrooms:

> The [interaction analysis] procedure has obvious attractions, and is seen as a great improvement over anecdotal reports or evaluative remarks of the sort: 'Nice job, but watch your blackboard work.' Whether it actually adds to our store of knowledge, however, of what goes on in the classroom, is questionable. The category-coding tradition is inescapably locked into a circularity, due to the selection of categories that are deemed relevant (p. 43).

**Teacher Talk**

Theoretical attention has also been paid to what is commonly referred to as "teacher talk," paying special mind to the notion of comprehensible input and formal instruction. In general, this area of research seeks to determine whether the special linguistic variability in the register of the instructional language used
by the teacher is indeed an aid to second language learning. The approach has been "to describe the features of L2 teacher talk which distinguish it from speech to L2 learners in noninstructional settings" (Chaudron, 1988, p. 8). For example, studies of teacher talk (e.g., Chaudron, 1983; Gaies, 1977, 1979; Henzl, 1973, 1979; Long, 1983; Long & Sato, 1983; Schinke-Llano, 1983; Wesche & Ready, 1983) indicate that similar kinds of modifications occur in the teacher's language as those observed in foreigner talk (Ferguson, 1975). Ellis (1986) provides a summary of the main findings of research on teacher talk:

1. Formal adjustments occur at all language levels. Gaies found that teachers' utterances were simpler on a range of measures of syntactic complexity when they addressed pupils than when they were talking among themselves. Henzl compared the language that teachers used when teaching pupils of different levels of proficiency. He observed adjustments in pronunciation (e.g., with low-level students, the teachers used a more accurate, standard pronunciation), in lexis (e.g., they substituted items with a narrow semantic field like 'young gal' by more general words like 'woman'), and in grammar (e.g., they adjusted the mean length of their utterances). These modifications mirror those observed in foreigner talk.

2. In general, ungrammatical speech modifications do not occur. This is presumably because the conditions that permit deviations from the standard language do not arise in the classroom. However, extreme simplifications involving deviant utterances can occur in certain types of classroom interaction such as those found in free discussion (See Hatch, Shapira, and Gough, 1978).

3. Interactional adjustments occur. Gaies notes interactional devices in teachers' speech similar to those observed in motherese (e.g., repetition, prompting, prodding, and expansions). It is likely that many of the interactional adjustments found in other simplified registers will also occur in teacher talk. But there are likely to be differences also. Long (1983b) and Long & Sato (1983) note that in language classrooms, tutorial (or display) questions such as 'Are you a student?' and 'Is the clock on the wall?' are more frequent than in natural settings. The same researchers note that whereas comprehension checks are more frequent in the classroom, confirmation checks and requests for clarification are less so. They explain this by the predominance of one-way communication in the classroom. Confirmation checks and requests for clarification (unlike comprehension checks) are used as feedback after a learner utterance, but in classrooms teachers dominate talk, with the result that pupils have few
opportunities to speak. Thus by restricting the pupils' contributions, the teacher also delimits the range of discourse functions that they typically perform (p. 145).

The research findings on teacher talk used during language lessons is broadly similar to that found in research in foreigner talk (Ferguson, 1970) and in "motherese" (Snow & Ferguson, 1977; Waterson & Snow, 1978), the language used by mothers when talking to their young children. For example, the talk directed at non-native speakers was grammatically simpler (e.g., contained fewer words per clause) than that directed at native language students in university classrooms (Chaudron, 1983; Wesche & Ready, 1983). Furthermore, the language used was slower, contained more and longer pauses, and contained more repetition. In the classroom, there are both formal and interactional differences at play because of the special constraints that operate in the classroom. Whereas foreigner talk and motherese normally occur in one-to-one interactions, teacher talk occurs in one-to-many interactions. As a consequence, teacher talk is probably not as finely tuned to the level of the language learner as in foreigner talk.

**Discourse Analysis**

Discourse analysis (e.g., Chaudron, 1977; Gremmo, Holec, & Riley, 1978; Riley, 1977) attempts "to analyze fully the discourse of classroom interaction in structural-functional linguistic terms" (Chaudron, 1988, p. 14). Like interaction analysis, discourse analysis takes into consideration both the teacher's and the learner's contributions. The difference between interaction analysis and discourse analysis is that the latter seeks to describe both the function of individual utterances and how these utterances combine to form larger discourse units. This approach to classroom analysis grew out of descriptive linguistics (Chaudron, 1988), and from ethnographic and

Analysis of classroom discourse has primarily "focused on one particular type--the three-phase discourse which is prevalent in teacher-centered classrooms (Ellis, 1986, p. 146). Both in language classrooms and in content classrooms, many interactions follow an IRF (initiation-response-feedback) pattern (Mehan, 1979; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). This is found most typically during lessons where the teacher takes control of both classroom content and management.

McTear (1975), working within the same discourse framework, has examined discourse in the language classroom. He has shown that the ubiquitous IRF structure is sometimes altered when language becomes the focus, as opposed to content. For example, he noted that an optional student response pattern occurs after the teacher's feedback move producing a modified structure, e.g., IRF(R), as shown in the following example:

T: What do you do every morning? Initiates
S: I clean my teeth. Responds
T: You clean your teeth every morning. Feedback
S: I clean my teeth every morning. Responds

(Ellis, 1986, p. 147).

This optional response pattern takes place when the pupil thinks the teacher is modeling an utterance. This, in turn, causes the student to respond one more time.

McTear has noted a number of the differences in the language of language classrooms. For example, he identifies four types of language use: (1) mechanical (where no exchange of meaning is involved); (2) meaningful
(where language usage is contextualized, but still with no meaning associated with it); (3) pseudo-communicative (where information is conveyed, but in a manner that would probably not occur outside the classroom); and (4) real communication (where spontaneous natural speech transpires). Nevertheless, communicative breakdown can occur at times when the teacher and the students are in conflict about which type of language use is in operation. The teacher, for example, may ask a question, which, according to the teacher's original intention, was designed to practice with a specific grammatical structure. The student, however, may respond in a way that shows he interpreted the question as a genuine one, one requiring real communication.

Gremmo, Holec, and Riley (1978) and Riley (1977) are concerned with what extent the traditional IRF discourse pattern, which is so prevalent in teacher-directed classrooms, constitutes an appropriate model for second language acquisition. They conclude their research efforts by asserting that the typical discourse patterns found in teacher-centered language classrooms represent a distorted model for language learners. They believe that this perverted language pattern inhibits opportunities for language learning.

When we analyze classroom discourse, it becomes clear that the very presence and participation of the teacher distorts the interaction to such an extent that it no longer provides even the basic raw materials from which a learner can construct his competence (Gremmo, Holec, & Riley, 1978, p. 63).

What pupils learn to do is how to reply, which does not prepare language learners for the kinds of interactions they will encounter outside the language classroom, where they can be expected to initiate discourse, among other things.

Work by Ellis (1980, 1984), in which he examines a number of different types of classroom interactions, shows that IRF exchanges are not the only
kinds of exchanges that take place in the language classroom. His proposal for a framework for analyzing various possibilities in based upon distinguishing three basic kinds of pedagogic goals. They are (1) core goals, which relate to the explicit pedagogic purpose of the lesson (e.g., to teach specific aspects of the second language, to convey specific subject content, to help the students make something); (2) framework goals, which relate to organizing the lesson (e.g., giving out materials, managing student behavior); (3) social goals, which relate to the use of language for more personal purposes (e.g., imparting private information, quarreling). Ellis also differentiates between types of address (i.e., who functions as speaker, listener, hearer). In this way, classroom discourse can be characterized in terms of the types of goal and address that can occur.

Examining the discourse found in elementary ESL classrooms, where English is both the target of instruction as well as the medium of instruction, Ellis has shown that a wide variety of interactions can take place, some of which have a very different pattern from that discussed by Gremmo, Holec, and Riley (1978). During interactions with framework goals, for example, where the teacher is concerned with organizing classroom activity, one finds the frequent use of directives, to which the student often responds non-verbally. These kinds of interactions may be ideally suited to the beginning language learner because they contain a great deal of directives.

Discourse analysis has attempted to illustrate the joint contributions of teachers and pupils. It does not focus entirely on the teacher's language (as in the study of teacher talk). With findings from discourse analysis, Kramsch (1981) has concluded that "the traditional patterns of classroom discourse are working against [language learners] as they try to develop conversational fluency" (p. 19) and that the foreign language to which language learners are
exposed on a daily basis in the classroom are "deviant patterns that have nothing in common either with the discourse patterns of their mother tongue or with those of the foreign language culture" (p. 19).

Discourse analysis has illuminated a great deal about the ways teachers and students talk in language classrooms. The descriptions obtained have led many to question just what it is that students learn as a result of exposure to the language of the classroom. These descriptions are valuable contributions in shedding light upon broad issues of classroom communication.

Summary

Interaction analysis, studies of teacher talk, and discourse analysis have all been attempts to describe surface features of interaction and the language of the language classroom. These approaches to studying language classrooms have produced general descriptions of classroom climate, of phonetic, lexical, and syntactic features of classroom language, and have been limited to surface level descriptions through frequency, type, and length of interactions in the classroom. While these descriptions are important in allowing us to understand certain features of life in classrooms, we still know very little about actual processes (i.e., recurring moment-to-moment, day-by-day activities as seen across time) through which language learners come to know another language in a formal classroom setting (Allwright, 1988; Breen, 1985; Kramsch, in press; van Lier, 1988). Although it can be said that a great deal of research has been done in classrooms, little has been done about the classroom (van Lier, 1988). As van Lier (1988) has recently asserted, "we know very little about what actually goes on in [foreign language] classrooms, and it is essential to find out" (p. 3).
SECTION TWO
ETHNOGRAPHY AND SECOND LANGUAGE CLASSROOM RESEARCH

The purpose of this Section of the Review of the Literature is to discuss the use of ethnography as a tool in second language classroom-oriented research. This Section is divided into two parts. Part One presents a general discussion of ethnography followed by a review of selected research in second language learning that has utilized this research approach. Part Two presents a discussion of an emerging ethnographic approach to second language classroom-oriented research, a social interaction approach, which is also followed by a review of related research.

Part One: Ethnography

Another approach is gaining prominence among classroom researchers. This approach to investigating foreign language classrooms has been called for by both Jarvis (1980) and by Cooper (1980), and more recently by van Lier (1988), Allwright (1988), and Kramsch (in press). The approach suggested by these noted scholars is the anthropological or ethnographic approach.

The third edition of the Handbook for Research on Teaching is a guide to the field of the study of teachers, teaching, classrooms, and the learning process. According to Shulman (1986), the approach suggested by the above-named scholars in second language education and research falls within a program of research, which he refers to as the "classroom ecology" (p. 18) program. This program of research clearly departs from the traditional process-product type of research endeavors used earlier in foreign language classroom-oriented research. (See Allwright, 1988; Long, 1983a and van Lier, 1988.) For example, the definition of effectiveness within the classroom ecology program of research differs from that found in process-product research. In the latter, effectiveness is "measured by end-of-year standardized achievement
tests or end-of-unit norm-referenced performance tests" (Shulman, 1986, p. 19).

In the former, by contrast, "criteria for effectiveness [are found] within the
situation" (p. 19). As Shulman describes it, the classroom ecology program of
research belongs to an "extended family of enquiries, not a simple, tightly knit
one" (p. 18).

Alternatively, these approaches have been tagged as ethnographic,
qualitative, social interaction, constructivist, and interpretive (Erickson, 1986).
The roots of these approaches extend into such areas as anthropology,
linguistics, sociology, among others. While differences exist among these
approaches, they each share common features and elements central among
which is the systematic exploration of daily life in classrooms as it is interpreted
by the participants in the situation (Erickson, 1986; Long, 1983a; Shulman,
1986). van Lier (1988) provides the following assumptions, which, according to
him, provide the rationale for using an ethnographic approach to second
language classroom-oriented research:

1. Our actual knowledge of what goes on in classrooms is
   extremely limited;
2. it is relevant and valuable to increase that knowledge;
3. this can only be done by going into the classroom for data;
4. all data must be interpreted in the classroom context, i.e., the
   context of their occurrence;
5. this context is not only a linguistic or cognitive one, it is also
   essentially a social context (p. 37).

Erickson (1986) proposes five general questions that those who attempt
to explore everyday life in classrooms frequently ask:

1. What is happening, specifically, in social action that takes place
   in this particular setting?
2. What do these actions mean to the actors involved in them, at
   the moment the actions took place?
3. How are the happenings organized in patterns of social
   organization and learned cultural principles for the conduct of
everyday life—how, in other words, are people in the immediate setting consistently present to each other as environments for one another's meaningful actions?

4. How is what is happening in this setting as a whole (i.e., the classroom) related to happenings at other system levels outside and inside the setting (e.g., the school building, a child's family, the school system, the federal government mandates regarding mainstreaming)?

5. How do the ways everyday life in this setting is organized compare with other ways of organizing social life in a wide range of settings in other places at the other times? (p. 121).

These questions, Erickson (1986) asserts, are significant ones for the study of teaching. One reason is because everyday life is often invisible and the tendency is not to see the details and patterns that comprise normal everyday living. The interpretive researcher must make strange the familiar before the commonplace can be seen (Philips, 1972).

Another reason why these questions are significant is the need for specific understanding through the systematic documentation of the details of the routine. "What is happening on a general level?" is, according to Erickson (1986), not too useful when trying to sort out complex social and instructional processes. Additionally, the importance of these questions entails the understanding of the "local meanings that happenings have for the people involved in them" (Erickson, 1986, p. 121, original emphasis), because behaviors and actions that may look alike may actually signal different social and/or academic messages to the participants.

Finally, these questions are important because they concern the need for a comparative perspective in the study of everyday classroom life. As Erickson (1986) maintains, the researcher asks continually "How does what is happening here compare with what happens in other places?" (p. 122). By knowing "what is happening here" and comparing it with other situations or classrooms, it is possible to filter out what is idiosyncratic to the particular setting and what is
generic across settings. Having a comparative perspective, Erickson (1986) argues, can lead to a better understanding of educational practice, which, in turn, can aid in informing change in that practice.

The five questions posed by Erickson (1986), along with the reasons for their importance, provide a general framework for considering research conducted within this program. The present study falls within this framework.

Review of Selected Research in Second Language Learning Conducted Within the Classroom Ecology Program

Research in second language learning within the classroom ecology program can be described in general as ethnographic or qualitative in nature (Chaudron, 1988; Long, 1983a; van Lier, 1988). Two areas of study are highlighted to illustrate the kinds of understandings that have been gained from this program of research: diary studies and classroom ethnography.

Diary Studies

The first of these two areas has employed ethnographic techniques. Bailey (1983) offers the use of intensive journals--diaries--to provide the data base for studying personal and affective variables in second language learning. In these diary studies, the learner and the researcher are usually one and the same. The learner-researcher is normally involved in the recording of events (i.e., in diary entries) in the classroom (or in whatever context the language learning takes place). The learner-researcher then reflects upon the diary entries soon afterwards to add interpretations before they are forgotten. Finally, the learner-researcher compiles and summarizes key elements. In this way, the
whole process exemplifies the more subjective aspects of ethnographic techniques. The difference between diary studies and more "normal" ethnography, however, has been that the diarists' principal object of study has been themselves. In keeping language learning diaries, the learner-researcher records "anything and everything perceived to be important to his or her current learning experience, [including] early impressions of the people and culture of the target language environment, the teacher and fellow students in a language class, comments about the learner's fears and frustrations, and the difficulties or successes experienced by the learner" (Bailey, 1983, p. 71).

Journals are offered in reaction to other methods of researching these (and other) variables, such as questionnaires and direct interviewing. Bailey (1983) discusses issues and problems associated with these methodologies and posits that journals, which are first-person case studies, can provide an excellent data base regarding personal and affective variables involved in language learning. Long (1979) suggests that diary studies belong to the anthropological (or ethnographic) research tradition because the research questions are not predefined, and open-ended notetaking is the data collection procedure used. Most diary research, furthermore, is largely introspective. The learner-researcher reflects upon the experience (in this case, language learning) and maintains notes and recordings of their reflections. Some diarists (Bailey, 1978), however, have also included comments and reflections upon other learners in the same environment.

There exist several diary studies of experiences of learning another language. Bailey (1978), for example, kept a diary while studying French as a second language in a low-level college French-for-Reading course. Entries were comments about the French class meetings, tests, homework, other
classmates, etc. Of particular note were three themes: (1) her response to the language learning environment, (2) her preference for a democratic teaching style, and (3) her need for success and positive reinforcement.

Two other themes, competitiveness and anxiety, also evolved for Bailey (1983) upon closer inspection of her diary. Lynch (1979, c.f., Bailey, 1983) also reports feelings of competition and anxiety as a result of overt comparison with his classmates. Likewise, Schumann (1978; Schumann & Schumann, 1977) reports these same affective variables when reviewing diaries dept during language--learning experiences while studying Arabic in Tunisia and Persian in Iran and in California. In their diary, they recorded "daily events and the thoughts and feelings related to them in a log-like fashion, paying particular attention to cross-cultural adjustments and efforts made and avoided in learning the target language, both in and out of class" (1977, p. 243). Similar findings have been reported by Snell (1978) and Bernbrock (1977), as well as by Rivers (1979), an experienced language learner and noted language educator. Moore (1977), too, has offered insightful analysis of the great difficulties he encountered while learning Danish in Denmark.

To summarize, diary studies, although scant and sporadic, have shed light upon some processes involved in second language teaching and learning. These ethnographic accounts can lend themselves to analysis in terms of strategies and difficulties that learners and teachers of other languages encounter across different language learning contexts. When studied systematically across cases, similarities can be identified. Out of these similarities can emerge hypotheses for later study, verification, validation, and perhaps even experimental manipulation.

Diary studies, however, can be criticized for being too introspective,
subject to idiosyncrasy, and non-generalizable to other situations. They can, nonetheless, provide insights and "grounded theory" for classroom researchers. As has been previously noted, research of this kind is primarily of a hypothesis-generating nature. Theory that has emerged from data collected in vivo seems much more valid that that drawn from external, unrelated areas (Long, 1983a). Nonetheless, diary studies have illuminated the classroom experience as a dynamic and complex process, as seen through the eyes of the language learner.

**Foreign Language Classroom Ethnography**

Classroom ethnography sets out to describe life in general within the foreign language classroom from the perspective of the participants. An example of a classroom ethnography is that of Gargan (1986), who presented a picture of the working world of one high school Spanish teacher in an urban public school. During his data collection phase, Gargan spent the last two terms of the academic year (some nine weeks) interviewing and observing the teacher both at home and at school. His study paints a picture of a teacher under extreme stress and duress, with little time to think let alone participate in researcher-designed tasks. In general, Gargan portrays the life of this Spanish teacher within the school culture, the classroom, at home, and at the university setting. The real world of the teacher is painted as a grim one at best.

The university has also been the object of ethnographic study. Colville-Hall (1983) examined the role of student interaction as it occurred in a fourth semester French class. In her study she found that student's attitude toward using French with their peers was found to be positive. Moreover, students felt less anxiety speaking French in small-group discussions than in
front of the entire class. During small-group talk she also found that verbal interaction consisted of discourse moves that initiated conversation, elicited a reply, responded to peer utterances, and extended the conversation.

The findings of this study are similar to those found by Kinginger and Savignon (in press). Students were found to be more successful at certain discourse moves during certain kinds of speaking tasks as opposed to others. The research suggests that instructors are able to create activities that increase student opportunities to participate in speaking activity that is more similar to that found outside the classroom setting.

Summary

In summary, ethnography has been used to seek out other kinds of understandings regarding the teaching and learning of foreign languages. The process is one that allows the researcher to penetrate the complex and dynamic nature of life in the classroom and to investigate that life from the perspective of the participants. Unlike process-product research, which has occupied a great amount of classroom-oriented research time and money, the ethnographic or anthropological approach allows the research questions to evolve as the study progresses. Questions of interest, then, are grounded in the observed data.

Part Two: A Social Interaction Perspective on Foreign Language Classroom Processes

This purpose of Part Two is to provide a detailed look at the study of teaching and learning from a social interaction perspective. The discussion will place the present study within a particular research perspective so that it can be seen both independently of and in relation to other studies and programs of research on teaching in traditional foreign language education.
A social interaction perspective was applied for use in the study because it permitted an understanding of complex social and instructional processes in the formal classroom setting. The following sections of this Chapter will explore the conceptual framework guiding this approach. This investigation will supply the framework necessary to define what is meant by a social interaction perspective and will also describe the manner in which life in the Spanish conversation classroom was conceptualized.

Identification of the Constructs that Form the Framework of the Social Interaction Perspective

The work of Green (1983a, 1983b; Green & Smith, 1983) has been foremost in the development of the conceptual foundation for the study of teaching and learning from a social interaction perspective. Green (1983a, 1983b), through a commissioned review of 10 core projects, has identified a set of common constructs underlying these studies. Table 1 presents these constructs that were grounded in varying disciplines and approaches, such as anthropology, sociology, sociolinguistics, and the study of teaching. When considered collectively, these constructs provide the foundation of a language for detailed descriptions of complex instructional and social processes as they unfold over time in the foreign language classroom. In this way, the constructs
are both outcomes of the research as well as the assumptions that guide observation, data collection, and data analysis (Green, 1983a, 1983b).

The twenty four constructs identified in Table 1 are summarized under five interrelated themes, each of which is described below. The constructs provide the basis for the study of life in the foreign language classroom from a social interaction perspective.

**The Second Language Classroom is a Communicative Environment**

Of central importance to the social interaction perspective is the understanding that classrooms are dynamic communicative environments. In these environments the events that make up everyday life are constructed by people as they engage in face-to-face interaction (Erickson & Schultz, 1981; Green & Wallat, 1981; Gumperz, 1981). In this setting both teachers and students are continuously monitoring what is occurring and how. As participants (i.e., teacher and students) interact together information is being communicated about the social (i.e., how do I participate) and the academic (i.e., what are we talking about) dimensions of instruction (Florio, 1980; Florio & Shultz, 1979; Green & Harker, 1982; Merrit & Humphrey, 1981; Philips, 1972, 1982; Shultz & Florio, 1978; Wallat & Green, 1982). To participate appropriately, students must monitor different demands and shifts in the manner of participation. Students must, therefore, understand not only what is being communicated about the academic part of instruction but also social knowledge (Mehan, 1979; Erickson, 1982; Green & Harker, 1982), which is defined as knowing who can do what, when, where, with whom, and for what purposes (Hymes, 1974). As Mehan (1979) argues,

*[t]o be successful in the classroom, students not only must know the content of academic subjects, they must learn the appropriate*
Constructs Underlying Studies of Teaching from a Social Interaction Perspective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classrooms Are Communicative Environments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation of roles exist between teachers and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships between teachers and students are asymmetrical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differential perceptions of events exist between teachers and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms are differentiated communicative environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons are differentiated communicative contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative participation affects student achievement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contexts Are Constructed During Interactions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activities have participation structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextualization cues signal meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules for participation are implicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior expectations are constructed as part of interaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning Is Context Specific</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All instances of a behavior are not equal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning is signalled verbally and nonverbally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contexts constrain meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning is determined by and extracted from observed sequences of behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative competence is reflected in appropriate behavior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inferencing Is Required For Conversational Comprehension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frames of reference guide participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame clashes result from differences in perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication is a rule-governed activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frames of reference are developed over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form and function in speech used in conversations do not always match</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers Orchestrate Different Participation Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers evaluate student ability by observing performance during interactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demands for participation co-occur with academic demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers signal their theory of pedagogy by their behavior (verbal and nonverbal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher's goals can be inferred from behaviors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
form in which to cast their academic knowledge. That is, competent membership in the classroom community involves employing interactional skills and abilities in the display of academic knowledge. They must know with whom, when, and where they can speak and act, and they must provide the speech and behavior that are appropriate for a given classroom situation. Students must also be able to relate behavior, both academic and social, to varying classroom situations by interpreting implicit classroom rules (p.133).

From this perspective, the events that make up daily life in the foreign language classroom are "not static scripts to be played out rotely; rather they are dynamic activities constructed by teachers and students as they process, build on, and work with their own and others' messages and behaviors" (Green & Smith, 1983, p. 355). In this way, lessons are constructed as part of the interactions between teacher and students (Erickson & Shultz, 1981; Green & Wallat, 1981; Gumperz, 1981; McDermott, 1978).

While the events that make up daily activity in the classroom are mutually constructed between and among the participants, the classroom is also a differentiated communicative environment (Gumperz, 1981). In other words, as the nature of the activity shifts across time so, too, does the nature of the interaction (e.g., from the teacher asking questions about factual material regarding verb morphology to the teacher providing opportunities for personalized responses to open-ended statements). When the activity changes the social rules for correct participation may also change in concert, although that change is not automatic (Florio, 1980; Florio & Shultz, 1979; Green & Harker, 1982; Merritt & Humphrey, 1981; Philips, 1972; Wallat & Green, 1982). As an illustration, in the example provided above, the students in the first activity described are expected to respond to known-information questions, that is, questions the answers to which the teacher probably already knows; the teacher wants to know if the students know also. In contrast, students must
answer questions with more personal information not already known by the teacher in the second activity. Students, then, are expected to monitor constantly the different academic and social demands and shift accordingly their manner of participation. As Green succinctly states it, "life in classrooms, therefore, is dynamic and complex" (P, 187).

**Contexts are Constructed Through Interactions**

As suggested above, an important assumption of the social interaction perspective is that meaning is constructed through face-to-face interaction between and among students and their teachers. At the same time that teachers and students interact with each other to reach the goals of instruction and to perform together the events that make up everyday life in the classroom, they are simultaneously constructing the social contexts within which instruction occurs. In this way, the participants are "signaling meanings and the rights and obligations for participation (e.g., who can talk when, about what, to whom, for what purpose" (Green, 1983b, p. 185). In short, context is not a given but rather a result of face-to-face communication (Bloome, 1981; Erickson & Shultz, 1981; Green & Wallat, 1979; Gumperz, 1981, 1982; McDermott, 1976, 1978). As suggested by McDermott (1976), people who are engaged in different types of interaction become environments for each other, and over time these interactionally constructed contexts change from moment to moment. The result is a constantly shifting array of rights and obligations for participation (Erickson & Shultz, 1981). From this perspective Green (1983a) asserts that

By observing how people hold each other accountable to what is occurring and how they signal through verbal and nonverbal actions what the activity is, the observer can begin to identify the differentiated activities that make up the everyday life of a classroom, (pp. 174-175).
For students to conduct themselves appropriately, then, within the confines of the foreign language classroom, they need to know what kinds of behaviors, both verbal and nonverbal, are appropriate within any given context (Erickson & Shultz, 1981; Green & Wallat, 1981, 1982). For example, during the Small-Group Speaking Task Presentation Phase of a speaking activity in the Spanish conversation course the teacher spells out what he expects of them during the small-group phase of the speaking activity. At the same time that the teacher is explicating the ground rules of the activity he is creating a context. In this way, rights and obligations are being constructed for the appropriate behavior expected during the activity. In other words, students are learning how to demonstrate that they are on-task, that is, to demonstrate knowledge of the social rules for participation.

Contextualization cues (Cook-Gumperz & Gumperz, 1976; Corsaro, 1981; Gumperz & Herasimchuk, 1973) play an important role in understanding what is appropriate behavior. These cues "include verbal aspects of messages such as syntax and lexical items and nonverbal aspects such as gesture, facial expression, proxemic distance and prosody (pitch, stress, intonation, rhythm, juncture" (Green, 1983b, p. 185), and occur simultaneously with the teacher's verbal delivery of information. They signal how a message is to be interpreted in any given context. For example, when the Spanish teacher says "Muy bien [Very good]" immediately following a student's response to a direct question, the message could possibly carry several meanings. On the one hand, it could be interpreted, depending upon the manner in which it was delivered by the teacher, that the student answered the question correctly and the teacher is saying "Well done. You got that one correct." On the other hand, the teacher might be signaling that the response, although correctly executed, still had
something wrong with it. In this way, cues to contextualization have an important role in helping both teacher and student determine what is going on during the flow of conversation and activity within the Spanish conversation class. Students and teachers, therefore, must continuously monitor both, covert and overt messages being delivered about both the social and the academic dimensions of instruction.

Context, however, is not a static phenomenon. Contexts are continuously changing throughout the instructional process. When the context does shift there is usually a concomitant shift in rules for appropriate behavior. Not all contexts, however, are new. Across time, as students and teacher work together, some contexts become part of the patterned way of life in the classroom (e.g., roll-taking, small-group task presentation, small-group activity). In this way, different frames of reference become established and stable over time (Elkind, 1979; Wallat & Green, 1982). These established frames of reference allow the participants to predict, to a certain degree, the types of behaviors expected and "to understand the limits to the actions that may occur" (Green, 1983b, p. 184). To illustrate, consider the fact that in the Spanish conversation class students had multiple opportunities to speak in small groups about certain teacher-prescribed topics. Each time the students formed their small groups they knew what was expected of them and rarely had to ask what was going on. This activity in the conversation class and its expectations for proper behavior became a stable aspect of the daily life of the course. It became a predictable feature of the conversation course, one that students were well aware of and were able to describe in detail, both during interviews and in their end-of-the-course journals. Lessons and instructional activities, then, can range from being completely spontaneous to being ritualized in nature
Meaning is Context Specific

Related to the conceptualization of context as something that is continuously being constructed and signaled between and among the participants is the concept of meaning as context specific. The fact that meaning is also context specific adds further to the already dynamic nature of life in classrooms. Message meanings are being signaled both, verbally and nonverbally. The meaning that an individual assigns to any given verbal or nonverbal message is fully dependent upon the context in which the message was delivered. In this way, each message is built upon messages that precede it and are part of the evolving conversation. Any one message, then, can not be considered in isolation but rather must be considered within the chain of messages and the contextualization cues that occur simultaneously with them (Gumperz & Simon, 1981; DeStefano & Pepinsky, 1981; Erickson & Shultz, 1981; Green & Wallat, 1979; Mehan, Cazden, Fisher, Coles & Maroules; Meritt & Humphrey, 1981).

As an illustration, consider a teacher's "Okay." Said with a smile and with an excited tone, it could mean "Very Good! Well done!" In another situation, however, such as when a student has continuously been touching another student on the shoulder and thereby bothering her, "Okay" could be interpreted as a warning to stop the inappropriate behavior. In still another context, "Okay" could be interpreted as a signal by a listener that he is listening to what the other person has to say, thus saying "Go on. I hear you." What on the surface may appear to be instances of the same word (e.g., "Okay"), all instances of it are not functionally equivalent. Rather, "each of these utterances must be
interpreted within the local history of the conversation by considering how it is used, what precedes it, and what follows it" (Green & Smith, 1983, p. 360).

While the task of the teacher and the student is to monitor continuously changing contexts over time, they must also continuously monitor and clarify ongoing conversation. However, because the teacher is considered the instructional leader in the classroom, he is usually responsible for both the direction and the flow of instruction (Barnes & Todd, 1977; Green, 1977; Green & Harker, 1982). For this reason, Florio (1980) has argued that the teacher is the only native speaker and that the primary responsibility of the student is "to discover the cultural expectations of the teacher and to learn to act appropriately" (Green, 1983b, p. 187).

**Inferencing is Required for Conversational Comprehension**

Whenever a teacher interacts with students, information is transmitted about both the academic and the social aspects of instruction (Erickson, 1986; Cazden, 1986; Green, 1983a, 1983b). In other words, the teacher transmits information via both verbal and nonverbal channels. This transmission of information can occur simultaneously. When the Spanish teacher, for example, begins to tell students about their next small-group activity he is signaling academic information (e.g., you are going to talk about houses) while at the same time he is signaling that they should be listening to his instructions rather than beginning to move to small group. Expectations can be signaled both directly and indirectly.

Teachers may state the rules for participation (e.g., 'I will call on those with their hands up'), or they may reveal them through sequences of behavior (e.g., calling on students with their hands up and ignoring students who call out). Therefore, in order to participate appropriately in the evolving lesson and acquire knowledge from that lesson, students must continually monitor
information from these direct and indirect messages (across verbal and nonverbal channels) in order to infer what is required (Green & Smith, 1983, p. 358).

Inferencing, a difficult and complicated process of assigning meanings to messages that are delivered through both verbal and nonverbal channels, is important for how a student understands a given message.

While inferencing may be a difficult process, patterned ways of life help in the inferencing process. Teachers and students draw upon past experiences in order to monitor the ongoing instructional conversations (Green, 1983). As students and teachers work together "frames are established by extracting from face-to-face situations the expectations for behavior. That is, from participating in a variety of situations, a participant develops a frame of reference or set of expectations for what should or might occur in similar situations. Therefore, frames can be formed for local events and/or can come from past events" (Green, 1983a, p. 180). When teachers and students have a shared frame of reference for participating in activities, that frame guides student behavior and expectations.

Having a shared frame of reference, however, while it can facilitate participation, does not insure appropriate behavior in an activity. When a divergence occurs between the teacher's and the students' perceptions of what is appropriate behavior, a frame clash results. By observing what occurs during these frame clashes it is possible to highlight what are the expectations for appropriate behavior (Cook-Gumperz, Gumperz & Simon, 1981; Green & Wallat, 1981; Heap, 1980; Mehan, 1979; Wallat & Green, 1982). For example, that the teacher reacts negatively toward the fact that students are speaking in English during small-group work highlights his expectations regarding the language they are supposed to use during these particular activities.
**Teachers Orchestrate Different Participation Levels**

The previous discussion has focused primarily on the nature of the classroom as a communicative environment and the factors involved in the interactions between teachers and students. This last construct discusses the role of the teacher in the communicative process as it is conceptualized from the social interaction perspective. Because the teacher is considered the instructional leader and the only "native speaker" in the classroom (Florio, 1980), he must manage and orchestrate numerous contexts, messages, and levels of interaction. The teacher's role, therefore, is a complex role, one that requires considerable skill. The teacher must distribute turns at talk, direct activity, manage discipline, monitor student behavior and student messages, and repair any frame clashes (Erickson, 1982; Green & Harker, 1982). In addition, the teacher must effectively transmit information regarding the academic task as well as the social expectations for appropriate behavior (Mehan, 1979; Erickson, 1982; Green & Harker, 1982). Cazden (1986) captures quite well the complexity of the teacher's role when she writes that

> [t]eachers create and change contexts by means of language innumerable times each day. [For example], within the same seating arrangement of a single group of children, . . . they change the context from sharing time (with one set of rules for participation) to planning for worktime (with another set of rules) . . . The successes and failures of classroom management can be construed as largely a matter of successes and failures in subtle aspects of this kind of creative language use (p. 435).

However, as Green and Smith (1983) suggest, "teachers do more than teach one lesson to one group at a time" [Merritt & Humphrey, 1979, 1981] (p. 361). Teachers must also (1) create methods for moving students along throughout the day from one lesson to another or from place to place (Cahir,
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1978); (2) arrange and monitor groups (Collins, 1981; Hymes, 1981; Merritt & Humphrey, 1981; Shultz & Florio, 1978); (3) monitor and respond to different messages from different groups engaged in any variety and number of tasks (Merritt, 1982); and (4) manage the discipline of the whole group of students without upsetting the delicate flow of the immediate activity in which students are presently involved (Merritt & Humphrey, 1981).

The fundamental means through which teachers orchestrate and maintain all these different dimensions of classroom life is communication both along the verbal and nonverbal dimensions. The primary medium for orchestrating classroom life, however, occurs through the verbal channels (Cazden, 1986). In other words, a great deal of complex communication goes on in any given classroom. From this perspective, a teacher's task is a complex communicative activity. Simultaneous with the fact that teachers are orchestrating complex patterns of life in the classroom, they are also communicating goals and pedagogical theories through their interactions (Cook-Gumperz, Gumperz & Michaels, 1981; Griffin, Newman, & Cole, 1981; Hymes, 1981).

Summary

As discussed above, the five constructs illuminated the foundation upon which the study of foreign language teaching and learning in formal academic settings from a social interaction perspective is constructed. These constructs are both products of the research, and assumptions guiding the inquiry process.

Some Representative Findings on the Study of Classroom Processes from a Social Interaction Perspective

The purpose of the following section of this literature review is to highlight the kinds of understandings about teaching and learning from a social
interaction perspective. The findings presented in this section, however, are not meant to be all inclusive but rather only representative. The first set of representative findings presented is on the nature of classroom communication. The second set of findings deals with a representative set of selected classroom strategies. Primarily, the findings are drawn from reviews of research on classrooms from a social interaction perspective found in Green (1983a, 1983b), Green and Smith (1983), and Cazden (1986).

Findings on Classroom Communication

Research findings on the study of classroom processes from a social interaction perspective indicate that the classroom is a rule governed environment. According to Green (1983b), rule governed refers to "patterned ways of acting or patterned expectations for communicative behavior and participation" (p. 190). The research suggests that patterned behaviors or expectations constrain and/or support what will occur. These behaviors are signaled both overtly and tacitly and provide the participants the means by which they can predict what will generally occur (Bloome, 1981; Cook-Gumperz, Gumperz & Simons, 1981; DeStefano, Pepinsky & Sanders, 1982; Erickson, 1982; Mehan, 1979; Merritt, 1982; Wallat & Green, 1982). The discussion that follows will highlight work that has explored the rule governed nature of classrooms.

One of the constructs derived from this work is that of procedural knowledge. Green (1983b) defines procedural knowledge as "knowledge of patterned ways of talking, behaving, and of interacting within instructional activities" (p. 191). The findings from four different research projects will be highlighted to help in defining procedural knowledge (Bloome, 1982, 1987;
Procedural display and mock participation are two types of Procedural display identified by Bloome (1982), which he defines as

... the display by teacher and students, to each other, of a set of academic and/or interactional procedures that themselves counted as the accomplishment of a lesson. Procedural display might not easily be related to the acquisition of academic content or to learning cognitive strategies. Simply put, procedural display occur[s] when teachers and students [are] primarily concerned with displaying to each other that they [are] 'getting the lesson done'; whatever academic learning occur[s] [is] at best, secondary or accidental (Bloome, 1987, p. 128).

During procedural display the teacher and students concentrate on finishing the lesson or academic activity, that is, on carrying out the appropriate sequence of actions necessary. In other words, the primary motivation was getting through the lesson as opposed to learning academic content.

Mock participation is the second type of procedural display identified by Bloome (1982). Mock participation occurs when students take advantage of their knowledge and understanding of the social and procedural expectations. In demonstrating their knowledge, the students "act as if" they know and understand the academic focus of the lesson. Bloome (1982), for example, describes the behavior of one student during a Language Arts lesson in which the student raised her hand when the teacher posed questions to the students about how many had correctly responded to a particular test question. This student, in spite of the fact that she had performed quite poorly on the test, raised her hand anyway. AsBloome (1981, 1982, 1987) argues, the student was able to demonstrate her knowledge of the procedures for participation, thereby responding to both the teacher's expectations as well as those of her peers. In light of these findings, Green (1983b) suggests that one way to view
procedural display and mock participation is as "patterns of interaction that can mask information about the mastery of information" (p. 191).

Erickson (1982) has been able to identify two other types of procedural knowledge that occur simultaneously in lessons and that can influence the degree of appropriate and successful participation in classroom instructional events. He proposes that, as teachers and students are engaged in doing a lesson together, they are drawing on two sets of procedural knowledge--knowledge about the academic task structure and the social participation structure of events.

The academic task structure as defined by Erickson (1982) is a "patterned set of constraints provided by the logic of the sequencing in the subject matter of the lesson" (p. 154). The academic task structure, then, governs the logical sequencing of the "instructional moves" (p. 154) made by teachers and students during lesson. The academic task structure has four identifiable aspects: (a) logic of subject matter sequencing, (b) information of content of various sequential steps, (c) "meta-content" cues toward steps and strategies for completing tasks, and (d) physical materials through which tasks and task components are manifested (c.f., Green, 1983b, p. 191).

While the academic task structure has to do with the academic nature of the lesson, the social participation structure is a "patterned set of constraints on the allocating of interactional rights and obligations of various members of the interacting group" (Erickson, 1982, p. 154). Like the academic task structure, the social participation structure also has four identifiable aspects: (a) social gatekeeping of access to people and to other sources of information in lessons, (b) allocation of communicative rights and obligations among various interactional partners in lessons, (c) sequencing and timing of successive
functional "slots" in interactions, and (d) simultaneous actions of all those engaged in interaction during lessons (c.f., Green, 1983b, p. 191).

In his discussion of task structures, Erickson (1982) affirms that there is a structure associated with the presentation of academic content during a lesson that co-occurs with the structure of appropriate participation in academic activity. Erickson's work, along with that of others (e.g., Au, 1980; Collins & Michaels, 1980; Cooper, Marquis, & Ayers-Lopez, 1982; Griffin, Newman, & Cole, 1981; Mehan & Griffin, 1980), has demonstrated that changes in the academic task structure have concomitant consequences for the social participation structure and vice versa.

[To] the extent that talk in a lesson concerns subject matter content, successful participation in the lesson involves knowledge of subject matter information and its logical organization, as well as knowledge of discourse and its social organization (Erickson, 1982, p. 156).

The work of Green and Harker (1982) has also considered the relationship between knowledge of academic task structure and social participation structure. In their work, they combined a sociolinguistic analysis with a proposition analysis and identified three structures that occur together in lessons and that can influence appropriate and successful participation in instructional events.

The three structures or themes identified were: contextual themes, content themes, and social themes. The contextual theme concentrates upon the nature of the event taking place (e.g., the teacher is presenting information about the small-group speaking task). The academic theme concentrates on the academic content that is being discussed (e.g., talk about what to do during small-group speaking task). The social theme presents information about who can and should do what (e.g., speak in Spanish with your partner(s)).
Green and Harker (1982) discovered that students were not able to "read" all three cues all the time. In addition, failure to do so may result in a student's inability to participate appropriately in the activity taking place. When a student does participate in an inappropriate manner, his behavior can influence what gets accomplished and, more importantly, what gets learned. It is important, therefore, for teachers to monitor carefully changes in contextual, academic, and social demands on students in such a way that students are reading the cues correctly and are appropriately involved in the instructional activity.

The preceding discussion has focused on the rule-governed nature of classrooms, especially concentrating on procedural knowledge necessary for students to be competent participants in an event. The work reviewed has shown that by focusing on procedures and social and academic information, researchers using a social interaction perspective to approach the study of teaching and learning can investigate the relationships between academic and social demands in place in classrooms, rules for participation both within and across activities, and factors that support and/or constrain participation in learning (Green & Smith, 1983).

While the findings on classroom communication highlight the rule-governed nature of the classroom environment, those rules are signaled both tacitly and overtly. The findings submit that instructional activities have both social and academic structures for the presentation of academic information and social information. Furthermore, students and teachers are actively involved in constructing those meanings within activities as they are in progress. Green and Smith (1983) affirm that the research stresses six major points:
1 the complexity of information facing teachers and students;
2 the degree of skilled cooperation necessary to achieve mutual goals;
3 the degree of skilled performance required of both teacher and students;
4 the variety of information that must be processed;
5 the high degree of inferring required of both teacher and students;
and finally,
6 the complexity of the teacher and student decision making required during activities (pp. 378-379).

When looked at holistically, the investigation of teaching and learning processes from a social interaction perspective shows (1) the differentiated nature of classrooms as learning environments, (2) the nature of the tasks in which the participants are involved, and (3) that there is some skill required for appropriate and successful participation in teaching and learning processes by both teachers and students (Green, 1983a, 1983b).

Classroom Strategies/Patterns of Communication

This section presents findings relative to patterns of language use in classrooms. The purpose is to demonstrate the kinds of understandings that can be obtained from exploring classroom strategies from a social interaction perspective. Three specific strategies are discussed: student sanctions, teacher praise, and student attention.

Sanctions

Discipline has been a continuing concern of teachers. One aspect of discipline--the use of sanctions--has received specific attention in the work of
Merritt and Humphrey (1981) and Hrybyk and Farnham-Diggory (1981). Merritt and Humphrey looked at both linguistic and behavioral use of sanctions by teachers from nursery school to Grade 3. One part of their exploration was of how teachers provided services, such as help, to students. They identified 297 instances of sanctions. Of the 297 instances, 250 concerned the placement of talk during lessons, 17 were for behavioral problems, 11 were responsive, eight were curt, six were double takes, and five were delivery.

Overwhelming attention was paid by the teachers in this study to the placement of talk during instructional activities. This attention to the placement of talk suggests the importance of appropriate linguistic participation in classrooms. Sanctions are important because they highlight rules for conversation, and the lack of such rules may influence the continuity of a lesson. The research highlights, once again, that the extent to which a student experiences problems in appropriate participation may influence how a teacher might evaluate that student. Furthermore, by highlighting students' attempts at getting the teacher's attention, it is possible to extract participation rules.

Hrybyk and Farnham-Diggory (1981) are concerned with sanctions as well. Their study, however, concentrated on interactions at a more general level rather than on specific linguistic features of the sanctions. These researchers show the general consequences that various types of sanctions can have. Sanctions of student behaviors had consequences for student learning and participation. As was often the case, student sanctions resulted in such things as loss of learning-center privileges, banishment to a desk at the back of a room, penalty points in classroom games, and biased turn-giving in lessons.

Because there were a variety of consequences for student sanctions, the differentiated nature of classrooms is once again suggested. For example,
biased turn giving directly affected the communicative demands in classrooms. In addition, students who finished work early had access to learning centers while those who were slower in completing work were denied access to those centers. As the authors argue, this practice meant that the reinforcement and practice work offered at the center was not afforded those who, more than likely, needed it the most, that is, the slower students.

Findings from these and other studies give new insights into something that is a common occurrence in classrooms, and that it occurs in a variety of ways and serves a variety of purposes. Sanctions are used for general misbehavior. That misbehavior is public conduct; therefore, sanctions can interrupt the general flow of classroom activities. "Sanctions provide signals to participants about expectations teachers and others have for appropriate behavior" (Green & Smith, 1983, p. 381). Research on student sanctions further clarifies the interactional features of classrooms, thus extending the idea of the already complex nature of teacher/student interactions and the task of inferring rules for appropriate behavior.

Teacher Praise

Research conducted by DeStefano and Pepinsky (1981) and Morine-Dershimer and Tenenberg (1981) is closely related to that done on sanctions. DeStefano and Pepinsky (1981) observed praise being used by one teacher twice as often as negative statements. Students' replies to questions, in addition, were either evaluated or accepted, but never ignored. When considered with other work on student perceptions of language use, the findings become clearer. Morine-Dershimer and Tenenberg (1981) provide seven findings from their study: (1) during interviews, students reported hearing
responses that drew teacher praise more frequently than responses that did not; (2) although it occurred less frequently than other forms of talk, students heard strong praise more frequently; (3) both teachers and students agreed that praise was given because it was merited; (4) significant relationships were found between defining praise as deserved and higher participation in class discussion ($p < .025$); (5) significant relationships were found between pupil perceptions of praise and entering reading achievement ($p < .01$), peer status ($p < .05$), and status with the teacher ($p < .005$); (6) questions were seen as instructional and praise as deserved by students of higher classroom status; and (7) students of lower status had the tendency not to provide any definition of these events.

In reviewing the work of Morine-Dershimer and Tenenberg (1981), Green and Smith (1983) suggest that, . . . while the teachers in these projects used praise frequently, praise is viewed differentially by various groups of students, is perceived by students as serving a variety of functions, and is related to student participation, achievement, and status. Praise, therefore, is a differentiated process (p. 381).

Moreover, these reviewers express that these findings complement those secured from studies of classroom management, such as those discussed in Brophy (1983) and Brophy and Evertson (1976).

**Attention**

Several studies have generated a number of findings relative to the nature of attention and the consequences of inattention (Cooper et al, 1981; DeStefano & Pepinsky, 1981; May, 1981; Morine-Dershimer & Tenenberg, 1981; Merritt, 1982). "Attention" is a complex phenomenon and has varied both within and across situations. The overriding question that is central to the topic
is "What counts as giving attention?" May (1981) found that all learning situations did not require constant attention and that students can provide attention without even understanding the content of the activity. Furthermore, the amount of attention required was dependent upon the degree of attention felt by the teacher to be necessary. In other words, no constant rule existed for attention giving. This variability meant that students had to monitor constantly each activity, including each activity phase within an activity in order to infer the requirements for participation. Little consistency in the teacher's rules for attention giving on the part of the student further adds to the complex nature of life in classrooms (Green, 1983a).

The complexity of the role of the teacher in focusing attention is quite obvious. DeStefano and Pepinsky (1981), Griffin et al., (1981); and Merritt (1982) have found that the nature of the task and the rules for participation were not a given; there was no automatic shared frame of reference. It is the teacher's role, then, to communicate expectations for doing classroom tasks and for participation. The teacher was responsible for directing and focusing students' attention on task and to social participation rules so that students would be able to know and, hence, be able to do in an appropriate manner. Furthermore, the degree of attention was dependent upon the specific activity under way.

Work conducted by Morine-Dershimer and Tenenberg (1981) and Cooper et al., (1981) provides insights into the relationship of student participation patterns and student learning. They indicate that students of varying ability levels and classroom status attend differentially to various dimensions of the teaching/learning process. In the work of Morine-Dershimer and Tenenberg (1981), for example, students who were of middle and low peer
status attended less to other students' responses than those students who were high in peer status. Work by Cooper et al (1981) has shown that student use of attention strategies during peer instruction was highly associated with positive outcomes for peer learners.

To summarize, research on student attention has demonstrated that attention from the teachers' perspective is a part of the teaching/learning process that varies dependent upon such factors as teacher goals, the nature of the activity, among others. From the students' perspective, however, when students give attention to such things as teacher's questions, other students' responses, and teacher's praise and sanctioning, information is provided not only about correct answers but what is required for appropriate participation in the activity. Moreover, considering what counts as attention and inattention "is a constructed phenomenon and a varied phenomenon that is situationally defined" (Green & Smith, 1983, p. 383). Attention, then, requires that both teachers and students actively monitor everyday events in order to know what is going on, when, how, and with whom.

Review of Selected Research from a Social Interaction Perspective in Foreign Language Classrooms

The social interaction perspective has been used in investigating patterns of life and linguistic behavior in middle school Language Arts classrooms (e.g., Bloome, 1981, 1982, 1987), in elementary classrooms (e.g., Green, 1977; Green & Harker, 1982; Green & Weade, 1985), in the gymnasium (e.g., Graham, 1986), among others. There has also been work conducted in university-level beginning Spanish classes (e.g., Brooks, in press; Schrier, 1988; and Welch, 1988).

Brooks (in press) looked at the small-group interaction between students
who were participating in a teacher-derived simulated conversation task, which
was a recurring feature of a first-semester Spanish class. A videotaped record
was made of the entire class, which included the interaction between two
students who were regular partners in similar paired conversational activity.
The findings showed the two students interacting in such a way that reflected
typical patterns of talk manifested by the teacher. For example, the more
proficient student took over the role of teacher and used speech patterns
consistent with those of the teacher. The student corrected linguistic errors in a
manner like that of the teacher. Furthermore, the student used conversational
management strategies that conformed to the IRF pattern found in the work of
Mehan (1979) and Sinclair & Coulthard (1975), also demonstrated by the
teacher. Brooks argues that the students, rather than participating in a
simulated conversation, as originally intended by the teacher, were actually
manifesting behaviors for "getting through the lesson" (Bloome, 1982, 1987),
thereby getting ready for a subsequent quiz on structural features of Spanish
being given that same day in class.

Findings by Welch (1988) are those similar to those found by Bloome
(1981, 1982, 1987). Data were extracted from a study of instruction and student
participation in an intensive ten-week elementary Spanish course at the college
level, which was taught by two different instructors; each instructor taught part
of the course. Students indicated during post-instruction interviews and through
behaviors observed during lessons that they were able to avoid being called on
by the teacher if they demonstrated the appropriate actions (e.g., look down at
book, turn pages in the book, appear to be looking for something). Students
could also get the teacher to call on them if they demonstrated appropriate
behaviors (e.g., lean forward in the desk, raise one's arm very slowly as if not
certain of the answer and then "shoot" it into the air). Furthermore, the study found that as the classroom culture evolved over time varying demands for participation were imposed on students. More importantly, problems in classroom management emerged when the second instructor arrived to take over the class for the second five weeks of the course. Also found were significant correlations between the number of times students participated verbally in the class and final course grades.

In a study of an intermediate university-level Spanish course during which the participants were discussing reading assignments from an abridged version of *Don Quijote*, Schrier (1988) investigated the influence of the classroom culture on reading comprehension. Her findings demonstrate that, as might be the case more often than not, what is presented in the text used in the class is not what students necessarily understand as demonstrated through recall protocols. As Schrier argues, there are multiple cultures (Breen, 1985) at play in the classroom that influence what students eventually walk away with in terms of academic knowledge.

**Summary of Research**

**From a Social Interaction Perspective**

The purpose of this section has been to situate the present study in a particular research perspective, the social interaction perspective. In so doing, it will be possible to view this work both independently of and in relationship to other work done in second language classrooms. A social interaction perspective was selected as the approach for the project because of its potential for both adding to current understandings of teaching/learning processes in second language classrooms and for creating new knowledge to add to that already-existing pool. The discussion in the following chapter,
Chapter III, presents the specific methodology used in the study of teaching/learning in a traditional college-level foreign language conversation course from the social interaction perspective.

SECTION THREE
CONVERSATION AS A SOCIAL PHENOMENON

Because the research project was conceptualized to investigate the nature of learner-to-learner conversation during recurrent small group speaking activity in a Spanish conversation class, the purpose of this section of the Review of the Literature is to discuss pertinent literature relative to the nature of conversation as a social process. The first part of this Section presents a survey of selected aspects of conversation as they relate to second language acquisition. The second part of this Section presents a discussion of related research conducted within the realm of second language acquisition.

Part One: Conversation

Human beings spend a great deal of time engaged in one kind of talk or another. Through talk human beings engage one another in linguistic communication to establish and maintain social relationships. Not all talk, however, is the same. For example, the kind of talk that takes place during a lecture presented by a full professor in a graduate humanities class is not the same kind of talk that takes place during an argument between good friends at a neighborhood bar. Each kind of talk requires a different set of interactional norms that govern not only the use of speech and topics for discussion, but also the manner in which the participants initiate talk, introduce and change topic during talk, repair communication problems with talk, and end talk, among other things.

Hymes (1972) uses the term speech events for talking activities that are
governed by norms for the use of speech. As a speech event, a conversation can be contrasted with other types of speech events, such as lectures, discussions, sermons, courtroom trials, interviews, debates, meetings, and so on. Different speech events are, according to Richards and Schmidt (1983), "as distinct by virtue of differences in the number of participants who take part in them, as well as through differences in the type and amount of talking expected by the participants" (p. 118). As such, speech events "have identifiable rules for proper beginnings, middles and ends, violations of which are noticed and reportable" (p. 118).

Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) argue that conversation exists as a polar end of a continuum along which kinds of talk can be posted. In this scheme, "kinds of talk" are placed along the continuum according to the means by which participants get a turn at talk. They write that

the linear array is one in which one polar type (exemplified by conversation) involves 'one-turn-at-a-time' allocation, i.e., the use of local allocational means; the other pole (exemplified by debate) involves pre-allocation of all turns; and medial types (exemplified by meetings) involve various mixes of pre-allocational and local allocational means (p. 729).

Conversation, therefore, because of the rather free and local allocation of turns at talk, is by its very nature an extremely cooperative form of human social interaction. In fact, Miller (1981) states that "participants must agree on a topic, they must take turns developing it, and their contributions must be intelligible, relevant, and truthful" (P. 121). Wardhough (1985) asserts that conversations are "generally neither structured in advance nor are they entirely 'free form'. Upon analysis they do seem to have structures of certain kinds; yet these structures are usually apparent only retrospectively" (p. 75).

The literature on conversation and conversation analysis (For a second
language perspective on this research, see Kramsch, 1981.) usually points out various structural features of this phenomenon of human social interaction. They are (1) initiating a conversation; (2) developing topic in a conversation; and, (3) ending or drawing to a close a conversation, among others. What follows is a brief discussion of these three features of conversation.

Initiating a conversation

Initiating a conversation in the real world can be a difficult and nerve-wracking task, to be sure. In a book entitled How conversation works, Wardhough (1985) points out that the task of initiating a conversation is going from silence to speech in a smooth and orderly fashion. As uncomplicated as that may sound, conversation does not simply or magically begin. The initiation of a conversation, like that of other speech events (Hymes, 1982), is a highly organized and orderly accomplishment that is negotiated between at least, although not limited to, two participants. The ways in which the openings of different speech events occur, however, are event specific. Turner (1972), for example, declares that some events require that a specified number of participants be present before the event may appropriately begin, such as a quorum at a formal meeting where voting is to take place.

A conversation, however, is quite different from other speech events. Conversations have no specified opening remarks, people, setting, agenda, quorum, etc. Nevertheless, a conversation, like other speech events, must be initiated. The structure of conversational openings has primarily been investigated in telephone calls (Schegloff, 1972), which normally begin with what is called a summons-answer sequence. The ringing of the telephone, for example, functions as the summons on the part of the person making the call. The person who is called answers the summons when the phone is picked up
and says "hello?". A summons-answer sequence, a question-answer sequence, a grant-request sequence, a statement-response sequence are commonly called "adjacency pairs" (Ervin-Tripp, 1974).

An "adjacency pair" consists of a specified first part (e.g., question, assertion) and a specified second part (e.g., answer, response) where the second part is unconditionally relevant to the first, that is, it is highly expected to follow. Grice (1975) refers to this as the cooperative principle of a conversation. If, however, the second part of the adjacency pair were not unconditionally relevant to the first, it would be very noticeable and could be cause for sanctions of some sort. Richards and Schmidt (1983) point out that, while such adjacency pairs might provide and allow for the possibility of talking beyond the immediate adjacency pair, and for engaging in conversation for a longer, unspecified amount of time, they neither always nor inevitably lead to full conversation. Greetings on the telephone, however, do necessarily provide for more talk because the answerer's 'hello' is the response to the caller's summons. It is the caller's responsibility, then, to initiate at least one topic for discussion in order to justify the call (Schegloff, 1968). Greetings, such as those exampled above, might be considered conversational openers and, therefore, invitations to talk further. From these possible openers a conversation may or may not be developed depending upon the flow of additional turns (Speier, 1972) following the initial contact.

Wardhough (1985) concludes that initiating a conversation is probably one of the most difficult problems encountered by a speaker as there are certainly many restrictions that prevent and deter anyone from engaging in free and easy conversation with just anyone. For example, it is often quite difficult to deal with strangers who may be intruding on the speaker's space or on whose
space the speaker may be intruding. If a speaker must interrupt or intrude on someone else the speaker must necessarily repair first of all the intrusion committed by trying to initiate conversation (e.g., "Oh, please excuse me, but . . .").

Another difficulty in initiating conversation, especially with a complete stranger is the selection of an initial topic with which to begin the conversation. Topics that are 'safe' are usually preferred. For example, initiating a conversation by saying "Hello, do you pick your teeth?" is, more than likely, to be responded to in a harsh and negative manner. Social 'chit chat', or 'small talk', perhaps about the weather or about the immediate surroundings (e.g., "Isn't this a pretty shade of blue Dr. Jones has in here!"), provides an escape from potentially damaging and threatening consequences, thus providing a means by which the conversants can "break ground," so to speak. More about developing topic in conversations will be discussed below.

Initiating conversation is not an easy task, especially for the non-native speaker of a particular language. Many socially-derived rules organize and prescribe certain characteristics about socially acceptable ways for initiating conversations. Participants in conversations must necessarily cooperate with one another when beginning to talk. While all parties must agree to engage in conversation before conversation is to take place, all parties must also agree to the topic(s) for discussion. If disagreement results when one party does not accept these conditions, the potential conversation is likely to be thwarted before it begins, and miscomprehension can result.

Establishing and Developing Topic(s) in a Conversation

The manner in which topics for conversation are selected, developed, and changed is an important aspect of conversational organization.
Conversations that are coherent follow certain norms regarding not only the choice of topic but also the manner in which topic is added to the conversation. Coulthard (1977) maintains that "an initial question is what sorts of things can and do form topics in conversation [because] . . . some topics are not relevant to particular conversations . . . and the suitability of other topics depends on the person one is talking to. We experience, see, hear about events all the time . . . Some are tellable to everyone, some have a restricted audience, and some must be told immediately, some can wait and still retain their interest" (pp. 75-76). In addition, Kramsch (1981) holds that

a conversation that is progressing well drifts imperceptibly from one topic to another, and speakers must constantly choose what is suitable to 'tell' in the course of a conversation. This concept of 'tellability' or newsworthiness is difficult to apply to a particular item in a particular conversation, but it is used by conversationalists all the time. Speakers who want to change the topic have to justify their new choice of topic by tying grammatically and topically what they want to say to what has gone before. If their own topic is being changed by another aggressive speaker, skillful speakers know how to reassert it by using "skip-connecting," i.e., relating back to the next-to-the-last utterance" (p. 11).

In conversations, however, topics are negotiated (Gumperz, 1976; Collins, 1983), and each speaker has the right to "veto" a topic being proposed for discussion. In this respect, topic changes are brought about through speaker interaction, that is, by what speakers do and do not do. Conversations, then, recognize a high degree of voluntary cooperation between speakers (Green, 1977).
The following excerpt from the work of Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) is offered to illustrate this point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>We got these exercises and you're to take the butt and hold point it away up there and we couldn't. Our arm used to shoot up and down it came.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>Well I joined for these reasons and plus the driving you get taught you're taught to drive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>Well also my father said I need a bit of discipline you know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>There's none there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>You won't get any there honestly it's just terrific.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>That's why I'm joining to make him think I'm getting discipline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>Oh it's great fun isn't it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>Oh but wait have you been on a drilling yet?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>Just you wait.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though the excerpt seems to be a discussion about military training, the
speakers were able to negotiate the topic of conversation going from Topic 1, rifles, to Topic 2, driving, to Topic 3, discipline, and finally to Topic 4, drilling. Each speaker had the right to change and to initiate a new topic. In this way, the negotiation of topic change in conversations is unpredictable.

What is tellable in a conversation, however, is heavily dependent upon cultural norms. Moreover, topics are limited by the speech event (Hymes, 1974) or speaking activity in which the talk occurs. For example, during a formal debate, it is probably unacceptable to mention in the stream of formal talk one's childrens' accomplishments at school unless these comments are somehow made relevant to the debate. Although topics are rather 'free floating' during a conversation, the possible topics and who may bring them up are not completely unlimited. Some constraints are in effect that prevent free discussion about certain topics with certain people; sometimes what is talked about is socially unacceptable. As Turner (1974) suggests, when related parties come together the possible topics for conversation may be limited only to bringing another person up to date, or to talking over old times, as during a reunion, for example.

Coherent conversation respects socially-derived norms about the choice of topic as well as the place of a particular topic within a conversation. The manner in which participants introduce, develop, and change topics within a conversation is an important dimension in the organizational structure of a conversation.

**Ending a conversation.**

Ending a conversation is finally progressing from speech to silence (Wardhough, 1985). Just as it is important to know how to initiate a conversation, it is equally important to know how to end a conversation. Under
normal circumstances, conversations do not just abruptly cease. As Coulthard (1977) asserts, "arriving at a point where a closing sequence can begin requires a certain amount of work" (p. 77). To draw to an end a conversation the participants make use of particular closing mechanisms with which they begin to wind down the encounter. The beginning of the end of a conversation is usually brought about by what Schegloff and Sacks (1973) call possible pre-closings. With a key utterance, a participant in a conversation can suggest that the participants cease talking about a given topic and thereby signal that an end to the conversation is near. This can be seen functioning in the first part of an adjacency pair by the use of signals such as 'well', 'all right', 'okay' (said sometimes with a falling intonation) to signal the listener that the speaker probably has nothing more to say about the topic, thereby indicating that the time has come to end the conversation or a particular topic. The corresponding second part of the adjacency pair is then a free turn that allows the next speaker either to introduce an entirely new topic and thus attempt to continue the conversation, to add more about the topic under discussion, or to add the next pre-closing utterance, hence indicating agreement that the conversation is coming to an end. In this way, closing a conversation, like initiating a conversation, is also an extremely cooperative venture (Wardhough, 1985). When a suggestion is made, either explicitly ("Well, I think I have to go now") or implicitly ("Gosh, it's getting pretty late"), to bring a conversation to a close, the speakers have the option to summarize their conversation ("Well, I really enjoyed talking to you this afternoon"), perhaps make arrangements for a possible future meeting ("I hope we can get together again sometime soon"), and eventually make the actual terminal exchange with another adjacency pair such as:
A: Goodbye.
B: Goodbye.

Closing a conversation, like opening a conversation, does not simply happen; people do not normally just walk away from each other without some closing mechanism. Closings "must be made to occur by coordinated activities of the conversationalists" (Richards & Schmidt, 1983, p. 134).

Conversational endings have particular structures that set them apart from other parts of a conversation. Two or more participants must agree that the encounter has come to a close and to begin the winding down sequence that eventually leads to the terminal boundary of the speech event. Unlike some other speech events (e.g., formal meetings, debates, sermons, interviews), a conversation has no preset ending. Although a conversational ending sequence might have been placed in motion by one or more of the participants, it is certainly possible to talk about "just one more topic" Other, more formal gatherings, however, usually end with some formal pronouncement that the event has now come to a close (e.g. "This court is now adjourned!").

Both opening a conversation and closing a conversation can present problems for non-native speakers of a particular language. Different conventions operating in the native language and the second language along with transference of rules and expectations brought from one to the other often create difficulties. Wolfson (1983), for example, reports differences in the opening conventions of telephone conversations in the United States, France, and Egypt. Closing a conversation, too, presents special problems for non-native speakers, especially in interpreting sincere vs. ritual invitations (Wolfson, 1983). These problems were probably most attributable to the "making arrangements" (P. 75) strategy for drawing conversations to a close.
Language learners may miss entirely the probable intentions behind pre-closing moves like "Well, I guess you have lots of things to do." Furthermore, they may have difficulties in bringing themselves to close a conversation. Non-native speakers have a tendency to be too abrupt and ending a telephone conversation in a manner like the following: "I have nothing more to say" (c.f., Richards & Schmidt, 1983, p. 135).

Summary

Conversation is a social phenomenon that is much more than being able to string words together to express coherent thoughts. It requires knowledge of more than just vocabulary, sentence structure, and verb forms. Conversations must begin and end as well, which themselves have been considerable topics for research (e.g., Richards & Schmidt, 1983; Wardhough, 1985; Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974; Schegloff, Jefferson & Sacks, 1977; Wolfson, 1983). Being able to participate actively and competently in a conversation is no easy task for anyone, especially for someone speaking in a non-native language.

Part Two: Repairing Trouble Spots in a Conversation

Conversations, unfortunately, do not simply flow unmarred. To be sure, there are recurrent problems in speaking, hearing, and understanding during any conversation. Conversation entails monitoring by both speakers and hearers to ensure that intended messages have been communicated. This involves a process of correction, where necessary, of unsuccessful attempts. Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977) use the term repair when talking about the efforts either the speaker or the hearer uses to correct trouble spots in conversation. Repairs may be initiated by either the speaker or the hearer.
Speaker-initiated repairs are termed *self-repairs*. The following example will illustrate this point:

Is a dollar all right or will I need more than that for the p... to cover the postage?

*Other repairs* are carried out by the hearer:

A: She married that guy from Australia... what was his name?...

Wilson... Williams?

B: Don Wilson

A: Yeah, Don Wilson.

Not all repairs succeed, however:

A: Can you tell me... do you have any records of whether you... whether you... sent... oh shit.

B: What did you say?

A: I am having the worst trouble talking (Richards & Schmidt, 1983, pp. 147-148).

While repair is a natural part of any interactive social organization, Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977) argue that conversation is organized to provide for self-correction before other-correction because speakers do not commonly interrupt a speaker to perform a correction.

Overview of Related Research on Conversation Repair in Second Language Acquisition

There has been a great deal of theoretical and practical interest in studies of second language acquisition relative to the notion of conversational repair. Ferguson (1970, 1975), in early studies of the language associated with native speaker/non-native speaker interaction, or "foreigner talk," identified a number of differences (i.e., omission of capula, elimination of verbal inflections,
reduplication, the occurrence of particular lexical items) characteristic of the talk addressed by native speakers to non-native speakers. In the section that follows, representative research related to the repairs found during native speaker/non-native speaker (NS-NNS) speech and non-native/non-native speaker (NNS-NNS) interactions will be reviewed.

The Negotiation of Meaning

The role of input as an active causal influence on the second language acquisition process can be traced to work on first language acquisition. Scollon (1976), for example, showed two syntactic constructions in early child language that could have been derived from constructions in caretaker discourse. Hatch (1978), following this line of research, began her analysis of NS-NNS interaction as discourse by investigating the way in which the meanings of utterances were negotiated by participants. This work has been continued by Long and his colleagues (e.g., Long, 1980, 1981; Long, Adams, McLean & Castanos, 1976; Long & Sato, 1983; Pica & Long, 1982). Of particular interest to these researchers is how conversational adjustments, or modifications of interaction, in NS-NNS discourse provide input that is comprehensible to the NNS.

In recent years the use of group work in the second language classroom has enjoyed increasing popularity. Learner-to-learner conversations are believed to present both pedagogical and psycholinguistic advantages over the traditional teacher-led "lockstep" lesson. (See Long & Porter, 1983.) This idea has grown out of Krashen's claim (1985) that input comprehensibility is the key to language development. Language learners make linguistic progress "in proportion to the extent to which their interlocutors make conversational adjustments in their speech to them (i.e., make it comprehensible to them)" (Allwright, 1988, p. 251).
It has been shown that during certain kinds of small-group activity language learners are successfully able to provide each other with modified input through the "negotiation of meaning," which, theoretically, is required for the acquisition of second language (Long, 1983a, 1983b). Long (1983a, 1983b) and Long and Porter (1985), for example, suggest that the modified interactions found in NS-NNS conversations is the sine qua non of second language acquisition. Because the goal of foreign language teaching is to enable learners to communicate as freely as possible in real situations, the encounters in which language learners are involved ought to bear some resemblance to the encounters in which they may be expected to participate after instruction. It is suggested that the classroom become more decentralized in order for learners to learn to participate in face-to-face conversation where negotiation of meaning can take place (Kinginger & Savignon, in press).

Negotiation, according to Schwartz (1980), "refers to the process whereby second language learners confer with each other in order to achieve understanding. Through this process they can build on each other's strengths to meet their individual needs" (p. 139). This repair work is a very necessary and natural part of conversations, and is felt by some to be a "vehicle of language socialization" (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977, p. 33). For there to be successful communication, there must be attentiveness and involvement in the discourse itself by all participants. Stevick (1980, 1981) claims that it is precisely active involvement that is a facilitator of acquisition in that it "charges" the input and allows it to "penetrate" deeply. Long and Porter (1985) feel that "learners must be put in a position of being able to negotiate the new input, thereby ensuring that the language in which it is heard is modified to exactly the level of comprehensibility they can manage" (p. 214, original emphasis).
Because the learners are more involved in keeping conversation going, the input they receive is made more meaningful. The discourse resulting from NNS-NNS interactions serves an important function for the NNS for it allows them a non-threatening forum within which to practice developing second language skills.

With adjustments in the forms and content of speech, when they are made interactively, that is, with the learners themselves signaling when adjustments are needed and when they are not, learners and speakers are said to "negotiate" the form of messages until they are comprehensible. This interactive work at making messages comprehensible is considered to be a crucial component in language learning. The pedagogical literature found in most foreign and second language journals, therefore, strongly suggests that language learners be put together in small groups to speak with one another to develop more fully the learners' ability to speak the target language. The negotiative interactions between second and foreign language learners who are reacting to each other's messages are positive forces in oral language development, because the learners appear to experience a greater degree of involvement in their negotiation of message meaning (Varonis & Gass, 1985). In this way, language serves as input when it satisfies a real communicative function.

**Review of Selected Research on the Negotiation of Meaning**

Schwartz (1980) investigated different aspects of the negotiation processes that developed when she had ESL students from diverse linguistic backgrounds get together and talk for fifteen minutes in a separate room during their breaks in their ESL classes. As the students conversed with one another, she videotaped their conversations and later transcribed them using
conversation analysis transcription techniques developed by Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson (1974). While transcribing, she located the repair segments and analyzed them along different dimensions, using the work of Sacks et al (1974) as a guide. Schwartz concludes her research asserting that:

as is true for native speakers' interaction, the second language learners in these conversations gave the speaker of a trouble source repeated chances to repair his own speech. However, when the trouble source involved was a matter of incompetence in syntax, lexicon, or phonology, the other speaker made repairs (pp. 151-152).

Schwartz further concludes that "second language learners can learn more from one another than they think they can" (P. 152), since "the teaching nature of repair work was evident in their conversation with each other" (p. 152).

Rulon and McCreary (1986) examined selected aspects of negotiational interaction found in two different task types, small group and teacher fronted. These researchers randomly selected students of diverse linguistic backgrounds, mainly from East Asian countries, enrolled in two sections of the same ESL class. The students were then assigned to either small groups or to teacher fronted classes (i.e., the teacher was in full charge) in which they had to discuss a 14-minute videotape of a lecture on the American Revolution and complete an outline listing the advantages and disadvantages of the colonists and the British during the Revolution. They conclude their research report by asserting that "when students are placed in a group situation and asked to complete a contextualized, two-way task, significantly more negotiation of content, like the negotiation of meaning, may be essential to the promotion of interaction necessary for successful second language acquisition" (p. 195).

Like Rulon and McCreary (1986), who examined effects of grouping on negotiative aspects, Duff (1986) examined the effect of two different types of
tasks, problem-solving tasks and debates, and of two task types, convergent and divergent, on the input and interaction of NNS-NNS pairs, between native speakers of Japanese and Mandarin learning ESL. For the study, the researcher controlled for such variables as first language background, length of residence in the U.S., proficiency level, familiarity (all were acquaintances), age, class standing, and gender. Duff (1986) concludes that debates reduce the opportunities for the negotiation of input and that problem-solving tasks seem to allow a great deal of clarification of meaning.

In a similar vein, Porter (1986) set out to respond to such questions as (1) What happens when students engage in communicative tasks with their production unmonitored by the teacher? (2) Do they learn mistakes from each other? (3) Is their grammatical accuracy less accurate than when monitored? (4) Do they carry over social interaction patterns from their native languages and cultures? (5) Should we set up groups or pairs according to language abilities? According to social skills?

Twelve learners of English, all adult males, who were speakers of Spanish from five Latin American countries, and six native speakers of English formed the pool of speakers. Using different pair combinations (n=27), the researcher had them discuss problem-solving tasks, such as "The Plane Crash," in which the participants had to rank 10 individuals as survivors; "The Alligator Story," which again involved ranking, but ranking five characters according to their moral behavior; and "Lost At Sea," which involved ranking 15 items for their usefulness for survival at sea.

Porter (1986) concludes her study into the language used by adult ESL subjects and native speakers of English in task-centered discussions by suggesting that teachers should consider pairing students of different
proficiencies in the target language. She found that the ESL subjects produced more speech when talking to each other than when talking to native speakers.

Varonis and Gass (1985) also focused their research efforts on interactions among non-native speakers of English. In their study, they used 14 NNS-NNS dyads, 4 NS-NNS dyads, and 4 NS-NS dyads. They found that the negotiation of meaning is more prevalent during NNS-NNS conversations than during NS-NNS conversations because, as the researchers speculate, the learners felt more comfortable with each other and were, therefore, more cooperative and interactive.

As part of their research report, Varonis and Gass (1985) provide a model to describe the conversations between non-native speakers in an attempt to explain what they describe as "pushdowns" from and "pops" to the main discourse. Their model is presented below:

\[
T \rightarrow (CC) \rightarrow I \rightarrow (CC) \rightarrow R \rightarrow (CC) \rightarrow RR \rightarrow (CC)
\]

In the model, T denotes a trigger, which "is that utterance or portion of an utterance on the part of the speaker which results in some indication [I] of non-understanding on the part of the hearer" (p. 74). Following the trigger and the indicator, the response [R] is the speaker's acknowledgment of the non-understanding in some way. Then, there is the hearer's response to the speaker's response [RR], such as that seen in the following example:

My father now is retire retire? yes oh yeah

\[
T \rightarrow I \rightarrow R \rightarrow RR
\]
Varonis and Gass (1985) argue that NNS-NNS discourse thus progresses in linear fashion. Unlike NS-NS discourse, however, NNS-NNS discourse is "marred by numerous interruptions" (p. 73). It is during these interruptions in the flow of the discourse that non-native speakers "negotiate meaning." In their scheme, these interruptions are referred to as "non-understanding routines" (p. 73) during which the non-native speakers attempt to "regain their places in a conversation after one or both have 'slipped'"(p. 73). These routines are operationalized as "those exchanges in which there is some overt indication that understanding between participants has not been complete" (p. 73). Specifically, they investigated "only those instances of non-understanding in which there is some overt marker on the part of the hearer, indicating an interruption in the horizontal flow of the conversation" (pp. 74-75).

To summarize, studies of NNS-NNS talk are concerned with the extent to which learners' conversations provide the means by which they can provide each other with certain kinds of communicative interactions felt necessary for second language acquisition. The overall consensus is that group work among non-native speakers is a practical alternative to teacher-led work, in that learners are able to provide one another with useful and varied practice in their second language. Furthermore, they are able to do so without necessarily influencing each other's linguistic forms (Porter, 1986). As a result, it has been suggested that small-group interaction may even be a more fruitful kind of activity than than with native speakers (Rulon & McCreary, 1986; Schwartz, 1980; Varonis & Gass, 1985).

The studies reviewed in this section, however, need to be looked at with a certain amount of caution. The subjects of the studies were, for the most part,
non-native speakers of English. On other words, the subjects were from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds and did not share a *lingua franca* with their partners. If students of similar linguistic and cultural backgrounds did happen to be paired together, it was coincidental, not necessarily planned for. Furthermore, the studies did not take place in intact classrooms. In other words, each of the studies undertaken was researcher-directed; they were quasi-experimental in nature. In contrast to the subjects in the ESL research reviewed above, the subjects in the present project were American students in a natural academic setting. They shared not only a common native language, English (with the exception of two students who were native speakers of other languages but who spoke English very fluently and almost exclusively during any given day), but also common school experiences. It has yet to be shown whether these kinds of students will display the same kinds of conversational behaviors as those displayed among the ESL students. (See Kinginger, 1989, however, for a notable exception.)

**CHAPTER SUMMARY**

This Chapter has presented a review of literature relevant to the present study of an intact Spanish conversation course from a social interaction perspective. Three areas were reviewed: literature pertaining to general ways in which the foreign language classroom has been explored, such as interaction analysis, studies of teacher talk, and discourse analysis. This literature, although valuable and illuminating, has shed little light on the kinds of recurring language learning activities students are exposed to in classrooms while learning another communication system as part of their academic preparation. The literature on ethnography and foreign language classroom research has
offered a particular approach to investigating on-going and recurring patterns of
textual content
Chapter III

METHODOLOGY

The general purpose of this study was to gain a better understanding of teaching and learning processes in traditional foreign language education. Specifically, the study was designed to investigate small-group learner-to-learner interaction during selected teacher-derived speaking opportunities during a Spanish conversation course at the college level. This purpose suggested the need to consider the full range of approaches to the study of foreign language teaching. Chapter II led to the conceptualization of daily life in the foreign language classroom as a dynamic communication environment after considering both traditional and emergent approaches to the study of teaching. Both the general purpose of the study and the resulting conceptualization of the foreign language classroom as an active communicative environment led to the primary goal of the study:

The identification of patterns of instruction and student participation during formal small-group learner-to-learner speaking opportunities in a Spanish Conversation course at the college level

Three major research questions guided the process of observation and subsequent analysis of data:

1. When and under what circumstances do formal opportunities for
speaking Spanish take place during the Spanish Conversation course?

2. What is the organizational structure of formal, teacher-derived speaking opportunities during the Spanish Conversation course?

3. What is the academic structure of formal, small-group learner-to-learner speaking opportunities in the Spanish conversation course?

The manner in which classroom teaching and learning processes are conceptualized influences the manner in which they are studied. Viewing the foreign language classroom as an active communicative setting had implications for what events would be observed, how they would be observed, and how the resulting data would be analyzed (Evertson & Green, 1986). The purpose of this Chapter, therefore, is to discuss the particular methodology used while conducting the present research project. Five primary areas concerning data collection and analysis are presented:

A Design of the Research;
B Locus of Observation;
C Procedures for the Collection of Data: An Overview;
D General Analytical Process;
E Trustworthiness of the Data: An Overview;
F Specific Procedures for Analysis/Procedures for Establishing Trustworthiness of the Data.

Any approach to research naturally provides only one representation of the phenomenon under study. As Evertson and Green (1986) assert, "the representation [of the phenomenon under study] is mediated by the tool used as well as by the representational process. [Therefore] the representation or
description obtained is dependent on the instrument used to record the observation and the way in which data were collected" (p. 156). In other words, "truth" can never be known, because reality cannot be directly apprehended (Fassnacht, 1982). For this reason, only a partial or confined representation of life in the Spanish conversation class could ever be obtained (Erickson, 1986; Shulman, 1986). This caveat notwithstanding, the attempt in the present study was "to collect sufficient and appropriate evidence to ensure that the description is as accurate as possible given the representational process used" (Evertson & Green, 1986, pp. 165-166). To accomplish this goal and thereby respond to the questions guiding the research project, three primary features characterized the research methodology:

1. the interactive-reactive, or dialectical, nature of the entire research process;

2. a comparative perspective; and

3. the triangulation of findings from multiple sources of data.

The manner in which each of these features influenced the nature of the evidence found and, as a result, the representation of life in the foreign language conversation class, is discussed in the remainder of this Chapter.

DESIGN OF THE RESEARCH PROJECT

Because there were at least five different major phases that composed the design of the study, and because each of these phases built on the phases that preceded it and informed the ones that followed, the research design of this study was a multi-stage and interactive-reactive process (Hymes, 1978; Corsaro, 1981; Erickson, 1986). The design is considered to be both reactive
and interactive in nature because decisions at any one point were grounded both in prior decisions and in the questions guiding the study. The diagram in Figure 1 illustrates the features of the research design discussed above. What follows is a description of each of the five phases in the research project.

**Phase One: Conceptualization of the Study**

The first phase in the design involved the identification of the purpose of the study, the basic conceptualization of the research process, and the writing of the specific research questions that guided the project. It was during this first phase in the design of the study that the researcher selected an appropriate site for conducting the proposed study. A time line for the research project was then developed. This time line is presented in Figure 2.

**Phase Two: Gaining Entry**

The second phase of the design involved gaining entry into the specific foreign language classroom in which the study was to take place. The major purpose of the gaining access phase of the study was to establish a social contract with the people who would be directly involved in the project. More importantly, this second phase was to establish and maintain a rapport with the teacher, with the students in the class, and with the institution. Building a sense of trust among the people concerned with this project was absolutely necessary to alleviate any possible sources of misunderstanding, embarrassment, and harm that could have had an adverse effect on the project, but more importantly on the participants in the study (Erickson, 1986; Erickson & Wilson, 1982).

Once the project was conceptualized and proposed, and a suitable site for conducting the study was located, the researcher approached an experienced and reputable instructor of Spanish as a foreign language, who had recently been contracted to teach an intensive Spanish conversation course at a
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small, private, Midwestern college during the summer semester of 1985. The course was considered intensive by both the instructor and the administration because it was designed to meet for six hours each class meeting, one day per week, for seven weeks. The course was designed in this fashion to meet the needs and time limitations of the students, who also had other classes during the week--normal summer classes met Monday through Thursday. This class format was suitable not only to the students but also to the instructor, because he was involved in dissertation research and wanted to have the other six days of the week free to do his work.

The researcher approached the teacher and asked if he would allow the project to take place during his course. The teacher was told of the study, its goals, and research methodology, which included videotaping of on-going classroom processes. Furthermore, he was told that the researcher, who was also fluent in Spanish and a Graduate Teaching Assistant in Spanish at a nearby university, planned to act mainly in the role of observer-participant during the seven-week course so as to lessen possible influences on both the participants and the settings. In addition, the teacher was told that the videotaping of the class in progress would not begin until the fourth day of the course. The teacher was also told, however, that the researcher was planning to audiotape as much as possible the activities during the first three class meetings in order to have an audio record of those days. In addition to the audiotapes, the teacher was told that the researcher would also be taking field notes to serve as background for the audiotapes. Because the teacher was also involved in similar ethnographic research at that time, he had no difficulty understanding the nature and purpose of the study.

In addition to the above teacher-researcher agreements, the
researcher also requested that the teacher tape record his goals for the course, each of his lesson plans for seven days, as well as his own personal philosophy regarding foreign language teaching and learning. Each of the audio recorded lesson plans was transcribed verbatim by the researcher only after the fact. Having a record of what the teacher planned to undertake in the course provided valuable information about how the teacher planned various lessons and for what purpose. In this way it was possible to know what was planned and what actually took place during the course. These transcribed audiotapes also provided for triangulation of some of the findings.

After the teacher agreed to allow the researcher to be present and to audio- and/or videotape the entire seven-week course, the researcher then approached the Head of the Language Program of the college and told her of the intent of the research project. At that time, a formal written proposal was presented to her that outlined the rationale for the study, the general research questions, the research approach, how the researcher planned to ensure anonymity, how the researcher planned to protect the integrity of the course, and how the proposed study would benefit the field of foreign language instruction. (See Appendix B for a copy of this proposal.) The Head of the Foreign Language Program then presented both the written proposal and her recommendation that the project be permitted to the appropriate Dean of the College, who subsequently gave his permission for the project to take place. The Head then contacted the researcher and administrative permission was granted.

Permission from the students in the Spanish Conversation class for the project to take place was obtained on the first and second days of the course by means of a two-step process, as suggested and preferred by the teacher. As
the first step in gaining the students' permission for the research project to take place during their class, the teacher introduced the researcher to the students the first day of class only after he had participated in the first speaking activity with the other students. After this activity, the teacher informed the class that the researcher was in the class making observations in order to gain an understanding of how the students participated in the conversations that took place during formal academic speaking opportunities. At this point, however, the class was not told about the researcher's intention to videotape the last four class meetings. This information was held for presentation at a later time at the request of the teacher. The students were informed, nonetheless, that the researcher would be audiorecording conversations and not to pay him or his recording device any mind.

The second step in gaining the students' permission took place at the end of the first day of class, before students went home. At that time, the teacher gave the floor to the researcher who then informed the students of the specific purpose of his presence in the class as the subjects of the study. It was at this time that the researcher informed the class participants of his intention to videorecord the last four days of the course. The researcher then answered questions posed by the students at that time. For the most part, the students wanted to know who would be seeing the videotapes. The researcher informed the students that the videotapes would only be shown, if at all, at sessions during formal, scholarly conferences, and during classes on foreign language teaching. Formal release letters that explained the research project were then given to the students who were asked to sign them thereby consenting to the study. (See Appendix C for a copy of this release letter.) Almost all students
signed the releases at that time. Some students, however, returned the next class meeting with their letters signed. 100% of the students (n=9) returned the releases signed.

**Phase Three: Conducting the Study/Collecting Observational Records**

During the third phase of the research project, the researcher began gathering raw data. Figure 3 provides the data collection phases followed by the researcher who audiorecorded as much as possible the first three days of instruction and took field notes. The researcher decided to audiorecord the first three days and to take field notes in order to locate possible recurring events in the Spanish conversation class, but with an eye on formal learner-to-learner speaking opportunities. These data later guided the videorecording that took place during the last four days of instruction. It was decided not to undertake a pilot study before the project, however, because the Spanish conversation course was described as experimental in nature by both the teacher and the Head of the Foreign Language Department and would most likely not be repeated. It was necessary, therefore, to begin data collection on the first day.

Included in Phase Three of the research cycle were interviews with students, usually two at a time. Interviews were set up throughout the course during lunch hours and after class. At one point, an interview was arranged with one of the students that took place at the nearby university during which the researcher played selected video segments collected up to that point. During the video play-back session, the researcher asked the student various questions regarding the structure of lessons. This session was audiorecorded for later use.

Not only were the students interviewed during the data collection phase of the project, the teacher, too, was systematically interviewed after each
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fieldnotes</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio Record</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Record</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with Teacher</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with Students</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3**

Data Collection Phases
day of instruction. The researcher asked the teacher to reflect upon what had transpired during the day. These conversations with the teacher were also audiorecorded for subsequent analysis.

Both the audio and video tapes as well as the field notes taken during the seven-week Spanish conversation course then provided the raw observational records that the researcher subsequently used to construct and to analyze data during the fourth phase of the research project.

Phase Four: Data Construction and Analysis

During the fourth phase in the research project the researcher constructed and analyzed data. As the analysis phase of the project progressed, new insights and understandings were revealed about what was occurring during the course. As new insights and understandings were gained, existing research questions were further refined and new questions were formulated. As a result, additional data construction and analysis were undertaken thereby causing the process to repeat itself. It is in this way that the design of the study became reflexive and dialectic (i.e., interactive-reactive) in nature.

Also during this stage the teacher was interviewed one more time to gain more understanding of his views of the course, particularly in terms of some of the researcher's preliminary findings. This one last interview with the teacher became an opportunity for the researcher to triangulate emerging hypotheses developed after preliminary data analysis. During this subsequent interview, the researcher presented the teacher specific questions, especially regarding the purpose and the structure of formal speaking activities.

The analytic process used during the fourth phase of the research design consisted of a dual-level, macro- and micro-analytic structure. Although
a more complete and detailed description of this analytic process is not presented here, the conceptualization of the foreign language classroom as a communicative environment required that both macro and micro descriptions of daily life in the classroom be developed. These descriptions were used to explore the way in which life during one formal speaking activity was both similar to and different from life during other analogous formal speaking activities that took place on the same day or on different days. In this way a comparative perspective was developed, and, as a result, the researcher was able to identify those demands that were generic across activities, those that were common to a particular type of activity, and those that were situation specific. This process facilitated the identification of factors that led to the description of patterns of instruction and student participation in the Spanish conversation class.

Phase Five: Writing the Research Report

The fifth and final phase of the research project involved writing the research report. This report presents the findings and conclusions from the study (i.e., Chapters IV and V).

LOCUS OF OBSERVATION

The locus of observation for the present study is described along the following dimensions: the unit of instruction, setting, and subject.

Unit of Instruction

The study involved analysis of an intensive, Spanish conversation course taught by a fluent-but-non-native speaker of Spanish during the summer semester, 1985, at a small, private Mid-western college. This unit of instruction was selected for the following reasons: (1) A conversation course is a standard
feature of the foreign language curriculum found in most colleges and universities in the United States where students can major in a foreign language. The conversation course is designed to provide students of foreign languages opportunities to practice speaking Spanish ostensibly not available during other courses; (2) The course was intensive in nature in that it did not follow the pattern of a normal semester-long course: the course met for a total of seven weeks, but one day per week, for six hours each day. This course, therefore, was deemed worthy of investigating formal opportunities to speak in Spanish, because students would be together continuously for a much greater amount of time than during a normal semester-long course, which usually meets three days per week, for some 15 weeks, for one 50-minute period of time. It was assumed that the intensive nature of the course (i.e., more time allowed to speak in Spanish), although meeting the immediate scheduling needs of the students, would allow for more time for speaking in Spanish without being interrupted; and, (3) The course was deemed appropriate for this kind of investigation into the patterns of instruction and student participation in speaking lessons that most typically take place in a formal classroom setting.

Setting

A college-level Spanish conversation class was selected as the site for the study. The particular school was selected because it offered an intensive Spanish conversation course during the summer semester for a seven-week period of time, which was suitable to the researcher in the light of time limitations on data collection. In addition, the school was amenable to having the research project take place in one of its courses; the researcher had previously taught an ESL Language Arts course for the department and, as a consequence, already knew the members of the language department and
several administrators of the college.

The classroom in which the course was taught was located on the lower level of the college's library, a modern, air-conditioned building found centrally located on the school's campus. The classroom, which had windows overlooking various points of the campus, was large, well lighted, and had six long tables, each surrounded by chairs, which the teacher arranged each day into a seminar-room type of arrangement in the front close to the chalkboards. The researcher remained in the back of the room where he took fieldnotes and where he eventually set up the video camera.

Subjects
Teacher

The teacher in the study had just completed three years of a doctoral program in foreign language education and was in the process of writing his dissertation during the time of the study. For this reason, the teacher felt that the scheduling of the course "seemed like an ideal set up." The teacher was an experienced teacher of Spanish with the following credentials:

(a) The teacher reported previous experience teaching Spanish conversation courses of the normal three-day-a-week one-hour-per-class format at other schools, including tutorials--one on one---for students in English conversation classes at private language institutes (e.g., Berlitz), both in the United States and in Spain.

(b) The teacher had lived in Spain for at least one year where he both lived and worked. In addition, the teacher had recently completed a Masters Degree in Spanish literature. Although his Spanish was not considered native-like (e.g., he was not a 5 on the ACTFL Proficiency Scale), he was, nonetheless, quite fluent in the language and was a fully acceptable linguistic
model for the students.

(c) During his doctoral program in foreign language education the teacher completed four separate courses in foreign language teaching methodology (three were specific to Spanish and one to ESL) that emphasized a communicative orientation to foreign language teaching. In addition, he completed a course in cognitive psychology and a course in second language acquisition, among other courses in the area of teacher education and supervision.

Students

The college-level Spanish conversation class in which the study was conducted consisted of nine students (M = 1; F = 8). All of the students had had at least one college-level Spanish course before entering the conversation course. Five of the female students were non-traditional college students: three were in their mid-to-late forties, the other two were in their early thirties. One of these non-traditional students, however, reported having only one Spanish class prior to the conversation class, although she had previously studied French for some time. This student was enrolled in a regular degree-seeking program at the college. Another of the non-traditional female students, a nun by profession, had lived for several years in Peru among native speakers of Spanish as a Catholic missionary. The Catholic Church, however, had asked that she return to the United States to improve her Spanish, which, at times, was difficult to understand, primarily because of interference from her "Pennsylvania accent," as she described it. Still another of these non-traditional female students had already had "several" college-level Spanish courses, although quite a number of years had passed between finishing them and entering this course. This student was taking the Spanish conversation class to satisfy her language
requirement for her degree program in Humanities at the nearby university. Still another of these five non-traditional students was from Hungary; she was enrolled as a regular degree-seeking student at the college, and was an employee in the college's library. The fifth of these non-traditional students was from Libya. She had already completed several Spanish courses at the college prior to the conversation class, and was also a regular degree-seeking student at the college. She was married and had a daughter some four to six years old. This student already spoke not only her native Arabic dialect but also English, Italian, "and a little French." She reported having travelled several different times to Spain. The other four students (3 females and 1 male) were traditional undergraduate Spanish majors at the college. They were all well into their program and, as a result, had already had quite a number of courses in Spanish. All four of these students had continuing close contact with native speakers of Spanish, mainly from Venezuela and Puerto Rico, all of whom were also students at the college.

PROCEDURES FOR THE COLLECTION OF RAW DATA

The process of data collection consisted of making permanent observational records, both audio and video, as well as written field notes of each class meeting, and of interviews with both teacher and students. The researcher also collected the journals and course evaluations that the students wrote at the end of the seven weeks. These raw data then became the corpus of observational records from which data were later extracted to answer the Research Questions. Data were extracted from the audio- and videotapes of the class meeting via the dual phase micro-macroanalytical process identified earlier in this Chapter. These observational records allowed for the extraction of
variables that were grounded in the recurring patterns of action and interaction in the Spanish conversation course. The following procedures were used for video- and audiotaping.

1 As stated earlier, the first three days of the class were audiotaped. Not all events, however, were audiotaped. Only those events that were considered to be instructional events were audiotaped. They were considered instructional because of the nature of teacher-student and student-student interactional patterns, both verbal and nonverbal, and because of the purpose of the event. The researcher was limited by the number of blank audiotapes he had taken with him to the research site as well as by the fact that he had only one audio recording device. In addition, it was impossible to tape all instructional events because of the various grouping patterns that the teacher had created. Moreover, the purpose of this pre-videorecording phase of the research project was to extract possible recurring patterns of instructional events to guide the subsequent videorecording phase.

During whole-group instructional events the researcher placed the audiorecording device on a table pointing the internal microphone in the direction of the middle of the group. When the researcher approached different small groups of students who were engaged in speaking Spanish about a teacher-generated topic, the recording device was placed near enough to the group to capture as clearly as possible the verbal interaction of the students without imposing any kind of obstacle or disruption. Some of the recordings, however, because of the placement of the recording device and because of the device's own inherent inadequacies (i.e., it was not the most sensitive device), were rather faint, making it difficult sometimes to hear all that was going on. For the most part, however, the teacher's own voice was reproduced quite clearly.
2 On the third day of the course the researcher brought the video recording equipment into the classroom area. He set the camera up in the back right-hand corner of the classroom so as to be as unobtrusive as possible. The video recording equipment, however, was not used on the third day. The purpose for bringing the equipment into the room and for setting it up on that day was simply to acclimate students and teacher to its presence. As was to be expected, both students and teacher reacted initially to seeing the camera, but mainly out of curiosity. At several times during the day, that is, during breaks and lunch as well as after the end of the day, various students wanted to see the equipment up close. At no time during the actual video taping of the class, however, did students appear to object to being taped, although some students joked about its presence and what they probably looked like on the TV monitor. In fact, during subsequent interviews with students and teacher, the researcher asked if the recording equipment at all bothered them. Their responses indicated that its presence in the classroom was of no concern. Two students even said they had forgotten it was there, especially when they were engaged in classroom instructional events.

3 The actual videotaping began prior to the formal beginning of class on the fourth day of the course. The researcher operated the video equipment. The video equipment used was a Sony video camera with tripod and Portapack. The researcher had been trained in the operation of the equipment one week prior to the study by the personnel of the Teacher Education Lab at the local university. JVC T-120 videotapes were used during the study in order not to be hampered by having to change the tapes too often and possibly interrupting the class. These tapes allowed for up to 120 minutes of uninterrupted video recording time.
On the first day of videotaping, the researcher decided to use a wireless microphone clipped to the teacher's shirt with the transmitting device clipped to his belt in order to pick up clearly the voice of the teacher during the class. At times, however, the researcher switched off the wireless microphone in order to try to get more student talk through the internal microphone on the video camera.

After the first day of videotaping and listening to the sound quality from the first day of videotaping, however, it was decided to switch to an external microphone. The researcher concluded that the wireless microphone, although it picked up quite well the teacher's voice, was not picking up well enough the students' voices. The external microphone was connected to the Portapack with a long extension wire. The researcher placed the microphone in the middle of the table so as to pick up both teacher and student voices. Some students' voices, however, were difficult to pick up at times because of the softness with which they naturally spoke.

The external microphone also allowed the researcher to pick up voices of students during small-group learner-to-learner speaking activities. During these small group activities the researcher moved the microphone closer pointing it in the direction of the group. Before moving the microphone to a particular group, however, the researcher asked the students whether or not they minded being recorded. On no occasion did any student ask the researcher specifically not to record.

CONSTRUCTION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA
An Overview of the Analytical Process

The research questions and methodological framework of the study required a process of analysis that was both interactive and reactive in nature.
This process included the extraction of recurring patterns of action and interaction during the Spanish conversation class and the construction of variables that were grounded in those observed patterns. The extraction and identification of recurring patterns of activity then provided the foundation for the generation of numerous hypotheses about different levels of daily activity in the conversation class. Once these hypotheses were generated, they were then tested across both similar and different cases using a type-case analytic research approach (Erickson & Shultz, 1981; Green, 1983). (See Figure 4.)

The orderly identification of patterns of action and interaction as well as the process of hypothesis generation/testing across both similar and different cases at all levels of the study allowed for the confirmation/disconfirmation of those hypotheses. The identification of inconsistencies across cases thus allowed for the extraction of new patterns and/or questions about the nature of daily life in the Spanish conversation class. In this way, the generation of new data resulted in the repetition of the whole process of hypothesis generation and testing and likewise the confirmation/disconfirmation of the new hypotheses. The findings discussed in the following Chapter are, therefore, products of the interactive-reactive nature of the research process.

Identifying recurring patterns and applying a comparative perspective across cases thus allowed for the discovery and exploration of areas of stability, instability, and change across the Spanish conversation course. The identification of various aspects of daily life during the Spanish conversation course showed that some were generic across activities, some were specific to particular types of situations, and some were idiosyncratic in nature. Consideration of sources of stability and variability in the academic structure and conduct across activities led to the primary purpose of the study: the
Typical Case Design

STEP 1
Select typical case of recurring activity
- segmentation
- transcription
- map construction
(Context 1)

STEP 2
Construct descriptive model of activity
(Context 1)

STEP 3
Constructive description model of activity

STEP 3A
Apply model to Context IA
(same context, different day or time)

STEP 3B
Take model to participants for validation

STEP 4A
If model not confirmed, check accuracy of description in Context 1

STEP 4B
If partially confirmed, refine model to include Context IA and any information obtained from participants.

STEP 4C
If confirmed, go to a new context, Context 2, and build new model or apply Context 1A to Context 2

STEP 5A
Continue applying model to similar contexts/validate.

STEP 5B
If model appropriate, add context to model and continue to examine similar contexts.

STEP 5C
If model not appropriate, build new model/validate.

Adapted from Green, Harker, and Golden (in press)

Figure 4. Type-case analytic model.
identification of recurring patterns of instruction and student participation during formal, small-group learner-to-learner speaking opportunities during a Spanish conversation course.

Focus of the Observation

Conceptualizing the foreign language classroom as a communicatively active environment had direct implications for the focus of observation. Although language use has both verbal and nonverbal dimensions, the primary focus of observation was on the verbal dimension. What occurred between and among the participants occurred primarily through the verbal dimension, that is, through an "instructional conversation" (Green, 1977; Green & Wallat, 1981). Focusing on these instructional conversations, both between teacher and learners during task presentation and between learners during small-group conversations, allowed for the investigation of what took place over real time. Investigating these conversations permitted detailed exploration of what messages got communicated as well as the structure of that communication process. Observing and exploring the verbal aspect of the moment-to-moment construction of messages provided the means by which the recurring patterns of action and interaction in the Spanish conversation class could be identified.

A Multiphased Approach to the Analysis of Instructional Conversation in the Spanish Conversation Class

Like in any classroom, life in the foreign language classroom consists of a complex array of factors that can influence teaching and learning outcomes. A multiphased approach to the observation and analysis of daily activity was, therefore, used. The specific process used consisted of systematic analysis of the instructional conversations that unfolded between both teacher and learners.
as well as between learners during small-group conversational activity. This systematic analysis took place at both macro and micro level. Microanalysis was conducted on three systematically identified speaking activities. The rationale for the identification of these activities for microanalysis along with specific methodology for conducting the microanalysis is presented in Appendix A. The end product of microanalysis was the identification of recurring patterns and action and interaction in the Spanish conversation class during selected teacher-derived speaking activities.

While microanalysis was performed on a selected sample of systematically chosen speaking activities, macroanalysis was undertaken on remaining activities for a comparative perspective. The purpose of macroanalysis was to confirm or disconfirm those recurring patterns previously identified during microanalysis. This dual phase process of microanalysis and macroanalysis of the instructional conversations was the general process used to uncover recurring patterns of instruction and student participation. The specific procedures for data construction and analysis used to respond to the individual research question are presented below on a research question-by-research question basis. Before discussing these specific procedures, however, an overview is presented of the specific methodology, called mapping, that was used in the microanalysis of the instructional conversations that unfolded during selected speaking activities.

Mapping: The Specific Methodology Used to Explore Instructional Conversations

Instructional processes are embedded in the instructional conversations that take place in classrooms. A form of discourses analysis, called mapping, was the specific analysis procedure used to capture and freeze
for retrospective analysis ongoing instructional conversations between teacher and learners in the Spanish conversation course (Green, 1977; Green & Wallat, 1981). Grounded in the social interaction perspective that formed the conceptual foundation of the study, mapping allowed for the systematic exploration, analysis, and reflection of the meanings constructed and transmitted via the instructional conversations. The completed maps, then, were a heuristic tool used to reveal patterns of action and interaction. This approach to data construction and analysis "permitted exploration of lesson construction processes in an equivalent manner across lessons" (Green, Weade, & Graham, 1988, p. 17).

The mapping procedure, which is part of an analytic system called the Descriptive Analysis System (Green, 1977; Green & Wallat, 1981), involved the systematic and principled transcription and segmentation of and reflection upon the instructional conversation. As a heuristic tool, this analytic procedure permitted the systematic segmentation of the instructional conversation into a hierarchy of pedagogical and conversational units. The final result of the mapping process is a structural map of unfolding action and interaction between and among the participants. This hierarchy of pedagogical and conversational units is presented below in ascending order: (See Appendix A for a complete description of these units and Figures 26 and 27 for examples of these units on a structural map):

Message Unit;
Interaction Unit;
Instructional Sequence Unit;
Phase Unit;
Activity Unit.
The segmentation process of the instructional conversations and the resultant hierarchy of pedagogical and conversational units allowed for the identification of structurally equivalent or analogous data sets. Equivalency of data sets allowed for the identification of recurring categories or classes of phenomena that were determined in the same systematic manner within activities, across activities, as well as across days. Each time, therefore, the researcher "looked" at a particular unit--task presentation, for example, the way the researcher "looked" was the same. The identification of equivalent data sets meant that the researcher was able to search for recurring patterns both within and across data sets of the same type. As a result, the researcher was confident that the data sets being compared were representative of the same phenomenon.

ESTABLISHING TRUSTWORTHINESS OF THE DATA: AN OVERVIEW

One of the most important issues in research is whether the results are trustworthy. As Lincoln and Guba (1985) pose the question, "How can an inquirer persuade his or her audiences (including self) that the findings of an inquiry are worth paying attention to, worth taking account of?" (p. 290). In the light of this question, Lincoln and Guba (1985) present four questions that inquirers can ask themselves:

(1) "Truth value": How can one establish confidence in the "truth" of the findings of a particular inquiry for the subjects (respondents) with which and the context in which the inquiry was carried out?
(2) "Applicability": How can one determine the extent to which the findings of a particular inquiry have applicability in other contexts or other subjects (respondents)?
(3) "Consistency": How can one determine whether the findings of an inquiry would be repeated if the inquiry were replicated with the same (or similar) context?
(4) "Neutrality": How can one establish the degree to which the findings of an inquiry are determined by subjects (respondents) and conditions of the inquiry and not by the biases, motivations, or perspectives of the inquirer (p. 290)?

In all research endeavors, within both the rationalistic and naturalistic paradigms, the criteria felt necessary for the establishment of trustworthiness have included the questions noted above. As within the rationalistic paradigm, certain ideas prevail within the naturalistic paradigm as to what determines good and trustworthy data. Within the naturalistic paradigm, good and trustworthy data are those data that are credible, transferable, dependable, and confirmable (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Good data, then, are the result of a process of respectable scientific inquiry.

Like any and all research endeavors, the present research project and its findings must also stand up to the test of close and careful examination. Determination of the trustworthiness of data, therefore, became an area of primary concern. In the present research project, two primary methods were used to establish trustworthiness measures of the data: Interobserver agreement measures (Hersen & Barlow, 1976; Johnson & Pennypacker, 1980; Tawny & Gast, 1984), and triangulation of multiple data sources (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Hammersly & Atkinson, 1983; Guba, 1981). The specific interobserver agreement measures used for each of the individual research questions, however, are presented below on a research-question-by-research-question basis. The manner in which the triangulation of multiple data sources contributed to establishing trustworthiness is presented in Chapter IV.

SPECIFIC PROCEDURES FOR ANALYSIS PROCEDURES FOR ESTABLISHING TRUSTWORTHINESS OF THE DATA
The purpose of the present section is to describe the specific data construction and analysis procedures used to answer each of the research questions. For those cases in which interobserver agreement measures were obtained, information is also provided concerning the specific measure used, the external observer, the specific training (if any), as well as the actual level of agreement reached.

Five different individuals, each considered to possess certain abilities and areas of expertise necessary for participation in establishing trustworthiness of the data, were asked to serve as external observers. The qualifications of each of the external observers are presented below. In the rest of this chapter, as well as in Chapter IV, each of these observers is referred to as External Observer A, B, C, D, and E.

**External Observers**

**Observer A**

External Observer A was an Assistant Professor of Spanish Linguistics at The Ohio State University. His area of expertise was Spanish phonetics and phonology. This observer, who was quite fluent in Spanish, had a number of years teaching experience at the university level and had experience observing and supervising Teaching Assistants in the Department of Romance Languages. Although the observer had no formal training in the research methodology used in this study, the researcher asked him to participate in the study because of his knowledge of Spanish, his willingness to spend time listening to and watching videotapes for specific phenomena, and his willingness to learn more about the study. This observer was asked to conduct
reliability checks relative to determining whether activities were considered Academic or Administrative. He was also asked to conduct validity checks on phase breaks during the speaking activities.

**Observer B**

External Observer B was a doctoral student to foreign language education at The Ohio State University. She was asked to conduct the agreement check on the hierarchical units of the Descriptive Analysis System (Green, 1977; Green and Wallat, 1981). She was asked to serve as the external observer for these units because she was already familiar with both the methodology of the study and the system of microanalysis. No special training of the observer was necessary beyond providing the definitions of the major parts of formal speaking activities.

**Observer C**

External Observer C was a certified teacher of Spanish who had completed quite a number of hours toward the Ph.D. in Spanish Literature. She was asked to conduct the agreement check on student engagement measures during small-group speaking opportunities because she had experience in teaching Spanish and had assigned students similar kinds of classroom speaking activities in her own classes. The only training she required was a description of activities that took place prior to Small Group Speaking Task Activities. She was asked to listen to and/or watch students as they participated in these activities to ascertain whether or not their participation in the activities was appropriate or not in accordance with the teacher's states task demands.

**Observer D**

External Observer D, who had completed a Master Degree in Spanish
Linguistics, was also a certified teacher of Spanish, and had a number of years experience teaching Spanish at both the secondary and university levels. She was asked to conduct reliability checks, along with Observer C, on student engagement measures during small-group speaking activities. She also was asked to listen to and/or watch students as they participated in these activities to ascertain whether or not their participation in the activities was appropriate or not in accordance with the teacher's stated task demands.

Observer E

External Observer E was an Assistant Professor of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation at the University of Alabama. Although she had no prior knowledge of Spanish or of foreign language education, she was asked to conduct reliability checks because of her experience with this kind of research. She was asked to conduct reliability checks on the data relative to the teacher's stated speaking task demand presented before the students moved to small group speaking activity. These activity checks required no knowledge of Spanish because, for the most part, the teacher delivered these task statements in English. When Spanish was used, however, the researcher translated the words into Spanish.

Research Question 1.1: Procedures for Obtaining Data

Data for exploration of macrostructural patterns of daily events across the seven days of the Spanish conversation class were obtained by means of a multi-stage process of macroanalysis of the instructional conversations that unfolded between and among the participants in the class. In addition to analysis of the instructional conversations, additional data sources were also consulted, such as the teacher's lesson plans that he recorded on a daily basis,
and which were later transcribed verbatim by the researcher; the researcher's fieldnotes; interviews with students during the course; and students' course journals and evaluations. Macroanalysis of events was first conducted on Day 1 of the course following the type-case analytic procedures. (See Figure 4.) Specifically, the following procedures were employed:

1. The researcher listened to the audiorecordings of the entire first day of class. In addition to these recordings, the researcher also referred to the fieldnotes from that day and consulted the transcripts of the teacher's audiorecorded lesson plans. While listening to the tapes of classroom activities, the researcher kept notes regarding shifts in the major classroom activities that occurred across time. For example, when the teacher changed from one major classroom activity to another, a record was made and a thematic title was assigned to it. The thematic title selected was, at times, the same thematic title the teacher used to refer to the activity in his lesson plans. At other times, the researcher assigned a thematic title to the activity based upon the content covered as well as participant activity. At this stage in the analytic process, however, only those shifts were recorded that occurred between major classroom activities. Thematically-related events located within the boundaries of the major activities were not recorded at this time. The result of the macrolevel analytic process was a macrolevel organizational map of major activities across the seven days of the conversation class.

2. This procedure was then repeated across each of the following days of the course.

The product of macroanalysis of each of the seven days was a structural map of the organization of major classroom activities across the entire Spanish conversation course. Once the maps were completed, they were
searched for recurring patterns of organization both within and across days. This search led to the identification of patterns of major instructional and noninstructional activities.

**Trustworthiness of the Data**

Appendix A presents specific procedures for determining trustworthiness of the identification of major instructional activities across the seven days of the Spanish conversation class. As the Appendix indicates, interobserver agreement for each of these activities was calculated at 100%.

**Research Question 1.2:**
Procedures for Obtaining Data

Data relative to the patterning of in-class activities were identified following the type-case model presented earlier in this Chapter (i.e., Figure 4). Specifically, the following procedures were applied:

1. The researcher re-entered the audiotaped records of the first day of the Spanish conversation course. He listened to and recorded in more detail those classroom events that took place while the participants were actually engaged in classroom activities. Specifically, differences and similarities were noted in terms of purpose, grouping, content, activity, and student participation. Using the macrolevel structural maps as a guide, the researcher was able to note two basic differences among the major classroom activities identified in Question 1.1, and was thus able to categorize those activities into two broad categories: (1) administrative or (2) academic/instructional in nature.

2. Once the major classroom activities across day 1 of the conversation class were categorized as either administrative or academic/instructional in nature, the other six days across the entire conversation course were also re-examined using both the audio- and
videotaped records. The major in-class activities for the remaining six days were categorized.

The result of the preceding analysis produced a more detailed structural map of the entire Spanish conversation class in terms of administrative and academic/instructional activities.

Trustworthiness of the Data

The accuracy of the researcher's designation of a particular in-class activity as being administrative or academic/instructional in nature was assessed by External Observer A on a post hoc basis. Analysis was conducted on audiotaped material from the first half (i.e., before the lunch break) or days 1 and 3, and on videotaped material from the first half (i.e., before the lunch break) of days 5 and 6. Interobserver agreement on the designation of a particular classroom activity as being either administrative or academic/instructional in nature was computed using the following formula:

\[
\frac{\text{Number of Agreements}}{\text{Number of Agreements} + \text{Number of Disagreements}} \times 100
\]

An agreement was recorded each time the observer's designation of a particular activity matched that of the researcher. Interobserver agreement as calculated at 100%

Training the Observer

The observer was trained to assess the accuracy of the researcher's ability to designate major classroom activities as being either administrative or academic/instructional in nature. He was asked specifically to listen and/or to watch classroom activities that had been located on the tapes by the researcher
and to make a decision as to which category the activity under consideration belonged. He was told that administrative activities were those events during which the teacher and the students were together in a whole group arrangement discussing, almost exclusively in English, administrative matters of importance to the group, such as when the lunch break was to take place, how to get copies of the commercially-prepared tapes at the library, directions on how to fill out personal information cards, what the schedule was for the last day of the course, what to prepare then, were those activities during which the participants were directly involved in some way with the academic content of the class, Spanish language, Samples of major classroom activities, from other days (i.e., 2 and 4), both administrative and academic, were provided by the researcher in order to familiarize the observer with these descriptions.

**Procedures for Determining Trustworthiness**

Specifically, the following procedures were adopted to determine the trustworthiness of the data:

1. The researcher located on the audiotape of Day 1 of the course the beginning of a major classroom activity.

2. Once the activity had been located, the researcher let the observer listen to it in its entirety. When the event came to an end, the researcher asked the observer to categorize it as either administrative or academic/instructional in nature, according to the descriptions given previously.

3. This same procedure was followed until all the activities sampled \(n=7\) were categorized by the observer.
Question 1.2.1:
Procedures for Obtaining Data

Data for exploration of patterns of administrative content during the previously identified Administrative Content Activities were obtained via the interactive-reactive research cycle. The extraction of recurring patterns of administrative content was made possible by following the steps described below:

1 The first Administrative Content Activity was located on the audiotape from Day 1 of the course. While listening, the researcher made notes of the different topics of information communicated by the teacher. Each time a new topic was identified it was described and labeled.

2 Using the topics of administrative content extracted from the first Administrative Content Activity as a model, the researcher then listened to each successive Administrative Content Activity that took place across the seven days of the course. Again, topics of information were extracted and labeled.

3 When all Administrative Content Activities were investigated and topics of information extracted and labeled, the researcher then created a taxonomy of these topics.

4 Using the taxonomy as his guide, the researcher then categorized each of the topics into several broad themes. The outcome of the procedures outlined above was the extraction of four major administrative themes that were communicated to students during the Administrative Content Activities.

Trustworthiness of the Data

As described above, the researcher inductively identified four administrative themes or categories of information that the teacher presented to the students during Administrative Content Activities. Post hoc validation of
these themes consisted of External Observer A testing the presence or absence of the themes during a selected sample of Administrative Content Activities. Interobserver agreement was calculated using the formula below:

\[
\frac{\text{Number of Agreements}}{\text{Number of Agreements} + \text{Number of Disagreements}} \times 100
\]

An agreement was recorded when the observer's decision of the presence or absence of each of the themes matched that of the researcher made during the process of analysis. The Administrative Content Activities found on Days 1 (n=3), 3 (n=2), 5 (n=3), and 6 (n=5) were sampled. Interobserver agreement was calculated at 92%.

**Procedures for Determining Trustworthiness**

No formal training session for the observer was necessary given the nature of the data for which agreement measures were to be determined. Specifically, the following steps were taken to determine interobserver agreement on the placement of an administrative content topic into one of the four categories the researcher had inductively determined:

1. On individual 3 x 5-inch notecards, the researcher wrote brief descriptions of each topic raised during the sampled Administrative Content Activities. This resulted in a total of 24 cards.

2. The researcher then took four more cards and wrote on them the four inductively determined categories and placed them face-up on a table in two columns of two cards each.

3. Each of the four categories was then explained to the observer.

4. Next, the researcher asked the observer to take the 24 Administrative
Content cards and, one-by-one, place them directly under the corresponding category card to which he felt the topic belonged.

5 Interobserver agreement of the observer's placement of a particular topic into one of four categories and that of the researcher's was computed using the formula identified earlier.

Research Question 1.2.2: Procedures for Obtaining Data

Data for exploration of patterns of academic/instructional activities during the Spanish conversation class were obtained by means of a multi-stage process of microanalysis and macranalysis of the instructional conversation. (See Appendix A for a complete description of microanalytical procedures.) Microanalysis of the instructional conversation of two selected activities as well as parts of three other such activities was conducted to obtain a working model of the purposes of the activities, the grouping patterns in place during different stages or phases of the activities, the content covered during the different phases of the activities, as well as student participation requirements across the different phases, and general activity structures. Once a working model of each of the three activities was obtained, other academic/instructional activities were explored via a process of macroanalysis, and models of these activities were likewise obtained. These models were then compared and contrasted with those obtained during the process of microanalysis of the instructional conversation.

The result of this multi-stage interactive-reactive analytic process was the extraction of recurring patterns of action and interaction during the many and varied academic/instructional activities across the seven days of the Spanish conversation course. This process led to the identification of six basic kinds of
Trustworthiness of the Data

The accuracy of the researcher's ability to designate a particular activity as belonging to any one of the six basic kinds of academic/instructional activities was assessed by External Observer A on a post hoc basis. Ten different activities were sampled from across the seven days of the conversation course. Interobserver agreement on the designation of a given activity as being of a particular type of activity was computed using the following formula:

\[
\frac{\text{Number of Agreements}}{\text{Number of Agreements} + \text{Number of Disagreements}} \times 100
\]

An agreement was recorded each time the observer's designation of an observed activity as a particular type matched that of the researcher. Interobserver agreement was calculated at 91% (i.e., there was one disagreement on the designation of a particular activity as being of a particular type).

Procedures for Determining trustworthiness

Because of the time involved in having the observer view and or listen to different activities (e.g., some activities lasted over an hour), there was no specific training session other than the fact that the researcher explained and described each of the six activity types and created hypothetical examples of each for him to consider. Once the observer had an understanding of the six activity types, the researcher wrote the name of each type on a 3 x 5-inch notecard and placed the six cards on a table. The researcher then located on one of the videotapes the beginning of one activity. Together, the researcher
and observer watched the activity from beginning to end. When the activity was completed, the researcher asked the observer to point to any one of the seven cards thus designating what type it was. This same procedure was followed for each of the remaining nine activities that were part of the sample. Following this procedure, interobserver agreement was calculated using the formula identified above.

**Additional Data Construction and Analysis:**

**A Product of the Interactive-Reactive Nature of the Research Process**

The preceding research process led to the identification of some instructional activities as being speaking activities. Because the purpose of the research project was to locate and explore formal, teacher-derived small-group learner-to-learner speaking opportunities, further questions were asked regarding the nature of the speaking activities identified. At this point, questions were raised as to whether all speaking activities were identical in terms of purpose, group make up, activity structure, participation structure, outcome, and the role of the teacher.

To determine the differences and similarities across varied speaking activities, data were collected on the manner in which they unfolded across time. Comparisons were made regarding purpose, content, activity, grouping patterns, patterns of participation, and the role of the teacher during the activity. The researcher explored the transcripts and structural maps of those activities and parts of activities that had already been microanalyzed. The data from these activities were used in order to compare and contrast activities.

The result of the above exploration process was the identification of four basic kinds of speaking activities. Although participants conversed in some way
during each of the previously labeled speaking activities, there were consistent differences noted between and among them.

**Trustworthiness of the Data**

The accuracy of the researcher's ability to designate any given speaking activity as belonging to one of the four kinds identified was assessed by External Observer A on a *post hoc* basis. Those speaking activities sampled during the reliability check were taken randomly from across the seven days of the course. Care was taken, however, to assure that at least one example of each kind identified was included in the sample. A total of seven speaking activities were included in the sample.

Interobserver agreement on the designation of one of the sampled speaking activities as belonging to any one of the four types identified was computed using the following formula:

\[
\frac{\text{Number of Agreements}}{\text{Number of Agreements} + \text{Number of Disagreements}} \times 100
\]

Agreements were recorded when the observer's designation of a given activity matched that of the researcher.

Initially, there was disagreement over the designation of one of the speaking activities. This disagreement led to a discussion between the researcher and the observer the result of which was final agreement as to what kind of speaking activity the activity in question was. There was, therefore, 100% agreement.

**Procedures for Determining Trustworthiness**

Because of the time involved, procedures for establishing trustworthiness
took place across several days. Prior to conducting the agreement checks, the researcher explained the purpose of the procedure: to determine the accuracy of the researcher's ability to designate a given speaking activity as belonging to a particular category. After a brief discussion, the procedures listed below were applied:

1. The researcher wrote on four 3 X 5-inch note cards the names of each of the four kinds of speaking events. These cards were placed on a table, face up.

2. The researcher, having written each of the thematic titles of each of the speaking activities on 3 X 5-inch note cards, randomly selected seven. He made sure, however, that at least one example of each kind of speaking was included in the sample of seven.

3. With the sample of seven note cards, the researcher then located on either the audiotape or the videotape the boundaries of the first speaking activity.

4. The researcher then instructed the observer to listen to and/or watch the activity and, at the end of the listening session, make a decision as to which category of activity the activity under consideration belonged.

5. This same procedure was conducted for each of the seven activities sampled.

6. Once the agreement check procedures were completed for each of the seven sampled speaking activities, interobserver agreement measures were computed using the formula identified above.
Additional Data Construction and Analysis: A Product of the Interactive-Reactive Nature of the Research Process

The procedures identified above resulted in the identification of 19 different speaking activities that were considered to be of a particular type. Even within these 19 different speaking activities, however, differences and similarities were again noted in terms of purpose, content, and participation structures. At this point in the research process, questions were raised regarding the differences and similarities between and among the 19 speaking activities, which led to additional data construction and analysis procedures by the researcher, including additional steps to determine trustworthiness of the findings.

To determine differences and similarities among the 19 identified speaking activities, the researcher re-entered the transcript data constructed from the microanalysis of three systematically selected speaking events. These were the same three activities that formed the original data set constructed at the beginning of the research cycle. The researcher watched activity patterns and listened to teacher-to-student interactions as well as learner-to-learner interactions during small-group speaking activity. Notes were made regarding these procedures.

Using two transcribed speaking activities along with pieces and parts of others as models, the researcher reviewed all 19 speaking activities on both a microanalytic and macroanalytic base. Because the researcher was directly interested in opportunities for learners to talk to other learners on a small-group basis, data were collected specifically on the activity structures during the learner-to-learner phases of the speaking activities.

From these analytical procedures, the researcher was able to note
similar and dissimilar activity structures in place during learner-to-learner, small-group conversations. As a result, the researcher was able to categorize further the 19 different speaking activities. Analysis showed that twelve of the 19 speaking activities followed a similar pattern of activity structure, which was different from the remaining six.

**Trustworthiness of the Data**

Validation of the accuracy of the researcher's ability to categorize each of the 19 different speaking activities into one of the two categories was conducted on a post hoc basis by External Observer C. The validation process consisted of the observer listening to and/or watching selected speaking activities. The observer listened to and/or watched both the teacher's directions for small-group activity as well as the learners as they were engaged in small-group speaking activity. Because not all activities were fully recorded, only those activities for which recordings were made were sampled. Once the observer had the opportunity to listen to and/or watch selected portions of speaking activities, she was asked to categorize the activity based upon the descriptions given to her by the researcher.

Testing whether a sampled speaking activity belonged to group I or to group II took place on a selected sample of activities, both audio- and video-recorded. Interobserver agreement was calculated by using the formula given below:

\[
\frac{\text{Number of Agreements}}{\text{Number of Agreements} + \text{Number of Disagreements}} \times 100
\]

An agreement was entered when the observer's decision as to which group the
activity under question belonged coincided with that of the researcher. 16 of the
19 speaking activities were sampled. There was discussion between the
researcher and the observer over the designation of one of the activities
sampled. However, after resolution of the discussion, there was 100%
agreement between the researcher's and the observer's decisions.

**Training the Observer**

Because of the nature of the observations to be made, no specific
training of the observer was necessary beyond the descriptions of the two
groups of speaking activities the researcher had derived during initial data
construction and analysis.

**Procedures for Determining Trustworthiness**

After the researcher responded to the observer's questions, the following
procedures were used during the actual coding session for which interobserver
agreement was determined:

1. The researcher located on the audiotape the first of the speaking
activities to be categorized. Specifically, the researcher located the point at
which the teacher presented directions for small-group activity. The observer
then listened to instructions given by the teacher and, as much as possible, to
the interactions between the learners during small-group activity. When the
listening session was over, the observer indicated the category to which she felt
the activity belonged.

2. This same procedure was followed for each of the remaining speaking
activities sampled.

When each of the sixteen sampled speaking activities had been
categorized and the observer felt comfortable about her decisions, interobserver
agreement measures were calculated using the formula identified above.
Research Question 2.1:
Procedures for Obtaining Data

Data for the investigation of patterns of organizational stability (Question 2.1.1) and variability (Question 2.1.2) for the 12 systematically selected speaking activities identified during the preceding stages of data construction and analysis were obtained via the multi-stage process of microanalysis and macroanalysis of the instructional conversations. (See Appendix A for a full description of microanalysis.)

Microanalysis of the instructional conversation was carried out on two selected speaking activities. Generally speaking, the following steps were undertaken for conducting the analysis:

(a) Write a rough transcription of the instructional conversation;
(b) Segment the transcription into hierarchical conversational and pedagogical units;
(c) Construct a map of the organizational structure of the activity employing the following hierarchical units:
   - Pre-Conversational Activity Part,
     Language Issue(s) Phase,
     Small-Group Speaking Task Presentation Phase
   - General Conversational Activity Part,
     Small-Group Speaking Task Phase,
     Words That Came Up Phase,
     Whole Group Speaking Task Phase,
   - Post Conversational Activity Part,
     Review Language Issue(s) Phase,
     Memory Game Phase
Figure 5 presents an illustration of the organizational map of one speaking activity ("Tell About Houses").

Macroanalysis of the instructional conversation was undertaken on all speaking activities not microanalyzed. The process of macroanalysis was very similar to that of microanalysis. The two processes differed primarily in the manner in which the units were identified. The nature of the information obtained, however, was not different. Specifically, the steps for conducting the macroanalysis were:

1. Segment the activity into the major parts and phases by listening to audiotapes or listening to and watching videotapes. When necessary, because of a lack of recorded data, the teacher's activity cards and the researcher's fieldnotes were reviewed. In other words, no transcription process was undertaken as was done during microanalysis. Rather, segmentation took place on a more molar level to identify the major pieces and parts of the rest of the speaking activities.

2. As each major part and subpart was identified, it was placed on the organizational map of the activity. Microanalysis and macroanalysis of speaking activities resulted in the construction of an organizational map for each of the twelve speaking activities. When these structural maps were completed, the researcher explored them for recurring patterns of organization both within and across activities. This process of inquiry resulted in the identification of patterns of stability and variability between and among the twelve previously identified speaking activities.

**Trustworthiness of the Data**

The specific procedures for determining trustworthiness of the identification of the hierarchical units are presented in Appendix A. As indicated
Tell About Houses

Intro: What we're going to do
- Generate vocabulary
- Find out who lives in a house
- T sets up speaking task

Pre-conversational Activity

Students in pairs finding out about houses
- Discuss words that came up
- Whole group call back session

General Conversational Activity

Discuss words that came up
- Juego de Memoria

Post-conversational Activity

Figure 5
Organizational Map of the Speaking Activity Tell About Houses
in this Appendix, interobserver agreement was calculated on a selected sample of Activity Parts and Subparts. Interobserver agreement for each of the units identified was calculated at 100%.

**Research Question 3.1:** Procedures for Obtaining Data

Data for investigation of patterns of information communicated by the teacher during the Small-Group Speaking Task Presentation Phases were obtained through both micro- and macroanalysis of the instructional conversation of ten of the twelve selected teacher-derived speaking activities (i.e., For two of the twelve speaking activities, recordings were not made of the Small-Group Speaking Task Presentation Phases. Fieldnotes, however, indicate that it was a feature included in them). The researcher obtained data by first searching the structural maps of the two microanalyzed speaking activities for patterns of information communicated during the small-group Speaking Task Presentation Phase. At the same time, the video records of the same two activities were reviewed. The researcher extracted recurring patterns of information by following the steps outlined below:

1. The researcher first viewed the videotapes of the two selected speaking activities (i.e., "Describing Houses" and "Daily Routines") that had been transcribed and segmented to locate the Small-Group Speaking Task Presentation Phase for each one. Once a pattern or category of information was identified, a description of it was recorded on a separate sheet of paper. After patterns of information had been extracted from these two selected activities, the researcher, following the type-case model presented earlier in this Chapter (i.e., Figure 4), then watched the video and/or listened to the audio records of each of the remaining selected speaking activities and located in
them the Small-Group Task Speaking Presentation Phases.

2 Once each of the task presentation phases had been located, the researcher then transcribed them verbatim.

3 When each of the small-group task presentation phases had been transcribed, the researcher then continued the search for recurring patterns of information in the remaining task presentations. If new patterns were identified, they, too, were recorded on a separate sheet of paper.

4 When all Small-Group Speaking Task Presentation Phases were reviewed and patterns of information communicated by the teacher were completed, analysis of these descriptions was conducted.

The analysis of the descriptions obtained resulted in the identification of ten different patterns or categories of information that the teacher communicated to the students during the Small-Group Speaking Task Presentation Phases during the ten analyzed teacher-derived speaking activities. The researcher assigned each of the patterns a descriptive title (e.g., "Teacher States Time Limit"). In this manner, each of the descriptions became variables of interest that were grounded in the observed interaction between the teacher and the students.

Trustworthiness of the Data

The process described above for obtaining data regarding patterns of information communicated by the teacher during each of the small-group Speaking Task Presentation Phases of the ten selected teacher-derived speaking activities identified ten patterns or categories of information. Post hoc validation of these patterns consisted of External Observer E testing the existence or absence of the patterns during the total number (n=10) of
Small-Group Speaking Task Presentation Phases. Interobserver agreement was calculated using the formula below:

\[
\frac{\text{Number of Agreements}}{\text{Number of Agreements} + \text{Number of Disagreements}} \times 100
\]

An agreement was recorded each time the observer and the researcher agreed on the presence or absence of each of the ten categories of information during the validation process.

Table 2 presents the interobserver agreement measures for each of the ten categories of information across each of the ten Small-Group Speaking Task Presentations. This table shows that there were only three instances of disagreement on the presence or absence of a category. Nevertheless, through discussions between the researcher and the observer, these disagreements were quickly resolved. This table indicates the original agreement measures. Agreement on the presence or absence of a category in the 10 Task Presentation Phases was between 90% and 100%.

Training the Observer

A 15-minute training session took place to train the observer for the interobserver agreement check. During this session, the researcher gave the observer a list of the descriptive titles of the ten inductively derived categories of information and described each of them to her, and gave several examples of each. Once the observer understood each of the category titles, she was asked to undertake the validation process.

Procedures for Determining Trustworthiness

After the brief training session, the researcher gave the observer the
Table 2

Interobserver Agreement on the Presence or Absence of Ten Categories of Information Communicated by Teacher to Students During the Ten Selected Teacher-Derived Speaking Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Information</th>
<th>D¹</th>
<th>A²</th>
<th>%³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. T. Structures Grouping Pattern</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. T. States Follow-up Activity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. T. Provides Context</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. T. Provides Example of What to Do</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. T. Provides Specific Topic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. T. States Time Limit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. T. States What to Do</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. T. States What Listeners Do</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. T. States Grammatical Purpose</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. T. Provides Structure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Number of Disagreements on Presence or Absence of Category

² Number of Agreements on Presence or Absence of Category

³ Interobserver Agreement (A/A+D) 100
verbatim transcriptions of each of the Small-Group Speaking Task Presentations to be analyzed (n=10). Because the observer did not know Spanish, however, the researcher translated into English those portions of the Small-Group Speaking Task Presentations that the teacher gave in Spanish. (For the most part, however, the Tasks were presented almost exclusively in English.) For coding purposes, the observer was also given a grid like the one presented in Table 3. On the left-hand side were listed from top to bottom the thematic titles of each of the ten different Speaking Activities. Along the top of the grid were listed out from left to right the 10 categories of information. Then, while reading each Task Presentation, the observer was asked to code which of the categories of information the teacher presented during each of the Task Presentation Phases by placing a check mark in the box. If the pattern of information was not present, the observer was instructed to leave the box blank.

Additional Data Construction and Analysis: A Product of the Interactive-Reactive Nature of the Research Process

Following analysis of the presence or absence of the ten patterns of information communicated to the students, questions were raised regarding the frequency of occurrence of each of them. A frequency count, therefore, was conducted to determine how often each of the patterns was presented to determine which were the most and the least frequent.

Data for exploration of the frequency of presence of each of the ten patterns of information across the ten Small-Group Speaking Task Presentation Phases were obtained by reexamining the grid pattern of checked and blank boxes. A tally was made and percentages of presence were determined. Table 3 indicates that, of the ten different patterns of information communicated by the
Table 3

Frequency of Occurrence of Patterns of Information Communicated to Students During 10 of the 12 Selected Speaking Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaking Activity</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pattern of Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Structures Grouping Pattern</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Provides Specific Topic</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. States What To Do</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. States What Listeners Should Do</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. States Follow-Up Activity</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Provides Example of What To Do</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Provides Structure</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Provides Context</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. States Time Limit</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. States Grammatical Purpose</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
teacher during the Small-Group Speaking Task Presentation Phases, three of the patterns, "Teacher Structures Grouping Pattern," "Teacher States Topic," and "Teacher States What to Do," were present in 100% of the Task Presentations. One pattern of information, "Teacher States What Listeners Should Do," was present in 70% of the Task Presentations, while another pattern, "Teacher States Follow Up Activity" was present in 60% of the Presentations. Two more patterns, "Teacher Provides Example of What to Do" and "Teacher Provides Structure," were each present in 30% of the Task Presentations, while the patterns "Teacher Provides Context" and "Teacher States Time Limit" were each present in only 20% of the Task Presentations. Finally, the pattern "Teacher States Grammatical Purpose" was present in only 10% of the Task Presentations.

Additional Data Construction and Analysis: A Product of the Interactive-Reactive Nature of the Research Process

Following the analysis of the frequency of the presence of each of the ten patterns of information across each of the ten Small-Group Speaking Task Presentation Phases, questions arose regarding the nature of the main-clause verbs used by the teacher pertaining to the category of information "Teacher States What to Do," which was present in 100% of the Task Presentations. Questions regarding the nature of the main-clause verbs in this category led to additional data construction and analysis by the researcher. In turn, this led to an additional process of validation of the findings.

Data for the exploration of the category "Teacher States What to Do" were obtained by reentering each of the verbatim transcripts of the ten Small-Group Speaking Task Presentation Phases. Data were obtained by searching for the main-clause verbs used by the teacher for stating what
students were to do during each of the speaking tasks in question. Specifically, only those verbs that reflected the teachers words in telling students what to do were investigated. In this way, information was obtained not only regarding specific verbs used by the teacher, but also the frequency with which each appeared in the Small-Group Speaking Task Presentation Phases. Analysis of these task presentations produced five different main-clause verbs used by the teacher when stating specifically what students were to do during the Small-Group Speaking Task, and their frequency of occurrence.

**Trustworthiness of the Data**

Validation for the presence and the frequency of each of the five main-clause verbs previously identified by the researcher was conducted by External Observer E. *Post hoc* validation consisted of the observer, who had a copy of the task presentation transcripts in front of her, taking a yellow marker and highlighting the verbs she felt pertained specifically to the category of information "Teacher States What to Do." Interobserver agreement was calculated using the formula identified below:

$$\frac{\text{Number of Agreements}}{\text{Number of Agreements} + \text{Number of Disagreements}} \times 100$$

An agreement was recorded when the observer highlighted in yellow the same verb(s) as the researcher. There was initial agreement on all but two of the verbs. After a discussion between the researcher and the observer, however, these differences were resolved. Interobserver agreement, after resolution of differences, was then calculated at 100%.

**Procedures for Determining Trustworthiness**
Because Observer E was the same person who had performed the validation check for the 10 different patterns of information the teacher presented during each of the speaking task presentation phases, she was asked to participate also in validating information relevant to the main-clause verbs used by the teacher when communicating to the students what to do. A measure of interobserver agreement was obtained following the procedures described below:

1. Observer E was given another copy of each of the *verbatim* transcripts of the ten small-group speaking task presentations. She was asked to highlight in yellow only those verbs she felt pertained to the pattern of information "Teacher States What to Do."

2. Simultaneously, the researcher performed the same task with a separate copy of each of the speaking task presentation phases.

At the completion of the validation session, an interobserver agreement percentage was computed following the formula identified earlier.

Additional Data Construction and Analysis: A Product of the Interactive-Reactive Nature of the Research Process

Following the analysis of the main-clause verbs used by the teacher in stating specifically what students were to do during the learner-to-learner speaking task, questions were raised regarding the topics for discussion. Investigation of the recurring patterns of information communicated by the teacher during the Small-Group Speaking Task Phase led to the identification of the fact that the teacher consistently provided topics for students to address. This category of information communicated to students was also present in 100% of the task presentation phases.
Data relative to the teacher-provided topics for discussion were obtained by reentering the transcripts of the 10 Small-Group Speaking Task Presentation Phases. After reviewing each of these phases, the researcher generated a list of topics.

**Trustworthiness of the Data**

Validation of the ten topics was also conducted by External Observer E. *Post hoc* validation consisted of the observer reading each of the *verbatim* transcripts and writing down a description of observed topics. Interobserver agreement was calculated using the formula identified below:

\[
\frac{\text{Number of Agreements}}{\text{Number of Agreements} + \text{Number of Disagreements}} \times 100
\]

An agreement was recorded when the observer's description of the topic agreed with that of the researcher. Interobserver agreement was calculated at 100%.

**Procedures for Determining Trustworthiness**

Because Observer E was the same person involved in the validation for patterns of information communicated to students, she was likewise asked to conduct the validation check for the identification of teacher-stated topics for learner-to-learner conversations. Specifically, she was asked to write down a description of each topic present in each of the Small-Group Speaking Task Presentation Phases. When the observer completed her list, both she and the researcher discussed the descriptions. Interobserver Agreement was then calculated using the formula provided above.
Addition Data Construction and Analysis:  
A Product of the Interactive-Reactive Nature  
of the Research Process

The identification and investigation of patterns of information communicated to students during ten of the twelve the Small-Group Speaking Task Presentation Phases served to explore patterns of information the teacher actually communicated to the students. At this point in the investigation, therefore, questions were raised about the effectiveness of that communication. In other words, questions were raised regarding whether or not the work expected of the students as specifically communicated by the teacher was what actually took place between the students during small-group learner-to-learner speaking activity. To determine the effectiveness of the information in terms of actual student performance, the researcher obtained data about the appropriateness or inappropriateness of the students' activity during the twelve previously-identified teacher-derived small-group speaking activities.

The researcher secured data for exploration of the appropriateness of students' performance during the small-group speaking activities by determining whether or not what the students actually did met the teacher-stated task demands in an appropriate manner (i.e., if they were on task). If the teacher stated, for example, that he wanted the students to find out information about each other's daily routines for every day of the week except Fridays, the observation focused specifically on whether or not the students actually did this and did not, say, talk exclusively about what they were going to do the next weekend thereby circumventing the topic presented by the teacher. Although this topic or others may have surfaced during students' conversation, it was not the overriding topic but rather only a small part of it. Therefore, the determination of whether or not students' performances were appropriate or not
was conducted on a holistic level. That is, it was necessary to look at the entire activity from beginning to end to determine appropriateness of participation.

To obtain data relative to the students' appropriate or inappropriate activity during the previously-identified small-group speaking tasks, the specific procedures described below were followed:

1. Because the teacher always stated the small-group speaking task specifications just prior to the students' small-group activity, the researcher located on the video- or audiotapes starting points within the larger speaking activity when the teacher stated the specific small-group speaking task.

2. When the playback device was turned on, the researcher again listened to the stated task demands as presented by the teacher. This phase in the analysis served to reorient the researcher to the specifics of the small-group speaking task.

3. Then, while viewing/listening to the student group as it went through its assigned speaking task, notes were taken about which of the students were present in the group. This step was taken to obtain specific information about individual student performance during the designated speaking activity.

4. The researcher decided if each member of the small group was to be designated as appropriately engaged or not in the speaking activity if their performance occurred under conditions that met the specifications of the task.

The steps described above guided the process of observation of students' performance of the teacher-stated speaking activity during four selected small-group speaking opportunities, "What I Like to Do," "Cherished Object to Be Saved," "Describing Houses," and "Daily Routines." In this way, a record was established of the names of the students who were either appropriately or inappropriately engaged in the stated small-group speaking
Trustworthiness of the Data

Two different external observers conducted the validation of the researcher's coding of students' engagement in the four different small-group speaking tasks identified above. Observers C and D, both of whom had had a number of years experience teaching Spanish at both the secondary and university levels, participated in the validation process. This process consisted of the two observers independently coding as either appropriate or inappropriate the participation of each of the students involved in the four selected small-group speaking activities. Interobserver agreement was calculated using the formula below:

\[
\frac{\text{Number of Agreements}}{\text{Number of Agreements} + \text{Number of Disagreements}} \times 100
\]

An agreement was recorded each time the observers' decisions on appropriate or inappropriate activity of a particular student matched the researcher's decision. There were a total of 11 instances where individual student speaking activity was coded during data analysis. Interobserver agreement between the researcher and the two external observers was calculated at 100%. On a holistic level, then, all students whose performance was evaluated were felt to be participating appropriately (i.e., they were on task) in the four small-group speaking tasks identified earlier as specified by the teacher during the Small-Group Speaking Task Presentation Phases.

Training the Observers

A short training session was held with each of the observers, although at
two different times. During the training sessions the researcher explained the purpose of the analytic procedures. The researcher explained to them that they were to rate the performance of each of the students identified (n=11) in the four small-group activities as being appropriate or inappropriate, according to the teacher's actual stated task demands. They were told, however, that determination of appropriateness of participation was to be considered on a holistic basis, that at times the students may mention topics that might be considered not a part of the activity. Before determining the appropriateness of the 11 students' participation, however, the researcher explained that the observers were first going to listen to the teacher's stated task demands that he gave just prior to the small-group activity. This phase was to orient the observers to the specific speaking tasks the students were to perform in their small groups.

**Procedures for Determining Trustworthiness**

The following procedures were used during the actual coding sessions for which interobserver agreement was determined. While the researcher worked independently with each of the external observers and did so on two separate occasions, the same steps were observed.

1. The researcher gave the observer four sheets of paper. On the top of each the researcher wrote the thematic title of the speaking activities on which analysis was to be conducted. Also on each sheet, the researcher wrote the names of each of the students who participated in the speaking activities. Then, beside each of the names, the researcher put two boxes labeled "Appropriately Engaged" and "Inappropriately Engaged."

2. The researcher located on the audio- or videotape the point at which the teacher presented the small-group speaking task, which he then played for
the observer.

3 At the completion of the small-group speaking task presentation, the researcher stopped the tape and asked the observer whether she understood what the teacher presented. The researcher then asked the observer to explain in detail the speaking task as she heard and understood it. If the observer expressed or demonstrated any confusion or miscomprehension, the researcher replayed the task presentation to help remove any misunderstanding concerning what the teacher presented as the speaking task.

4 Once the observer expressed understanding of the speaking task, the researcher then let the observer listen to and/or watch the students.

5 As the researcher and observer were listening to/watching the recorded interactions, the researcher identified the individual students for the observer.

6 As each individual student took his/her turn, the researcher asked the observer to rate the performance of the student.

7 The same procedure was followed for each of the four sampled small-group activities.

When the observer completed the rating for each of the 11 instances of student participation, interobserver measures were calculated according to the formula identified above.

Research Question 3.2:
Procedures for Obtaining Data

Data for the investigation of patterns of student participation during small-group learner-to-learner speaking opportunities were obtained through both micro- and macroanalysis of the unfolding learner-to-learner conversations. The researcher obtained data by searching the structural maps of the three
microanalyzed learner-to-learner speaking opportunities (i.e., "Describing Houses," "Cherished Object to be Saved," and "Daily Routines," while simultaneously reviewing both the audio- and videotapes. Two students participated in the first small-group activity, and three during each of the remaining two. The researcher extracted recurring patterns of student participation following the steps detailed below:

1. The researcher reviewed the video- and audiotapes of the the first previously microanalyzed speaking activity identified above, "Describing Houses." Simultaneously, he reviewed the learner-to-learner portion of the structural map of this activity. Once a pattern of student participation was identified, a description of it was recorded and its exact locations were identified on the structural map.

2. After recurring patterns of learner-to-learner participation had been extracted during this first speaking activity, the researcher, following the type-case model presented earlier in the Chapter, performed the same analytical procedures to the remaining two speaking activities (i.e., "Cherished Object to be Saved" and "Daily Routines").

The preceding analytic procedures resulted in the identification of three patterns and numerous subpatterns of interaction culled during the investigation of learner-to-learner talk for the three activities that comprised the sample. Each of the patterns and subpatterns and their subsequent descriptions became variables of interest grounded in the observed interaction during small-group learner-to-learner talk.

In the sections below, each of the patterns identified will be described separately. Following each description are the specific procedures for establishing trustworthiness of the data where applicable.
Pattern 1

The first pattern extracted from the raw data sources showed that, once students were instructed by the teacher to begin their small-group speaking tasks according to the teacher-specified task demands (i.e., Research Question 3.1), students selected between and among themselves who would begin the actual talk. While this was a general pattern found across the three instances of small-group work, the specific mechanisms used by each group to select who the first person would be to start the talk varied slightly.

Pattern 2

Once a student gained the floor to begin the actual speaking task the student then began to give a narrative description based upon the topic as prescribed by the teacher during the Small-Group Speaking Task Presentation. (See Research Question 3.1.) The narrative description portions of the student's talk were easily distinguished from other kinds of talk and were highlighted in yellow on the structural maps for easy location.

Trustworthiness of the Data

The accuracy of the researcher's ability to locate and highlight those Message Units (See Appendix A for a definition of Message Unit and for the process of how Message Units are identified) that corresponded specifically to a student's narrative description was validated on a post hoc basis. External Observer C participated in the process of validation.

Testing the accuracy of the researcher's ability to locate and highlight those Message Units pertaining to a student's narrative description took place
on a selected sample of learner-to-learner talk. Specifically, the researcher sampled the talk during the activities entitled "Cherished Object to be Saved" and "Daily Routines." Interobserver agreement was calculated using the formula below:

\[
\frac{\text{Number of Agreements}}{\text{Number of Agreements} + \text{Number of Disagreements}} \times 100
\]

An agreement was entered when the observer's highlighted Message Units matched those of the researcher. For the learner-to-learner conversational portion of the speaking activity "Cherished Object to be Saved," interobserver agreement was calculated at 86% while for the activity "Daily Routines," interobserver agreement was calculated at 88%.

**Training the Observer**

A one-hour-and-20-minute training session was required to train the observer to highlight those Message Units she felt directly pertained to a student's narration/description. The procedures listed below were applied during the training session.

1. The researcher used the structural map and videotapes from the activity entitled "Describing Houses" for the training session. The researcher first explained the purpose of the validation session. Following this short introduction, the researcher, using the videotape and structural map, went through the narration/description of the first student's turn at talk explaining why he highlighted particular Message Units as belonging to her description/narration as opposed to other kinds of talk.

2. When it was the next student's turn at talk, the researcher allowed the
observer to perform the same procedures explaining each decision. When questions arose, the researcher responded using the videotape and structural map as the guide.

**Procedures for Establishing Trustworthiness**

After the training session, the researcher gave the observer clean copies of the structural maps of the learner-to-learner portions of the activities entitled "Cherished Object to be Saved" and "Daily Routines." These structural maps contained only Message Units and their corresponding numbers. Other hierarchical units were not included on the structural maps.

The researcher then located on the videotapes the beginning of the learner-to-learner portions of these activities. Because the observer already knew how to work the remote control device for stopping, pausing, and rewinding the video playback machine, no special training for this was required. Validation consisted of the observer watching videotapes and/or listening to audiotapes while simultaneously following along with the copies of the structural maps of the conversations sampled. While listening and watching, the observer highlighted with a yellow highlighter only those Message Units she felt pertained to the student's actual narrative descriptions based upon the Teacher's stated topic. She was also instructed to leave unhighlighted all other Message Units not pertaining exclusively to a student's narrative description.

**Pattern 3**

The previous pattern (Pattern 2) revealed that a student got the floor to give his or her narration/description according to the topic that the teacher had previously established. (See Research Question 3.1.) The third pattern culled from the conversational data revealed that the student's turn at talk was
characterized by numerous interruptions or breaks in the main flow of that student's narration/description. These interruptions caused the main flow of topic development to be suspended temporarily for varying amounts of time until certain conversational repairs (Schwartz, 1980; Varonis & Gass, 1986) were achieved. Following resolution of the interruption, however, the student resumed the narration/description. A particular student's turn to share information continued through a series of descriptions/narrations and interruptions of various kinds until that student's turn to share came to an end.

**Trustworthiness of the Data**

The findings relative to patterns of interruptions or breaks in the main flow of a student's turn to narrate/describe was validated on a *post hoc* basis. Validation of these patterns consisted of External Observer C testing the specific locations of the interruptions in the main flow of a student's turn at talk found in the samples of learner-to-learner interaction during the activity entitled "Daily Routines," Interobserver agreement was calculated using the formula below:

\[
\frac{\text{Number of Agreements}}{\text{Number of Agreements} + \text{Number of Disagreements}} \times 100
\]

An agreement was recorded each time the observer and the researcher agreed on the location of an interruption in the main flow of a student's turn to share information with the other participants. Interobserver agreement was calculated at 88%.

**Training the Observer**

A 15-minute training session took place to train the observer for the
interobserver agreement check. During the session, the researcher explained the purpose of the agreement check. Because External Observer C had already participated in the validation process for locating those Message Units that corresponded to the main flow of a student's narration/description, she had no difficulty in understanding what she was being asked to perform while locating the points in the learner-to-learner interaction where interruptions took place.

**Procedures for Determining Trustworthiness**

The procedures listed below were employed for determining the trustworthiness of the data:

1. When the training session concluded and the observer had no more questions, the researcher let her use the same copy of the structural map of learner-to-learner interaction for the activity "Cherished Object to be Saved" she had used during the previous validation process (i.e., Pattern 2).

2. When the observer indicated she was ready, the researcher asked her to draw a line to separate the main flow of talk from: other talk each time she felt the main flow was interrupted. In addition, she was instructed to draw still another line when she felt the student's main flow of talk was resumed. Following the validation process, interobserver agreement was calculated using the formula identified earlier.

**Additional Data Construction and Analysis: A Product of the Interactive-Reactive Nature of the Research Process**

The procedures identified above resulted in the identification of specific break points or instances of interruption in the main flow of a student's turn at giving information to the other participants in the small-group learner-to-learner
conversations. At this point in the research process questions were raised regarding the specific nature of those break points. The nature of the interruptions was investigated along two dimensions: (1) the source of the interruptions (i.e., who perpetrated them) and (2) the reason for the interruptions (i.e., why the interruptions took place), which led to additional data construction and analysis procedures by the researcher. These additional data construction and analysis procedures produced subpatterns within the pattern of interruptions.

To determine the source of and the reason for the interruptions in the main flow of a student's turn to provide information, the researcher reentered the structural maps of learner-to-learner conversational activity. Each break point, which had been previously identified, was more closely investigated to determine both the source of and the reason for the interruptions. Each of the subpatterns and their corresponding procedures for determining trustworthiness will be presented separately below.

Subpatterns 3A and 3B

The result of investigating the source of each interruption in the flow of a student's turn to provide narration/description showed that there were two patterns of interruptions. Either the student whose turn it was to talk self-initiated the interruption (Subpattern 3A), or the interruption was other-initiated (Subpattern 3B).

**Trustworthiness of the Data**

Validation of the data relative to the source of the interruption, self-initiated or other-initiated, was performed *post hoc* by External Observer C, who coded
each interruption as either self-initiated or other-initiated. Interobserver agreement was calculated using the formula below:

\[
\frac{\text{Number of Agreements}}{\text{Number of Agreements} + \text{Number of Disagreements}} \times 100
\]

An agreement was recorded each the the observer's decision as to the source of the interruption matched that of the researcher. Interobserver agreement was calculated at 96%.

**Training the Observer**

Because of the nature of the validation process and because Observer C had taken part in the validation process relative to the general pattern of breaks or interruptions found during a student's turn to share information, no training was required beyond explaining what the observer was to do in coding the source of each break previously identified.

**Procedures for Determining Trustworthiness**

Using the same structural map and videotape for the activity "Daily Routines" that she had used in the validation process of Pattern 2 above, Observer C coded the source of each previously identified interruption. When the validation process was completed, interobserver agreement measures were calculated using the formula identified above.

**Additional Data Construction and Analysis: A Product of the Interactive-Reactive Nature of the Research Process**

While investigating the source of each of the interruptions, also noted were the reasons why each of the interruptions took place. Reasons for each of
the interruptions were investigated for each source of interruption. Reasons for each of the self-initiated interruptions will be presented followed by reasons for other-initiated interruptions.

Subpatterns 3A.1 and 3A.2

As previously noted, the student who had the floor to share his or her narration/description sometimes self-initiated interruptions that caused the main flow of talk to be suspended while some repair work took place. Two reasons were noted why a student self-initiated an interruption of his or her own turn at talk. Those two reasons were (1) to initiate a word-search (Schwartz, 1980) (Subpattern 3A.1), and (2) to initiate a word-confirmation (Subpattern 3A.2).

**Procedures for Determining Trustworthiness**

Validation for the two subpatterns of reasons for self-initiated interruptions was conducted by External Observer C. She was asked to code each of the previously identified self-initiated interruptions as either the student's initiation of a word search or a word-confirmation. Interobserver agreement was calculated using the formula below:

\[
\frac{\text{Number of Agreements}}{\text{Number of Agreements + Number of Disagreements}} \times 100
\]

An agreement was recorded each time the observers coding matched that of the researcher. Interobserver agreement was calculated at 97% for word-searches and 95% for word-confirmations.

**Training the Observer**
Because the observer had become quite familiar with the structural map, having participated in the validation process for numerous learner-to-learner conversational patterns, little training was required beyond giving examples of each of the two reasons for self-initiated interruptions.

**Procedures for Determining Trustworthiness**

The observer took the same structural map (i.e., for the activity "Daily Routines") for which she had validated other variables related to interruptions in the main flow of a student's turn to share narration/description relative to the teacher stated task. Because she had already located and coded each of the interruptions (Pattern 3 above), she had no difficulty going back and coding the reasons for each of the self-initiated interruptions according to the descriptions given.

**Additional Data Construction and Analysis: An Investigation into the Nature of Self-Initiated Word Searches**

One of the patterns uncovered for reasons for self-initiated interruptions revealed that the student who had the floor to present a narrative description relative to the teacher's stated task introduced a conversational repair strategy called word search (Schwartz, 1980).

At his point in the research process questions were raised regarding the nature of self-initiated word searches. To investigate the nature of self-initiated word searches, the researcher returned to the structural maps of each of the three microanalyzed learner-to-learner portions of the three sampled speaking activities (i.e., "Describing Houses," "Cherished Object to be Saved," and "Daily Routines"). At each of the previously identified self-initiated word searches, the actual Message Units used by the students to initiate the interruption were
extracted for subsequent analysis.

The result of the analysis of the Message Units pertaining to the initiation of word searches was a taxonomy of ways in which the students interrupted their own main flow of narration/description in order to initiate a word search strategy. Because of the nature of the findings, it was decided that post hoc validation was not a necessary component of the investigation.

Patterns 3B.1, 3B.2, and 3B.3

As previously noted, the main flow of a student's narration/description was also interrupted by some other individual. Investigation of the reason for other-initiated interruptions led to the identification of three ways another individual interrupted the main flow of a student's narration/description: other-initiated content search (Subpattern 3B.1), other-initiated language correction (Subpattern 3B.2), and other-initiated content confirmation (Subpattern 3B.3).

Trustworthiness of the Data

Validation for each of the subpatterns was conducted on a post hoc basis by External Observer C. She was asked to code each of the previously identified other-initiated interruptions according to the descriptions for each of the patterns. Interobserver agreement was calculated using the following formula:

\[
\frac{\text{Number of Agreements}}{\text{Number of Agreements} + \text{Number of Disagreements}} \times 100
\]

An agreement was recorded each time the coding of a given other-initiated interruption with respect to one of the three identified reasons
matched that of the researcher. Interobserver agreement was calculated at 100% for Subpattern 3B.1, 99% for Subpattern 3B.2, and 100% for Subpattern 3B.3.

**Training the Observer**

Because External Observer C had participated in validation processes for a number of patterns of learner-to-learner conversational interaction, and because the observer had become quite familiar with each of the structural maps used during the validation processes, little training was required beyond explanation for what she was to do. In addition to the explanation, the observer was given descriptions of each of the patterns identified for reasons for other-initiated interruptions.

**Procedures for Determining Trustworthiness**

Using the structural map for the learner-to-learner portion of the activity "Cherished Object to be Saved" along with the videotape, the observer coded each of the identified other-initiated interruptions in accordance with the descriptions given. Interobserver agreement was calculated using the formula identified above.

**SUMMARY**

This Chapter presented the design of the research process, the locus of the observation, the procedures for the collection of raw data, the general analytical process, the specific procedures for analysis of the data, and the procedures for establishing trustworthiness of the data. The study involved the identification of a variety of types and sources of data, all of which were interactive-reactive in nature. Finally, the discussions on trustworthiness of the data collected demonstrated that the product of the analysis procedures offers a reliable set of findings.
CHAPTER IV
DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

The general purpose of this study was to respond to the need for a better understanding of teaching and learning processes in foreign language education. To accomplish this goal, it was necessary to reconsider the nature of life in the foreign language classroom. The preceding chapters outlined the rationale for and the nature of the conceptualization of daily life in foreign language classrooms as a complex communicative process. These chapters presented the theoretical foundation upon which that conceptualization was based (Chapter I and Chapter II) and a methodology for capturing and analyzing daily events in the foreign language class (Chapter III).

Both the general purpose of the study and the resulting conceptualization of the foreign language class as an active communicative environment led to the primary goal of the study:

**The identification of patterns of instruction and student participation during formal small-group learner-to-learner speaking activities in a Spanish conversation class at the college level.**

This goal was arrived at by exploring both the social and academic nature of daily life in the foreign language class.

Three major research questions guided the process of observation, data collection, and data analysis:

1. When and under what circumstances do formal, teacher-derived
opportunities for speaking Spanish take place during the Spanish conversation course that met for six hours a day, one day a week (Friday), for seven weeks?

2. What is the organizational structure of the 12 selected formal, teacher-derived speaking activities in the Spanish conversation course?

3. What is the academic structure of the small-group learner-to-learner speaking tasks located within the 12 teacher-derived speaking activities in the Spanish conversation course?

One way to view these questions is to see them as a nested set of circles with Question 3 embedded in and related to Questions 1 and 2. (See Figure 6.) In this way, Question 3 becomes the primary question of interest and the other questions providing information about the factors that affect the academic performance (i.e., speaking in the foreign language) of the participants. The complexity of daily life in the foreign language class required that the three major research questions be further subdivided to reflect different aspects of the teaching/learning process. While some questions were extracted from past work in instruction (e.g., Bloome, 1981, 1987; Graham, 1986; Green, 1977; Green & Wallat, 1981; Green & Weade, 1985, 1987; Green, Weade & Graham, 1988; Weade & Green, in press), other questions emerged from the data collected during the study. The specific relationship of the subquestions to the major question, including the interrelationships between and among the various subquestions, are discussed in separate sections of this Chapter.

1.0 When and under what circumstances do formal, teacher-derived opportunities for speaking in Spanish take place in the Spanish conversation course?

1.1 What is the macrostructural pattern of events across the seven-day Spanish conversation course?
Figure 6

Embedded Nature of Research Questions
1.2 What is the pattern of events that took place during in-class times as identified in Research Question 1.1?

1.2.1 What is the nature of Administrative Content Activities?

1.2.2 What is the nature of Academic Content Activities?

2.0 What is the organizational structure of the 12 selected formal, teacher-derived speaking activities in the Spanish conversation course?

2.1 How is the organizational structure of one of the teacher-derived speaking activities both similar to and different from the organizational structure of other analogous speaking activities?

2.1.1 What is stable about the organizational structure of these speaking activities?

2.1.2 What is variable about the organizational structure speaking activities?

3.0 What is the nature of the academic structure of the small-group learner-to-learner speaking tasks located within the 12 teacher-derived speaking activities in the Spanish conversation class?

3.1 What are the patterns of information communicated to students during the Small-Group Speaking Task Presentation Phases?

3.2 What are recurring patterns of interaction during small-group learner-to-learner speaking activity?

STRATEGY FOR PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

This Chapter presents findings relative to the major questions presented above. The theoretical and methodological framework upon which the questions were based required a research process that was both interactive and reactive in nature. The process utilized in this study involved the exploration
and subsequent extraction of recurring patterns of life in the Spanish conversation course. The identification of recurring events, in turn, provided the basis for the generation of hypotheses regarding the nature of daily activity in the classroom. These hypotheses were then tested across similar and dissimilar cases following the type-case model as discussed in Chapter III.

The process of data collection and subsequent analysis permitted the extraction of multiple kinds of data from an array of sources to respond to the major Research Questions and their subquestions. A discussion of the reliability of the data extracted was presented on a Research Question-by-Research Question basis in Chapter III. Findings are presented in both quantitative and qualitative format. Quantitative information is presented using descriptive statistics. Qualitative findings are presented in narrative form with extracts taken from the structural maps as examples. The results of the data analysis will be presented using a question-by-question format. Each major question with its constituent subquestions will be dealt with separately and in order.

RESEARCH QUESTION 1.0:
ANALYSIS OF WHEN AND UNDER WHAT CIRCUMSTANCES FORMAL, TEACHER-DERIVED SPEAKING ACTIVITIES TAKE PLACE DURING THE SPANISH CONVERSATION CLASS

Because the primary objective of the study was to explore patterns of instruction and student participation during formal, teacher-derived learner-to-learner speaking opportunities in the Spanish Conversation class, this first Research Question seeks primarily to examine the macrostructure of the course across the seven days to arrive at an understanding of when and under what circumstances students were provided formal opportunities to engage in small-group face-to-face conversation in Spanish. The answer to this first
Research Question will aid in the identification of patterns of instruction and student participation during formal small-group speaking activities by revealing a recurring pattern of deliberate (i.e., teacher-derived) instructional events during which formal opportunities to speak in Spanish between and among the participants took place. The question that guided the analysis was:

1.0 When and under what circumstances do formal opportunities for speaking in Spanish take place in the Spanish Conversation class?

This major question was divided into two subquestions:

1.1 What is the nature of the macrostructure of the seven-day Spanish Conversation class?

1.2 What is the nature of events that took place during the in-class times identified in Research Question 1.1?

The preceding question was divided into two parts.

1.2.1 What is the nature of Administrative Content Activities?

1.2.2 What is the nature of Academic Content Activities?

Research Questions 1.1 and 1.2 were derived after initial investigation of the primary data sources during the analysis phase of the study. In this way, the description of the macrostructure was "grounded" in the primary data sources. Analysis of the macrostructure and the events that occurred within it aided in identifying a consistent structure comprised of two major components (1) formal break times or out-of-class time across the seven days of the Spanish conversation course, and (2) formal in-class time, during which teacher-derived instructional events took place.
To arrive at an understanding of when and under what circumstances the participants had formal, teacher-derived opportunities to speak in Spanish, all videotapes, audiotapes, fieldnotes, student journals, student course evaluations, the teacher's own lesson plans (which were audiorecorded by the teacher and later transcribed by the researcher), and the teacher's own activity cards (which he kept in his hands for quick reference during the course) were systematically explored. In addition to the various data sources just mentioned, the teacher was interviewed on several occasions during the data collection phase as well as during the data analysis phase of the study. Of these multiple data sources, the primary sources were the field-notes and the video- and audiotapes that were made during the data collection phase of the study. These primary data sources aided in the reconstruction of all the activities that took place during and across each of the seven days of the Spanish conversation course.

Triangulation of findings was achieved through various means: (1) student interviews, individually as well as in groups of two; (2) student journals and course evaluations; (3) teacher planning tapes and activity cards; and (4) interviews with the teacher. Before it was possible to determine when formal, teacher-derived speaking opportunities of a small group nature took place in the Spanish conversation class, it was necessary to undertake a macro-level analysis of in-class and out-of-class times across the seven days of the Spanish conversation class.
Research Question 1.1: Patterns of Macrostructural Components

The macro-level analysis of the course followed the type-case model as presented in Chapter III. The macrostructure of the first day was explored for recurring patterns of action and interaction by considering the general content, the type of talk, and the demands for participation in place during the activities identified within the primary data sources.

The product of this analysis procedure was a broad macro-level structural map of the major events that took place across the first day of the course. A model for that day was constructed and compared to the analysis of the other six days of the class in order to determine what events were stable and what events were variable. From this analysis procedure, the schedule of all the major activities as they actually took place on each day of the seven-day Spanish conversation course was constructed. Figure 7 provides a graphic representation of the broad macrostructure of each of the seven days of the course. Figure 7, however, provides only a wide-angle, skeletal view of the major activities that took place. No internal details of each of those activities are provided. Those that are identified in Figure 7 are identified by thematic titles (e.g., "Getting Acquainted"), song titles (e.g., "Sin saber por que"), or by the words "Administrative Issues," "Break," or "Lunch" Those activities identified by the words "Exit" or "Entry" were those periods of activity during the day when the participants were either entering or exiting the classroom.

For example, the first formal academic teacher-derived classroom activity on Day 1 of the Spanish conversation course is identified as "Getting to Know You." It was considered formal and academic because the teacher purposefully planned the activity, as revealed by the teacher's planning tapes and the activity
## MACROSTRUCTURE OF DAY 1

### ENTRY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduce Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill Out Information Cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Description of Course</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| SPEAKING ACTIVITY:             |
| "Getting to Know You"         |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Read/Talk About Syllabus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask the Teacher Questions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| SPEAKING ACTIVITY:             |
| "Two or Three Good Things About Myself" |

---

### MORNING BREAK

| SPEAKING ACTIVITY:             |
| "Amnesia Game"                |

---

### LUNCH BREAK

| READING/WRITING ACTIVITY:      |
| "First Impressions"           |

| SPEAKING ACTIVITY:             |
| "What I Like to Do"            |

---

### AFTERNOON BREAK

| CONTINUE SPEAKING ACTIVITY:    |
| "What I Like to Do"            |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Researcher Introduces Project/Requests Permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Assigns Homework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXIT

---

**Figure 7**

Macrostructure of Conversation Course
**MACROSTRUCTURE OF DAY 2**

### ENTRY

**ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES**
- Review telephone numbers/class roster
- T. introduces/discusses Berlitz tapes

**SPEAKING ACTIVITY:**
- "Things We Do (In The Present Tense)"

---

**—MORNING BREAK—**

**LISTENING ACTIVITY (SONG):**
- "El sueno imposible"

**SPEAKING ACTIVITY:**
- "Clock Line-Up"

---

**—LUNCH BREAK—**

**SPEAKING ACTIVITY:**
- Interview Native Speaker

**SPEAKING ACTIVITY:**
- "Talking About Our Families"

**ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES**
- Talk about/assign homework for next class

### EXIT

---

*Figure 7 Continued*
### MACROSTRUCTURE OF DAY 3

#### ENTRY

**ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES**
- T. asks who's planning to be in class next week (July 5)
- T. announces/explains experimental placement exam

**SPEAKING ACTIVITY:**
- "Talking About Weather and Dates"
  - [in preparation for "Favorite Times"]

**SPECIAL EVENT:**
- Students out taking experimental placement exam

---

**—MORNING BREAK—**

**LISTENING ACTIVITY (SONG):**
- "Amar y querer"

**SPEAKING ACTIVITY:**
- "Favorite Times"

---

**—LUNCH BREAK—**

**SPEAKING ACTIVITY:**
- "Places In My Life"

**SPEAKING ACTIVITY:**
- "Favorite Possession"

**ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES**
- Talk about/assign homework for next class

#### EXIT

---

Figure 7 Continued
Figure 7 Continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MACROSTRUCTURE OF DAY 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENTRY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. asks if Students have any &quot;administrative-type&quot; questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LISTENING ACTIVITY(SONG):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Sin saber por que&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPEAKING ACTIVITY:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Teach Me&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SINGING ACTIVITY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn to sing Happy Birthday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(student celebrates birthday)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>—MORNING BREAK—</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. reminds/discusses required student journal assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. discusses final projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. discusses schedule change for last day of course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. discusses going to restaurant on last day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. introduces new tape series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. discusses &quot;Fashion Show&quot; activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPEAKING ACTIVITY:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Los animales&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>—LUNCH BREAK—</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPEAKING ACTIVITY:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native/Fluent speakers to class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. discusses/assigns homework for next week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of off-campus music festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXIT</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7 Continued
MACROSTRUCTURE OF DAY 6

ENTRY

ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES
T. announces afternoon guests
T. gives brief overview of day’s activities

SPEAKING ACTIVITY:
“Daily Routines”

LISTENING/WRITING ACTIVITY:
T. reading out loud student compositions—students guessing who wrote
Students writing down corrections on assignment

ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES
How long break should be/when and how long lunch should be

—MORNING BREAK—

ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES
When to go to lunch/when to be back

WRITING/LISTENING/READING OUT LOUD ACTIVITY:
“Los profesiones”

VERB MORPHOLOGY ACTIVITY
Discussion of morphology of “imperfect” in Spanish

ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES
T. calls for/collects scripts for skits
T. tells expectations for skits
T. reminds class of afternoon guests
T. passes out information regarding off-campus events

—LUNCH BREAK—

LISTENING/DANCING/SINGING ACTIVITY:
Two guests to class

ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES
Finalize schedule for Day 7 of course: skits
T. reminds students of trip to restaurant
T. reminds students of change in class time for Day 7 of course

EXIT

Figure 7 Continued
## MACROSTRUCTURE OF DAY 7

### ENTRY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES</th>
<th>T discusses plan for the day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T discusses trip to restaurant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPEAKING ACTIVITY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skits and Presentations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

---

### BREAK

### SPEAKING ACTIVITY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES</th>
<th>Discuss/show how to get to restaurant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discuss who is going/driving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DINNER AT RESTAURANT

### EXIT COURSE

*Figure 7 Continued*
cards he used, to allow the participants to speak in Spanish among themselves in small groups so that they could get acquainted with one another. Other activity titles that are given in Figure 7 are the same titles that the teacher used in his planning tapes. In other words, the teacher planned many different formal academic activities for specific purposes so that the participants could achieve the major academic purpose of the course; that is, speaking in or about Spanish language.

Upon analysis, however, it was discovered that not all activities were formal academic activities. Some activities, for example, were markedly different in that the participants were engaged in discussing, almost exclusively in English, administrative and procedural aspects of the course that were important to the members of the class. In Figure 7 these non-academic activities are labeled "Administrative Issues," "Break," or "Lunch." More about the administrative and procedural activities (e.g., schedule changes, handing out homework assignments, coming events) will be presented below (i.e., Research Question 1.2).

An examination of Figure 7 indicates that, although there were many formal academic activities during any given day, there was a consistent pattern of major break points across the seven days at which time the participants were able to leave the formal classroom setting either to take a break or to go to lunch. Figure 8 graphically illustrates the consistent patterning of major break points across the seven days of the conversation class.

An examination of Figure 8 indicates that each day had at least one break time in the morning between the beginning of class and the lunch break. Because the Spanish Conversation class was scheduled to begin at 9:00 am and students went to lunch sometimes before 1:00 pm, the participants
### Figure 8

Patterning of Major Break Points Across the Seven-Day Spanish Conversation Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day 1</th>
<th>Day 2</th>
<th>Day 3</th>
<th>Day 4</th>
<th>Day 5</th>
<th>Day 6</th>
<th>Day 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Drive to Restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exit</td>
<td>Exit</td>
<td>Exit</td>
<td>Exit</td>
<td>Exit</td>
<td>Exit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
potentially had some three-and-one-half to four hours of formal class time to be engaged in classroom learning activities. The teacher, however, felt that a break was needed in order to give the students time to get a refreshment, to smoke, and to use the bathroom. The first break of the day usually lasted from ten to fifteen minutes.

Day 7 of the Spanish Conversation class, however, provided an alteration in the normal break-time routines. On this day, because the participants went to a local Mexican-style restaurant to have dinner together as the last activity of the course, the class did not begin until after 1:00 pm. The first break, therefore, occurred in the afternoon. Nonetheless, the timing of the first break was consistent with that of other days. That is, the first major break occurred some time between the beginning of the class and before the meal time.

Although every day included a morning break time, as noted on Figure 8, Day 1 also included an afternoon break, which did not occur on other days. A possible explanation for this inconsistency is found in the fact that the teacher, as indicated in his first planning tape, was trying out "a smorgasbord of activities" on the first day in order to come to an understanding of what the students were able to do in terms of speaking Spanish. In a subsequent interview the teacher indicated that, as far as the first day of class went, he did not know how the timing would work out. The first day, therefore, was for "getting [their] feet wet" and for "develop[ing] certain routines that [they] d[id] week in and week out."

In addition to a consistent pattern of breaks in the morning after the beginning of class, there was also a consistent lunch break, as shown in Figure 8. Examination of the fieldnotes, however, indicates that, although these break
points were consistently a part of the daily classroom routine, the actual clock time at which they took place was relatively variable. For example, going to lunch did not occur at exactly the same time each day as one would expect, say, in a secondary school setting in which everything during the day is normally controlled by a "bell" schedule. One consideration, however, did dictate one aspect of the lunch break. The lunch break needed to begin sometime before 1:00 pm, because the college's dining hall in which some of the students ate closed its doors at that time. The lunch break usually lasted between thirty and forty-five minutes.

Consideration of these major break points indicates that any given day was divided into three major blocks of time that could potentially be filled with classroom language-practice activities. Examination of Figure 8 shows that the first block of time, labeled Phase I, took place between the time the class began and the morning break. Phase II took place after the morning break and before lunch. Phase III took place after lunch and before the end of the day. On Day 1 of the course, however, there occurred an afternoon break that allowed for a fourth phase to take place, between returning from lunch and the end of the day. On no other day was there a break between returning from lunch and leaving at the end of the day.

In summary, the findings in this Section 1.1 of the macro-level analysis of the seven-day Spanish conversation course indicates that, with little variation, a daily macro-level structural pattern of in-class time and out-of-class time was firmly in place across the seven days of the Spanish Conversation class. There was a consistent pattern of morning and lunch breaks that broke up the day into three distinct blocks of potential time for the academic work of the class. Whether or not this structural stability was clear to the students and whether or
not this structural patterning facilitated a shared reference between teacher and students in class could have been determined by obtaining the perspective of the class participants. In spite of the fact that the participants were not asked about this factor regarding the structure of an entire day during the course, the actions and interactions of the participants suggested that a shared frame of reference did indeed exist. In fact, when there was variability (e.g., no afternoon Break after Day 1) the participants did not appear upset in any way.

While there was a relatively stable pattern of major break times across the seven days of the Spanish Conversation class, it was between the break times that the formal academic work of the class was conducted. The section below explores patterns of academic events that took place during in-class times.

Research Question 1.2: Patterns of In-Class Events

At this point in the analysis phase of the study, because no consistent patterning of events other than that presented above was evident at the macro level, a closer and more detailed examination of each of the various activities that took place during the course between the break times was undertaken, and differences and similarities across both days and activities were identified. Analysis of both the video- and audio-tapes of each lesson as well as the fieldnotes taken during the seven-day Spanish conversation class resulted in the construction of more detailed structural maps of each of the seven days of the course. Figure 9 represents a segment of a map that was constructed. The maps indicate different aspects of each major event such as thematic title, purpose, grouping, content, activity, and student participation requirements. Analysis of these maps revealed that not all in-class activities were alike in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Gap</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Social Demands</th>
<th>Academic Demands</th>
<th>Comments / Notes</th>
<th>Blank</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>WG</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Students walk into classroom, find seat, sit down, T. sets up materials, arranges tables chairs</td>
<td>Come in find seat, get prepared, may ask questions, greet others</td>
<td>Sets up materials, greets students as they enter, answers questions</td>
<td>Prepare for the day; set up, get settled</td>
<td>Set up course / day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>T asks students to fill out cards with specified information</td>
<td>Listen to request</td>
<td>T gives directions for task</td>
<td>Ss supply 1) name; 2) address-phone; 3) things might like to talk about / do in class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IIb</td>
<td>Ss fill out card in silence</td>
<td>Listen to request</td>
<td>T monitors students / answers questions; takes cards when finished</td>
<td>Ss fill out card according to T's specifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>T gives general description of course</td>
<td>Listen</td>
<td>Provides information to students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting Acquainted</td>
<td>WG</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>&quot;The first thing I want you to do&quot; T tells students about activity to do</td>
<td>Listen</td>
<td>Provides information about activity</td>
<td>listen to T give information about activity</td>
<td>T sets up procedural aspects of activity: what, how, and with whom, for what purpose</td>
<td>Pre-conversational activity: talk about what to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;add&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Students in small groups</td>
<td>Get with assigned partner and talk in Spanish about assigned topic</td>
<td>Walks around / monitors groups / answers questions helps with language problems</td>
<td>Be in groups / speak in Spanish about assigned topic: tell about self, listen to partner tell about self, be prepared to tell gist to class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9: Partial Macrostructural Map of Day 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Grp</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Social Demands</th>
<th>Academic Demands</th>
<th>Comments / Notes</th>
<th>Blank</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting to know you (cont)</td>
<td>WG</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Reform to whole group</td>
<td>Speak in Spanish tell 2 or 3 things about partner to whole group</td>
<td>Initiate speakers / write down vocabulary on chalkboard / signal speaker's turn</td>
<td>Tell in Spanish 2 or 3 things about partner to the rest of the group</td>
<td>T encourages Ss to write down verbs that they don't know</td>
<td>General conversational activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WG</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>T asks Ss recall questions about what info was communicated about Student K</td>
<td>Answer T's questions - anybody - call out answers</td>
<td>Ask recall questions to test memories of Ss</td>
<td>Recall information in Spanish as requested by teacher - no need to raise hand</td>
<td>Recall questions specifically about Student K</td>
<td>Post-Conversation check on information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WG</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>T asks Researcher to tell about Student E</td>
<td>Provide information learned about partner</td>
<td>Listen ♦</td>
<td>Tell in Spanish something learned about partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WG</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>&quot;Vamos a ver un examen de memoria&quot;</td>
<td>Listen to T's questions</td>
<td>Ask Ss questions about information</td>
<td>Recall information as requested by T in Spanish</td>
<td>T introduces idea of &quot;Juego de memoria&quot; for the first time in class</td>
<td>Post-conversation check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WG</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>&quot;Un ejercicio rapido&quot;</td>
<td>Say what T wants you to say quickly when called on by T in round-robin fashion</td>
<td>Set up demands for what to do and how</td>
<td>Ss are to say &quot;Soy de____&quot; and tell what country followed by &quot;Soy____&quot; and add nationality.</td>
<td>&quot;You say 'Soy de' and give the country...And then you say 'Soy americano' or whatever&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WG</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>&quot;Okay mas preguntas&quot;</td>
<td>Answer T's questions - can call out answer</td>
<td>Ask q's to test S's memories of what different people said</td>
<td>Answer T's questions - don't have to raise hand - can shout out answer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post-Conversation check</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Social Demands</th>
<th>Academic Demands</th>
<th>Comments / Notes</th>
<th>Blank</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What we do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>&quot;Okay, omo ejercicios&quot; T writes on board: &quot;Trabajo en_____&quot; &quot;Soy______&quot;</td>
<td>Watch/listen at T writes on board</td>
<td>Set up activity structure for Ss/ provide example&quot; &quot;Trabajo en casa&quot; &quot;Soy ama de casa&quot;</td>
<td>Listen as T gives instructions for what to do</td>
<td>Pre-Conversation</td>
<td>audio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>&quot;All right. We'll go around again&quot; T goes around &quot;round robin&quot; and calls on students.</td>
<td>Respond when called upon according to model given.</td>
<td>Call on Ss to respond.</td>
<td>When T calls on you respond according to the given model but with personal information</td>
<td>T directed general-conversational activity</td>
<td>audio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>&quot;Preguntas?&quot; T calls for q's from students regarding things gone over</td>
<td>Ask questions if have any, may make comments</td>
<td>Listen for / respond to student questions/ comments</td>
<td>At this time Ss may ask questions/ make comments</td>
<td>Post-conversational activity</td>
<td>audio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More about the course: Official Syllabus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>&quot;Okay now. Este es el programa oficial&quot; T passes out official course description.</td>
<td>Listen to T</td>
<td>Give out course description</td>
<td></td>
<td>- audio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Ss reading silently</td>
<td>Read handout</td>
<td>wait silently</td>
<td></td>
<td>audio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>T tells about course / reads from course description</td>
<td>Listen to T tell about course / may ask questions</td>
<td>Give Ss more information / expand information</td>
<td>Listen to T / ask questions if have any / pay attention</td>
<td>audio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9 Continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Grp</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Social Demands</th>
<th>Academic Demands</th>
<th>Comments / Notes</th>
<th>Blank</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Introduce the Researcher to the group | WG | I | T introduces Researcher by name | Students: Listen to T  
Teacher: Introduce Researcher to the group | Students: listen to the T tell about researcher | | | audio |
| | WG | II | T asks SEve to tell what she learned about Researcher during first speaking activity | Students: Listen to SEve  
Teacher: Listen to SEve, monitor / add information | Students: While other Ss listen, SEve tells in English what she learned about Researcher | | | audio |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Ask about the Teacher | WG | I | "Bueno, otra actividad -- Oh me?"  
Student initiated event | Students: Ask q's in Spanish about the teacher  
Teacher: Listen to q's and respond in Spanish | Students: If you wish, you may ask questions in Spanish to the T about himself as an individual | | | audio |
| Tell 2 or 3 more things about self | WG | I | "Bueno / Ahora / Otra ejercicio muy similar"  
T gives new activity to do | Students: Listen to T  
Teacher: Provide topic / procedures for doing new activity / selecting partners | Students: Listen for specific instructions for doing new activity.  
Teacher: Directions given in English with T providing example | | Pre-Conversational activity | audio |
| | SG | II | Generate more information about self - share / tell partner in Small group format | Students: Tell information to partner about self in Spanish  
Teacher: Monitor groups / help with language / ask questions / talk with students in group | Students: Generate more personal information and tell in Spanish to partner | | | audio |
| | WG | III | Go back to whole group format | Students: Tell class 2 or 3 things about partner  
Teacher: Monitor / help / assign next speaker | Students: Tell in Spanish about partner when called on or may volunteer | | | General Conversational activity |

Figure 9 Continued
terms of what actually took place, and that not all followed the same patterns of purpose, grouping, content, activity, or student participation requirements.

After consideration of purposes, grouping, content, activity, and student participation requirements, the major events identified at this level of analysis were further divided into two major categories: (1) Administrative and (2) Academic. Figure 10 provides a taxonomy of each major activity type. Administrative Content Activities were events during which the participants discussed administrative and procedural matters that were important to the group. Academic Content Activities were events during which the participants were engaged, although in varying ways, with the actual academic work of the class. What follows is a macro-level description of the general nature of each type beginning with Administrative Content activities. This description will be followed with a macro-level description of Academic Content Activities.

Question 1.2.1: The Nature of Administrative Content Activities

During the major category of activity labeled Administrative Content the participants were engaged in discussing, almost exclusively in English, administrative and procedural matters of importance, interest, and concern for the group. Figure 11 indicates that Administrative Content activities occurred at various points during the day as well as across days. Figure 11 provides a graphic representation of the points during each of the days when these activities took place with respect to the major break points identified above. Examination of Figure 11 indicates that each day of the course began and ended with some kind of Administrative Content activity. Day 7, however, presents the only exception to this pattern in that there was no Administrative Content activity at the end of the evening meal at the Mexican-style restaurant.
Figure 10

Taxonomy of Major Activities
During the Spanish Conversation Course
Day 1  | Day 2  | Day 3  | Day 4  | Day 5  | Day 6  | Day 7  \\
------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------\
Entry  | Entry  | Entry  | Entry  | Entry  | Entry  | Entry  \\
✓      | ✓      | ✓      | ✓      | ✓      | ✓      | ✓      \\
✓      |        |        |        |        |        |        \\
Break  | Break  | Break  | Break  | Break  | Break  | Break  \\
✓      |        |        |        | ✓      |        | ✓      \\
Break  |        |        |        |        |        |        \\
Lunch  | Lunch  | Lunch  | Lunch  | Lunch  | Lunch  | Drive to Restaurant \\
✓      |        |        |        | ✓      |        | ✓      \\
Exit   | Exit   | Exit   | Exit   | Exit   | Exit   | Exit   \\
n=3    | n=2    | n=2    | n=2    | n=3    | n=5    | n=2    \\
**Total=20**

* ✓ = location of Administrative Content Activities

**Figure 11**

Location of Administrative Content Activities Within and Across Each of the Seven Days of the Spanish Conversation Class*
Rather, the students left the restaurant at different times and said their "goodbyes."

While each day both began and ended (except Day 7) with some sort of administrative issue of importance to the participants, there were also times during the formal day when Administrative Content topics came up. For example, Figure 11 indicates that Day 1, 5, 6, and 7 had Administrative Content activities during the course of the day in addition to those at the beginning and at the end. Day 1 had one extra Administrative Content activity during Phase I of the day, Day 5 had an Administrative Content activity immediately following the morning break, and Day 6 had 3 extra Administrative Content activities: two occurred immediately before and after the morning break, and one occurred immediately before lunch. On Day 7, there was an additional Administrative Content activity that occurred immediately prior to the students' leaving for the Mexican restaurant.

Because there was a varying number of Administrative Content activities across the seven days of the Spanish Conversation class (except during Day 2, 3, 4, and 7), each activity was reexplored for recurring administrative content topics. Figure 12 provides a taxonomy of the Administrative Content Topics that were discussed. The administrative issues that were discussed dealt with four broad administrative themes: (1) scheduling and timing of academic events, (2) academic assignments, (3) commercial tapes provided by the teacher, and (4) general announcements.

As indicated above, however, there occurred varying numbers of Administrative Content activities on different days of the course. Of special interest was the fact that while on Days 2, 3, 4, and 7 there occurred only two Administrative Content activities, one at the beginning of the day and one at the
Introducing the course
Filling out personal information cards
Reading/Discussing course description
Introducing Researcher/Project
Going over class roster/phone numbers
Introducing Berlitz tapes
Handing out homework assignment sheets
Discussing required written journal
Discussing final projects: skits/presentations
Discussing schedule change for last day
Discussing new tape program acquired by T
Announcing what’s going to happen today
Announcing “Fashion Show” activity
Reminding students of when class begins
Explaining experimental placement exam
Announcing up-coming off-campus events
Negotiating length of break and lunch
Reminding students of time changes for last day of class
T calling for “scripts"
Discussing expectations for final “skits”
Announcing afternoon guests
Discussing directions to restaurant

Figure 12
Taxonomy of Administrative Content Topics
end (except on Day 7), on Day 6 there occurred five of these activities, and on Days 1 and 5 there occurred three. At this point in the analysis each of the administrative activities was reexplored in order to determine which of the topics identified in Figure 12 was discussed during any given activity in an attempt to understand their relationships with the academic activity of the class.

Figure 13 graphically illustrates which topics were discussed during any given Administrative Content activity across the seven days of the Spanish Conversation class. Patterns of topic distribution show that, while some topics were recurring topics, others were not. For example, one recurring topic was the handing out of homework assignments at the end of each day of the conversation class, except for the last day, Day 7. It is in this way that the students were, at least potentially, prepared for the next class meeting. More importantly, the homework assignments gave students opportunities to have some contact with the academic material of the class, even while they were not in class. The teacher handed out homework assignments at the end of each day by having the students file by a table and pick up prepared papers on which the teacher had written out specific assignments: what to do, what to study, what to bring to class, and why. For example, at the end of Day 1 the assignment was for the students to draw their family trees according to certain specifications and to bring in pictures of various family members, because they were going to be doing an activity in which these materials were to play a role some time during Day 2 of the class.

Often included in the homework assignments were commercially prepared vocabulary and grammar exercises copied from several outside sources by the teacher designed for the participants to have some kind of practice opportunity with particular lexical items and grammatical issues that
DAY 1
ENTRY
ADMINISTRATIVE
- Read/discuss course description handout
- Fill out personal information cards
- Introduction to course/teacher
- Introduction to Researcher/Project
BREAK
LUNCH
BREAK
ADMINISTRATIVE
EXIT
HAND OUT HOMEWORK ASSIGNMENT SHEETS
- Researcher discusses project/passes out "Releases" to be signed

DAY 2
ENTRY
ADMINISTRATIVE
- Go over class roster/phone numbers
- Introduce/discuss Berlitz tapes
- Tapes placed on reserve
BREAK
LUNCH
BREAK
ADMINISTRATIVE
EXIT
HAND OUT HOMEWORK ASSIGNMENT SHEETS

Figure 13
DAY 3
ENTRY
ADMINISTRATIVE
— T. announces and explains
Experimental Placement Exam
BREAK
LUNCH
ADMINISTRATIVE
EXIT
— Pass out homework assignment
for next week.

DAY 4
ENTRY
ADMINISTRATIVE
— T. announces/describes new tape
program he got in that he has to get
ready for the students
BREAK
LUNCH
ADMINISTRATIVE
EXIT
— Pass out homework assign-
ment for next week.
Remind students that class
begins at 9:00
Announce "Fashion Show"
and "Cherished Object of
Clothing" for next week

Figure 13 continued
DAY 5
ENTRY
ADMINISTRATIVE

None brought up when asked by T.
Remind about/discuss required student journals.
Discuss final projects: skits & presentations
Discuss schedule change for last day of course
Discuss going to restaurant
T. introduces new tape series he has for students
Discuss "Fashion Show" activity

BREAK
ADMINISTRATIVE

Pass out homework assignments for next week.

LUNCH
ADMINISTRATIVE

Announce off-campus music/cultural events

EXIT
ADMINISTRATIVE

DAY 6
ENTRY
ADMINISTRATIVE

Announce afternoon events: guests to class
Discuss/negotiate length of break and lunch
Continue above discussion on when to go to lunch
Call for/discuss/hand in "scripts"
Announce afternoon guests
Announce/discuss off-campus movies

BREAK
ADMINISTRATIVE

Finalize schedule for day 7:
skits/presentations
Remind of visit to restaurant

ADMINISTRATIVE
LUNCH

EXIT
ADMINISTRATIVE

Figure 13 continued
Figure 13 continued
were to be covered the next class meeting. For example, included in the family
tree assignment described above given at the end of Day 1 were several
commercially prepared practice assignments on which students were to perform
various fill-in-the-blank operations, such as complete a fictitious family tree as
indicted.

The recurring administrative activities discussed above served as a way
to establish beforehand a frame of reference for at least part the next class
meeting’s activity. While the students were not involved with the Spanish
conversation class directly during the remaining six days of the week, they did
have specific outside-of-class assignments to prepare during the rest of the
week when the class was not meeting. In this way the students were not
completely ignorant of what to expect in the way of possible topics for
discussion or language-related issues to be reviewed and practiced.

Another recurring topic that came up for discussion during the
Administrative Content Activities was commercially prepared language learning
and practice tapes that the teacher made available for the participants (i.e., from
Berlitz). The topic of these commercially prepared tapes came up publicly for
the first time during the morning administrative activity on Day 2 of the course.
At that time, the teacher announced that he had made available and placed "on
closed reserve" in the library a set of Berlitz tapes at the special request of at
least one student, who wanted to have some type of additional contact and oral
practice opportunities with Spanish outside of class.

The topic of commercial tapes again became an official matter for
discussion at the beginning of Day 4 when the teacher announced that he had
recently received in the mail another set of commercially prepared language
learning and practice tapes, which were different from the Berlitz tapes
mentioned at the beginning of Day 2. The topic of tapes again came up after the Break on Day 5 as well as after the Break on Day 6. It is also important to note that discussion of these tapes took place during the Entry stages of Day 3, 4, 5, and 6. At these times, however, the teacher spoke one-on-one to individuals (although not to all the participants) about the tapes they were using, asked their opinions about the worth of the tapes, when and how they listened to them, and sometimes he exchanged tapes between and among the participants. These discussions were sometimes in Spanish, although usually they were in English.

An additional recurring topic for discussion during Administrative Content activities was what was going to take place on Day 7 of the course, the last day. The first official discussion took place on Day 5 after the Break. At this time, the teacher announced that he had "some administrative materials" to bring up with the group. The teacher informed the participants that he had decided to change the normal time schedule for Day 7, although the final decision to do so was up to the students. This time schedule change was suggested as a possible alternative for the last class meeting because the teacher felt it would be nice if the whole group got together at a local Mexican-style restaurant for dinner that evening ostensibly to speak Spanish with real Spanish speakers outside the formal classroom setting. (It should be noted that, although the teacher couched the dinner in an opportunity for speaking Spanish, the group did not do so. The waiters at the restaurant all spoke English.)

At that same time, the teacher also announced another recurring topic for discussion, the final project for the students: the preparation and acting out of skits and/or presentations that were to be the "final exam" for the course. The topic of skits/presentations again arose twice on Day 6, both before the Lunch
break as well as at the end of the day.

While there were recurring topics for discussion during Administrative Content Activities, there also arose topics that were idiosyncratic, that is, non-recurring. For example, on Day 1 of the course, the first administrative activity occurred as the first official activity of the course. At that time, the teacher introduced himself and the course in English. After two specifically-planned speaking activities that followed the introduction, the teacher, as the second administrative activity of the day, handed out the official course description, which the participants read silently and subsequently discussed in English for a brief time. This discussion was immediately followed by the official introduction by the teacher of the researcher and the research project. This particular introduction, also in English, was purposefully brief as requested by the teacher. At the end of Day 1, however, the teacher gave the researcher his time to go into more detail with the participants about the research project and to pass out the release forms for the students to sign, thus indicating their agreement to have the research project take place during their conversation course.

Other administrative matters and concerns came up as well. On Day 2 in the morning, for example, the teacher requested that the students review the class roster for any necessary corrections. After corrections were made, the teacher passed out a copy of the roster to each student. On Day 3, because one of the members of the Modern Languages Department wanted to administer an experimental placement exam to the students in the Spanish conversation class on that day, the teacher took time as the first activity of the morning to discuss the exam, in English, with the students. On Day 5, after the morning break, the teacher decided it was appropriate to bring up on one more
time the required student journals that were briefly discussed on Day 2, as well as mention the "Fashion Show" activity that was to come that afternoon. On Day 6, there began a discussion initiated by a student of how long they could have for the morning break and for lunch. This discussion, which began prior to leaving for the break, and continued after returning from the break, arose because the morning activities seemed to take a longer than normal amount of time and the students wanted some time to relax and eat a leisurely lunch.

In summary, Administrative Content activities were discussions, usually in English, between and among the class members of administrative and procedural matters of concern to the group. While some administrative topics were recurring, others were idiosyncratic in that they came up once on a particular day. These administrative activities served to reorient the group to what was happening, when, and how. The discussion that follows turn to the Academic Content Activities that also occurred during in-class times.

**Question 1.2.2:**
The Nature of Academic Content Activities

During Academic Content Activities the participants were engaged in formal teacher-generated and directed academic activities of varying types. Figure 14 provides a taxonomy of each type of academic content activity. These activities were considered to be academic in nature because they all dealt directly, although in varying ways, with the academic purpose of the class--Spanish language. Six different categories of Academic Content Activities were identified. They are (1) speaking activities, (2) listening activities, (3) singing activities,(4) a dancing activity, (5) a verb morphology activity, and (6) a vocabulary review activity. Each will be briefly described separately below.

1 **Speaking activities.** Although speaking activities did take place during
Figure 14

Taxonomy of Academic Content Activities
the Spanish conversation course, they were not identical in terms of purpose, group make up, activity, etc. Investigation of those occasions when the teacher provided the students formal opportunities to speak in Spanish on a given topic revealed varying patterns of speaking opportunities. Figure 15 provides a taxonomy of the four different types of formal speaking activities: (A) Teacher Derived, (B) Native/Fluent Speakers, (C) Skits/Presentations, and (D) Interviews. Each will be described separately.

A Teacher-Derived speaking lessons were typically composed of varying parts, phases, and subphases that lasted for varying amounts of time. They are called "teacher-derived" because it was the teacher who specifically planned for (as noted in the teacher's planning tapes, as revealed on the teacher's daily activity cards, and as discussed during daily interviews with the teacher), put into action, and monitored each of these activities.

B Native/Fluent Speaker activities also occurred during one of the afternoon sessions of the Spanish Conversation Class. These activities brought guests to the class (friends of the teacher), who were fluent and/or native speakers of Spanish. One of the guests was a native speaker of Spanish from Colombia, the other two were fluent but non-native speakers of Spanish. The students, in groups of three or four, were invited to speak with these guests in Spanish. Unlike during "Teacher-Derived" speaking activities, topics for discussion were not imposed a priori by the teacher.

C Skits/Presentations were also included in the Spanish conversation course. On the last day of class, for example, the students presented their final formal speaking opportunities by either putting on skits or giving individual presentations in Spanish for the rest of the class. These skits and presentations were prepared and memorized outside of class.
Figure 15

Taxonomy of Speaking Activities
D Interviews also took place at varying points during the course. On the first day of class, for example, after the students had participated in a self-introduction speaking activity, the students were invited to interview the teacher to find out more about him. The next day of class, a bilingual student from Puerto Rico, who was studying at the college, and who was a friend of two of the participants, came to class. At this time the teacher invited students to interview her for a short while to find out information about her such as her age, where she was from, what she was studying, etc. On still another occasion, another bilingual student, this time from Venezuela, also a friend of two other participants, came to class. The participants were invited to interview her as well.

2 Listening Activities Not only was there a variety of formal opportunities to speak in Spanish, there were also formal listening opportunities of various types. Figure 16 presents a taxonomy of the different kinds of listening activities that occurred during the seven-day Spanish conversation course. These activities were considered to be of a listening type because the participants were not engaged in speaking Spanish. Rather, the activities, as structured a priori by the teacher, required the students primarily to listen to numerous things presented in Spanish and then to acknowledge comprehension in varying ways.

A Listening to recorded songs sung in Spanish occurred on six different occasions during the course. While listening, the students were required to fill in blanks on printed scripts of the songs from which varying numbers of words had been deleted. After listening to the songs, the participants discussed the literal meanings of the songs in English and on a word-by-word and/or line-by-line basis. Following this discussion, the instructor cleared up any language elements in the songs that the students did not understand.
Formal Listening Activities

- Listening to recorded songs and completing transcripts
- Listening to teacher read student-generated compositions
- Listening to other students read out loud student-generated work histories
- Listening to fluent guest speaker describe recent trip to Costa Rico

Figure 16

Taxonomy of Listening Activities
B In addition to the five music-listening activities, there was one listening activity that called for the participants to listen to the teacher as he read aloud several students' compositions that had been written in Spanish outside of class for homework and subsequently corrected by the teacher. As a whole-group activity, the students, upon listening, were to guess who, from among the students, had written the compositions.

C One occasion the students were called upon to read out loud the work histories of other students. These histories were written as an in-class activity. The histories were in the form of lists of different kinds of jobs/positions that people had held during their lives. Upon writing the lists, a student was then selected to read another student's work history while the other members were to listen and then guess who wrote the work history.

D Included in the listening lessons was one occasion when a guest speaker to the class told of her recent trip to Costa Rica. The students listened, but asked no questions.

3 Singing Figure 17 presents a taxonomy of singing activities. During the course, one student celebrated her birthday. This occasion allowed the teacher to lead the class in two versions of the birthday song, which the teacher taught and the group sang in Spanish, to highlight the occasion. Also, during the afternoon on Day 6 of the Spanish conversation class, the group sang together the words to the song "La Bamba" as directed and led by a native speaker who brought his guitar to the class.

4 Dancing One dancing activity occurred during the afternoon session Day 6. A guest speaker to the class, who was a native from Colombia, taught several participants (some of the more reticent class members chose not to participate directly, although they did watch and clap their hands) the steps and
Sing two birthday songs
Sing “El sueño imposible”
Sing “La bamba”

Figure 17
Taxonomy of Singing Activities
body movements to a popular Latin American dance.

5 Verb Morphology On one occasion, the teacher led the class through a rather quick lesson on the morphology of the imperfect tense in Spanish. The teacher wrote several verbs with their imperfect morphemes on the chalk board, led the students through some quick choral repetitions of the forms, told the students that this tense was used to talk about what people "used to do" and quickly ended the lesson. The teacher stated to the class that his rationale for including the activity was because "[he] wanted to at least get to the past" because "[he]'d still like [the participants] to leave with a little more structures . . ." The teacher also stated that the activity was a little preview "for next time." That next time never materialized, however.

6 Vocabulary Review On still another occasion, the teacher reviewed vocabulary for clothing and parts of the body with the class. During the lesson, the students referred to commercially-prepared materials that the students were to have completed for homework. The structure of this activity was similar to other vocabulary review activities that took place during the Pre-Conversational Activity Part of formal speaking lessons described above (i.e., See Research Question 2.0).

Tables 4, 5, and 6 provide a summary of the preceding discussion that was offered in response to Research Question 1.0. Table 4 presents the percentages of major activities in the Spanish conversation course. There were a total number of 61 major activities identified in this first analysis stage of the study. Of the 61 major activities, 42 (69%) were identified as academic in nature while 19 (31%) were considered administrative.

Table 5 provides a summary of information regarding percentages of different Academic Content Activities. Of the 42 total Academic Content
Table 4

Percentages of Major Activities in the Spanish Conversation Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Activity</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Content</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Content</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5
Percentages of Different Academic Content Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dancing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocab. Review</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6
Percentages of Different Speaking Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaking Activity</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-Derived</td>
<td>n=19</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native/Fluent Speakers</td>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skits/Presentations</td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Activities identified in Table 1, 29 (69%) were identified as Speaking Activities, 8 (19%) were identified as Listening Activities, 2 (5%) as Singing, 1 (2%) as Dancing, 1 (2%) as Morphology Review, and 1 (2%) as Vocabulary Review. What can be seen in Table 2 is that Speaking Activities comprised a significant portion of the Academic Content Activities in the Spanish Conversation Class.

Table 6 provides a summary of percentages of the different kinds of Speaking Activities identified in Table 2. Of the 29 total Speaking Activities, 19 (66%) were considered Teacher-Derived, 2 (7%) were considered as Native/Fluent Speaker, 5 (17%) were Skits and/or Presentations, and 3 (10%) were considered interviews. What is easy to see is that a significant portion of the formal Speaking opportunities were considered formal, Teacher-Derived Speaking opportunities as described above.

While the investigation revealed a substantial number of teacher-derived speaking opportunities (N=19) during the Spanish conversation course, closer analysis uncovered further differences, thus allowing the activities to be divided again into two types. The first type of teacher-derived speaking activity consisted of the teacher asking students to tell and to share personal information with one another as it related to a teacher-selected topic. During small-group, learner-to-learner conversation, then, the participants were to find out the requisite information from the other group members in order to share it with the rest of the class during a subsequent part of the activity. In contrast, the second type of Teacher-Derived speaking activity, while it, too, asked the participants to get into small groups and to talk about a teacher-generated topic, the students were not to share or find out personal information per se. Rather, the students were to do something different, such as practice teaching something to another group member. As revealed in Table 7, 12 or 63% of the
Table 7

Percentages of Type 1 and Type 2 Speaking Activities

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type 1</td>
<td>12 (63%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 2</td>
<td>7 (37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher-Derived speaking opportunities fell into the first category while 7 or 37\% fell into the second.

Analysis revealed a substantial number of selected teacher-derived speaking opportunities that took place during the Spanish conversation course. The 12 identified activities were found to be analogous in nature to one another in that all provided similar opportunities for the participants to share personal information with one another, information that was later to be shared with the rest of the class during whole-group conversation.

Validation for this finding was accomplished while interviewing the teacher during the analysis phase of the study. The teacher stated that the primary goal of speaking activities was to have students get together in small groups, share in Spanish among themselves information as it pertained to a teacher-specified topic, and then return to a whole group format during which the students would share individually with the other class members what they had learned about each other.

Summary

The purpose of this discussion has been to present a macro-level description of when and under what circumstances the teacher provided opportunities for the students to speak in Spanish between and among themselves in a small-group format. The analysis revealed a pattern of analogous small-group speaking opportunities (n=12) found during investigation of the intensive Spanish conversation course that met for six hours a day, one day a week (Friday), for seven weeks. Because the primary focus of this study was on the nature of formal activity designed specifically to allow for small-group learner-to-learner speaking opportunities in Spanish, it was decided
to concentrate only on those activities that developed toward providing the participants such opportunities.

As a first step in the analysis, it was necessary to abstract from the wide variety of events that took place during the entire seven day course when and under what circumstances speaking activities took place. The primary data sources used in seeking an answer for this first Research Question were the fieldnotes, videotapes, and audiotapes that the researcher generated during the data collection phase of the study. The macrostructural analysis, which represents the first phase of analysis in this study, revealed an array of activities that were divided into two major categories: academic and administrative. Academic activities were those activities that dealt directly with the Spanish language in one way or another. Administrative activities dealt exclusively with administrative and procedural matters regarding the organization and requirements of the course that were of interest and concern to the group.

The identification and description of 12 systematically selected teacher-derived speaking activities presented above now helps in seeking an understanding of how these activities varied in their organizational structure one from the other because not all speaking activities developed in exactly the same manner. What follows, then, is a discussion of the stability and variability of those speaking activities both within and across activities.

RESEARCH QUESTION 2.0: THE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE TWELVE SELECTED SPEAKING ACTIVITIES IN THE SPANISH CONVERSATION COURSE

Because the primary purpose of the study was to investigate the nature of recurring opportunities for the participants to speak in Spanish between and among themselves in small groups, Research Question 1.0 sought an
understanding of when and under what circumstances formal opportunities to speak Spanish in a small-group format were provided for the participants during the Spanish conversation course. Analysis revealed that, although there was a variety of academic activities, those speaking activities that specifically provided opportunities for the participants to speak in Spanish between and among themselves in small groups about a variety of teacher-designated topics were of a significant number, which suggests that they were an important component of the course. Triangulation for this finding was accomplished in varying ways. The teacher, during interviews, commented several times on these activities and their purposes; the teacher's planning tapes revealed his specific plans for these activities; the students mentioned the same activities during interviews; the students described the activities during subsequent written course evaluations. Further investigation of those activities, therefore, was warranted. The question in this section, then, seeks to present findings relative to the organizational structure of the twelve systematically selected speaking activities that took place during the Spanish conversation course. The major question that guided the analysis is:

2.0 What is the organizational structure of the twelve speaking activities in the Spanish conversation class?

This major question was further refined:

2.1 How is the organizational structure of one speaking activity both similar to and different from the organizational structure of other similar activities?

The preceding question consisted of two parts:

2.1.1 What is stable about the organizational structure of the twelve selected speaking activities?
2.1.2 What is variable about the organizational structure of the twelve speaking activities?

Research Question 2.1 was derived after interacting with the primary data sources during the initial analysis phase of the study. After it was determined that the Spanish conversation course consisted of activities other than just speaking activities (Research Question 1.0), the researcher decided to attend only to those activities that were identified as formal, teacher-derived speaking activities of a particular type thereby narrowing the scope of the study to investigate specifically how those activities were constructed and how students participated in them. Research Question 2.1, while grounded if the specific research project, was also grounded in recent research on classroom processes from a social interaction perspective. This literature has repeatedly suggested that the way in which academic activities become organized through face-to-face interaction can influence the manner in which students perform both socially and academically within them (e.g., Erickson, 1982; Graham, 1986; Green & Harker, 1982; Green & Weade, 1985, 1987; Green, Weade, & Graham, 1988; Mehan, Cazden, Coles, Fisher, & Margoules, 1976; Puro & Bloome, 1987; Weade & Green, in press).

Question 2.1.1: Analytic Process
Question 2.1.2: Analytic Process

To answer the research questions about organizational stability (Question 2.1.1) and organizational variability (Question 2.1.2) across the twelve systematically selected speaking activities during the Spanish conversation course, a multi-stage process consisting of microanalysis and macroanalysis of the instructional conversations between and among the participants was used. Microanalysis of instructional conversations was
conducted for two of the twelve speaking activities: "Describing Houses" (Day 4) and "Daily Routines" (Day 6). Macroanalysis of the instructional conversation was conducted on the remaining 10 activities not microanalyzed. Microanalysis of the conversations resulted in the construction and analysis of organizational maps of the activities. (See Appendix A for those organizational maps.) Although microanalysis and map construction was not conducted for all speaking activities, the steps for macroanalysis were very similar. (See Chapter III.)

The process of microanalysis and macroanalysis produced structural maps of the twelve systematically selected analogous speaking activities. Those maps that were constructed from macroanalysis, however, differed only in the level of hierarchical units used. For example, the structural map constructed for the activity on "Describing Houses" (Day 4) contained conversational data relative to the units in the sociolinguistic Descriptive Analysis System (Green, 1977; Green & Wallat, 1981) (See Chapter III.), from Message Units to Phase Units, while the structural map constructed for the activity entitled "Getting to Know You" (Day 1) contained only Phase Units. Once these maps were constructed, an investigation of recurring patterns of structural organization both within and across the twelve speaking activities was conducted. The product of this investigation was the identification of both stable and variable features of speaking activities.

Question 2.1.1: Patterns of Organizational Stability

After the structural maps were constructed, a search for repeated patterns of organizational stability and variability both within and across the twelve speaking activities was conducted. This systematic search through the
primary data sources (i.e., Research Question 1.0) led to the identification of one completely stable, macro-level organizational pattern of instructional events for the twelve speaking activities identified in Question 1.0. This macrolevel pattern of instructional events was the pattern of organization for each of the speaking activities. This stable macrolevel pattern consisted of two different but interrelated parts. Figure 18 illustrates this structure, which was composed of:

(a) Pre-Conversational Activity Part
(b) General Conversational Activity Part

Within each of these major parts, however, there were also stable subparts that occurred in each of the selected speaking activities identified in Question 1.0. The findings relative to each macrolevel part and its subparts are presented below separately.

**Pre-Conversational Activity Part of Speaking Activities**

The Pre-Conversational Activity Part of speaking activities repeatedly consisted of one or more phases. (See Figure 18.) One important phase that remained stable throughout each of the 12 selected speaking activities consisted of the teacher presenting (or assigning) the major small-group speaking task for the students to accomplish during the first phase of the next major part of the activity, the General Conversational Activity Part. This Small-Group Speaking Task Presentation Phase of the activity was used by the teacher in each speaking activity to set up the specific academic task to be accomplished between and among the learners: speaking in Spanish to learn information from one another relative to a teacher-generated topic, which included specific task instructions regarding who was to talk with whom, how, and for what purpose. (Further discussion of the Small-Group Speaking Task
Figure 18

Macrostructure of Speaking Activities*
Presentation Phase is presented in Research Question 3.0.)

Stability in the fact that the teacher always set up the topic and direction for discussion as a component the Pre-Conversational Activity Part of speaking activities developed a shared frame of reference between the student members of the class and the teacher. Students clearly knew what was expected of them in terms of requirements for participation in the small-group speaking phase of the General Conversational Activity Part that followed. In this way, students were able to get started quickly with the small-group speaking task without "wasting time" trying to figure out what to talk about, with whom, or how to talk about it.

The findings indicated above demonstrate stability in the fact that specific speaking tasks to be accomplished in small groups were presented to students. From an organizational perspective, that the teacher consistently acted out his role as instructional leader by formally assigning a specific speaking task facilitated students' participation in carrying out that task. In this way, students were able to begin speaking, thereby having the opportunity to practice speaking in Spanish about a given topic.

In summary, the findings with regard to stability within the Pre-Conversational part of the twelve selected speaking activities revealed that during the Presentation of Small Group Speaking Task Phase, the teacher consistently provided the students not only with the major topic for discussion but in so doing the manner in which the students were to talk as well as who was to talk with whom.

**General Conversational Activity Part of Speaking Lesson**

The next set of findings with respect to patterns of organizational stability
within the twelve systematically selected speaking activities focuses on the second part of the macro-organizational structure, which is identified as the General Conversational Activity Part. Because the Spanish conversation course was primarily one in which students were to be provided opportunities for speaking in Spanish, this part of formal, teacher-derived speaking activities was determined to be the major emphasis of activity. In his planning tape for the first day of the course, for example, the teacher stated that his goal, while affective in nature (i.e., "To develop a sense of group camaraderie . . . [so that] . . . students will feel comfortable"), was to provide students with opportunities to speak about topics "that are part of their world, their experiences, and their interests rather than talking about external topics, such as politics, abortion or economy, or things like that." In a follow-up interview, when the teacher responded to a question about why students got together in pairs or in threes, which they did following the PreConversational Activity Part of Speaking Activity, the teacher stated that his whole thrust in the course was for students "to be able to talk together in Spanish about certain topics and themes, and thereby come to know each other better."

**Small Group Speaking Phase**

Within the completely stable General Conversational Activity Part of the twelve selected speaking activities there occurred another stable phase, the Small-Group Speaking Phase. It was during this phase that students were to form their assigned small groups and to speak with one another about the topic the teacher presented during the preceding Small-Group Speaking Task Presentation Phase. During this phase, students were to find out/share/talk about information from one another relative to the teacher-generated topic. For
example, during the speaking activity "Places in My Life" students were to share information about their neighborhoods by describing buildings and other places, such as parks, shopping centers, rivers, and swimming pools that were close to their homes or in their neighborhoods. Because this phase of speaking activities remained stable across the twelve selected speaking activities, it became the subject for more indepth analysis (i.e., See Research Question 3.0).

The findings in this Section 2.1.1 presented data relative to the stable aspects of the organizational structure of the twelve systematically selected speaking activities found in the Spanish conversation course. The existence of stable patterns of organization indicates that a firm structure was in place. Not only was the stable structure visible during the analysis phases of the study, students, too, were able to describe the structure. As indicated in Table 8, of the five (out of nine) students who turned in journals at the end of the course, three students (60%) described the stable pattern of events within speaking activities. In addition, of the six students interviewed during the course, 100% described verbally the stable pattern of events.

The existence of stability within the organizational structure of the twelve teacher-derived speaking activities does not, however, suggests that these speaking activities were static phenomena. On the contrary, while stability did exist, variability existed within the stable parts of these activities. In fact, patterns of organizational variability indicated that, in addition to the two stable parts discussed above, still another part existed in a number of the selected speaking activities. These patterns of organizational variability are discussed in the following section.
Table 8

Percentages of Students Who Identified the Core Pattern of Events in Journals and/or during interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Student</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Not interviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>No journal</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>No journal</td>
<td>Not interviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>No journal</td>
<td>Not interviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>No journal</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 2.1.2: Patterns of Organizational Variability

The findings discussed in this section will demonstrate that although the basic macro-level organizational structure of teacher-derived speaking activities discussed above remained stable for the twelve speaking activities identified in Research Question 1.0, there also existed variable elements within the stable structures. In addition to the variable elements found within the basic macro-level structure, there also existed another major part that occurred at the end of several speaking activities, the Post-Conversational Activity Part. (See Figure 18.) The findings relative to the variability within activities demonstrated that there were phases of activity that were specific to individual speaking activities while at the same time there were phases that were found across several activities. In this way, each activity had its own set of goals, purposes, and content. Because there existed variable phases within each of the major parts identified, the findings will be presented separately.

A Variable Phase Within the Pre-Conversational Activity Part

Language Issues Phase(s)

During this phase the teacher and the students were engaged in language instruction and review activity designed to instruct or review specific teacher-selected aspects of Spanish language, such as the formation of the present tense in Spanish, the periphrastic future, telling time, reviewing vocabulary specific to particular clusters (e.g., members of the family, buildings, days of the week and months of the year), reviewing noun/adjective agreement rules, among other language-oriented issues. Table 9 shows that 8 or 67% of the selected speaking activities contained in Language Issues Phase, which
Table 9

Percentage of Speaking Activities that Contained Stable and Variable Parts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Issues</th>
<th>Pre Conv. Part</th>
<th>General Conv. Part</th>
<th>Post Conv. Part</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small Group Task Presentation</td>
<td>Small Group Speaking Activity</td>
<td>Words That Came Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting To Know You</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Or Three Good Things</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What I Like To Do</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Things I Do (present Tense)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clock Line Up</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking About Our Families</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorite Times</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Places In My Life</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorite Possession</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describing Houses</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherished Object To Be Saved</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Routines</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

67% 100% 100% 25% 83% 33% 17%
suggests that the teacher was concerned that the students receive some kind of instruction or a review of pertinent language points in preparation for the following General Conversational Part. The purpose of this phase was to prepare the students in some way to speak with one another during the following small group activity by providing them with needed language structures and vocabulary.

Variability Within the General Conversational Activity Part:

The Whole Group Call Back Session Phase

As discussed above, the purpose of the General Conversational Part of speaking activities was for students to get together and accomplish a teacher-defined speaking task using Spanish as the primary means of communication. Variability within the General Conversational Activity Part of speaking activities consisted specifically in the teacher's grouping strategies. While all activities required students to get together in small groups, some activities contained what the teacher referred to as the Whole Group Call Back Session. Table 9 indicates that 10 or 83% of the selected activities contained the Whole Group Call Back Session within their macrostructure, which suggests that this phase was considered an important element in the speaking activity as a whole. During a subsequent interview, the teacher explained the importance of the Whole-Group Call Back Session in the overall scheme of things. He stated that he "wanted the students to share the information they got from their partners and not just forget about it. After all, reporting information is important. Besides, if I didn't ask them to do it, what purpose would they see in the activity? I wanted them to be responsible for the information they learned,"
thereby, hopefully, they would listen more and be more attentive to the others in the group."

During the whole-group speaking activity, the students were to share information obtained from their partners during the preceding small-group activity. Hence, the topic of discussion was directly related to the preceding small-group speaking activity as well. During this activity, the teacher nominated speakers (or individuals volunteered to share) to share information with the rest of the group. In this way, the teacher was successful in having students be accountable for the information learned about their partners as it related to the topic. For example, during the speaking activity entitled "Describing Houses" students who lived in apartments were to talk with those students who lived in houses during the small-group speaking activity and find out information about their houses (e.g., how many floors, how many bedrooms, where located, etc.). Then, during the Whole-Group Call Back Phase, the students who lived in apartments were to share information learned about the houses of their partners with the rest of the class.

Words That Came Up Phase

Between the Small Group Speaking Phase and the Whole Group Speaking Phase, however, there sometimes occurred a short phase during which the teacher briefly highlighted vocabulary that came up during the preceding small group activity. Table 9 indicates that in only 3 or 25% of the twelve selected speaking activities did this Phase take occur.
Another Variable Part of Teacher-Derived Speaking Activities:
The Post-Conversational Activity Part

As indicated above, in addition to the two stable macro-level parts of speaking activities, the Pre-Conversational Activity Part and the General Conversational Activity Part, there also existed one variable part, the Post-Conversational Activity Part. Table 9 indicates that 4 or 33% of the selected speaking activities contained this variable part within their organizational structure. The Post-Conversational Activity Part of Speaking Activities served as a follow-up to the preceding major parts. During this variable part of speaking activities, the teacher conducted various activities that served three major functions: (1) to review and/or add to language issues already discussed; (2) to "test" students memory about what others had said during the Whole Group Call Back Session of the General Conversational Activity Part, and (3) to bring closure to the activity. The findings showed that this part of speaking activities contained two variable phases. Each phase is discussed individually below.

Review/Add To Language Issues Phase

During this phase, the teacher reviewed and/or added on to the language issues that had been discussed during the Language Issues Phase of the Pre-Conversational Activity Part or brought up additional lexical items or grammar points that arose during the General Conversational Activity Part. Table 9 shows that this phase appeared during only two or 17% of the twelve identified speaking activities.

Memory Game Phase

During this phase, the teacher "tested" students' memories regarding information about the members of the class that were discussed during the
Whole-Group Call Back Session of the General Conversational Activity Part of Speaking activities. In the teacher's planning tapes he remarked that "listening is so important in conversation." In this way, the Memory Game ("Juego de memoria") served as a test to reinforce the importance of listening and remembering what others say during conversation. As Table 9 indicates, this phase took place during four or 33% of the speaking activities.

The findings presented above relative to the variabilities found within the twelve selected speaking activities combine with the findings relative to patterns of organizational stability to provide a macro-level description of their organizational structure. As was shown, the speaking activities were made up of a stable macro-level structure that contained both stable and variable elements within it. The picture that emerges from these data is that the formal speaking activity, which was a recurring phenomenon during the Spanish conversation course, was a dynamic entity that provided students with consistent opportunities to reach the overall goal of the course, speaking in Spanish about a variety of topics, which the teacher felt were of interest to the group and of linguistic importance.

RESEARCH QUESTION 3.0:
ACADEMIC STRUCTURE OF SMALL-GROUP SPEAKING TASKS DURING THE SELECTED SPEAKING ACTIVITIES

The question in this section seeks to examine the nature of small-group (i.e., learner-to-learner) academic speaking tasks previously identified as a recurring feature of each of the 12 selected speaking activities in the Spanish conversation course. The general question guiding the analysis in this section is:

3.0 What is the academic structure of the small-group learner-to-learner
speaking tasks located within each of the 12 teacher-derived speaking activities in the Spanish conversation course?

Although academic content most assuredly occurred in the Pre-Conversational Activity Part of of the 12 selected formal, teacher-derived speaking activities (e.g., Language Issue(s) Phase), the small-group speaking task activity was a primary feature of the 12 selected speaking activities. Both the teacher and the participants identified small-group activity as one of the most outstanding characteristics of the course. Hence, the small-group speaking task was a principal source of academic information. The discussion of academic task and academic structure, therefore, will concentrate on the small-group speaking task.

The small-group speaking task, while it is a primary source of academic activity and information, was not an undifferentiated component. Students were to perform differing speaking tasks, which were presented by the teacher in varying ways. Because of the varying nature of small-group speaking tasks, Research Question 3.0 required a series of sub-questions:

3.1 What are patterns of information communicated to students during the Small-Group Speak Task Presentation Phases?

"Task presentation" has been of considerable concern among researchers investigating the teaching-learning process from a process-product program of research. This question, therefore, was derived from traditional means of investigating foreign language classrooms. (See Allwright, 1988; Chaudron, 1988; Long, 1983.) In addition, Shulman (1986) and Erickson (1986) have discussed recent work on the study of teacher knowledge, that is, ways that teachers gain knowledge and the manner in which that knowledge gets transformed and subsequently presented to students during instruction. The
question guiding the observation and analysis is thus grounded in both past and recent work on instruction.

3.2 What are the recurring patterns of interaction during learners' participation in small-group learner-to-learner speaking activity?

In responding to this question, a number of recurring patterns of interaction during small-group speaking activity were identified.

**Question 3.1: Analytical Process**

The question in this section explores the patterns of information communicated by the teacher regarding the small-group speaking task just prior to the students' performing the task. The specific question guiding the analysis is:

3.1 What are the patterns of information communicated to students during the Small-Group Speaking Task Presentation Phase of the Pre-Conversational Activity Part of the 12 selected speaking activities?

Data for exploration of patterns of information communicated by the teacher during the Small-Group Speaking Task Presentation Phase of the Pre-Conversational Activity Part were extracted via the process of microanalysis of the speaking task presentation phases of ten of the selected speaking activities identified in Research Question 1.0. The data were obtained by first searching the structural maps of two of the speaking activities (i.e., "Describing Houses" and "Daily Routines"). Patterns of information were extracted and described. Following this first step in the analysis process, the remaining eight Small-Group Speaking Task Presentations Phases were transcribed verbatim and were likewise explored. Whenever new patterns of information were extracted, they, too, were recorded and described. Ten recurring patterns of
information communicated by the teacher were inductively derived.

**Question 3.1: Patterns of Information**

The ten patterns of information are presented in Table 10 and discussed below. They are presented in the order of frequency with which each appeared across each of the ten Small-Group Speaking Task Presentation Phases.

**Teacher Structures Grouping Pattern**

The pattern "Teacher Structures Grouping Pattern" refers to the information communicated by the teacher regarding his assigning the students to particular groups. Students were not allowed to selfselect partners for small group work. During one interview with the teacher he stated that he did not want "cliques" of students always talking with the same students. He said he wanted to make sure that "no one got left out during the small groups" and that "everyone should have the opportunity to talk with everyone else." This category of information occurred in 100% of the small-group speaking tasks.

**Teacher Provides Specific Topic**

The pattern "Teacher Provides Specific Topic" was also present in 100% of the Small-Group Speaking Task Presentation Phases. The teacher, in his planning tapes and on the activity cards he kept with him throughout each class meeting, had already decided upon and planned for specific topics he wanted students to talk about during the small-group phase of speaking activity. The topic for small group discussion was sometimes first introduced during the Language Issue(s) Phase of the Pre-Conversational Activity Part. For example, during the activity entitled "Talking About Our Families," the teacher and the students reviewed specific vocabulary for talking about family members as well
Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaking Activity</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pattern of Information</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Structures Grouping Pattern</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Provides Specific Topic</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. States What To Do</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. States What Listeners Should Do</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. States Follow-Up Activity</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Provides Example of What To Do</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Provides Structure</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Provides Context</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. States Time Limit</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. States Grammatical Purpose</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
as common adjectives used to describe people, such as "alto", "bajo", "tiene ___ _ anos," among many others.

**Teacher States What to Do**

"Teacher States What to Do" is a pattern of information also communicated to students during 100% of the Small-Group Task Presentation Phases. This category of information refers to the specific verbs that the teacher used to inform the students of the nature of the speaking tasks they were expected to perform. The teacher used such verbs as "tell [your partner]," "give off," "give us," "share," "find out," "tell about." These verbs are explored later in this section.

**Teacher States What Listeners Should Do**

The teacher's specifically mentioning what students who are receiving information should do occurred in 70% of the Small-Group Speaking Task Presentation Phases (7 out of 10).

**Teacher States Follow-up Activity**

Sometimes (i.e., in 6 out of 10 or 60% of the Small-Group Speaking Task Presentation Phases) the teacher specifically mentioned a follow-up activity, that is, what the participants were going to do following the small-group speaking phases. He said, for example, "[When you're finished in the small group] we'll share some of that," "Report back to the class [with the information you got from your partner]," "We'll have a round table where we'll learn what everybody's favorite [time of the day] is. These statements served to inform and remind students of what they were going to need to do with the information they got from their small group partner(s). In other words, student were held
accountable for the information.

**Teacher Provides an Example of What to Do**

The pattern "Teacher Provides an Example of What to Do" occurred in 30% (3 out of 10) of the Small-Group Speaking Task Phases. This pattern refers to instances when the teacher gave an example of something students might say to one another during their small group speaking activity. For example, during the speaking task presentation phase of the activity entitled "Favorite Times" the teacher told the students to talk about their favorite season and favorite day of the week, giving two reasons why for each. He used an example regarding himself saying "Por ejemplo, en mi caso mi estacion favorita es el verano, eh? es el verano porque no tengo que llevar mucha ropa y porque hay mucho sol todo el dia" [For example, in my case my favorite season is the summer eh? it's the summer because I don't have to wear much clothing and it's sunny all day long].

**Teacher Provides Structure**

This pattern refers to instances when the teacher provided certain fixed or stock expressions that students could use in telling information to their partners. By providing structure, the teacher tried to facilitate participation for those students who were of a lower proficiency. The teacher provided these structures during 3 out of the 10 (30%) of the Small-Group Speaking Task Presentation Phases. During the activity entitled "What I Like to Do," for example, the teacher provided stock expressions like "A mi me gusta" [I like] and "A mi tambien" [Me too] that the students could use while participating in the assigned speaking task.
**Teacher Provides Context**

A few times (2 out of 10, or 20%), the teacher provided a wider context in which the students might find themselves saying certain things or talking about certain topics. For example, during the Small-Group Speaking Task Presentation Phase of the activity "Two or Three Good Things About Myself," the teacher said to "[Tell] some things that if you talk to somebody at a party for a long time they might come out if you had a two-way conversation."

**Teacher States Time Limit**

The pattern "Teacher States Time Limit" appeared during 2 (or 20%) of the Small-Group Speaking Task Presentation Phases. Twice the teacher mentioned a time limit for small group activity. Although the teacher mentioned a time limit for carrying out the assigned speaking task, the teacher did not adhere to the limit. The students continued with the small-group activity beyond the stated time allocation.

**Teacher States Grammatical Purpose**

During only one of the task presentation phases (10%) did the teacher mention a specific grammatical purpose for the assigned small-group speaking activity. For example, during the speaking task presentation phase of the activity "What I Like to Do," the teacher stated that they were going to be using "the present tense, so we'll get to practice that a little bit."

To summarize, ten different patterns of information communicated by the teacher were extracted from ten of the twelve selected Small Group Speaking Task Presentation Phases (i.e., two of the Small-Group Speaking Task Presentation Phases were not recorded and no permanent record of them is available). These patterns represent recurring pieces of information that the
teacher presented to students as he presented and defined the small-group speaking task. While a general description was given of each of the ten patterns, an indepth look at one pattern is presented below.

**An Indepth Look at One Pattern of Information:**
**Teacher States What to Do**

One of the most frequently occurring patterns of information, "Teacher States What to Do," provided an important instructional focus as regards the specific speaking task requirement. Because this pattern occurred in 100% of the Small-Group Speaking Task Presentation Phases of the selected speaking activities, questions were raised about the nature of the teacher-stated speaking task. To determine the nature of the speaking task, it was necessary to reenter each of the ten transcribed speaking task presentation phases.

Upon reentering each of the transcribed task presentations, data were extracted by searching for the specific verbs used by the teacher when telling students what to do. Beginning with the the first Small-Group Speaking Task Presentation Phase, specific verbs pertaining to what students were supposed to do when speaking in their small groups were located and highlighted. In this way, data were obtained in relation to both the individual verbs and the frequency with which each appeared across the ten task presentation phases. Analysis of these elements resulted in the identification of 5 verbs that the teacher used in telling the students specifically what to do during the small-group speaking task. Table 11 provides a summary of the findings extracted during this phase in the analysis process.

As presented in Table 11, the verbs used by the teacher when telling students specifically what to do when participating in the the small-group speaking task are "Tell," which appeared in 4 of the task presentations; "Talk
about" appeared in only 1 of the task presentations, while "Share" appeared in 3. "Find out about" appeared in only 1 task presentation, as did the verb "Give off."

The discussion above explored the specific verbs used and the frequency of their use by the teacher during 10 of the 12 Small-Group Speaking Task Presentation Phases. These verbs were highlighted to understand better the nature of the speaking tasks as communicated by the teacher. These verbs were identified as a major instructional focus in the carrying out of small-group speaking tasks.

**An Indepth Look at Another Pattern of Information:**

**Teacher Provides Specific Topic**

Another of the most frequently occurring patterns of information communicated by the teacher during the Small-Group Speaking Task Presentation Phases is the category "Teacher Provides Topic." This pattern also supplied an important instructional focus related to the topics for learner-to-learner discussion. Because this pattern of information also occurred in 100% of the task presentations, questions were raised about what those topics were. To determine the varying topics for discussion, it was necessary to reenter the verbatim transcripts of the ten task presentation phases.

Data were extracted by pulling those transcript lines that pertained to the presentation of the specific topic. Figure 19 provides a summary of these data. In the left-hand column are found the thematic titles of the ten speaking tasks investigated. On the right-hand column are descriptions of the topics.

For the first speaking activity, entitled "Getting to Know You," the participants were to "Tell about [self] . . . just general things about [self]." The speaking activity entitled "Two or Three Good Things About Myself" called for
Table 11

Verbs used by the teacher and frequency of use in stating specifically what to do during shared-group speaking task.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Tell&quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Talk About&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Share&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Find Out About&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Give Off&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>n=10</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Title</td>
<td>Topic/What To Do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Getting to Know You</td>
<td>Tell about yourself; just general things about yourself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Two or Three Good Things</td>
<td>Tell two or three good things about yourself; tell about things that show you in a good light.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About Myself</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What I Like to Do</td>
<td>Give off/share some things you like to do; just take turns sharing with each other what you like to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Things I Do</td>
<td>Give a little more information about things you do using the present tense; tell more information about when you do them and where.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Clock Line Up</td>
<td>Tell the other people in your group your favorite hour of the day and why it's your favorite.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 19**

*Taxonomy of Small-Group Speaking Topics*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Title</th>
<th>Topic/What To Do</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Teaching About Our Families</td>
<td>Tell about other members of your family, using photographs and/or family trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Favorite Times</td>
<td>Share information about your favorite season of the year and day of the week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Cherished Object To Be Saved</td>
<td>Share what things you'd like to save from your burning house and why this is the particular thing you'd like to have saved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Describing Houses</td>
<td>People who don't live in a house talk to people who do. Find out information about this house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Daily Routines</td>
<td>Talk about your average day, but not Friday; talk about all the things you do; tell the saddest (i.e., most detailed) routine story possible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 19 continued

Taxonomy of Small-Group Speaking Topics
the students to "Tell two or three good things about [self] . . . [that] . . . show you in a good light." For the activity entitled "What I Like to Do," students were instructed to "Give off some things [they] like to do . . . just take turns sharing with each other what [they] like to do." "Things I Do" called for the students to "Give a little more information about things [they] do using the present tense . . . tell more information about when [they] do them and where." During the small-group phase of the activity entitled "Clock Line Up," students were to "tell other people in [their] group [their] favorite hour of the day why it's [their] favorite." In "Talking About Our Families," students were instructed to "Tell about other members of [their] family, using photographs and/or family trees." "Favorite Times" allowed students to "share information about [their] favorite season of the year and day of the week," while the activity entitled "Cherished Object to Be Saved" provided the participants an opportunity to "share what [they would] like to have saved from [their burning house] and why this is the particular thing [they would] like to have saved." In "Describing Houses," the teacher instructed "the people who don't live in a house to talk to the people who do . . . [and] . . . find out information about this house." Finally, during the small-group speaking task for the activity entitled "Daily Routines," the teacher told the students to "get into [their] little groups ... [and tell] . . . the saddest routine story possible when [they are] talking about [their] average day. Not Friday because Friday is a special day . . . but for other days . . . I want to hear a real sad one, you know, just, you know, all the things you do."

The above discussion was provided to respond to questions raised relative to the topics the teacher provided the participants for discussion during the ten small-group speaking activities. In response to those questions, the researcher reentered the verbatim transcripts and extracted transcript lines and
synthesized information communicated by the teacher in order to arrive at the
descriptions of topics. The findings demonstrate that there was a wide variety of
topics for discussion. The descriptions of the topics for discussion as well as of
the recurring verbs used by the teacher when telling students what specifically
to do provided the framework in which students could be assessed in terms of
their participation during small-group work.

Examining Effectiveness Holistically:
A Communicative Perspective

The general description of the ten patterns of information the teacher
communicated to students during each of the ten Small-Group Speaking Task
Presentations, along with a more indepth inquiry into both the verbs used by the
teacher to communicate the specific speaking tasks and the teacher-defined
topics for discussion provided only a description of what information actually got
communicated. These data, however, provide little information regarding the
effectiveness of that communication. Because the goal of the project was to
investigate patterns of instruction and student participation during these
small-group learner-to-learner speaking opportunities, at least two additional
questions have to be posed at this point. Did the information the teacher
actually communicated to the students create a shared frame of reference
between the students and the teacher and did that shared frame, in turn,
facilitate the conduct of the participants while performing their small group
speaking tasks?

In responding to these two questions, it became necessary to investigate
the appropriateness or inappropriateness of the students' activity while
participating in the small-group speaking task. It was assumed that if the
participants were considered appropriately engaged during the assigned
small-group speaking task, then the teacher's communication of task-related information regarding the conduct of academic work had been performed effectively. As pointed out by Graham (1986), "this measure of effectiveness, then, was different from that used in traditional research on teaching, namely, student learning (i.e., as usually determined by gain scores on an end-of-instruction product measure(s) (p. 272). (See Shulman, 1986.) In this way, effectiveness of instruction is linked to the appropriateness or inappropriateness of the conduct of the participants during a given task.

Data for exploration of students' appropriate or inappropriate activity during small-group speaking opportunities were obtained by applying the categories Appropriately Engaged or Inappropriately Engaged to each student's turn at talk. Student turns at talk were sampled from four selected small-group speaking opportunities, "What I Like to Do," "Cherished Object to Be Saved," "Describing Houses," and "Daily Routines." The determination of appropriateness or inappropriateness of student conduct during the four sampled small-group speaking opportunities was performed on a holistic basis. It was necessary to look at the entire small-group speaking activity, from beginning to end, to determine appropriateness of participation for any single student in the sample.

**Findings.** Table 12 shows the findings relative to the students' appropriate engagement in academic activity (i.e., speaking in Spanish about a teacher-defined topic). Those findings are shown in terms of the percentage of students appropriately engaged in the small-group speaking opportunities as defined *a priori* by the teacher. The data indicate that in all cases sampled (n=4), all students (n=11) were considered to be consistently engaged in an appropriate manner in the academic work of the small-group activity. The data
Table 12

Percent of Students Appropriately Engaged During
Small-Group Speaking Opportunity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaking Activity</th>
<th>Percent Appropriately Engaged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What I Like To Do</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherished Object To Be Saved</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describing Houses</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Routines</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
suggest, therefore, that the communication of information during the Small-Group Speaking Task Presentation Phases had been accomplished effectively. The students and the teacher did indeed share a frame of reference regarding the purposes and outcomes of the small-group speaking task.

**Question 3.2: Analytical Process**

The question in this section explores patterns of interaction between and among the students while participating in their small-group learner-to-learner conversations. The specific question guiding the analysis is:

3.2 What are recurring patterns of interaction during learners' participation in small-group learner-to-learner speaking activity?

Data for exploration of patterns of interaction found during smallgroup learner-to-learner speaking activity were extracted by means of the process of micro- and macroanalysis of the Small-Group Speaking Phases of three of the 12 systematically selected speaking activities identified in Research Question 1.0, and whose patterns of organizational stability and variability were explored in Research Question 2.0. Specifically, the Small-Group Speaking Phases of the speaking activities "Cherished Object to Be Saved," "Describing Houses," and "Daily Routines" were explored. The data were obtained by exploring the structural maps of each of the small-group activities. Simultaneously, the video- and audiotapes were reviewed. Using the type-case analytic model presented earlier (See Chapter III.), whenever a pattern of behavior was located in one of the activities, it was described and located on the structural map. Following the discovery and investigation of a pattern in one particular small-group speaking activity, the other two were explored for the occurrence or non-occurrence of that same pattern. The product of the analytic process was the systematic
exploration of four recurring patterns of action and interaction found during small-group learner-to-learner speaking activity.

Question 3.2: Patterns of Learner-to-Learner Activity

Four recurring patterns of activity were explored across the three Small-Group Speaking Phases. Each pattern will be described separately along with examples extracted from the structural maps.

**Pattern 1.**

Immediately following the end of the Small-Group Speaking Task Presentation Phase of the Pre-Conversational Activity Part of speaking activities, the students were instructed by the teacher to get with their assigned small groups and thus begin their speaking task: discussion of the topic as prescribed by the teacher. Once students formed their small groups, the first order of business was to decide between and among themselves who was going to be the "first" to speak, that is, to begin the actual academic task. Sometimes, a student became the moderator of speaking turns. The following example was extracted from the beginning of the small-group activity from the speaking activity entitled "Daily Routines:"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcript Line #</th>
<th>Student Speaker</th>
<th>Thematicaly Tied Message Units</th>
<th>Non-Verbal Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students begin taking seat positions/ taking out note-books/pencils.</td>
<td>J looks at M. M leans forward in chair and...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this first episode, M immediately takes over the role of turn purveyor. In line #001, for example, she takes it upon herself to designate J as the first speaker to describe her daily routines by pointing to her and saying "You start." J accepts the self-imposed moderator role of M in line #002 by accepting M's designation of her as the first to begin her description. However, when J has reached the end of her turn to share information regarding her daily routine, M wants to make sure that J has said all that she wants to say, thus asserting once again her role as turn moderator:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcript</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Thematically Tied MessageUnits</th>
<th>Non-Verbal Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line #</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>que mas? nada?</td>
<td>shakes head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>nada</td>
<td>nada mas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In line #111, M inquires into whether J has completed her turn at talk by asking "Que mas? Nada? [Anything else? Nothing?]" to which J responds by shaking her head from side to side thereby indicating that she has finished and that she has nothing more to say. M reacts by repeating "Nada [nothing]." J responds saying "Nada mas [nothing more]."

When J's turn to share information has come to an end, M once again assumes the role of turn dispenser and proceeds to select E as the next
speaker to give her description of her daily routine:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcript</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Thematically Tied Message Units</th>
<th>Non-Verbal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line #</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>y tu</td>
<td>M turns eye gaze to E and-points to E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this example, M nominates E to be the next speaker, lines #115-#116, saying "y tu, E [And you, E?]."

Similar turn taking strategies are located within the other small-group speaking activities investigated. In other words, in order to gain the floor to share his/her description in the small group another member of the group takes the initiative and nominates another person, although the person nominated may not have volunteered to take the floor or might not necessarily have wanted to have the floor to speak. In this way, each student is granted the floor to speak by someone else, and then has priority to speak, that is, to communicate information relative to the teacher stated topic. Then, when that person has finished his/her turn, s/he relinquishes the floor to someone else.

**Pattern 2**

While Pattern 1 above discussed the recurrent pattern of ways in which students got their turn to provide information to the other participants, Pattern 2 discusses that student's turn at talk. Pattern 2, therefore, demonstrates that, once a student gained the floor to talk, that student presented narrative description relative to the teacher-stated speaking task. A narrative, according to The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language (1978), is "a story or description of actual or fictional events; a narrative account" (p. 873).

As an example to demonstrate this pattern, the following transcript
excerpt is taken from the activity "Describing Houses." During the small-group speaking phase of this activity two students, B and A, are talking to one another. While the actual teacher-stated task called for those students who lived in apartments or dormitories to talk with those students who lived in houses and to get information about the house, both B and A lived in houses. Nonetheless, they both performed the same speaking task. The excerpt begins with the moment these two students began the small-group speaking activity, just immediately following the Small-Group Speaking Task Presentation Phase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcript Line #</th>
<th>Student Speaker</th>
<th>Thematically Tied Message Units</th>
<th>Non-Verbal Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>037</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>es su casa?</td>
<td>A is drawing on a piece of paper. B looks at paper for a few moments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>038</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>primer</td>
<td>A moves pencil; points to paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>039</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>primer piso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>040</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>the porch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>042</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>y um</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>043</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>(incomprehensible)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>044</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>la calle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>045</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>sala sala una sala</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>046</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>entonces um</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>047</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>oh es es en el campo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>048</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>es um muy vieja</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>049</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>y um</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>050</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>diez y ocho</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>051</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>cien y cincuenta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>y cinco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this episode, A begins first of all to draw what appears to be a floor plan of her house on a piece of paper in her notebook, which she has on the desk in front of her. She refers to the piece of paper while she describes her house. B initiates the first interaction, line #037, by asking "Es su casa [Is this your house]?") A then proceeds to present a description of the house saying in lines #039-#051: "primer [first] .. primer piso [first floor] .. y [and] . street] . . sala
sala una sala [living room living room a living room] the country] . . es um muy vieja [it's very old] . . y um [and um] . . diez y ocho [eighteen] . . cien y cincuenta y cinco [one hundred and fifty five]."

With this turn at talk A provides a list of words and phrases that she uses to describe her house. This episode is interrupted by two questions asked by Student B about her house. (Interruptions in the flow of a students description will be discussed in Pattern 3.) At the point when A has responded to B’s questions, A picks up the narrative and continues with it:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Thematically Tied Message Units</th>
<th>Non-Verbal Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>065</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>entonces esta um cuarto cuarto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066</td>
<td></td>
<td>cuarto de dormir para mi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>067</td>
<td></td>
<td>una es un otro cuarto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>068</td>
<td></td>
<td>y um mi hijo dorme aqui</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>069</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>070</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>071</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>072</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>073</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student A continues her description saying "entonces esta um [then this is um] . . cuarto cuarto [room room]. cuarto de dormir [bedroom]. para mi [for me] . . um es un [um this is] . . otro cuarto [another bedroom] . . y um [and um . . . mi hijo [my son] . . dorme aqui [sleeps here]."

As indicated, when a student has the floor to talk, his/her talk takes the form of a list of descriptive attributes regarding the particular topic, in this case houses. Description appears to be the overriding concern while participating in the small-group speaking activity. Even when the narrative becomes temporarily suspended, the student returns to the narration. (See Pattern 3 below.)

Another example is provided from the activity "Daily routines." In this activity, students were to describe to one another all the events that took place
during everyday of the week with the exception of Friday. The teacher did not want to know about Fridays because students were in Spanish class all day long (i.e., approximately from 9:00 am to 3:00 pm). Here, J begins the description of her daily routine:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcript Line #</th>
<th>Student Speaker</th>
<th>Thematicaly Tied Message Units</th>
<th>Non-Verbal Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Me levanto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td></td>
<td>a las ocho</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>a las ocho</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>y um</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td></td>
<td>me me ducho</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>uh huh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>y me visto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011</td>
<td></td>
<td>y me peino hal ha!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012</td>
<td></td>
<td>y um</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013</td>
<td></td>
<td>me arreglo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014</td>
<td></td>
<td>um no no desayuno</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015</td>
<td></td>
<td>J turns head down</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

J begins her description saying "me levanto [I get up] . . a las ocho [a eight o'clock]. M, however, repeats the time she gets up in line #006 saying "a las ocho [at eight o'clock]." J is not interrupted but continues with the description saying, beginning in line #007 "y um [and um] . . me me ducho [I take a shower]." Once again, M provides backchanneling in line #009: "uh huh." But J continues with her description in line #110: "y me visto [I get dressed] . . y me peino hal ha! [and I comb my hair hal hal] . . y um [and um] . . me arreglo [I get myself ready] . . um no no desayuno [I don't eat breakfast] . . y [and] . . ." At this point, J turns her head down and looks at her notebook, which is in her lap, apparently looking for more things to say.

The above discussion has presented the basic description of a pattern of learner-to-learner interaction during small-group speaking activity. Once a student got the floor to speak, that student's turn to tell information is characterized primarily by narrative description. In the samples investigated
during the analysis phase of the study, students described such things as the houses they lived in, their daily routines, and a cherished object they would want to have saved from impending destruction by fire, along with reasons why that particular object should be saved.

**Pattern 3**

The third pattern of speaking activity explored during the investigation of students' turns to share their descriptions shows that, while the students' turns were characterized by narrative description, that description is also typified by numerous interruptions or breaks in the main flow of the student's turn at talk. Varonis & Gass (1985) also discuss the interrupted nature of non-native speaker/non-native speaker interaction. In a study of fourteen [ESL] conversational dyads between non-native speakers, they found that their "conversational flow [was] marred by numerous interruptions" (p. 73). This pattern will show that the interruptions in the Spanish course are precipitated for different reasons and by different people.

Figure 20 presents a graphic illustration of a student's turn to share his/her description with the other members of the small group. As shown, a student gets the floor to begin his/her description relative to the teacher stated topic. The main flow of talk (i.e., the narrative description) continues vertically down until a break or interruption occurs. Once the interruption is repaired/resolved, the student continues the main flow of the description until another break or interruption ensues. The student's turn thus follows through a series of flow points and interruptions until the student has completed the description and finally relinquishes the floor to another student. The following
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transcript episode will provide an example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcript Line #</th>
<th>Student Speaker</th>
<th>Thematically Tied Message Units</th>
<th>Non-Verbal Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>um</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td>y un ah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td>no garaje pero una</td>
<td>(14 seconds silence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td>granero</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>donde tu pones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td>es donde tu pones tu carro?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>un pero no no empleo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
<td>aqui es es calle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
<td>y aqui</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td>enfrente de mi casa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student A is in the process of describing her house saying that she does not have a garaje (line #128) but rather a barn (line #129). Apparently because A mentioned the absence of a garage, B interjects a question asking if that is where she puts her car (lines #130 and #131). A responds to B's question regarding the car saying that there is one car in the barn, but that that car either does not run or that she does not use it (line #132). However, once having responded the B's question, A returns to her narrative and describing her house in line #133 saying "aqui es es calle [here is is the street]... y aqui [and here]... enfrente de mi casa [in front of my house]... ."

An Indepth Investigation into the Nature of Interruptions in the Main Flow of a Student's Turn at Talk

At this point in the investigation, while it had been established that a student's turn at talk was characterized primarily by a series of flow points and break points, questions were raised about the nature of the points of interruption in the main flow of a student's turn at talk. Because each break point had been located on the structural maps of the three small-group speaking phases, the maps were reentered and patterns of interruption were extracted along two
dimensions: (1) the source of the interruption, and (2) the reason for the interruption.

**Subpatterns 3A and 3B**

Exploration of the data relative to the source of the interruptions of a student’s narrative description produced two patterns, labelled Subpattern 3A and Subpattern 3B. A taxonomy was then created (See Figure 21) that graphically displays the two subpatterns. Interruptions were either self-initiated (Subpattern 3A) or they were other-initiated (Subpattern 3B). The first of these two subpatterns shows that at times the interruption was self-initiated. In other words, the student who had the floor to share information purposefully interrupted his/her own flow of talk. The main flow of talk, therefore, because temporarily suspended.

The reasons why self-initiated interruptions took place were then explored. Re-entering the structural maps of the three Small-Group Speaking Phases, the researcher was able to return to each of the self-initiated interruptions, which had already been located, and, again following the type-case analytic model (i.e., See Chapter III), extract patterns of why the breaks occurred. The result of this investigation produced two patterns of self-initiated interruptions, labelled 3A.1 and 3A.2. Each will be described and examples given below.

**Subpatterns 3A.1 and 3A.2**

Figure 22 presents a taxonomy of reasons for self-initiated interruptions. Self-initiated interruptions occurred either because the student needed to initiate a "word search" (Schwartz, 1980), or because the student needed to confirm a lexical items about which the student was not sure. Schwartz (1980) defines
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"word search" as a "repair operation, in which a word is not available when it is 'due'" (p. 143). The student who had the floor sometimes had to stop the description and ask for help in locating a particular vocabulary items, as displayed in the following example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcript Line #</th>
<th>Student Speaker</th>
<th>Thematically Tied Message Units</th>
<th>Non-Verbal Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>048</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>pero si tengo elegir yo pienso que este</td>
<td>B moves head up then looks down at paper on table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>049</td>
<td>mi mi mi trunk no se como se llama trunk, I don't know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The example, taken from the activity "Cherished Object to Be Saved," shows B arriving at a point in his description when he doesn't know the Spanish equivalent for the word "trunk," an important lexical item needed for the description of what he would want saved from imminent destruction: the trunk in which he stores important personal items, such as pictures, credit cards, and important papers. B's strategy is to request help in searching for this vocabulary item. B begins the excerpt by saying "pero si tengo elegir yo pienso que este [if I have to choose I think that um]," at which point B stops, looks up and then down, apparently thinking of the lexical item he wishes to use at this point, then makes his request for lexical help, "mi mi mi trunk no se como se llama trunk, I don't know [my my my "trunk" I don't know how to call "trunk," I don't know." B's strategy to deal with this stumbling block is to make an appeal for lexical help. His appeal, however, is made with a combination of Spanish and English.

Further investigation into self-initiated word searches revealed a pattern of word search strategies. Students used either English word search strategies
or Spanish word search strategies. All, however, are direct appeals for lexical help. Table 13 reveals the frequencies of each type of strategy. Of the total number of self-initiated word searches found in the sample (n=31), 68% (n=21) were initiated primarily through the use of English while 32% (n=10) were initiated primarily through the use of Spanish. Clearly, the students' primary use of English for initiating word searches was the preferred strategy.

At this point in the analysis, questions were raised regarding the nature of word searches. In other words, regardless of the language used, how were word searches manifested? Figures 23 and 24 present taxonomies of the specific strategies used by students. Figure 23 shows that there were five recurring patterns of English strategies. The most frequently occurring of the English strategies was simply to say the word or phrase in English. This strategy occurred 12 times in the sample. The least frequently occurring English strategy was to ask "Is it [Spanish lexical item]?" This strategy occurred only one time in the sample. Figure 24 shows that there were four recurring patterns of Spanish word search strategies. The most frequently occurring Spanish strategy was simply to say the lexical item in question in Spanish but with a rising intonation, thus indicating that the speaker was not sure of the lexical item.

As stated earlier, self-initiated word searches caused a temporary interruption in the flow of the student's narrative description. During each of the word searches described above, the main flow of talk was interrupted for differing amounts of time. Self-initiated word searches elicited the help of the other members of the group in arriving at the desired lexical item as demonstrated in the following example. In this episode, from the activity entitled
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Frequency of Word Search Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of English Strategies</th>
<th>n=21 (68%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of Spanish Strategies</td>
<td>n=10 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>n=31 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Use of English to signal Word Search

- "How do/can you say ________?"
- Say word/phrase in English
- "What's ________?"
- ________ would be?
- "Is it [lexical item in Spanish]?

Figure 23
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Use of Spanish to signal Word Search

- "Cómo se dice ________?"
- "Cómo se llama ________?"
- "No sé cómo se llama ________?"
- Rise in intonation on Spanish lexical item in question

Figure 24
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"Daily Routines," E is describing her daily routine:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcript Line #</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Thematically Tied Non-Verbal Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>um</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>me levanto le uh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>uh huh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>ah uh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>a las seis um</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>uh me visto um</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>take a shower?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>ducho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ducho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>ducho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>me ducho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>y mi y me um</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>bano (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>peino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>arreglo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>how do you say wash my hair?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>arreglo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>bano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>peino is to do my hair so</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E is having difficulty with certain lexical items, specifically those reflexive verbs in Spanish that are used to talk about things people do everyday relative to their daily routines, such as take a shower and wash their hair. In fact, the class had spent quite a bit of time (i.e., over two hours) going over and practicing reflexive verbs during the Language Issues Phase of the Pre-Conversational Activity Part of the speaking activity "Daily Routines," just prior to the Small-Group Speaking Phase. They even received handouts they went over as a whole group, along with a commercially prepared language
learning tape that the teacher played for the students in conjunction with the printed handouts. Specifically, E needed lexical items for taking a shower (line # 123) and washing hair (line #132). These vocabulary items are preventing E from achieving her goal, that is, describing her daily routine in Spanish to the members of her small group. As a result, E elicits the help of her two partners (lines #123, again in line #129, and yet again in line #132), who are only more than willing to help her find these sought-after lexical items (i.e., lines #125, #127, #130, #131, #133, and #135).

Word searches, then, were the primary precipitators of selfinitiated interruptions. Within the flow of narration, a lexical item is not available when it is "due" (Schwartz, 1980). The word search strategy helped the speakers to regain their place in the flow of their narratives. When the needed lexical items was found, the student speaker picked up once again the narrative description and continued on until the next point when yet another lexical item was sought.

While the self-initiated word search was a commonly used strategy to elicit help from others in locating a needed lexical item, the self-initiated word confirmation (Pattern 3A.2) was another pattern speakers exercised to educe lexical help. In this case, however, the student did have a particular Spanish lexical item in mind but was not sure if it was correct, as in the following example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcript Line #</th>
<th>Student Speaker</th>
<th>Thematically Tied Message Units</th>
<th>Non-Verbal Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>328</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>um y um</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>and then if you say return to studying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>would that also be regreso yo regreso a estudio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here, E knows the verb "regreso [I return]" but wants confirmation that
that is the correct word to use in this context.

**Subpatterns 3B.1, 3B.2, and 3B.3**

As noted above, other-initiated interruptions (Pattern 3B) were also quite prevalent throughout the sample. Three different patterns of other-initiated interruptions were explored. Figure 25 presents a taxonomy of Other-Initiated Interruptions, labelled "Content Search" (Subpattern 3B.1), "Language Correction" (Subpattern 3B.2), and "Content Clarification/Confirmation" (Subpattern 3B.3). Table 14 presents the frequencies of instances for each of the subpatterns found in the sample. Subpattern 3B.1, "Other-Initiated Content Search," comprised 50% (n=21) of Other-Initiated Interruptions, Subpattern 3B.2, "Other-Initiated Content Confirmation/Clarification," comprised 36% (n=15), while Subpattern 3B.3, "Other-Initiated Language Correction," comprised 14% (n=6).

Other-Initiated Content Searches were instances of interruptions when a member of the small-group asked the student who had the floor a question soliciting more information relative to a piece of information that had just been given. Consider the following example of an Other-Initiated Content Search extracted from the activity "Daily Routines."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcript Line #</th>
<th>Student Speaker</th>
<th>Thematicaly Tied Message Units</th>
<th>Non-Verbal Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>um</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>tengo una clase hasta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>um</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>la diez</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>what what day?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>um</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>en que dia?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>(no response)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>que dia?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>what what day?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>um</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>lunes martes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the excerpt, E is describing part of her daily routine, mentioning that she has a class until 10:00 (line #196). Upon completing her statement, she turns her head down and looks at her notebook in front of her in her lap. J, who desires more information, then wants to find out on what day (line #200) she has class. E does not respond immediately (line #201), which prompts M to restate the original question (line #202). Assuming that E did not understand the original question, J translates the question into English (line #203). E finally responds to the question saying that she has class at 10:00 on Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday (line #205). But the line of questioning does not stop here, because both M and J want to ask the same question, which M begins to ask in English (line #206), but J's question overrules, asking what class she has (line #207). E responds saying that she has an English literature class (line #209). Finally, when this line of questioning ceases, E is able to continue on with her description.

The Other-Initiated Content Search was a strategy used by the other members of the small-group to get information the speaker either did not originally intend to provide for whatever reason, or was never given the chance to provide on his/her own. The act of posing the question, however, caused the speaker to suspend temporarily the original flow of his/her description to respond to another's request for more detailed content relative to the information the speaker had just stated. Each time the solicitation for more information was made and the speaker responded, the speaker returned to and picked up once again the original flow, as noted in the following example from...
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Table 14
Frequencies of Other-Initiated Interruptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other-Initiated Interruptions</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Initiated Content Search</td>
<td>n=21</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Initiated Content Confirmation</td>
<td>n=15</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Initiated Language Correction</td>
<td>n=6</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>n=42</td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The activity "Describing Houses:"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcript Line #</th>
<th>Student Speaker</th>
<th>Thematically Tied Message Units</th>
<th>Non-Verbal Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>donde es um la cocina?</td>
<td>looks at paper in front of A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>aqui</td>
<td>points to paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>estuvos</td>
<td>points to paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>y ah</td>
<td>points to paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>el agua</td>
<td>points to paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>frigid refrigidor</td>
<td>points to paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>y um</td>
<td>points to paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>estuvo por por calor en invierno</td>
<td>points to paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>y um</td>
<td>points to paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>la escalera</td>
<td>points to paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>la escalera</td>
<td>points to paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>y cuarto de bano</td>
<td>points to paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>cuarto banos?</td>
<td>points to paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>no no cuarto banos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>cuarto banos?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>uno</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>es una casa vieja</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>hal hai ha! ha!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>um</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>y um uh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>no garaje pero una</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>(14 seconds silence)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>granero</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The excerpt begins with B's question about where the kitchen is located (line #107), to which A responds "aqui [here]" while pointing to a piece of paper in front of her on the table. A then begins to go through all the things in the kitchen, mentioning the stove (line #109), the water (line #111), the refrigerator (line #112), the furnace (line #114), and the stairs (lines #116 and #117). Finally, in line #119, A locates the bathroom. B, because he is supposed to find out as much as he can about A's house, asks how many bathrooms there are (line #120). A, however, thinking that B has said "four bathrooms" (line #121), denies that there are four. B, then, changes his statement somewhat repeating what A has said (line #122). A then says that there is only one bathroom (line...
#123) commenting further that the house is an old house (line #124), thereby justifying the existance of one bathroom. When all is said about the kitchen and bathroom, A then proceeds to mention that there is no garage (line #128) but rather a barn (line #130).

Another frequently occurring Other-Initiated Interruption culled from the data was when an individual interjected a content confirmation/clarification request (Subpattern 3B.2). The following example, from the activity entitled "Describing Houses", is presented as an illustration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcript Line #</th>
<th>Student Speaker</th>
<th>Thematically Tied Message Units</th>
<th>Non-Verbal Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>054</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>y um</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>055</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>esta una tienda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>056</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>ahora</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>057</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>por um</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>058</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>las ropas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>059</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>tu casa?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>060</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>si</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>061</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>ahora?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>062</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>no no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>063</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>oh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>064</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>065</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>entonces esta um</td>
<td>points to paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>cuarto cuarto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>067</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>cuarto de dormir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>068</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>para mi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this excerpt, A is talking a little bit about the history of the house, which was built in 1855. She said that her house was at one time a clothing store (lines #055 - #058). B, however, requests clarification when he asks "tu casa [your house]?” (line #059), to which A responds affirmatively (line #060). B asks A if she is talking about right now (line #061); A responds with a negative response (line #062). When this information is clarified, A continues to describe her house mentioning where her bedroom is (lines #065-#068).
The third pattern of Other-Initiated Interruptions (Subpattern 3B.3) is when another group member interrupted another student's flow of talk to correct a language error. Language errors corrected were errors in pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary. In the following example, E is talking about her daily routine:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcript Line #</th>
<th>Student Speaker</th>
<th>Thematically Tied Message Units</th>
<th>Non-Verbal Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>entonces regreso a la casa y uh lavo los platos desayuno</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>del desayuno</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>del desayuno</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td></td>
<td>y um estudio por dos horas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just prior to this episode, E had requested lexical help in determining how she would say "wash the breakfast dishes." The teacher had just arrived at the group to listen when E asked for help. After a lengthy discussion, primarily in English, between the teacher and the rest of the group participants, E picks up once again her description, saying that she washed the breakfast dishes when she got home (line #282). J, however, notes a grammatical error in what she said. E should have said "los platos del desayuno." Therefore, J, in line #283, corrects E's grammar, which E then repeats (line #284). Once the grammar correction has been made, E resumes her description (line #285) of her daily routine.

To summarize, the above discussion presented recurring patterns relative to the nature of interruptions in the flow of a student's narrative description. Two basic patterns regarding the source of the interruptions were noted. The interruptions were either self-initiated or they were initiated by someone else. Self-initiated interruptions were of two kinds. The first kind of
self-initiated interruption dealt with the fact that the speaker requested help in locating a needed lexical item. In doing so, the speaker used strategies that involved either the primary use of English or the primary use of Spanish. A second pattern of self-initiated interruption showed that the speaker sometimes initiated a word confirmation strategy.

While self-initiated interruptions were recurring patterns within the data sample, patterns of other-initiated interruptions were also explored. Three patterns of other-initiated interruptions were noted. At times another member of the small group initiated a content search, asking questions concerning more information relative to information presented by the principal speaker. A second pattern was also noted in which another speaker initiated a content confirmation/clarification strategy, which asked the principal speaker to pull out of the narration to confirm or clarify information for another member of the group. A third pattern was noted and explored as well, a language correction strategy, in which another group member interjected some kind of statement correcting the language of the principal speaker.

**Pattern 4**

Earlier in this Chapter (i.e., Research Question 3.1) questions were raised regarding patterns of information the teacher communicated to students during the Small-Group Speaking Task Presentation Phase. During that Phase, the teacher communicated information relative to the topic, specific tasks to perform, who was to talk with whom, etc. In other words, the teacher established a framework about what it was he wanted students to talk about, the manner in which they were to talk about it, and with what outcome. Following this, the teacher signalled students to form their small-groups and to begin the
speaking task.

Although the teacher signalled when to begin the speaking task, the teacher also signalled when to bring it to a halt and to move into the next phase of the General Conversational Activity Part of speaking activities. In this manner, the teacher brought the conversations to an artificial close. More often than not, however, the students were still engaged in conversation about the specific teacher-defined topic when the teacher indicated that he wanted the students to halt their present activity as noted in the following example taken from the end of the Small-Group Speaking Phase of the activity "Describing Houses:"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcript Line #</th>
<th>Student Speaker</th>
<th>Thematically Tied Message Units</th>
<th>Non-Verbal Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>371</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>¿es una casa nueva?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(incomprehensible)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373</td>
<td>TEACHER</td>
<td>OKAY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>374</td>
<td></td>
<td>UM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>¿es por su familia?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>TEACHER</td>
<td>PERDON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>si?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>si</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>oh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380</td>
<td>TEACHER</td>
<td>PERDON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381</td>
<td></td>
<td>UM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOW WE'RE GOING TO GET BACK AND WE'RE GOING TO SEE HOW MUCH INFORMATION PEOPLE HAVE PICKED UP OKAY?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this episode, A and B are both continuing to talk about B's house. A asks if the house is a new house (line #371), to which B responds, although the response is incomprehensible, in line #372. At this point, the teacher begins to
call the groups' attention (lines #373 and #374) thereby signalling the end of the Small-Group Speaking Phase. A, however, is still asking B questions about his house, wanting to know if the house was for his family (line #375). The teacher again signals that he wants the students' attention (line #376). B and A are still talking (lines #377 and #378). Finally, A acknowledges the teacher's attempt to call the groups together (line #379). Lines #380-#382, then, show the teacher finally getting the groups' attention and signalling the next phase of the General Conversational Activity Part.

**SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

This Chapter has presented findings relative to the three major research questions and their related subquestions. A general summary of the results is presented here. A discussion of the findings is presented in Chapter V.

**Research Question 1.0**

The first research question presented data regarding the multiple kinds of academic and non-academic activities that comprised the Spanish conversation course. Academic/instructional activities were found to be of varying types. An exploration of these multiple academic/instructional activities was necessary, therefore, to extract recurring patterns of small-group learner-to-learner conversational opportunities. The product of the explorational process was the extraction of twelve systematically selected and analogous speaking activities.

**Research Question 2.0**

Once the twelve systematically selected speaking activities were located, they were explored for patterns of structural stability and variability. The product of this investigation was the development of a macrostructural model of the
twelve activities. Analogous small-group learner-to-learner tasks were located within these activities and found to be a standard (i.e., recurring) feature of speaking activities. The academic work of speaking activities, then, was organized and conducted around a series of recurring small-group speaking tasks. Prior to each of the small-group speaking tasks, however, was the Small-Group Speaking Task Presentation Phase. During this recurring phase, the teacher presented specific guidelines regarding how he wanted the participants to perform the speaking task, including who was to talk to whom, about what, in what manner, and with what outcome.

Research Question 3.0

The research process investigated the nature of information the teacher communicated to the students and the effectiveness of that communication on the academic work of students in the small-group speaking task. The effective communication of information about academic work occurred by means of 10 patterns or categories of information. With the fact that students' participation in the small-group speaking tasks was considered to be appropriate, questions were then asked regarding the nature of recurring patterns of activity. In other words, what did "being on task" entail?

Four recurring patterns of student activity were explored. The findings revealed that

(1) once the students formed their small groups, the first order of business was to select who the first speaker would be. Students nominated others to speak;

(2) when students did get their turn to share information, the process of talking resulted primarily in the presenting of narrative descriptions relative to
teacher-derived topics;

(3) while a student did provide primarily narrative descriptions, those descriptions were typified by many interruptions or breaks in the main flow of talk. Those breaks were either self-initiated, that is, by the student speaker, or they were other-initiated, that is, by some other group member. Self-initiated interruptions were precipitated by two concerns, (a) initiating a word search strategy to solicit help in finding the Spanish equivalent of a particular lexical item, and (b) initiating a word-confirmation strategy to solicit confirmation of a given lexical item.

Other-initiated interruptions were precipitated by three primary concerns, (a) a search for more information from the student speaker, (b) a content confirmation, and (c) the correcting of some language error;

(4) the small group conversations were typically ended or brought to a close by the teacher in his attempt to move on to the next phase in the instructional process. More often than not, students were still involved in their conversations when the teacher began the transition to the next phase of activity.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

Recent research on classroom learning from a social interaction perspective has consistently highlighted the overwhelming complexity of the teaching-learning process. The complexity of classroom life is grounded in the multidimensional nature of the academic setting. As has been shown through past research from a social interaction perspective (see Cazden, 1986; Erickson, 1986; Green, 1983a, 1983b; Green & Smith, 1983), academic activity in classrooms is comprised of three primary features: a social structure, an academic structure, and an organizational structure. Academic learning, then, is nested in and is influenced by both the social and the organizational structures. These structures, however, are not separate from one another but rather pieces and parts of the same structure. Moreover, these structures have been shown not to be static; they are dynamic in nature, subject to change and continuous evolution across time. What is more, these structures are mutually constructed through the interactions of the participants.

The foreign language classroom becomes considerably more complex, however, when one takes into account that, in this particular setting, the foreign language is both the raison d'être of instruction as well as the means of
Students are learning a foreign language while at the same time they are using a foreign language. The foreign language conversation course, meanwhile, is considered an integral part of traditional undergraduate foreign language curricula in that it is designed specifically to assist the language learner in particular ways by providing opportunities for speaking the foreign language ostensibly not available during other courses in the curriculum. Despite the importance in the foreign language conversation course, it has virtually been ignored by the research community.

Previous foreign language classroom-oriented research has not dealt with the multidimensional nature of academic life in these particular classrooms. The approach in this and in other studies from the same social interaction perspective is contrary to traditional classroom-oriented research, which has looked primarily at the actions and behaviors of teachers and the actions and behaviors of learners. The social interaction perspective investigates the interactions of both as they construct together the processes of everyday life in the classroom (Gumperz, 1986). As Allwright (1988) has argued,

... we can usefully work on both at the same time, and preferably not in separate teams but collectively. That is what observations of naturally occurring lessons make possible. We can use them to investigate learner behaviour, but in so doing we are necessarily involved in trying to make sense of instruction itself, since, following the view that classroom lessons, like any other form of interaction, are co-produced, learner behaviour is a vital part of what constitutes instruction, of what determines the learning opportunities that learners get (pp. 256-257).

The first part of this Chapter will present a discussion of the findings from this study of systematically selected features of life in the Spanish conversation course from a social interaction perspective. The discussion explores the findings relative to the social, academic, and organizational features of the
selected academic events.

Then, because the second major purpose of the study was to explore the applicability of the research process, the discussion, in the second part of the Chapter, will present a discussion of the research process itself. Following a discussion of the research process, the Chapter will conclude with suggestions for future topics for foreign language classroom-oriented research.

**DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS**

In an attempt to capture and describe selected aspects of foreign-language learning activity in this particular conversation course, a research approach was selected that allowed for the systematic and principled exploration of recurring patterns of action and interaction between and among the course participants. The research project focused on describing the recurrent nature of selected aspects of learner-to-learner conversations during selected formal, teacher-derived small-group speaking opportunities during an intensive Spanish conversation course at the college level. The course met for seven consecutive Fridays for six hours each class meeting during the summer session.

The design of the research project departed from more traditional approaches to classroom-oriented research (e.g., interaction analysis) in that it did not assume "sufficient knowledge of the issues it purport[ed] to investigate" (Long, 1983a, p. 16). Rather, the researcher took a highly systematic approach to observing the daily moment-to-moment activities throughout the entire seven-week course in order to extract patterns of life in the classroom. Raw data were extracted in the form of fieldnotes, videotape, audiotape, and interviews with both teacher and students. Student course evaluations and journals also provided valuable information for the triangulation of emergent
hypotheses. In addition, the researcher established himself not as an agent of change or intervention in the classroom, but rather as an observer-participant and resource person, thereby establishing a more collegial relationship between him and the course participants. In this way, the researcher was able to make permanent and retrievable records of daily events in the classroom throughout the duration of the course.

A sociolinguistic ethnographic research approach was selected because of its ability to extract information about recurring patterns of language usage during academic language learning activity in a formal classroom context. This approach to exploring classroom life is consistent with a major emphasis in classroom-oriented research in general (Cazden, 1986; Erickson, 1986; Shulman, 1986) and foreign-language classroom-oriented research specifically (Allwright, 1988; Breen, 1985; Kramsch, in press; Long, 1983a; Savignon, in press; van Lier, 1988). Calls for this kind of approach to foreign language classroom-oriented research were made almost a decade ago (Cooper, 1980; Jarvis, 1980); yet, little research of its type has been conducted in traditional foreign language teaching contexts. (See Brooks, in press; Colville-Hall, 1983, Gargan, 1986, Schrier, 1988, and Welch, 1988 for notable examples.)

Data were extracted from classroom "maps" of varying detail (i.e., some were more microlevel than others) following a procedure described by Green (1977) and Green and Wallat (1981), thus allowing for the construction of "grounded theory." In other words, variables of interest were grounded in the observed patterns and then tested across other cases following a type-case analytic model (Erickson, 1986; Green, 1983a, 1983b; Green & Smith, 1983). This process permitted the construction of models of action and interaction that were reliable and trustworthy. Moreover, the researcher was able to use
 descriptive statistics to provide information relative to the frequency of occurrence of certain aspects of life in the Spanish conversation course.

Discussion

The initial research question sought an understanding of when and under what circumstances formal, that is, teacher-derived opportunities to speak Spanish in the Spanish conversation course took place. It was necessary, therefore, to sift through the myriad of academic activities in order to extract those opportunities. What was uncovered in the process was the fact that the Conversation course consisted of much more than just opportunities to participate in conversations in Spanish. A wide array of activities took place, many of which had nothing directly to do with actually conversing in Spanish between and among themselves. What did take place seemed more as support for subsequent conversation by providing other kinds of opportunities to interact with Spanish language. For example, the teacher arranged for specific opportunities to listen to Spanish, either in the form of music sung in Spanish, or in the form of listening to others as they read aloud from different kinds of written work. Although during these primarily listening activities the students were listening to spoken Spanish in varying ways, they were also required, in more cases than not, to react in some way to the Spanish they had heard, ostensibly to demonstrate comprehension. The teacher, for example, required students to fill in words in incomplete transcripts of songs. On other occasions, he and the students sang the songs along with the recordings. When students listened to others read aloud, the teacher had them respond to questions about who from among the other participants wrote the piece being read aloud.

The conversation course was also an opportunity to learn about various
aspects of Hispanic culture, although in a limited way. The students learned, for example, to sing two different birthday songs in Spanish when it was discovered that a fairly popular student celebrated her birthday during the course. Students also had the chance to learn to dance a few popular dances from South America when a guest native speaker from Colombia and his fiancee arrived one day, having been invited by the course instructor. During that visit, the students heard a description of a recent month-long trip to Costa Rica taken by the fiancee. She discussed in Spanish the overall geography of this small Central American country with the aid of a wall map and brought examples of popular music from that same country, which the students listened to, filled in again another incomplete transcript of the words, and later sang the song together. In addition to the singing and dancing, the fiancee brought several examples of realia from Costa Rica that she also described.

Writing, albeit in a limited fashion, also figured into the Spanish conversation course. The students had opportunities to write about several aspects of their own lives. For example, students wrote brief compositions for homework, which the teacher and other students read aloud for others to guess about. Students wrote in class also about their own personal work histories (i.e., the students wrote in Spanish lists of positions they had held at different times in their lives), which were again read aloud by others for others to guess to whom the histories pertained.

Although there were a number of different kinds of academic activities that took place during the conversation course, the findings also revealed that speaking activities were the most frequently occurring, which stands to reason, since this was a course specifically designed to provide opportunities for speaking in the Spanish language. The fact that speaking activities in general
were the most frequently occurring activities, more in depth analysis revealed that not all speaking activities were found to be similar in terms of student participation requirements. Further analysis, then, was required to separate out and categorize those activities considered to be speaking activities. The result was the extraction of 12 specific speaking activities that shared similar patterns of student participation requirements.

Analysis of these specific speaking activities revealed that there was a relatively stable pattern of thematically related instructional events that unfolded during any given speaking activity, thus allowing for a shared frame of reference relative to what students were to expect. Triangulation for this finding was accomplished when a number of students wrote about these speaking activities in their course evaluations and journals. Also, when the researcher asked them to do so during interviews, students were able to describe the stable pattern of instructional events during speaking activities. The academic work of speaking activities during the Spanish conversation course, then, took place within a stable framework that facilitated students' conduct both socially and academically. At no time during these speaking activities did students not know what was expected of them.

In addition to the above, the findings also indicated that the teacher effectively communicated information about what students were to do and how, specifically during small-group learner-to-learner speaking activity. The teacher's effective communication of information about the academic task during the Small-Group Speaking Task Presentation Phase was a crucial aspect of the activity structure that involved the skillful articulation of a number of different kinds of information relative to the students' performance of the academic task. Most noteworthy, however, is that, while the teacher effectively
communicated information about the academic speaking task, that communication was performed primarily in English. The teacher resorted to using Spanish only in the form of separate vocabulary items or isolated phrases embedded in the English. Never did he communicate an entire academic task presentation in the target language. In this way, students had little difficulty in understanding the small-group speaking task, in spite of the complexity of what students needed to know in order to perform the academic task.

Given that the teacher effectively communicated information relative to the small-group learner-to-learner speaking task, closer inspection of the nature of the language used by the teacher in communicating specifically what to do highlighted a rather restricted discourse structure being tacitly imposed upon the students. Students were almost exclusively asked to describe and/or narrate. And indeed this is what they did. In other words, the speaking tasks dealt with specific predefined content matter (e.g., describing houses, telling about daily routines, describing a cherished object to be saved from imminent destruction by fire) and the exchange of specific information related to this content matter. Some aspects of communication were addressed while at the same time neglecting others. Wilkins (1972) has argued that "what people want to do through language is more important than mastery of language ... [and] ... while reporting and describing are acts that we would like to carry out with language, they are by no means the only ones that are important" (p. 12 my emphasis). In addition, Brown and Yule (1983), have indicated that much of human day-to-day communication is not necessarily aimed at the transmission of specific pieces of information or discussing problems of content matter. A great deal of human communication is also aimed at developing and maintaining social relationships and at self expression. In this way, Brown and Yule distinguish between
transactional and interactional language, both of which require attention in the language learning context. In this regard, Kramsch (1981, 1985, 1987) has repeatedly argued for the importance of explicit teaching of conversational management strategies along with language forms.

At the same time that a particular type of discourse was covertly imposed upon students, topics for discussion were overtly imposed. Students, even though they had successful opportunities to speak in Spanish between and among themselves, had little opportunity to select, negotiate, modify, or reject topics for discussion. It was the teacher's decision made in the confines of his own home what the students were going to talk about. It was probably necessary for him to do so, however, because of the didactic, goal-oriented nature of classrooms and classroom discourse. (See Green, 1983a, 1983b; Lorscher, 1986, for a greater discussion of classrooms and classroom discourse.) The speaking activities had to be assigned and carried out "with the aims of teaching and learning elements and aspects of subject matter, values, and/or practical skills" (Lorscher, 1986, p. 18). Not only was this a requirement of his role as teacher in an academic setting, it was also probably anticipated by the students in the class (Nash, 1976). In fact, one member of the class revealed during an interview that he would probably not have been comfortable if he or any other member of the class, was supposed to be the one required to bring up topics for discussion. More interesting, however, is that the teacher, after the first day of the course, said on his planning tape:

[The students] have some absurd idea that they're going to be able to just talk about external topics and that everybody is going to be interested in listening to what they say. You know, like let's get together and we'll . . . we'll talk about abortion, for example.

The teacher, then, effectively ignoring the ostensible interests of some of the
students, preselected topics for discussion based upon what he called "vocabulary clusters," such as members of the family with adjectives, rooms in a house, and daily routines.

In addition to the fact that the teacher imposed topical restrictions upon the students, the teacher also initiated the conversations not only through his defining of topical boundaries but also by telling the students when to begin talking about these topics. Furthermore, because the teacher was working within the academic setting, which is restricted due to temporal constraints and the goal-oriented nature of classroom academic activity, students were told when to end small-group speaking activity. In this manner, the role of teacher in the Spanish conversation course was one of facilitator and, in a rather tacit sort of way, limiter of student learning outcomes. The teacher's defining of topic, direction, and length of time for talking activity during formal small-group speaking activities both supported and constrained student learning. This stable aspect of activity structure, however, was supportive of immediate student participation requirements during the Small-Group Speaking Phase of the General Conversational Part of speaking activities because students clearly knew what was expected of them in terms of the requirements for participation. Students were able to get started quickly with the assigned speaking task without "wasting time" trying to figure out what to talk about, how to talk about it, with whom to talk about it, and with what outcome. All of that had already been laid down by the teacher. In this way, it can be said that the students had successful opportunities to speak in Spanish.

While the fact that the teacher consistently assigned specific speaking tasks was supportive of immediate student participation requirements, it also limited and constrained, albeit tacitly, student learning. As Lorscher
(1986) has cautioned, "the didactic nature of the classroom communication, the specifics of the foreign language discourse, and certain organizational features of the school as a public institution, represents constraints that can hardly be ignored" (p. 20). In this way, a possible topic for conversation was neither proposed by the course participants, negotiated between the course participants, nor built up between and among them. The students knew what they had to talk about and, more importantly, how they were going to be held accountable for what they talked about. The students, therefore, were never able to partake in topic proposals for discussion and eventually to defend them, which certainly are functions of language that will be needed beyond the classroom setting.

Foreign language learning, like first language learning, is often referred to as an interactional process. (See Kramsch, 1987; Pica, 1987.) Allwright (1984), for example, asserts that "interaction is what somehow produces linguistic development [which] suggests a process to account for language development" (original emphasis, p. 9). However, in the Spanish conversation classroom as in most classrooms, because the teacher interacted with students and, more importantly, because the teacher participated within the structure of a formal college credit system (one that required the teacher, by his official role as instructional leader and student evaluator, to set up specific speaking tasks), the teacher effectively controlled when the students would begin to talk, whom they would talk to, the topic about which they would speak, the outcome of the conversation, and the length of time that the students would speak. In other words, the teacher initiated talk for the students, forced a topic for discussion on them, told them what to do with the topic, and then told them when to stop talking about the topic.
Conversation, however, is much more than being able to string words together to express coherent thoughts. Conversations must begin and end as well, which themselves have been topics of considerable research (e.g., Richards & Schmidt, 1983; Wardhough, 1985; Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974; Wolfson, 1983). This research field consistently indicates that, among other things, initiating a conversation and then drawing it to a close are difficult social accomplishments, especially for the non-native speaker of a language. More importantly, it is primarily a culturally determined ability that is a natural outcome of the socialization process. The students in the conversation class, however, never had the opportunity either to struggle through the initiation phase of a conversation or with the wind down phase of a conversation.

Although it can be said that the major learning goal in foreign language education is the ability to function with communicative competence and with proficiency in varying real-world situations (Lambert, 1987; Kramsch, 1987; Savignon, 1987), the communicative structure of the classroom and the academic credit system within which the course functioned, a product of the didactic and goal-oriented nature of foreign language classrooms, effectively hindered if not prevented the students from moving toward this goal (Kasper, 1986; Kramsch, 1981; Lorscher, 1986). Although the management structure the teacher provided did support student participation by clearly defining what students were to do, with whom, how, and with what outcome, it also restricted what students could do, and hence could learn to do --mainly, propose, negotiate, accept, and reject, topics for conversation. In addition, the students were never provided opportunities to begin a conversation or to end one. Therefore, in terms of the didactic nature of formal, teacher-derived speaking activities, that the teacher presented topics for conversation was, on the one
hand, managerially effective in supporting immediate student participation. Furthermore, this control positively influenced student attitudes about language practice and learning, as suggested by student comments found in course journals and evaluations. On the other hand, it is questionable whether this aspect of classroom discourse actually provided students opportunities to reach the wider goals of Spanish language instruction, that is, socially acceptable and appropriate functional competence to communicate with speakers of Spanish in culturally authentic settings (Kramsch, 1981, 1987, in press). Most, if not all, foreign language classroom learning, unfortunately, concentrates on grammar and vocabulary (Wilkins, 1972, cited in Kramsch, 1981, p. 18). Students, too, seem to equate their difficulties in communicating in Spanish with a lack of grammar, vocabulary, or idiom when in fact their difficulties probably stem more from the inability to manage conversations with native speakers (Kramsch, 1987; Riley, 1976). This aspect of perceived language difficulty was reinforced by the teacher in this study when he told the class on the third day of the course:

One of the purposes of a class like this is just to try and embed a lot of vocabulary in your mind that you can tap into when you go someplace, and it will hopefully come back to you, because you really can't learn to speak in the classroom. That's an accepted fact; so the purpose of this [course] is to build a working vocabulary and use it and get rid of some of the fear of speaking; but, you know, this class doesn't work miracles. It's just trying to embed that stuff in your mind. It'll hopefully come back, you know.

When students did talk to one another, it was found that, at least in some ways, the structure of their talk did resemble the structure of talk found in other studies of NNS-NNS discourse (e.g., Schwartz, 1980; Varonis & Gass, 1985). That is, their conversations were also characterized by numerous interruptions when student speakers needed a lexical item that was not available. When this
was the case, there was a need to repair the interruption through a "word search" strategy (Schwartz, 1980) so that the description/narration could continue. Unlike the repair strategies found in the work of Schwartz (1980) and in Varonis & Gass (1985), where non-proficient learners of English used their only *lingua franca*, English, to repair the interruptions, the students in the Spanish conversation class resorted to asking their partners, the teacher, and the researcher for help using English, or to consulting a bilingual dictionary. There were often direct appeals for needed lexical items, and those appeals were quite often made in English. The "negotiation of meaning," therefore, resembled a time to "slot out" of the flow of the "academic" conversation whenever a lexical item was needed, find the lexical item through the use of English and direct appeal, (e.g., "What is the word for . . .") and then slot back into the conversation in order to continue with the assigned topic. The code-switching strategies for word searches exhibited by the students seem to reflect the fact that Spanish, the language supposedly being learned (i.e., the academic content of the course), is really not necessary or even logical for natural communicative exchange, especially when communication breakdowns or interruptions occur. Whenever there is a language problem (i.e., the unavailability of a particular lexical item when it is due) or a comprehension problem, revert to English, make the repair, then get on with the Spanish. In this way, it may also be considered that the students were trying simply to "get through" the small-group speaking activity as best they could in order to be considered competent during the following Whole Group Speaking Activity Phase, where they were expected to inform the other members of the class of what information they found out about their partner(s) relative to a specific topic predefined by the teacher.
The presence of the *lingua franca*, English, made it easy for the students to avoid taking the interactional risk of perhaps showing their incompetency in Spanish. It would appear logical, however, that these learners would revert to English to make conversational repairs, especially in light of the fact that the teacher himself implicitly encouraged this type of behavior. On numerous occasions throughout the course the teacher, too, reverted to English to explain himself to students and to help students find lexical items. He even asked for a bilingual dictionary on several occasions so that he, too, could look up lexical items. Furthermore, he encouraged students to bring bilingual dictionaries to class. The message that appeared to be sent was that student problems during oral face-to-face communication could easily be resolved if only they had better command of grammar and lexicon.

Summary

The discussion in this section has provided a view of a limited number of aspects of the 12 systematically selected teacher-derived learner-to-learner conversations in a Spanish conversation course, which were extracted by means of one particular analytic approach. The conversation course was shown to be comprised of more than just opportunities to speak the target language. Although there were a number of other academic activities that seemed to support the primary goal of the course, speaking activities did demonstrate a certain prominence. The teacher's role, however, was shown to be of both facilitator and limiter of student learning. Student conversational outcomes reflected the teacher's tight control over such things as topic selection, length of conversation, initiation and termination of conversation. In this way, the instructional process was shown to be a dynamic and complex process that contains both social and academic dimensions. The resultant
description of language learning activities and the nature of the instructional processes is different from the way in which instruction in foreign languages has typically been viewed and investigated. Given this view, the discussion in the next section will turn to the nature of the research process.

DISCUSSION OF THE RESEARCH PROCESS

Instruction, as discussed throughout this study, has been shown to be a complex phenomenon that is comprised of various interrelated dimensions (i.e., social, academic, and organizational). In other words, the instructional process is embedded in the instructional conversations (which have both verbal and nonverbal dimensions) that unfold between and among the classroom participants. By means of this instructional conversation, both academic structure (i.e., what we're doing here) and a social structure (i.e., how we're expected to be doing it) are being simultaneously constructed. The result is the mutual construction of an organizational structure that has been shown to be a recurring feature of the inductively derived units of analysis (i.e., the 12 systematically selected speaking activities) in the Spanish conversation course. The description of the nature of recurring academic activity is quite different from the way in which research on foreign language teaching/learning processes have traditionally been addressed. Given that the purpose of the research project was to explore what could be learned about the foreign language teaching/learning process from a social interaction perspective, the discussion will now focus on the nature of the research process that yielded these views of the complexity of academic activity in the Spanish conversation.
The present study employed a social interaction perspective to study complex teaching/learning processes in a Spanish conversation course at the college level. With the views of academic activity presented in this research report, the specific research perspective will be discussed in terms of six selected issues or concerns it raises for those engaged in the classroom-oriented study of foreign language teaching/learning processes.

The first issue raised relates to the nature of the research questions permitted by the social interaction perspective. All research endeavors must begin with a question or a series of questions. The nature of the research questions, however, determines the approach used to explore the answers to those questions. Included in the formation of research questions is the reason for which the person is asking the questions. Following the identification of these concerns, foci for observation must be determined, among other things. Who gets observed, what gets observed, how they are observed, when they are observed, how data are gathered and analyzed all relate to the "theory, beliefs, and/or past experiences of the person who is doing the observation [and thus] form the frame of reference of the observer and influence the decision-making as well as the observational process" (Evertson & Green, 1986, p. 163).

The social interaction perspective permitted the identification of a first set of questions of a general nature regarding when and under what circumstances formal opportunities to speak Spanish took place during the conversation course. Following the identification of this initial set of questions, constituent subquestions were also identified. Although several questions were grounded in past work in instruction in general, others were emergent in nature; that is,
they were the product of interactions with the data that signaled the need to inquire about additional dimensions of activity in the conversation course. In this way, deeper understandings of certain dimensions of life during the course were obtained.

The problem surrounding the nature of the research questions permitted, however, is not a problem of questions determined \textit{a priori} versus questions that emerge during interactions with the various sources of data. As Shulman (1986) asserts, "the framing of a research question, like that of an attorney in a court of law, limits the range of permissible responses and prefigures the character of possible outcomes" (p. 3). Therefore, the issue of research questions has more to do with the \textit{kinds of understandings} that they permit (Graham, 1986). In other words, future studies of classroom foreign language learning processes need to explore questions that may be determined \textit{a priori} while at the same time allowing for the interactions with data to suggest further questioning and exploration thereby increasing understanding of emergent phenomena of interest. This is in contrast with more traditional approaches to research in which the questions of interest are determined before hand and are thus frozen and inflexible.

In concert with the above issue, a second issue raised deals with the kind of observational lens or set of lenses used to gather and reflect upon not only the processes of teaching and learning in foreign language classrooms but also the particular context in which those processes take place. Academic activity is indeed complex social activity. The use of a broad lens approach makes it possible to obtain as much information as possible about a particular phenomenon of interest. The particular phenomenon of interest, then, becomes illuminated by the processes and interactions that surround it. The
phenomenon is thus viewed contextually, that is, as part of and in the light of a larger whole, not as an isolated or unrelated entity. Traditionally, data have been gathered in a somewhat willy nilly fashion. That is, particular instances of data were gathered not in the light of their surrounding environment but rather based upon some arbitrary time scheme, for example, such as every three or five seconds. For example, "positive reinforcement" has often been determined by \textit{a priori} description. Each time "positive reinforcement" was "seen" by a researcher, it was coded as such without regard for the fact that what might be interpreted as positive reinforcement by someone might not be interpreted as such by someone else (e.g., a particular classroom participant or set of participants).

This broad lens perspective is characterized by at least three primary attributes. (1) Analysis focused upon the verbal and nonverbal aspects of unfolding social interaction between and among the participants. (See Appendix A for a description of the data construction procedures employed in this study.) (2) Both qualitative and quantitative data relative to those aspects were gathered. (3) This perspective consists of exploring the interrelationships of the different pieces and parts because of the interactive-reactive nature of the research process. That is, questions and their subsequent analysis at any given point were allowed to interact with and inform other questions and their analysis at other points, thus permitting the expansion of information surrounding a single topic.

A third issue raised by the findings is that of the need for a process of inquiry that facilitates in-depth investigation of the specifics of the foreign language teaching/learning process. Erickson (1986) has cogently argued for the need to understand the details of complex teaching/learning processes in
classrooms as opposed to searching "for general characteristics of the analytically generalized effective teacher" (p. 130). He writes that

The search is . . . for concrete universals, arrived at by studying a specific case in great detail and then comparing it with other cases studied in equally great detail. The assumption is that where we see a particular instance of a teacher teaching, some aspects of what occurs in a given instance of teaching are specific to the historical and cultural circumstances of that type of situation. Still other aspects of what occurs are unique to that particular event, and to the participating individuals engaged in it. The task of the analyst is to uncover . . . what is broadly universal, what is unique to the given instance. This can only be done by attending to the details of the concrete case at hand (p. 130).

In this way, the research process involves both in-depth explorations of phenomena and the adoption of a comparative perspective thereby allowing detailed observation to take place both within and across cases.

Flexibility is the fourth issue raised. The research process allowed for the easy and systematic reentry into the corpus of raw data for the back and forth movement across them. This movement also entailed the opening and closing of the aperture of the observational lens, thus permitting from broad to fine-grained, detailed observations and descriptions. Included in the issue of flexibility is the fact that the researcher was able to move between the structural maps and the video- and audiotaped records of the instructional conversations to extract both quantitative and qualitative information. Other ways of obtaining data that have been employed in exploring foreign language classrooms have not allowed for post hoc retrieval of information throughout the research process (e. g., rating scales, category systems, checklists). The flexible nature of the research process, then, can aid in increasing understandings of selected phenomena.

The research project also raises a fifth issue regarding units of analysis.
As Fassnacht (1982) argues, decisions about units are of great importance insofar as they establish principles with regard to the statements that can be made about a topic before anything has been discovered about it. By deciding on certain units, the nature of the relationship that can subsequently be discovered is defined. One can neither discover nor construct anything beyond the limits imposed by those units. The unit defines, so to speak, the intellectual limits of possible statements and only allows relationships within the context (p. 57).

Relatedly, Shulman (1986) posits that "the units of instructional activity that serve as the starting point for analyses of teaching (sic) are certainly critical choices for the researcher" (p. 8).

Although units of analysis can be determined deductively, they can also be determined inductively. Traditionally, however, the units of analysis in foreign language classroom-oriented research have been determined a priori. Researchers deductively arrived at what they wished to investigate before the research began, such as question-asking, pre- and post-solicitation wait time, teacher managerial behaviors, time-on-task, positive reinforcement, T-units, etc.

The present research endeavor resulted in the arrival at a set of highly reliable, inductively determined units of analysis that were grounded in the actions and interactions of the classroom participants. Rather than rely exclusively on using observational units determined in a priori fashion, the findings of the study suggest the need to utilize research approaches to studying what Kramsch (in press) describes as "the socially and instructionally mediated acquisition of a foreign language in a classroom setting" that allow for the inductive identification of units of analysis.

A sixth issue raised by the research project involves the primary focus of this study, the particular academic activity of the foreign language classroom. Traditional approaches to investigating educational processes have not focused on the specific academic dimensions of instruction in a specific area.
Classroom foreign language instruction involves what some believe to be a process unique to this particular discipline. Hammadou and Bernhardt (1987), for example, affirm that teaching a foreign language teacher is in many ways unique within the profession of teaching. Becoming a foreign language teacher, too, is a different process from that which other future teachers experience. This reality is rooted in the subject matter of foreign language itself. In foreign language teaching, the content and the process for learning the content are the same. In other words, in foreign language teaching, the medium is the message. . . For foreign language teachers to provide genuine instruction in communication in a foreign language, they must use a medium the students do not yet understand (p. 301).

The social interaction perspective is an approach to educational research that is grounded in such disciplines as anthropological linguistics, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, and the ethnography of communication (Green, 1983a, 1983b; Green & Smith, 1983), and is predicated on the theoretical basis that teaching and learning are communicative processes.

The basic assumption is that teaching and learning must be treated as interactive processes that require the active participation of teachers and students to ensure that information is conveyed as a precondition for learning. What is accomplished in the classroom can thus be studied as a function of what is communicated through the interplay of curricula, pedagogical strategies, and what participants perceive over time (Gumperz, 1986, p. 57).

In other words, one learns by being a social participant in the process. Learning to become communicatively competent in another language, then, is not simply a matter of acquiring language forms alone. It involves a plethora of other factors as well. Kramsch (in press) argues that foreign language learning] must consider language to be quintessentially indeterminate and culturally relative and thus view communication, especially communication between interlocutors
of two different cultures, as the negotiation of meanings intended and interpreted within an interactional context . . . If learning another language is mediated by the social environment of the classroom and if in addition this social environment is supposed to lead to a reorganization of sociocultural consciousness through the acquisition of foreign cultural meanings (Vygotsky, 1962; Frawley & Lantolf, 1985; Wertsch, 1985), then we need more research into the social context for classroom [foreign language learning]. Furthermore, classroom learning is, as we know, constrained by institutional parameters: It is related to the ability of learners to display items of academically defined, and thus socially acceptable, knowledge, to match this knowledge with pre-established norms, to equate it with numbers of chapters in a textbook or items on a syllabus. In the classroom, difficulties in language acquisition are not due to linguistic complexity alone, but to a host of external factors such a lack of experiential background, lapses in memory, high affective defenses, and procedural deficits, i. e., the inability to navigate around established norms of classroom discourse (Allwright, 1980).

It is in this way that the classroom can be considered an emerging culture (Breen, 1985), one in which people come together and interact thus establishing a shared communicative context so that they can understand each other's intentions and meanings (Gumperz, 1986). In this as in other social settings, people become environments for each other (Erickson, 1986) establishing and maintaining rules for acceptable social behavior. A social interaction perspective can assist in coming to understand better "the conditions of [foreign language] learning in classrooms so that we can change and improve these conditions" (Kramsch, in press).

The [social interaction perspective] focuses on the interplay of linguistic, contextual and social presuppositions which interact to create the conditions for classroom learning. Analysis focuses on key instructional activities that ethnographic observations have shown may be crucial to the educational process. These activities are realized through definable speech events which stand out against the background of everyday conversation; they have characteristics which can be understood and can be described by ethnographers and recognized by participants. Moreover, knowledge of the events and what is accomplished in them is common to groups of people; they are not occasional occurrences but have a place in the daily conduct of affairs of groups. From
this perspective language in the classroom can be seen as part of the language of the school setting; characteristics of particular classroom situations of children of different ages are seen to occur regularly as speech routines held together through the daily practices of teachers and students; that is, there are features of these routines which are similar across all classroom contexts and some that vary as school progresses (Gumperz, 1986, p. 65).

Summary

The purpose of the preceding discussion was to highlight a selected set of issues and concerns raised by the findings from the present study. If we consider that the goal of classroom-oriented research in foreign language learning is to increase understandings of the complexity of life and, thus, learning in those classrooms, thoughtful consideration must be given to speaking to these concerns. Given this view, the discussion in the next part of this Chapter will turn to specific recommendations for further research in classroom foreign language learning.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Based upon the findings from this study of an intensive Spanish conversation course from a social interaction perspective, the researcher is led to make the following suggestions for further investigation into and descriptions of life in traditional foreign language classrooms:

1 The identification and investigation of factors that influence teaching and learning practices in public school foreign language classrooms.

2 The investigation of teacher perceptions regarding language, language learning, and language teaching, and how those perceptions are manifested in traditional foreign language classrooms.

3 The investigation of student perceptions of classroom language learning activity and proposed outcomes of foreign language instruction.

4 The exploration of formal and informal speaking opportunities provided
to foreign language learners across the different levels of classroom language instruction.

5 The comparison of life in foreign language classrooms with that found in other content classrooms.

6 The investigation of conversational management strategies used by traditional learners of foreign languages when placed in a "real" communicative setting outside the classroom context when reverting to their native language is impossible.

7 The investigation and description of student participation found in upper-level foreign language classrooms when students ostensibly "know" more language.

8 The investigation of the relationship between social participation structures and academic structures during traditional classroom language learning opportunities.

9 The investigation of how students are socialized into becoming learners of foreign languages in traditional classroom settings.

10 The investigation of the influence of the ways in which the teacher uses the foreign language on the ways in which learners use the foreign language, both in and out of the classroom setting.

CONCLUSIONS

Research studies that have examined the social interaction patterns of teaching and learning activity in classroom settings have lead to greater understandings of life in classrooms. The study described herein did not answer all the possible questions that could have been raised, however, and did not resolve dilemmas surrounding the success or failure at learning foreign languages when taught in a traditional U. S. classroom setting for academic credit.
Nevertheless, the study did adopt a particular lens to investigate certain aspects of life found in a single foreign language conversation course from a social interaction perspective. The perspective permitted the identification and description of patterns of student and teacher behaviors and raised additional questions for future study. The goal of the study was to investigate the nature of formal classroom speaking opportunities between and among the learners. Issues were raised that were perhaps critical but that were at the same time illuminating. It is important to understand the nature of classroom language learning activity as it does exist in real classrooms. Simply experimenting with what could possibly happen if certain types of activities were used as opposed to others does not permit the painting of a picture of "what happens in the classroom" (van Lier, 1988, p.38).

Coming to understand real language teaching and learning practices in real classrooms should be a goal of those concerned with the future success of foreign language learning in the United States. More observational studies need to be conducted in a variety of classroom contexts and using a variety of investigative lenses. This is the only way in which researchers will even begin to discover and describe the state of foreign language learning in formal classroom settings.
APPENDIX A

METHODOLOGY FOR CONDUCTING MICROANALYSIS
The purpose of this Appendix is to describe the specific methodology used for conducting microanalysis of the instructional conversations during selected events in the Spanish conversation course. As presented, the methodology allowed for the identification and exploration of recurring patterns of action and interaction in the conversation class. The identification of the recurring patterns helped in locating and describing certain recurring aspects of life during the conversation course and, thus, in accomplishing the goal of the study.

THE SPECIFIC METHODOLOGY FOR CONDUCTING MICROANALYSIS OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL CONVERSATION: AN OVERVIEW

Mapping was the specific methodology used to capture and to freeze instructional conversations for subsequent analysis and reflection (Green, 1977; Green & Wallat, 1981). Gounded in the social interaction perspective presented and discussed in Chapter II, mapping is a kind of discourse analysis that allowed selected activities in the Spanish course to be reconstructed in the form of a map of an unfolding activity. (See Figure 26.) This map allowed for the systematic exploration of meanings constructed and conveyed by means of the instructional conversations and provided the raw data from which recurring patterns of action and interaction in the conversation course were drawn.

In general, constructing a map involves the transcription and segmentation of the instructional conversation into hierarchical units that represent different layers and levels of description. Transcribing and segmenting transcripts is part of the process of an analytical system called the Descriptive Analysis System (Green, 1977; Green & Wallat, 1981), which is based upon theoretical constructs (i.e., presented in Chapter II) from such
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PDU Line</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
<th>IU</th>
<th>Thematically Tied Message Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>ALL RIGHT</td>
<td></td>
<td>Begin &quot;Tell About Houses&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>BUENO</td>
<td></td>
<td>Begin Phase I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td>VAMOS CON COSAS MAS FORMALES, NO? EH?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td>EN NUESTRO GRUPO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td>AH HABLAMOS SOBRE LAS HABITACIONES DE LA CASA NO?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007</td>
<td>LA SALA, NO?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>LA COCINA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009</td>
<td>CUALES SON LAS HABITACIONES, EH? CUALES SON?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010</td>
<td>CUALES SON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011</td>
<td>Ss: (inaudible)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012</td>
<td>EH?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013</td>
<td>POR EJEMPLO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014</td>
<td>Ss: cocina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015</td>
<td>COCINA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016</td>
<td>QUE MAS?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>017</td>
<td>Ss: baño (inaudible)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>018</td>
<td>EL BANO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019</td>
<td>QUIEN DIJO ESO?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020</td>
<td>Ss: (inaudible)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>021</td>
<td>Sg: la sala</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>022</td>
<td>LA SALA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>023</td>
<td>OKAY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>024</td>
<td>S? el dormitorio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>025</td>
<td>EL DORMITORIO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>026</td>
<td>Sk: el estudio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>027</td>
<td>COMO?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>028</td>
<td>Sk: el estudio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 26** Map segment 1 ("Daily Routines")
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>029</td>
<td>EL ESTUDIO OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>030</td>
<td>SI, ES UNA PALABRA EN ESPANOL?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031</td>
<td>SÍ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>032</td>
<td>SÍ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>033</td>
<td>SÍ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>034</td>
<td>NO LO SABÍA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>035</td>
<td>HA HA HA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>036</td>
<td>Ss: sotano basement sotanio</td>
<td>SOTANO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>037</td>
<td>Ss: sotano sotano</td>
<td>SOTANO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>038</td>
<td>Sg: sótano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>039</td>
<td>Ss: sótano</td>
<td>SOTANO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>040</td>
<td>Ss: sotano</td>
<td>OKAY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041</td>
<td>Ss: veranda</td>
<td>COMO?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>042</td>
<td>Ss: veranda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>043</td>
<td>Ss: veranda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>044</td>
<td>Ss: veranda</td>
<td>Sg: balcón</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>045</td>
<td>Ss: veranda</td>
<td>balcón</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>046</td>
<td>Ss: veranda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>047</td>
<td>Ss: veranda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>048</td>
<td>VERANDA?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>049</td>
<td>SÍ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>050</td>
<td>Ss: el balcón balcón</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>051</td>
<td>Sg: balcón</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>052</td>
<td>Ss: patio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>053</td>
<td>Ss: patio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>054</td>
<td>Ss: veranda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>055</td>
<td>Ss: veranda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>056</td>
<td>Ss: desván</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Ss: desván</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Ss: desván attic desván</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Ss: desván attic desván</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Ss: or a guardilla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>EL ATICO?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Ss: attic okay el ático what do I know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>NO NO NO NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 26 (continued)
diverse fields as sociolinguistics, conversational analysis, and the study of teaching. The descriptive system is a multi-stage analysis system that is specially designed to describe the flow of the instructional conversation. The system, however, is used only as a heuristic tool, one that permits the instructional conversations to be frozen in systematic ways, thus allowing the conversations to be explored for recurring patterns of action and interaction in the Spanish conversation course. This Appendix, then, specifies the mapping methodology as it was used in this study.

Mapping Is a Heuristic Device

In this section, a brief discussion is presented on the nature of the structural map as a tool for the capturing and subsequent exploration of complex instructional and social processes. In short, the structural map of the instructional conversation is a representation of the sequential evolution of the conversations that unfold during classroom activities. The maps are the means by which unfolding conversation and activity are captured and frozen in theoretically grounded or principled ways. This allows the researcher to identify and explore both social and academic activity, which are embedded in the verbal and nonverbal interactions between and among teacher and students. The map, then, is but one reconstruction of evolving social and academic activity, as accomplished through the "instructional conversation" (Green, 1977; Green & Wallat, 1981).

Once the transcriptions of conversations are made, they are frozen into a series of hierarchical conversational and pedagogical units. Being hierarchical in nature, these units create different layers and levels of description of each activity, which is possible as a result of the systematic layering of different
dimensions of the instructional conversation. In this way, a broad view can be
dissected into a finer or microanalytic view of an activity, depending upon the
number of layers that are pared back. Just as the microscope allows the
biologist to view micro-organisms from broad to fine-grained perspectives by
switching powers of lenses, so do the different layers of the analytic process
permit the researcher to move back and forth across the different levels and
layers to explore whole-part/part-whole relationships. The research questions
and emergent phenomena are the means by which the researcher is guided in
focusing the analytic lens.

The result of the identification of the various conversational and
pedagogical units is the construction of equivalent data sets. The significance
of structurally equivalent data sets is that all streams of talk identified as a
particular type of unit stand for the same class of phenomena, and they are
determined in the same systematic way. Hence, each time the researcher
"looked" at the instructional conversations during the Spanish conversation
course, the "looking" took place in an equivalent way. The only aspect that
varied was the way the unit functioned in a particular context. In other words, "it
was the inductively derived description of unit function that varied, not the unit
itself" (Graham, 1986, p. 387).

The determination of data sets in systematic ways means that two
observers who are looking at a single instance of a particular phenomenon
should be able to extract similar functional and structural descriptions of what is
happening. Therefore, the researcher is able to look both within and across
data sets of equivalent types for recurring patterns, and thus be assured that
the data sets being compared are representative of the same type of
phenomena. Furthermore, a researcher can be confident that independent
observers will be able to derive equivalent descriptions of a particular instance of a phenomenon.

The following illustration is presented to show the process of identification and description of structurally equivalent data sets. One important premise of the analytic system is that instructional conversations are by nature goal-directed phenomena. Any interruption in the conversational flow is defined within the Descriptive Analysis System as a Potentially Divergent Unit. The Potentially Divergent Unit, then, represents a particular kind of conversational unit. All Potentially Divergent Units, therefore, are considered to be structurally equivalent data sets. The potential result is that all instances of divergences are able to be explored to determine whether they are both functionally and structurally equivalent. For example, the Spanish teacher is explaining a particular grammatical issue when a student interrupts him to ask about when the break is going to begin. The effect of the student's question is that the flow of the instructional conversation is temporarily interrupted when the teacher responds to the question, then returns to the original flow. The teacher's response to the student's question is then frozen into a potentially divergent unit on the structural map. The unit was thus determined in a principled fashion, that is, all streams of conversation that do not directly follow the thread of the evolving conversational theme are potentially divergent. In this way, the researcher is able to look for patterns both within and across all potentially divergent units during both the same and different classroom activities. Hence, the researcher can be assured that equivalent data sets are being compared. Moreover, independent observers can also give similar descriptions of events taking place within the potential divergences.

Up to now, this Appendix has presented an overview of the mapping
process, the specific methodology for capturing and freezing instructional conversations. The discussion that follows will focus on the premises underlying the analytic system, including the multistep process used to create and analyze the map of the instructional conversation.

PREMISES UNDERLYING THE DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS SYSTEM

Below are identified the premises of the Descriptive Analysis System, which stem from the combination of sociolinguistic and pedagogical concepts. These premises provide the theoretical foundation for the systematic description of instructional conversations presented in this Appendix.

1. Conversations are created by people acting on and working with the messages from and behavior of others;
2. Pedagogical actions on the part of student and teacher overlap conversational strategies, i.e., strategies such as focusing, confirming, and clarifying are at the same time pedagogical and conversational in nature;
3. The instructional conversation is goal directed;
4. The roles for teacher and student are specified;
5. The teacher determines the structure and direction of the conversation;
6. The structure of the conversation includes non-verbal and co-verbal aspects of the instructional chain;
7. The structure of the conversation may be tied to the students' interactions, the teacher's messages or the materials or topic central to the lesson;
8. A description of the instructional conversation must be obtained on a message by message basis;
9 Messages are context bound; therefore, interpretation of any part of the instructional conversation requires the consideration of the immediate context in which the aspect under consideration occurred;

10 Context is constructed as part of the evolving conversation; it is not merely background;

11 The contextualization cues to message realization, message boundary, and message ties (e.g., kinesics, proxemix, prosodic) used by participants are available to an observer;

12 Conversational relationships or ties exist between some messages in an instructional conversation but not between all messages;

13 Thematic and/or pedagogical cohesion exists on a variety of levels; therefore, consideration of the various levels of cohesion provides the basis for the identification of tied conversational units of varying length and type (Interaction Units; Instructional Sequence Units; Phase Units; Lesson Units);

14 Structural maps that symbolize the flow of the evolving conversation can be constructed using the conversational units identified;

15 Analysis of thematic cohesion and breaches in cohesion provide the basis for identification of instructional patterns and social interaction patterns (Green & Wallat, 1979; pp. 163-164).

MAPPING THE INSTRUCTIONAL CONVERSATION

Mapping the instructional conversation involves primarily a three-part process. These parts are:

1 transcription of the instructional conversation;

2 segmentation of the instructional conversation;

3 analysis of the instruction conversation.
The discussion that follows provides an in-depth look at these three processes.

**Transcription**

As the first step in the mapping process, it is necessary to obtain a rough draft of the unfolding instructional conversation between and among the participants from videotapes and/or audiotapes of the activity. The transcriptions should be as accurate as possible, which means that inaudible portions should be designated as such on the transcript. All teacher talk is typed in upper-case letters. Student talk is typed in lower case letters. (See Cochran-Smith, 1984, and Ochs, 1979 for a discussion of the relationships between theory and transcription.)

**Segmentation**

Upon completion of the transcription, the second part of the process consists of segmenting the instructional conversation into the various hierarchical conversational pedagogical units. These units are placed on the structural maps of the lesson. The message unit is the first unit in the hierarchy.

**Message Unit**

"A message unit (MU) is the minimum unit coded in this system. An MU is a minimal unit of conversational meaning on the part of the speaker" (Green & Wallat, 1981, p. 196). Examples of message units are provided in Figure 26 transcript lines 001, 001, 003, 004, 005, and so on. Although the Research Questions did not require this level of analysis, each MU, once identified, can be defined in terms of its source, form, purpose, level of comprehension, and tie. (See Green 1977 and Green & Wallat, 1981, for a full discussion.)

Segmenting the instructional conversation into message units takes
place by means of listening to and observing the manner in which messages are delivered. Hence, a message unit cannot be predicted in advance, but rather on a post hoc basis by observing the nonverbal, verbal, and paralinguistic cues to the delivery of a message (Green & Wallat, 1981). These cues are cues to contextualization (Gumperz, 1982; Gumperz & Herasimchuk, 1973; Erickson & Shultz, 1981). Determination of when a message begins and ends encompasses the full range of contextualization cues, such as pitch, intonation contours, stress, pauses, head and arm gestures, head turning, etc. In addition, these cues may signal the manner in which messages are interpreted.

Following the segmentation of the rough transcript into message units, these units are then placed on the map. The segmented transcript is then typed with each message unit beginning on a new line, such as those shown in Figure 26. As described previously, teacher talk is in upper case letters while student talk is typed in lower case letters, and is indented.

When message units have been identified and the transcribed text has been constructed, the videotapes and/or audiotapes are used concomitantly in order to identify on a post hoc basis the other units of varying types and lengths, each embedded in the instructional conversation. These units are based on a synthesis of previous research on conversational structure, conversational analysis, and the study of teaching (Green & Wallat, 1981). Conversational and thematic cohesiveness provides the possibility of identifying these units because conversations are not simply "random strings of messages with no coherence" (Green & Wallat, 1981, p. 170). Conversational cohesion is something that occurs in all conversations, whether they are instructional or not, because "participants have little trouble creating a coherent or cohesive entity" (p. 170). In other words, conversations by nature have a coherent and cohesive
structure; they are goal oriented. The purpose of talk, more often than not, is to reach some logical end. Cohesiveness, including breaches in cohesion, allow for the identification of structures whose function is to maintain cohesion within conversation. These structures are presented below.

**Interaction Unit**

A sequence of tied or cohesive message units is called an interaction unit (IU).

An interaction unit is defined as a series of conversationally tied message units. Which message units tie to form an interaction unit depends on consideration of verbal aspects of the message and cues to contextualization. If the delivery of a message indicates that more is to follow (e.g., rhythm, pitch, intonation contour), then that message and the one that follows are described as tied. Conversational "pull" rather than syntax and/or semantic tie is the key. Consideration of contextualization cues is critical to the identification of which Message Units tie to form Interaction Units and which do not. (Green & Wallat, 1981, p. 200).

Examples of interaction units in Figure 26 are lines 001-003, 004-008, 009-015. The map indicates that an interaction unit is marked by the bracket (I) and the horizontal line after the last Message Unit in the Interaction Unit.

Conversational cohesion is but one type of cohesion that can take place in instructional conversations. Another type is called thematic or topical cohesion. "All conversational units (i.e., "message units, interaction units) that continue the flow or thread of the unfolding conversation are marked in the 'Thematically Tied Units' Column" (Green & Wallat, 1981, p. 170).

**Instructional Sequence Unit**

Just as there can be thematic cohesion across Message Units to form Interaction Units, there can exist thematic cohesion across Interaction Units to form Instructional Sequence Units.
An instructional sequence unit (ISU) is composed of a series of tied interactions units (IU). An instructional sequence unit is defined in terms of content. All interaction units which focus on the same aspect of the total conversation belong to a single instructional sequence unit. The ties for the instructional sequence unit are ties that exist across units thematically. The end of an instructional sequence is marked by a shift in the general content within the lesson. Contextualization cues don't play a central role in the identification of instructional sequence units. This unit corresponds to a step the teacher takes in building the pedagogical structure of a lesson. Like message units, the instructional sequence unit is determined in retrospect. One cannot determine in advance whether or not an instruction unit will be part of the preceding instructional sequence unit or will begin a new instructional sequence unit. Instructional sequence units are generally composed of more than one interaction unit, but there are times in which an instructional sequence unit will be composed of a single interaction unit (Green & Wallat, 1981, p. 201).

Examples of instructional sequence units are shown in Figure 26, transcript lines 001-003, 004-056. According to specification by Green and Wallat, (1981), the ISU is indicated by a "double-barred line at the end of the sequence and by the number in the upper left hand box in the thematically tied units column of the map" (p. 171).

While most conversations flow in a thematically cohesive way, a break in cohesion may occur in an ISU that threatens the teacher's instructional goal or theme. Whenever this occurs, the break is called a Potentially Divergent Unit (PDU). Any kind of a conversational unit (i.e., message unit, interaction unit) that does not directly continue the cohesive thread of the unfolding conversation gets placed in the PDU column. An example is provided in transcript line 030. How the teacher continues thematic cohesion, including how the teacher handles the break in cohesion, provides a systematic way of determining rules of social action in the instructional setting (Green & Wallat, 1981).

Phase Unit

While thematic cohesion exists across Message Units and Interaction
Units, thematic cohesion across Instructional Sequence Units likewise forms a larger unit called a Phase Unit.

A Phase Unit consists of a series of thematically tied Instructional Sequence Units. Pedagogically, a lesson is composed of parts or phases each with a distinct purpose (e.g., Introduction, Content Presentation, Evaluation Period or Summary). Consideration of the pedagogical and social structure being constructed will determine which Instructional Sequence Units belong to a Phase Unit and which do not. Consideration of who is group, when is group, and the expectations for behavior, provide the structural cues that can be used to determine Phase Units for a given period of time. While generally Phase Units are composed of more than one Instructional Sequence Unit, there will be instances when a Phase Unit will consist of a single Instructional Sequence Unit. Like all previously described units, the Phase Unit is determined in retrospect (Green & Wallat, p. 201).

An example of the end of one Phase Unit and the beginning of another is provided in Figure 27, transcript lines 135-137 and 138-141. Green & Wallat (1981) specify that the Phase Unit is marked on the map at the point of its terminating boundary, marked after transcript line 137, with the new Phase Unit beginning with transcript line 138.

Thus far, the conversational and pedagogical units that are defined by the analytic system have been presented. Described below is an additional analytic unit, the Activity Unit, which was inductively arrived at during the process of transcribing and segmenting the instructional conversations.

**Activity Unit**

The Activity Unit is the broadest organizational structure within which academic work in the Spanish conversation class took place. This unit was inductively derived after consideration of the fact that there were thematically tied Phase Units across a number of Phase Units. Within the boundaries of the Activity Unit there were usually a number of events each one of which contained thematically tied units. The identification of this unit made it possible to look at
| 125 | + | Se: (incomprehensible) |
| 126 | + | ATTIC |
| 127 | + | Se: aquí aquí (pointing to dictionary) |
| 128 | | HAY OTRA PALABRA NO? |
| 129 | | Se: yeah yeah aquí aquí describe (holding dict.) |
| 130 | | SI? |
| 131 | | Se: sí |
| 132 | | NO ME SUEÑA NO ME SUEÑA |
| 133 | | Se: (incomprehensible) |
| 134 | | NO |
| 135 | | LA COCINA |
| 136 | | EL BANO |
| 137 | | TAMBIEN EL COMEDOR, VERDAD? |
| 138 | | OKAY UNA PREGUNTA, NO |
| 139 | | CUANTAS PERSONAS |
| 140 | | VIVEN |
| 141 | | EN UNA CASA? |
| 142 | | SS: (raise hands) |
| 143 | | Sm: depende |
| 144 | | DEPENDE DE QUE |
| 145 | | Sm: oh okay |
| 146 | | NO NO EN UN APARTAMENTO COMO YO NI NI NI ESO NO |
| 147 | | EN UNA CASA |
| 148 | | SS: (raise hands) |

**Figure 27** Map segment 2 ("Daily Routines")
thematically tied events and see that there was a certain cohesion that indicated a larger unit of analysis possible. The Activity Unit is analogous to the Lesson Unit, although the Activity is an even broader unit of analysis. As indicated in Chapter IV, the Activity Unit contained between two and three Parts, each one of which was thematically tied to the other.

So far, the discussion of the mapping methodology has concentrated on the construction of the map by means of the two-stage process of transcription and segmentation of the instructional conversation. The third stage, analysis of the structural map, is discussed below.

ANALYSIS OF THE STRUCTURAL MAP

After the map of the instructional conversation was constructed, it was reviewed for recurring patterns of action and interaction in the Spanish conversation class. Upon the extraction of patterns, variables grounded in those observed patterns were then constructed. Following this analytic process, the variables were tested across similar and dissimilar cases using the type-case analytic model (See Figure 4, Chapter III) (Erickson & Shultz, 1981; Green & Harker, 1982). A full description of analysis procedures is provided in Chapter III for each of the Research Questions.

TRUSTWORTHINESS OF THE ANALYTICAL SYSTEM

To determine the trustworthiness of the data, interobserver agreement measures were obtained on the researcher's identification of the conversational and pedagogical units located during the process of mapping. Interobserver agreement was determined specifically on the following units in the hierarchy:

Message Units;
Phase Units;
Activity Units.

These units were selected for measurement of interobserver agreements because they provided the basis for the presentation and discussion of findings in Chapters III and IV. In the discussion that follows, specific dimensions of the process of determining trustworthiness are provided. Those dimensions are:

External Observers;
Sampling for Interobserver Agreement;
Methodology for Obtaining Interobserver Agreement;
Training of the External Observers;
Procedures for Conducting the Validation Process.

External Observers

The process of validating the researcher's identification of the conversational and pedagogical units on the unfolding instructional maps employed two external observers. (See Chapter III for a discussion on external observers.) External Observer B conducted the validation process for the Message Units. Observer B was asked to serve as the external observer for these units because, through course work, she had already become familiar with and had practice using the same system of microanalysis. No special training, therefore, beyond how to use the remote control device for the VCR equipment, was necessary. External Observer A was asked to serve as the external observer for the Phase Units and Activity Units because he was a fluent—although a non-native-speaker—of Spanish, he was an experienced teacher of Spanish, he had experience observing and supervising Teaching Assistants, and because he had a high level of interest in the study.
Sampling for Interobserver Agreement:
Method of Obtaining Interobserver Agreement

Interobserver Agreement on the researcher's identification of the specified units took place on a post hoc basis. A systematically selected example of the specified conversational and pedagogical units was used. Below, each sample is identified and the method for determining interobserver agreement levels is discussed.

**Message Units**

Interobserver agreement was determined on message units occurring during theoretically selected events. (See Chapter III.) These events were selected because they represented a random cross section of teacher talk and student-to-student talk. The first three minutes of the beginning of the three transcribed speaking activities were sampled. These sections were selected for interobserver agreement analysis because they represented a sample primarily--although not exclusively--of teacher talk. Samples of student-to-student talk were taken during the first three minutes of small-group talk as well as during a three-minute period of time that began after the students were five minutes into their speaking task. (The researcher had identified a total of 287 message units during these nine minutes.) Interobserver agreement was calculated according to the following formula:

\[
\text{Percentage of Agreement} = \frac{\text{Number of Agreements}}{\text{Number of Agreements} + \text{Number of Disagreements}} \times 100
\]

An agreement was recorded each time the external observer identified a message unit the same as one of the researcher's 287 identified units. Disagreements were all message units in the sample of 287 that were not agreed upon. Interobserver agreement was calculated at 78% (i.e., agreement on 241 of 287).
Phase Units
Interobserver agreement was determined for Small-Group Task Presentation Phases (n=3), Small-Group Speaking Task Phases (n=3), Whole-Group Task Speaking Phases (n=3), Memory Game Phases (n=2) in the three transcribed activities. Interobserver agreement was calculated for each of the four phases according to the formula below:

\[
\frac{\text{Number of Agreements}}{\text{Number of Agreements} + \text{Number of Disagreements}} \times 100
\]

An agreement was marked each time the observer identified a phase within the speaking activity. Disagreements were all phases in the sample that were not agreed upon. Interobserver agreement was calculated at 100%.

Activity Units
Interobserver agreement was determined for all Activity Units on days one and five of the Spanish conversation class. Interobserver agreement was calculated according to the formula below:

\[
\frac{\text{Number of Agreements}}{\text{Number of Agreements} + \text{Number of Disagreements}} \times 100
\]

An agreement was recorded each time the external observer identified an Activity Unit on the sampled days. A disagreement was recorded for all Activity Units that were not agreed upon. Interobserver agreement was calculated at 100%.
Training of the External Observers

External Observer B

As previously stated, no special training beyond how to use the remoted control device for the VCR equipment was necessary for this external observer; she was already familiar with the analytic system as well as its theoretical frame.

Procedures for Conducting Validation

Procedures for obtaining interobserver agreement on Message Units previously identified by the researcher during the mapping process followed the steps identified below.

1. The observer was given an unsegmented copy of the transcription of the instructional conversation for the designated parts of the activity to be sampled for interobserver agreement checks.

2. The researcher located the portions of the videotapes for the observer where the verification of message units was to be made.

3. Because the observer was already familiar with the workings of a VCR (i.e., fast forwarding, rewinding, stopping, pausing), she only needed to be familiarized with the particular remote control device to be used with the playback equipment. A short (five minutes) practice session for working the remote device was completed.

4. Once the observer was comfortable with the remote control device, she independently operated the equipment as was necessary to identify the message units and mark them with slash marks (i.e., "/").

5. When the preceding Steps were completed, interobserver agreement was calculated using the formula identified earlier.
External Observer A

As indicated earlier, External Observer A was an experienced teacher of Spanish, had experience observing and supervising Teaching Assistants, and had a high interest level in the study. Unlike Observer B, however, this observer had no prior knowledge of the theoretical orientation of the study or in the analysis system being used.

Procedures for Conducting Validation

Procedures for calculating interobserver agreement consisted in following the steps identified below for each hierarchical level (i.e., Phase Units and Activity Units). Because this observer was unfamiliar with the theoretical orientation of the study and the analysis system being used, he was given a brief introduction to the study, its theoretical framework, and the role he was to play in the validation process. After a brief question and answer session, the steps outlined below were followed.

1 External Observer A, because he, too, was already familiar with the general workings of a VCR and the remote control device, required no special training in stopping, rewinding, fast forwarding, and pausing the videotape. He did, nonetheless, request a few minutes "to get the feel of the equipment" and to adjust the volume on the VCR (i.e., he was using headphones).

2 Because this observer was unfamiliar with the analytical system being used to segment the rough transcripts into the hierarchical units, the researcher gave the observer a definition of a Phase Unit (Green & Wallat, 1981). Then, using another videotape (i.e., not the same tape he was to use in the validation process), the researcher identified Phase Units while simultaneously describing his decisions. Immediately following this explanation,
the observer was asked to use another tape to identify verbally several Phase Units located in other activities. When problems arose, they were worked out between the researcher and the observer.

3 Following the preceding practice session, Observer A was provided with an untreated copy of the rough transcript of the instructional conversations for the designated activities. He was asked to listen to and to watch the videotape and mark on the transcript with a slash mark (i.e., "/") whenever the teacher and the class ended one Phase and entered into another one.

4 After completing this procedure, interobserver agreement was calculated using the formula identified earlier.

The procedures described below were followed for the validation of Activity Unit:

1 Because Observer A was unfamiliar with the analytical system being used in the study, the researcher provided him with a definition of Activity Unit. Following this definition, the researcher, using another videotape (i.e., not the same tape he was to use in the validation process), located and demonstrated several Activity Units. Immediately following this explanation and demonstration process, the Observer, using still another tape, practiced locating points in the instructional conversations where an activity ended and another one began.

2 Following the procedure for definition and practice session, Observer B was provided with a rough transcript of the instructional conversation. He was asked to mark with a slash mark (i.e. "/") the point during the instructional conversation where designated activities either ended or began.

3 When the preceding steps were completed, interobserver agreement was calculated using the formula identified earlier.
SUMMARY

The purpose of this Appendix was to describe the specific methodology used in mapping the instructional conversations and to describe the Descriptive Analysis System upon which the methodology was based. The system, as suggested by interobserver agreement measures reached during the validation process, was found to be a reliable one.
APPENDIX B

ABSTRACT OF RESEARCH PROPOSAL
ABSTRACT

Introduction and Problem Statement

The espoused goals of current foreign language instruction require that students learn foreign language in order to use it in a proficient and culturally appropriate manner. Not a great deal is known, however, about how activities designed for conversational use of a foreign language in a formal classroom context are structured by the instructor and students. Analysis of the instructional talk that goes on between and among the participants in the foreign language classroom can shed light upon how these goals are played out within the formal classroom environment. With this in mind, the following research project is proposed.

Purpose of the Research Project

The purpose of this research project is to explore systematically the instructional talk that goes on between and among the participants of the foreign language classroom. It is through systematic and principled analysis of this instructional talk that one can come to know more about the teaching and learning processes that actually take place in the classroom.

Theoretical Base

This research project assumes that teaching and learning are conversational processes (Green, 1983). Analysis of the instructional talk that goes on between the foreign language teacher and students will reveal information not only about the goals of foreign language instruction, but also information about when and how to use the foreign language, as well as about expectations for participation within the classroom. With this theoretical frame in mind, the following research questions will guide the research:
1. What is the nature of the activities designed to promote conversation in the foreign language?

2. What are the social and academic demands for participation in the formal classroom activities?

3. What factors support and/or constrain conversation in the foreign language?

4. What are the conversational outcomes that come about as a result of participation in this conversation class?

**Design of the Study**

This research project is ethnographic in its approach. This ethnographic approach calls for the researcher to enter the setting for an extended period of time. It also calls for the researcher to conduct participant observation. The purpose of participant observation is to get a participant's view of "what is happening" in the situation under observation. In order to carry out this study two general phases for systematic data collection will take place in order to find out more about who talks to whom, when, about what, and for what purpose.

Phase one consists of data collection. This phase has two steps. Step one will consist of my entering the field. This will take place initially on day one of the class. At this time I will be introduced as a person interested in researching the nature of conversation in a foreign language class designed specifically for conversation. During this step I will begin to take what are called field notes. The purpose of these field notes is to begin to investigate what kinds of events take place during a typical meeting of the class. By means of these field notes I hope to shed light upon what the recurring events are that have a consistent pattern across class meetings. Also during this first step, audio taping of the
class will begin in support of the field notes. In addition, the teacher will be asked to audio record his plans and intentions. This will take place throughout the research project.

Step two of phase one of the project consists of the videotaping of selected episodes of recurring events. This videotaping will be done in order to have a permanent record of these events for subsequent microanalysis of the conversations. From this permanent record I hope to gain a detailed picture of the model or models of conversation that take place within the classroom during selected representative episodes.

Phase two of the research project consists primarily of the analysis of data. Analysis of the data will consist of the construction of structural maps of the instructional conversation as described by Green (1977) and Green and Wallat (1981). A brief description of the data analysis procedures is presented here:

Step 1 Transcribe video tapes and teacher goals;
Step 2 Code tapes (two coders work together);
Step 3 Maps are created based on conversational units obtained in Step 2;
Step 4 Analysis and description of research questions as reflected on maps;
Step 5 Analysis of teacher goals from Teacher's audio tape transcripts;
Step 6 Researcher meets with the teacher to:
   a. Review tapes and maps;
   b. Clarify goals;
   c. Check validity of findings and descriptions.
Statement of Human Subjects

Consent forms (see attached Letter of Consent) will be presented to the participants for their signature. Their signing of this letter signifies (1) that they will allow for this research project to take place, and (2) that they will allow me to use segments of the videotapes on which they may be recorded.

The participants in this class will not be asked to change anything that they might do. In addition, while the students might be asked to be interviewed about what they are doing in the class, they will not be removed from instruction.

Anticipated Benefit to the Instructor

Through the results of this research project, the Instructor will come to know more about the teaching and learning processes that evolved during the course of the class. In addition, the Instructor will come to know about the students' perceptions of the events that were designed to promote conversation in the foreign language.

Anticipated Benefit to the Field

Through the results of this research project the field of Instruction in general and the field of Foreign Language Instruction in particular will come to know more about how actual teaching and learning activities in a foreign language conversation class are constructed and carried out. This knowledge will help generate hypotheses regarding the nature of instruction in a foreign language classrooms, context. In addition, the results will add to the growing data base regarding the general nature of classroom instructional processes.
APPENDIX C

LETTER TO STUDENTS
May 14, 1985

Dear Student,

Because your Spanish conversation course takes place on Fridays for a period of six hours per class meeting, it is rather unique. The uniqueness of your class presents an opportunity for a researcher interested in coming to know more about how conversations take place in a foreign language class designed specifically for conversation. Your Instructor has agreed to take part in an investigation into the conversations that take place during your Spanish conversation class. For this reason I would like to explore the nature of the conversations that occur between you and your teacher as well as between you and your fellow students.

This research project will include video- and audiotaping various activities during the course of the class's formal routines. Since taping will be done at selected times, you may be recorded. It is for this reason that I would like to have your permission (1) to do this research during your Spanish conversation course, and (2) to use a segment or segments of the tapes on which you may be recorded.

During the course of the research project, I would like to interview you at times convenient to you. The purpose of these interviews is to find out your perceptions of what is happening on the tapes. Videotaping will take place several weeks into the project. Prior to taping I will be taking what are called field notes to have a record of the normal routines of the class on a day-to-day basis. It is with the aid of these field notes that I will be able to decide which segments of the class to tape. The purpose of the taping is to have a permanent record of selected episodes of normal classroom procedures for subsequent analysis. The usefulness of this record of the Spanish conversation course includes (1) a sample or samples of the classroom routines; (2) a record of the classroom routines that can be used in second language classroom research and in teacher education.

I will appreciate your willingness to participate in this research project. I assure you that your name and the name of your school will not be used in reports of this project.

Sincerely yours,

Frank B. Brooks, Ph.D. Candidate
The Ohio State University

Your signature___________ Date ____/____/1985.
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