

Old Dominion University

ODU Digital Commons

Theses and Dissertations in Urban Services -
Urban Education

College of Education & Professional Studies
(Darden)

Winter 1994

Linguistic Theory Applied to Teaching Practice: Looking Through Linguists' Eyes at an Urban ESL Classroom

Caroline Mary El-Kadi
Old Dominion University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/urbanservices_education_etds



Part of the [Linguistics Commons](#), and the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

El-Kadi, Caroline M.. "Linguistic Theory Applied to Teaching Practice: Looking Through Linguists' Eyes at an Urban ESL Classroom" (1994). Doctor of Philosophy (PhD), dissertation, , Old Dominion University, DOI: 10.25777/vhkq-pv08
https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/urbanservices_education_etds/109

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Education & Professional Studies (Darden) at ODU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations in Urban Services - Urban Education by an authorized administrator of ODU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@odu.edu.

LINGUISTIC THEORY APPLIED TO TEACHING PRACTICE:
LOOKING THROUGH LINGUISTS' EYES AT AN URBAN ESL CLASSROOM

by

Caroline Mary El-Kadi

B.A. June 1961, Leeds University, U.K.
B.A. June 1971, London University, U.K.
M.A. June 1975, Old Dominion University

A Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of
Old Dominion University in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirement for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

URBAN SERVICES

OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY
December, 1994

Approved by:

Denny Wolfe, Dissertation Chair

Member

Concentration Area Director

Member

Dean of College of Education

ABSTRACT

LINGUISTIC THEORY APPLIED TO TEACHING
PRACTICE: LOOKING THROUGH LINGUISTS' EYES
AT AN URBAN ESL CLASSROOM

Caroline Mary El-Kadi

Old Dominion University, 1994

Director: Dr. Denny Wolfe

The quality of instruction in English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) programs is of utmost concern to urban educators as more and more non-native speakers settle in urban areas and need better language skills to participate fully in American society. Training of ESL instructors is often difficult, given the limited resources of most programs. In ESL, a close study of classroom discourse has long been considered particularly useful, but undirected classroom observation is of limited use because what novices notice in the classroom is often inaccurate or irrelevant. Ways are needed to focus beginning teachers' observations. Over several decades, discourse analysts have devised methods for describing discourse, many of which have focused on the classroom. This study chose three distinctly different methods of describing classroom interaction. It was hypothesized that if the insights gained through these methods are congruent with the insights of experienced teachers, they might be used to focus student teachers' observations. Twelve sessions of a listening-speaking class were videotaped, and transcripts made. After examining the data, the teacher shared with the researcher his insights

into the classroom interaction. Two student teachers were then presented with selected data, and their observations noted. The experienced teacher's conclusions and observations differed considerably from those of the novices. Parts of the data were then analyzed using the three previously selected methods. The analyses proved to be congruent with the experienced teacher's viewpoint, suggesting their potential use as a teacher training tool. The study showed one drawback to such use: transcription of classroom data is technically difficult and time-consuming. In spite of that drawback, more such studies are recommended, as a means of bringing the insights of linguistic research into the classroom.

Copyright by Caroline Mary El-Kadi 1994

All Rights Reserved

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my gratitude to the following people, without whom this dissertation would never have been finished.

My dissertation committee--Dr. Denny Wolfe, Dr. John Broderick, and Dr. Jack Robinson--who gave me unqualified support and encouragement and showed infinite patience.

Richard LaPrade, Kirstin Reed-Perez, and Kitty Penny, who participated in the research cheerfully and unquestioningly.

Fred Warren, who spent many hours helping me with the format of the manuscript and the design of the charts.

Bobby Schmidt, who set up and operated the video cameras.

My family--Ali, Mona, and Dina--who tolerated the disruption to our lives for so long.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
LIST OF CHARTS	iv
 CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND	1
PURPOSE AND FOCUS OF STUDY	2
STATEMENT OF PROBLEM	4
METHODOLOGY	9
IMPORTANCE OF TOPIC	15
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	16
3. RECORDING CLASSROOM DISCOURSE	32
4. RECORDING THE OBSERVERS' INSIGHTS	44
PART 1: THE EXPERIENCED TEACHER	44
PART 2: THE STUDENT TEACHERS	61
PART 3: EXPERIENCED OBSERVERS VERSUS NOVICES	80
5. USING SYSTEMS FOR ANALYZING CLASSROOM DISCOURSE	87
PART 1: CHOOSING SYSTEMS	87
PART 2: SINCLAIR AND COULTHARD	90
PART 3: FANSELOW	117
PART 4: SHUY	153
6. CONCLUSIONS	175
 BIBLIOGRAPHY	 186
APPENDIX: TRANSCRIPTION OF APRIL 19TH CLASS	193

LIST OF CHARTS

CHART	PAGE
1. Synopsis of Sinclair and Coulthard's System	93
2. Dialogue Analyzed Using Sinclair and Coulthard's System	94
3. Extract from April 19th, Analyzed Using Sinclair and Couithard's System	97
4. Synopsis of Fanselow's System (Focus)	119
5. First Excerpt Analyzed Using Fanselow's System	130
6. Second Excerpt Analyzed Using Fanselow's System	147

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Background

The field of Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL) is a major concern in a large number of urban universities and community colleges. More and more people whose native language is not English are settling in urban areas, and finding the best methods and best teachers to give them language instruction becomes increasingly important as they learn how to participate fully in American life. In addition to the increasing numbers of international students coming to the United States to study English before entering the university to major in an academic field, the population of non-English speaking immigrants and permanent residents is rising daily. The English as a Second Language (ESL) classroom is often the major conduit through which non-native speakers learn how to use English in a social context.

In order to accommodate the language-learning needs of these populations, urban education centers are instituting not only ESL courses but full-scale intensive English programs catering to the needs of learners from the most elementary levels to university skill levels. Such programs are typically found in universities in large urban centers of population because the largest numbers of non-native speakers

of English cluster in these areas. Thus, the urban universities are the institutions that tend both to develop the programs and to train the teachers. These programs very often do not have the resources--in either time or money--to devote to teacher training and enrichment. Although many university English departments have courses or even whole programs in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), time spent in in-service training may be quite limited, and new teachers often go out into the field with minimal preparation. In fact, the ESL profession, perhaps more than any other, has many practitioners who assume they are qualified because they are native speakers of the language, even if they are not fully trained teachers. With such a situation, it is crucial to find efficient and effective ways of training new teachers and enriching the skills of those already doing the job. Unlike most other foreign language instruction, the ESL field is expected to produce results quickly and thus must be very practically oriented.

Purpose and Focus of the Study

One very important aspect of English as a Second Language is the teaching of oral communication--listening and speaking skills. For new immigrants in particular, skill in negotiating social communication is imperative to their very survival in urban American society. One of the most interesting aspects of this particular type of ESL classroom

is that the process and the product are quite literally the same. One of the primary aims of the teacher must be to try to reproduce in the classroom the kind of language and communication situations that the student is likely to face outside the classroom, so that as much time as possible is spent dealing with "real-life" language rather than "classroom" language. For this reason, teachers of listening-speaking skills in particular have always been interested in classroom discourse and interaction. Examination of the discourse is useful for student teachers because it can be a means of focusing their attention during classroom observation. It can be useful for experienced teachers too because through it they can check their own intuitions about their teaching and look for ways in which the classroom interaction can be more of a true reflection of how language in society really works.

This particular study focuses on analyses of classroom discourse devised by linguists. The primary impetus for most of these systems has not been to provide practical help to the practitioner but rather to reach a deeper theoretical understanding of language at the discourse level. But since the language of the classroom is so integral to the primary aim of the ESL teacher, a deeper insight into how interaction between the teacher and the students works is likely to be of great utility in teacher enrichment, to both beginning and experienced teachers.

The study examines some of these systems with a view to comparing them with the insights of ESL practitioners, both experienced and novice. If indeed the interests and intuitive insights of practitioners are congruent with the conclusions reached by the discourse analysts, then some at least of these systems could be used in urban ESL programs to tackle the problem of providing effective training for instructors in programs for growing populations with fewer and fewer resources.

Statement of the Problem

In examining classroom interaction with a view to observing particular teachers' techniques, teacher training and development programs have largely relied on checklists and coding schemes made up of predetermined interaction categories, such as "speaks clearly and distinctly," "motivates students," or "uses illustrations effectively." While such categories are undoubtedly important in teacher training, they are not an effective means of studying the linguistic aspects of classroom interaction. Karen Watson-Gegeo, in an article called "Ethnography in ESL: Defining the Essentials" (1988), speaks of the "inconsistency in defining and operationalizing" categories such as attitude, higher-level questioning, or accepting feelings. She says that "such terms, along with their operational definitions, may or may not have validity for the teacher and students whose behavior is being rated or evaluated" (Watson-Gegeo 1988, 580). In the

ESL classroom in particular, since language is both the medium and the message, it is important for teachers to be aware of how they are using and communicating through it.

In the often hectic environment of an urban ESL program, experienced teachers and student teachers alike rarely have time to observe their own or others' teaching with a view to reflecting on the effectiveness of teaching methods and practices. On the other hand, one of the main emphases of many linguists working at the discourse level has been the classroom. Much of the research into discourse has been conducted in the classroom because classrooms have such well-defined boundaries and easily defined "rules," in general much neater and thus easier to examine and segment than the largely indefinable discourse of everyday life. Thus, a large body of research has specifically focused on classroom interaction.

Researchers into classroom discourse are increasingly turning to the ethnographic or naturalistic inquiry approach to examine the classroom, gathering the data first and then developing categories or patterns based on a close analysis of that data. This approach has generally begun with what George Psathas (1990) calls "unmotivated looking" (Psathas 1990, 3). Data are collected from "naturally occurring interaction" recorded using audio and/or video equipment so that there is no precategorizing and no reliance on the senses such as occurs with observers' checklists or notes. Such notes are by their nature inaccurate because "they are and can

only remain 'notes about phenomena'" (Psathas 1990, 9). With the ethnographic approach, the researcher develops hypotheses by gathering the data. As Nessa Wolfson (1986) puts it,

after looking at a particular speech setting, event, or act and gathering as much data about it as possible, one looks to see what the patterns and rules of interaction are. (Wolfson 1986, 693)

Many of the linguists who have focused their research on classroom discourse have developed systems of analysis much like grammatical systems, but at the discourse level. These systems are ways of defining what is going on at the level of discourse--ways of setting parameters and establishing rules of discourse similar to rules of syntax. If these systems developed by linguists show conclusions congruent with those reached by ESL practitioners who have observed and examined their own or others' classrooms, then these systems could perhaps be of use to both experienced and novice teachers as a means of focusing their attention on pertinent aspects of the language in the classroom. For experienced teachers they could be used as a device to confirm their intuitions or check quickly on their particular interests or points of focus. They could be used in teacher enrichment sessions for similar reasons. For inexperienced teachers they could be used as a means of focusing observation, since one of the problems of classroom observation, long regarded as a useful tool in teacher training, is that inexperienced teachers do not necessarily know what they are looking at or looking for. It would be short-sighted to believe that any one system of

analysis shows the "reality" of the classroom. However, the descriptive systems devised through ethnographic methods are undoubtedly less biased and more accurate than coding systems or checklists because the hypothesized categories arise out of direct observation of the data rather than observation being influenced by already defined categories.

It is important to differentiate between descriptions of classroom discourse and observation checklists. Checklists or coding systems developed specifically for classroom observation set up categories of more or less successful teaching methods, and the observer then notes to what extent the observed method of teaching lives up to the expectations of these categories. Examples of categories in checklists are qualities such as enthusiasm, humor, and patience; or methods such as "Uses teaching aids," "Defines terms," or "Follows a sequence." Systems of discourse description, on the other hand, consist of categories of language which exist only insofar as they have already been observed by the researcher, and they are not meant to be used to judge classroom interaction by dividing it into "better" or "worse."

Consider, for example, the following short piece of discourse:

Teacher: Where do you go to rent the tapes?
Student: Blockbuster Video.
Teacher: On 21st Street?
Student: Yes.
Teacher: I sometimes go there.

An observation checklist might count the questions and

responses: two teacher questions and two student responses. A descriptive system, on the other hand, breaks the discourse down and puts names to the various elements of the interaction. This chunk of dialogue would typically be seen as consisting of two exchanges. The first exchange consists of two moves: "Where do you go to rent the tapes?" and "Blockbuster Video." The second exchange consists of three moves: "On 21st Street?" "Yes" and "I sometimes go there." In the second exchange, there is an opening move consisting of a solicitation, an answering move consisting of a response, and finally a follow-up move on the part of the teacher.

Observation checklists typically posit an ideal and set up categories that allow the observer to look for items consistent or inconsistent with that predetermined ideal. The discourse descriptions, on the other hand, are simply a means to discover and name the patterns of language already there, not to impose them.

The close description and analysis inherent in such systems are very unlike a coding system that picks out from the interaction only those items of interest to the observer. These systems are an attempt to discover and illuminate the patterns already there in the language, not to count occurrences of a limited number of predesignated items. The systems are based on existing data. Developed without preconceptions, such systems grow and are modified to deal with distinctions which come to light as different data are

examined.

Some systems of description are multidimensional in that they use descriptions not only of the language but of many other aspects of the classroom, such as relative positions of the participants, gestures, movements, and so on, using videotaping to gather the data. A characteristic of all of them is that the data are presented in entirety, recorded with no preconceptions, and then analyzed. As George Psathas says, recording is a necessity because there is no preselection and because the phenomena in question are too intricate for the researcher to rely on the senses. Recording allows repeated listening/viewing, so that interpretations of the data may be constantly refined and so that the data are always available for other researchers to examine (Psathas 1990, 5).

The Methodology

Qualitative research was the methodology chosen for this study. The term "qualitative research" has been variously defined. According to Stainback and Stainback (1988), it is used as a generic term for investigations involving ethnographic, naturalistic, anthropological, field, or participant-observer research (Stainback and Stainback, 1). Watson-Gegeo (1988) discusses the use of ethnographic methods in ESL research. She describes ethnography as "a detailed description and analysis of a social setting and the interaction that goes on within it" (Watson-Gegeo 1988, 582). Its methods include

observation, participant-observation, informal and formal interviewing of the participants observed in situations, audio- or videotaping of interactions for close analysis . . . and other techniques required to answer research questions posed by a given study. (Watson-Gegeo 1988, 583)

Of particular interest to this study, she asserts that over the past 15 years "discourse analysis (of various types) has become a central approach to data analysis in ethnographic work" (Watson-Gegeo 1988, 583). She points out that

ethnographers do not use quantified, fixed-category checklist observational schemes in their observations because such schemes cannot capture the complexity of classroom interaction and cannot address the relationship between verbal and nonverbal behavior or between behavior and context. (Watson-Gegeo 1988, 583)

In particular, coding schemes that use arbitrary units of observational time "fail to capture whole interactions, which may be played out over several minutes or even longer" (Watson-Gegeo 1988, 583-4).

Watson-Gegeo also discusses how qualitative research in the ESL classroom can "directly serve practice" (Watson-Gegeo 1988, 587). As she says, ethnographic techniques can be used for teacher supervision and feedback "whether in initial teacher training or in staff development." They can also be used perhaps "to provide helpful feedback to teachers about what is going on in the classroom, including interactions that are outside the teacher's conscious awareness" (Watson-Gegeo 1988, 588). She cites Himes' characterization of this type of feedback as "ethnographic monitoring." Ethnographic techniques can also be used to "help teachers make a

difference in their own classrooms." Through ethnographic studies, "teachers can gain new awareness of classroom organization, teaching and learning strategies, and interactional patterns in their own classrooms." A combination of "intensive ethnographic research" and teachers' "ethnographic observations of their own practice" can help produce a "multilevel understanding of good teaching" (Watson-Gegeo 1988, 588).

For purposes of this study, three main types of data were collected and analyzed: raw classroom data consisting of transcriptions of videotaped class sessions; information about various systems for analyzing classroom discourse, gathered from the literature in the field; and field notes from interviews and discussions with various participants in the ESL program used in the study. As an experienced ESL practitioner myself, I first analyzed and compared the reactions of the participants; I then analyzed parts of the raw data using three different systems chosen from the many that are available. Finally, I considered the results of the analyses in conjunction with the comments of the experienced teacher and the student teachers who had originally looked at the data.

The Raw Classroom Data

The study was conducted in an urban university that has both an intensive ESL program and a graduate program for training new ESL teachers. The classroom data were gathered

by audio- and videotaping one specific teacher's classroom in a seven-week advanced speaking/listening course that met three times weekly. Overall, twelve hours of data were recorded, capturing a broad range of teacher-student and student-student interaction. Before the sessions were recorded, those connected with the program, including the teacher himself, were told only that the recording was being done for a study about classroom interaction. The videotaping was done by an assistant who was told only that the purpose was to gather as much of the interaction as possible, as unobtrusively as possible.

The rationale for taping sessions over the entire seven weeks rather than simply picking a session randomly was that the classroom discourse was likely to vary as the course progressed. For example, at the beginning of the course the participants would be unacquainted with one another, and more time might be spent on classroom management and less on formal language teaching than later in the course. In other words, the proportion of talk about the classroom rather than talk about language or practice of the language might vary at different points in the course. Similarly, the proportion of teacher talk to student talk might vary considerably. One might expect more teacher talk at the beginning of the course, before the students got to know the teacher and each other, than at the middle or the end. Recording segments throughout the course allowed access to a representative and varied body

of data from which to make selections for analysis. Also, the students had time to become accustomed to having the classroom observed and the interaction recorded.

Information About Systems of Analysis

The second type of data collected was information about various approaches to analyzing discourse in the classroom. This information came from a study of the literature in the field of discourse analysis and ESL methodology. This examination, directed to discovering which systems could be used on a practical level, was guided by three main considerations: my own background as a long-time teacher of ESL; application of the systems to the data gathered; and discussions with the participants in the study--the teacher himself and two student teachers.

Interaction with Participants

My interaction with the class teacher and student teachers, the third type of data gathered, played a major role in focusing the analysis of the classroom data. The videotapes and written transcripts were made available, and input was solicited at various points in the study. In much qualitative research, interviewers

gather much of their data through participant observation and many casual, friendly conversations. They may interview people without their awareness, merely carrying on a friendly conversation while introducing a few research questions. (Stainback and Stainback 1988, 52)

Since the researcher does not necessarily know all the

relevant research questions in advance, "relevant questions are seen to emerge from the interaction process in which the researcher becomes 'sensitized' to what is meaningful" (Stainback and Stainback 1988, 52). The understanding gained through these unstructured interviews was a valuable aid to making informed decisions about which systems of analysis would be most useful and even whether close analysis of classroom discourse is feasible as part of the day-to-day functioning of a busy urban program.

Analyzing the Data

An important dimension was added to the study by the fact that the researcher is also an experienced ESL teacher. A major part of the study consisted of applying several systems of analysis to parts of the classroom data and comparing these analyses to an analysis of the interviews, discussions, and comments of those who examined the classroom interaction. The value of the comparisons lay in noting the similarities and differences between the linguistic analyses and the insights of the various participants. The teacher of the class, with many years of experience, focused on specific aspects of the classroom discourse that illuminated teaching techniques and practices, while the student teachers tended to make observations that were either narrative or evaluative. They often failed to see or understand what was occurring of significance in the classroom. Since the systems of analysis were applied to the data by a researcher (myself) with

approximately 20 years of experience in ESL teaching, it is likely that the conclusions reached about the systems' practical value are sound. To varying degrees, the systems of analysis directed the observer's focus to aspects of the classroom similar to those focused on by the experienced teacher. It seems likely, then, that such systems could be used to direct the focus of student or novice teachers, enhancing the value of observation as a tool in teacher training or enrichment without imposing arbitrary categories on the discourse.

Importance of the Topic

An examination of the classroom language, the process, is also an examination of English at the discourse level, the product. It enables both experienced and student teachers to understand the role played by student-teacher interaction in effective language learning. Of course, the value of these systems as observation tools must be weighed against the amount of time expended and the practical difficulties encountered in collecting the data and learning to use the various systems of analysis. This study addresses those issues.

CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

As long ago as 1935, British linguist J. R. Firth had urged linguists to study conversation as a way to better understand how language works (Firth 1935). However, until the late 1960s most of the work in discourse analysis was being done primarily by sociologists, anthropologists, and philosophers. For a comprehensive overview of linguists' work in discourse analysis up to the 1970s, see Malcolm Coulthard's book An Introduction to Discourse Analysis (Coulthard 1977).

Hierarchical Analyses

It is significant that Coulthard devotes one chapter of his book to the language of the classroom. Discourse analysts have turned frequently to the classroom, undoubtedly because the easily definable limits of the classroom provide a useful "laboratory" for research into the often difficult-to-define elements of language above the sentence level. Coulthard himself, in fact, with J. MCH. Sinclair, produced one of the most influential systems for analyzing classroom discourse (Sinclair and Coulthard 1975). Their system analyzes discourse in hierarchical terms, breaking the discourse into categories very similar in essence to the grammatical categories at the level of syntax. At the syntax level, for

example, a sentence may be composed of words or phrases that function as subject, direct object, indirect object, and so on. At the discourse level, sentences, clauses, or phrases may be moves in a teaching exchange, functioning as initiations, responses, and so on.

This type of analysis, which attempts to account for every facet of the discourse, is one of the most commonly devised types. The system devised by Bellack (1966) had examined classroom language in terms of turn-taking on the part of the teacher and the students. Bellack's intention was to describe what actually occurs in what he called "the language game of teaching" rather than what ought to occur in an ideal classroom. In describing these "rules" he pointed out that they were to be seen "not as a prescriptive guide to teacher behavior, but rather as a descriptive model of what actually occurs in classrooms" (Bellack 1966, 237). His system breaks down classroom interaction into four types of pedagogical move. A structuring move sets the context for future behavior, for example by opening a topic. A soliciting move is intended to elicit a response from the person or persons addressed. A responding move fulfills the expectation of a soliciting move. And a reacting move is occasioned by a previous move but is not directly elicited by it. For example, it may serve to modify or rate what has just been said.

In 1970, Michael Flanders devised a similar, very

influential system that concentrated solely on initiation and response, measuring classroom time in three-second intervals to determine the amount of time when either the teacher or a student was speaking, along with the amount of silence. Flanders' system has often been criticized (for example, by Watson-Gegeo 1988) on the grounds that it simply measures the amount of talk, not taking other variables into account, such as the owner of a period of silence. Flanders' coding system and its descendants are considered limited because they use arbitrary time units to measure what in fact is a highly complex interaction. In 1974, Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson examined the complexities involved in turn-taking (Sacks et al. 1974), and their analysis was followed in 1975 by the study mentioned above by Sinclair and Coulthard.

Since Sinclair and Coulthard's system appeared, many classroom discourse researchers have either used their system or developed other systems which rely heavily on similar categories. Among many possible examples, Chaudron (1977) uses elements from their system to describe teachers' corrective treatment of language learners' errors. Ramirez (1988) analyzes speech acts in language arts classrooms, using their hierarchical system. And Chappelle (1990) uses the same hierarchical structure as a basis for CALL, a system for computer-based analysis of classroom discourse. Of these, Ramirez' analysis is particularly pertinent in that such an approach "seems to permit the evaluation of subtle differences

in teaching styles" (Ramirez 1988, 136). Here are some specific examples taken from Ramirez' system. Under the category of opening move he lists items such as real question ("Who said that?") and pseudo question ("Where does the capital letter go in the sentence?") Under answering move he lists items such as repeat ("repeating what student has said in opening in question form, not using the exact words"). Unlike many of these hierarchical analyses, Ramirez' system is meant to have practical uses. He mentions the pedagogical applications of such a system, going so far as to conclude that "by specifying the use of acts within the context and goals of the lesson, it was possible to differentiate between effective and ineffective teachers" (Ramirez 1988, 137).

Multiple Perspective Analyses

Much recent research into classroom discourse has had the same underlying goal as these earlier systems, that is, to produce a complete description of the discourse in the classroom through the use of categories such as moves, turns, and acts. However, unlike the relatively straightforward systems of Bellack, Flanders, and Sinclair and Coulthard, many of the recently developed systems are multidimensional, and some are extraordinarily complex. In 1981, for example, Sato collected data by videotape, audiotape, and observation to code a multiplicity of interactions. Her categories include teacher to class solicitation, teacher to student solicitation, response, waiting time, student initiation, and

teacher feedback. Allen (1983) describes classroom events at the level of activity, using multiple categories, among them type, participant organization, content, skills, and materials. Bloome and Theodorou (1988) devised what they describe as a multiple-layer discourse analysis of the classroom, arguing that for a full understanding of what is occurring in the classroom the observer must take into account more than just turn-taking. They identify three complex levels that all interact: teacher-student, teacher-class, and student-student. Their system relies on analysis of videotapes and audiotapes and, besides linguistic data, includes such items as position of participants, who is facing whom, and body movement.

One of the most interesting of these complex systems, because of its relevance to teaching practice, is that devised by John Fanselow, described and discussed at length in his book Breaking Rules (Fanselow 1987). Fanselow's system, called FOCUS (Foci for Observing Communications Used in Settings), distinguishes between five different characteristics of communications, answering two questions: what is being done and how it is being done. The two characteristics that answer what are source/target and move type. The three characteristics that answer how are medium, use, and content. Each of these categories can be further subdivided. Move types, for example, can be structuring, soliciting, responding, reacting, or bearing. (These distinctions are

dealt with in detail in Chapter 5 of this study.)

Analysis by Language Dimensions

In contrast to these complex and detailed systems of analysis, many recent systems emphasize larger dimensions of the classroom language in an attempt to obtain a holistic view of what is occurring. Many linguists have argued that while highly complex systems can indeed illuminate a great deal about classroom discourse, their very complexity can render them of little use in the real world. As the system becomes more complex, the analyst must work with progressively smaller amounts of data if the analysis is to be feasible in terms of time expended and comprehensibility. And while linguists and other researchers may find whole books about five minutes of discourse fascinating, they are probably of little practical use to classroom practitioners.

R. L. Allwright discusses this problem in his article Turns, Topics, and Tasks (Allwright 1983). He lists analytical categories that he has found "useful and usable to date" (Allwright 1983, 168). He divides these into turn getting and turn giving. Under turn getting are such categories as accept ("respond to a personal solicit") and take ("take an unsolicited turn, when a turn is available"). Under turn giving, he lists items such as "fade out and/or give way to an interruption" and "make a personal solicit (i.e. nominate the next speaker)" (Allwright 1983, 168-69). He concedes that these are "high-inference" categories and

that coding them in practice is difficult "if not impossible." But as he says, such broader high-inference categories can "capture things that are interesting; whereas low-inference categories, though easy to use and talk about, are liable to capture only uninteresting trivia" (Allwright 1980, 169). The difficulty lies in trying to strike a compromise between the two.

In this same holistic genre of analysis, Delamont (1976) constructed an observation system using a sociological point of view, deliberately not using basic units of analysis such as the move. Cherry (1978) likewise relied on a sociolinguistic basis for her method of analysis, which she used to study teachers' expectations. Edwards and Furlong (1978) tackle the problem of setting up categories. As they point out, if a system sets up categories of speech acts and then looks for these speech acts through observation, a problem of validity arises, because the observer is bound by the categories (Edwards and Furlong 1978, 39). In dealing with questioning, the difficulties of form versus function are particularly apparent because utterances in the form of questions are not necessarily functioning as questions. For example, in the context of the classroom, "John, will you come to the blackboard?" is usually a command even though it is framed in the form of a question. John does not have the option to answer "No." Edwards and Furlong emphasize the importance of context in any definition of speech acts. As

they say, "a neglect of sequencing in verbal interaction has been a main criticism of systematic classroom research" (Edwards and Furlong 1978, 41). A sociolinguistic approach to classroom analysis emphasizes context. And the researcher's task in such an approach is to show "how teachers and pupils make known and sustain a common definition of what is going on at different points in their interaction" (Edwards and Furlong 1978, 55).

In this same vein, Cazden (1983) emphasizes the need to look at the social, cognitive, and academic dimensions of lessons. This outlook concentrates on the communicative aspects of classroom language. Frohlich et al. (1985) focus on an observation scheme designed to capture differences in the communicative orientation of second-language classrooms. Their emphasis is on communicative competence as displayed in teacher-centered classrooms. Allen (1983) presents an observation scheme that, like Frohlich's, looks at classroom language from the point of view of communicative orientation.

Working in this same tradition of emphasizing the larger dimensions of language is Roger Shuy, who reports on a research project involving 36 language arts classrooms, in which six dimensions of language are identified and examined (Shuy 1988). These dimensions are question-asking strategies, the use of language for classroom management, topic manipulation, self-referencing, suprasegmentals, and the degree of naturalness of language use. Although Shuy's

analysis deals with larger elements, his system is quite complex. As he says, "any description or interpretation of a given exchange of talk must be set in the many conceptual and physical contexts in which such talk occurs" (Shuy 1988, 116).

A recent trend that concentrates on the larger dimensions of classroom discourse is the identification of classroom tasks as units of analysis. Allwright (1980) presents a turn-taking analysis of such larger elements, concentrating on turns, topics, and tasks. Heap (1988) similarly concentrates on the importance of task in classroom discourse, as does Nunan (1991). Savignon (1991) discusses the viability of task-based curricula, suggesting that researchers should look at language events, broken into units of analysis to establish a typology of tasks that teachers can use. The goal of such research should be to establish a relationship between tasks and learning outcomes. Long and Crookes (1992) discuss task-based syllabus design, which takes the task as the basic unit of analysis in the language classroom. Shaw (1992) emphasizes the importance of communicative competence, recommending analysis of individual learners' needs and tasks.

The dimension of classroom language that has perhaps been the most frequently examined is questioning. Barnes et al. (1969) present a system of analysis that describes and categorizes teacher questions. Cole and Williams (1973) discuss the relationship between the cognitive level of

teachers' questions and the cognitive level, length, and complexity of students' responses. In the field of English as a Second Language, numerous studies have specifically concentrated on questioning strategies. Brulhart (1986) analyzes question types in beginning and advanced ESL classrooms. Brock (1986) describes the effect of referential questions in ESL classes. McKenna (1987), from a somewhat different viewpoint, analyzes question types in college-level lecture classes for use in preparing materials for English for Special Purposes (ESP). Shuy's identification of questions as an important dimension of the classroom has been mentioned above. As part of that same research project on language arts classrooms, Tenenberg (1988) concentrates on the analysis of question cycles to illuminate classroom interaction. He concludes that pupils "derive meaning from a variety of cycle sequences and form-function combinations" (Tenenberg 1988, 192). Proficiency in this skill apparently involves "attention to contexts considerably larger than the single solicit/respond/react cycle, and some kind of continuous covert self-monitoring about being 'on the right track'" (Tenenberg 1988, 192).

Pedagogical Analyses

The majority of these studies of larger dimensions of classroom discourse are related to a growing trend in classroom analysis: concentration on outcomes directly relevant to pedagogical practices. Hatch et al. (1980) look

upon the analysis of classroom discourse as useful and practical, not simply theoretical. Allwright (1983) provides an overview of a large number of classroom-centered research studies linking discourse analysis to practical outcomes for teachers. A book devoted entirely to classroom-oriented research in second language acquisition is that edited by Seliger and Long (1983). Coyle and Bisgryer (1984) report on research using classroom observation that was a search for a definition of "real communication" in the second-language classroom. Their research led to the development of a classroom activity called "the teacher is unprepared approach," which depends heavily on the use of unrestricted language patterns and native-speaker discourse strategies. Pearson (1985) likewise reports on research using discourse analysis of the agreement/disagreement function in native speaker conversations that led to the production of materials for an oral ESL classroom.

According to Frohlich et al. (1985), a good observation scheme is an important step toward understanding what makes one set of instructional techniques more effective than another. Spada (1987) uses classroom observation of three adult ESL classrooms to investigate instructional processes and outcomes. Richards (1988) recommends the use of clinical observation for practice teaching and points to the need for an observation system that will fulfill that purpose. Finally, Fanselow (1987), mentioned above, devotes a whole

book to the description of a method of observing communications, particularly in the classroom, with an overt pedagogical purpose--to improve classroom teaching.

The trend toward using discourse analysis for classroom research with practical implications has gone hand in hand with an emphasis on the use of qualitative and ethnographic methods in classroom research. Researchers have increasingly looked for alternatives in teaching practices by examining the classroom as it is, rather than as it has traditionally been expected to be. Edwards and Furlong (1978), for instance, discuss the problems that are likely to result from setting up expected categories of behavior and then searching for those categories in the classroom behavior of particular teachers. They suggest that a primary objective of classroom research should be the construction of a detailed system of categorizing speech acts with the aim of making teaching less haphazard and less accidental.

Ethnographical Analyses

In research done in the early 1980s there were increasing calls for such objectivity in observation. Wilkinson (1981) analyzes teacher/student interaction as a way to discover a relationship between communicative competence and the teacher's use of language in the classroom. Green and Wallat, in Ethnography and Language in Education (1981), stress the importance of observation schemes that use ethnographic methodology. They call this a bottom-up approach--to observe

and then deduce variables from that observation. Cook-Gumperz et al. (1982) focus on the ethnography of communication, particularly in the classroom. They argue that the ethnography of communication can

reveal the key speech events that make up the communicative economy of any group or setting, such as a school classroom . . . by examining the patterns of events over time and space: that is, in different settings, schools, or classrooms. (Cook-Gumperz et al. 1982, 22)

Through such explorations of conversational inference and contextualization of meaning, specifics of classroom interaction can be linked to characteristics of teachers' practices and educational outcomes (Cook-Gumperz et al. 1982, 22). Piper (1984) outlines ethnomethodological approaches to discourse analysis, concluding that such classroom discourse analysis must be encouraged.

More recently, Wolfson (1986) has stressed the importance of the type of methodology used in classroom research. She concludes that the most appropriate approach is ethnographic, in which the researcher begins with systematic observation and allows hypotheses to emerge from the data. Jackson (1986) asserts that the most appropriate methods or systems of analysis are those that offer clearly formulated empirical claims, using specific examples as support. Watson-Gegeo (1988) discusses ethnographic methods for research into language learning. She uses such methods to analyze the discourse in a university-level ESL classroom. Finally, Psathas (1990) discusses the importance of using an

ethnomethodological approach to research into interactional competence. By this he means that such studies must be grounded in observation of naturally occurring interaction, using a non-intuitive, data-based method of description (Psathas 1990, 2).

Action Research

A recent development that draws all of these trends together is the call for collaboration between teachers and researchers. As far back as 1973 Fuller and Muller had discussed using video playback as a method for teachers to see themselves teaching (Fuller and Muller 1973). However, it is only more recently that researchers have concentrated on the idea of action research, the collaboration between teacher and researcher.

Wallat et al. (1981) call for research to be done with the teacher rather than to the teacher. They stress the goal of mutual validation of the outcomes of studies in which research questions are based on field practice. They give an example of a researcher who analyzed ten minutes a day of a particular teacher's class and then reported to the school that the teacher's method of questioning was "opinionated" and "directive." The ten minutes observed every day happened to be time set aside by the teacher to discuss procedures to be used by the students before they moved to math centers. As the authors note,

Had the researcher taken the time to observe the class

in order to gain background knowledge of the classroom structure, he might have been able to observe that being 'opinionated' or 'directive' at the particular time sampled fulfilled the teacher's objectives and instructional responsibilities. (Wallat et al. 1981, 92)

They attribute such problems at least in part to the "lack of mechanisms to give teachers the opportunity to share what they know" and suggest "collaboration between groups of researchers and teachers" to solve such problems (Wallat et al. 1981, 92).

Grimmett and Granger (1983) discuss the need for a teacher-researcher partnership, and Klinghammer (1986) similarly stresses the idea of the teacher as researcher, using such methods as videotaping, discourse analysis, ethnographic studies, and case studies. Gebhard et al. (1987) point out the advantages in getting away from outside prescription by using the teacher as the investigator. Watson-Gegeo (1988) too stresses the importance of research done in collaboration with the teacher for positive changes in the quality of classroom teaching.

Fanselow in particular has stressed the idea of the teacher as researcher. The whole premise of his book describing FOCUS (Breaking Rules, 1987) is that the teacher can and should do his or her own classroom observation. In an article in TESOL Quarterly (1988), he looks at teacher observation as shared experience rather than as prescription from outside. He considers the most useful type of classroom observation to be a discussion between teacher and observer and suggests that teachers should develop their own categories

through direct observation of their own classrooms. He notes the possibility of multiple interpretations of classroom language and behavior, emphasizing the need to get away from prescriptive observation based on predetermined categories.

Sheal (1989) also says that teachers should be involved in classroom-oriented observation research. The focus should be on colleagues working together rather than on evaluation of the teacher by outside evaluators. Savignon (1991) calls on researchers to look to teachers to define researchable questions. He says that teachers need to participate in the interpretation of findings for the development of materials and refinement of classroom practice.

Two of the main underpinnings of this present study are direct observation of the classroom and collaboration between classroom practitioners and the researcher. In essence, it is an examination of the amount of congruence between the insights of linguistic researchers and the intuitions of teachers themselves. As such it is backed up by a great deal of recent research into classroom interaction and the importance of collaboration.

CHAPTER III
RECORDING CLASSROOM DISCOURSE

It is interesting that although so many of the research studies done on classroom interaction involve collecting and analyzing enormous amounts of data, few if any mention the practical difficulties of performing such collection and analysis. Since one of the purposes of this study was to consider the feasibility of using classroom data for teacher training and enrichment, the difficulties involved in data collection were important. I collected the raw classroom data by making videotapes, audiotapes, and transcripts.

Making the Videotapes

Although more and more ESL programs have access to advanced technology, it is still the case that many urban programs have neither the equipment nor the personnel to be able to indulge in sophisticated data collection techniques. I find it significant that the fairly amateurish videos that I made as part of this study have been borrowed again and again for use in teacher enrichment seminars and methods classes.

The program I worked with owned one videocamera. To videotape the classes, I used that camera and another camera borrowed from a friend. With no experience myself in

videotaping techniques, I enlisted the help of a student with such expertise, paying for his services with the promise of foreign language tutoring at a later date. As my assistant in gathering the data, he was not given any details of the purpose of the research. I simply told him that I was interested in the interaction between teachers and students and asked him to arrange the equipment in the best possible configuration, given the limitations of time, equipment, and space.

As my classroom, I selected an advanced listening-speaking class taught by an experienced teacher, Roger, whom I knew fairly well and who I knew would not be affected by the presence of videotaping equipment and two outsiders. I felt that the lack of discomfort or awkwardness on the part of the teacher would help dissipate any discomfort the students might experience in being videotaped. The class was a small one, consisting of seven students in all. It was rarely the case that all the students were present. On some occasions, only three or four students came. In this respect, it was not a typical class; however, since my intention was to examine methods of observing and analyzing interaction in the classroom rather than reaching conclusions about methods of teaching, types of classrooms, or types of classroom discourse, I felt that the number of students was not a significant variable.

The cameras were set up at the back and the front of the

class. The camera at the back of the class was stationary, taking in the whole front of the classroom, including the space in which Roger would move and the whole of the blackboard. The front camera, placed at the front and slightly to one side, was operated by my student assistant and could be moved around to concentrate on several students, individual students, or a side view of Roger.

The class met three times a week for seven weeks. On several occasions, either I or my cameraman was unable to be there. On two other occasions a substitute teacher taught the class. As a result, we finally taped twelve class sessions, beginning on March 22 and ending on May 1. I decided to videotape through the whole seven-week session rather than just one or two hours because at the time I had no preconceptions about the amount or type of data I would need. It seemed likely that the presence of the cameras at almost every session would allow the students to become completely used to them and also would give me a more representative sample of classroom interaction to choose from than would a smaller number of sessions.

For the first few classes, we began by turning on the cameras as soon as Roger entered the room. However, I quickly discovered that this was not soon enough, since Roger often seemed to enter the room talking and it was difficult to establish the exact point at which the class began. I discovered this because I watched each video later on the same

day that the recording had been made. Doing so enabled me to compare what appeared on the videos with my recollection of the class itself and to discover such drawbacks as our missing beginnings. We began waiting out in the hall for him and making sure the cameras were on before he came in. I felt that waiting until after Roger had come in before turning the camera on had involved making a premature decision about what constituted the beginning of a class before enough data had been collected to be analyzed.

Similarly, by watching the videos immediately I discovered that we were sometimes missing the ends of classes, for the same reason. We would hear or see a cue that seemed to signal the end of the class, for example, a closure from Roger such as "Have a nice weekend," or a nonlinguistic signal such as Roger's putting his books and papers into his briefcase. A decision to turn off the cameras in response to these signals, like the decision on when to turn them on, involved reaching a premature conclusion. We decided to keep the cameras on until Roger actually walked out of the room.

At the first session, Roger introduced me and my assistant and told the students that I was there simply to observe classrooms. None of the students seemed to mind, or for that matter even to care. I sat at the back of the class during each session. Before beginning the study, I had expected the students' behavior to be affected by the presence of the cameras. But from the first, the students either

ignored us or treated us as part of the group. On only one or two occasions do the tapes show a student looking directly at the camera. For example, one of the students liked to make jokes and on one occasion grinned at the cameraman to see what he thought of the joke. Apart from such rare occasions, everyone ignored us. The students accepted my presence readily, perhaps because Roger did. I stayed out of the classroom interaction as much as possible, though on one occasion Roger asked me to be a partner to one of the students in an oral exercise and on a few other occasions asked me a question, for example, about usage of a word. Otherwise, he ignored me, setting the tone for the rest of the group. During the seven weeks of taping, I made notes on the classes and, as mentioned, also watched the videotapes as the course progressed.

Making the Audiotapes

As a novice, I thought that my next task would be to make transcripts from the videos. However, I immediately discovered the impossibility of doing so and instead made audiotapes from the videos in order to make transcription feasible. I found it impossible to make transcriptions from videotapes for two main reasons: first, it is more time-consuming to start and stop videotapes than audiotapes; second, there are too many extralinguistic phenomena on a videotape that distract from the language itself. Although it is easier to hear and understand the speech on a videotape

than on an audiotape, it is not easier to remember it and write it down. To avoid the visual distractions, I found myself avoiding looking at the video. Thus, I used audiotapes as an interim step between the videos and the transcripts.

Making the Transcripts

Of all the tasks involved in collecting the raw data, making the transcripts was undoubtedly the most time-consuming and tedious. Those who have made transcripts know this; those who have not, however sophisticated linguistically they may be, can have no idea what the problems are. It is important to enumerate them because so many research studies suggest that teachers can or should collect their own data and observe their own teaching. Collecting the data is not as easy as it sounds.

First of all, transcribing recorded speech is an enormously slow process. It involves listening to two or three short segments of speech at a time, stopping the tape, and writing down what was heard. Even with sophisticated equipment the process is time-consuming because, without extralinguistic cues such as facial expression, accuracy is difficult to achieve and requires listening again and again to the same segments. In this particular case also the transcription involved non-native speakers, with idiosyncracies of pronunciation, intonation, and stress that made comprehension even more difficult.

In addition to the question of accuracy, decisions had

to be made about exactly what to include in the transcription. At one end of the scale, transcriptions can be very tight and detailed, recording stress, pronunciation idiosyncracies, all pauses, hesitations, and so on. Here is an example: "Brad 'n I: 'n To:mmy: (.) y'know wunnered if we c'n come over later. =Do we haf tu pay any fee er somethin' tuh get ()" (Davidson 1990). At the other extreme, the transcription is very loose. In this kind of transcription, speech is tidied up, hesitations are not recorded, and the result looks much like the script of a play. The example above, transcribed in this looser way, might be rendered thus: "Brad and I and Tommy, you know, wondered if we can come over later. Do we have to pay any fee or something to get . . ."

In transcribing Roger's classes, I opted for a degree of detail somewhere between these two, noting mispronunciations, for instance, only where they were significant to the lesson (for example, if Roger corrected the pronunciation or the words were clearly misunderstood). I noted pauses when they were clearly significant, for instance, when Roger deliberately did not respond to a student or did not fill in a silence when a student either could not or would not speak. In my discussions with Roger, he remarked more than once on the significance of silences in the class; thus, I felt they needed to be recorded.

Another difficulty in transcribing from audiotapes is that there are no extralinguistic features to give clues to

what is going on in the class. What is the significance of a silence, for example? In some systems of analysis of discourse, silence is coded as no response. However, if the teacher asks the class "Do you all understand?" and everyone simply nods, there is a response, though a nonlinguistic one. To what degree can a written transcript capture such nuances? In my initial transcripts, I opted not to record nonlinguistic elements, with the exception of such items as "writes on blackboard," since to ignore such an important item would have made the transcription unintelligible at some points.

Several decisions had to be made too about the format of the transcription. By format I mean items such as punctuation and line breaks. Transcribing speech involves imposing an interpretation on it to turn it into written language. The decision to divide two utterances into separate sentences with a period between them, rather than render them as one sentence with a semicolon, is a decision that can affect an analysis if that analysis involves identifying speech acts--separate utterances perhaps to be counted to see who initiates most frequently.

I found line breaks pertinent for similar reasons, although this did not become a factor until I began to analyze the data. In a system that breaks the interaction into turns, for instance, the actual format of the transcript on the page might lead to decisions about who is beginning or ending a turn that are based on what the eye sees on the page rather

than by the content of the utterances. Consider, for instance, this short utterance by Roger:

"What kind of game? Explain it for Koji and Yoshi."

That was how I wrote it down initially, and I considered it to be one turn. But how many turns is it really? If I had transcribed it on two separate lines, as two utterances, I would probably have seen it as two turns, with the slight pause between the two sentences coded as nonresponse on the part of the student addressed.

Another quite complex question is the transcription of pauses. Take, for example, this segment of dialogue between Roger and one of the students, Graciella.

R: You like to sleep during the day?

G: Yeah.

R: And you can't during the week.

G: No.

R: So Sunday's a good day.

(pause)

G: I play with them games, you know, table games?

My first inclination was to transcribe the pause on the same line as Roger's remark about Sunday. My second inclination was to transcribe it as the beginning of Graciella's next utterance. However, both of these choices imply a decision about who owns the pause. To put it with Roger's utterance is to say that the silence is his. To put it with Graciella's utterance is to call it a nonresponse on her part. Both of these are conclusions that belong at the analysis stage rather than at the transcription stage.

There are many parts of the interaction where Roger is

speaking and a significantly long pause occurs before he starts to speak again. It could be argued that this pause belongs to him and could be transcribed as simply "(pause)" with no break in the line. But what if a pause occurs in the middle of a student's utterance and is not filled in by Roger? It could be argued that the student expects the teacher to speak--since teachers usually do--and that Roger deliberately does not. Thus, this pause may be Roger's rather than the student's. And in the previous example, when Roger pauses, that pause may be owned by the students and could be coded as a nonresponse.

Until I began to analyze the interaction, many of these nuances and difficulties had not occurred to me. As I began picking out sections of the transcript to analyze, I had to make new decisions about the appearance of the page. I started a new line for most sentences, and I began to separate every significant pause and give it a line to itself.

Conclusions

It perhaps seems unnecessary to point out how different these four types of data are--viewing the class live, watching a videotape, listening to an audiotape, and reading a transcript. However, the actual collection of these various types of data, singlehandedly over a period of time, made the differences startlingly clear. I transcribed the twelve hours of data over a period of about three months. I then spent several weeks working only with the written transcripts. When

I next watched the video of one of the classes that I had been examining in detail in transcript form, I was astonished at the differences. Most obviously, of course, the videotaped dialogue was accompanied by a great many extralinguistic items not present on the transcripts. Utterances could be interpreted differently when facial expressions could be taken into account or when it became clear who was being addressed, or not addressed. On the other hand, a great many subtleties that seemed obvious in the transcript disappeared on the video because of the very multiplicity of extralinguistic features. And on the video, of course, no sooner was something uttered than it disappeared. On the printed page, it remained, to be looked at again and again and considered in conjunction with all the utterances around it.

Overall, collecting the raw classroom data was very valuable if only because it demonstrated just how tedious, time-consuming, and difficult the process is. It involved the expenditure of enormous time and effort--time which is undoubtedly not available to anyone working in a typical urban English language program. Making the transcriptions required a wide familiarity with the field of English as a Second Language and with linguistics. It was not a task that could have been done satisfactorily by an inexperienced clerical worker or a student. And naturally it would be difficult for teachers or administrators to find the time to gather and record such an amount of data without the kind of incentive

that I, as a researcher, had.

And yet the process, painful though it was, proved to be a very valuable one. I was able to compare live observation with videotapes, audiotapes, and finally close and detailed work with written transcripts. Moving from one medium to another illuminated the language and the interaction to a surprising degree. In particular, after working for hours listening over and over again to a lesson and writing it down, I invariably found myself taken aback to see it again on the videotape, with all its real-life ephemeral qualities, passing by me so quickly and yet infinitely more lively than it was on the printed page. I concluded that, in spite of the difficulties, the actual process of data collection is in itself a valuable exercise for research of this nature. Like the deconstruction of a text, it enables the researcher to make more of the whole once it is put back together again.

CHAPTER IV
RECORDING THE OBSERVERS' INSIGHTS

Part 1: The Experienced Teacher

The first use made of the raw data--videos and transcripts--was to note the reactions of the teacher, Roger, both in written comments and in discussions. Because my focus was primarily on ways of examining texts of classroom discourse, I gave Roger copies of the transcripts as soon as I had prepared each one. As he examined them, he made marginal comments on them, and then we discussed his reactions informally. I made notes during and after each discussion with a view to finding out what aspects of the classes captured his attention most; what aspects of his teaching he was particularly interested in; and what the transcripts could be most useful in illuminating.

Informal Discussions

One of the points that came up again and again in our discussions concerned his overall style of teaching and his preferred types of classroom exercises. He remarked on his discomfort with a lecturing style and his preference for the type of student-centered classroom that would give rise to real conversation. Several times, in remarking on his discomfort with formal, structured classroom situations, he

said he felt that such situations, typically involving monologues on the teacher's part with little student interaction, caused him to teach badly. He pinpointed one occasion when, as he put it, he escaped quickly from an exercise involving his reading at length to the students. He remarked that because of his preference for unstructured, open communication, he opts for exercises involving such activities and in fact does not teach well in structured situations. Even more concretely, he said on one occasion that because of his dislike for "set" lessons like exercises for the TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language), during such exercises he feels that the language he uses is different and the style or tone of the lesson changes.

In conjunction with these and similar remarks on his overall style, he noted that, although he always has a lesson plan, he rarely carries it out, preferring a natural flow that would lead to the kind of real-life interaction that he is interested in achieving. On the other hand, on several occasions he referred negatively to these conversations as "digressions." He remarked that his lessons do not look like lessons, particularly to Asian students, that he has been criticized for this by observers, and that he knows many students do not like such an atmosphere because it makes them feel uncomfortable.

I found these comments by Roger on his own overall style significant because his teaching preferences directly reflect

his major purpose: as he put it, his primary motivation is to produce communication. Thus, in examining his own teaching, he was most interested in discovering how or even whether such communication took place. He expressed an interest in several specific aspects of the classroom interaction that involved conversation. On one occasion, for example, he had had a particularly long exchange with one student. He remarked that it would be interesting to see what signs in the class indicate that it is time to move on. In commenting on another similar occasion, he speculated on whether the more traditional students actually tune out the casually flowing conversations that he is so careful to include. He wondered whether the data might show evidence of this.

Because of his many comments on his overall teaching style, it seemed clear that he was particularly interested in the broad elements of classroom interaction. In differentiating among techniques, methods, and approaches, with techniques being the smallest and approaches being the broadest category, he said that his main interest lay in approaches, that is, overall ways of teaching, on a large scale.

On the other hand, many of his remarks in our discussions concerned very specific items, as did his written marginal comments. He commented several times, for instance, on what he called his display of preference for some students over others. I noted on one occasion that "he seems to think his

avoidance of certain students is egregious." As a specific example, one of the Asian students was very hesitant and slow in speaking, and Roger said that he actually avoided talking directly to this student because the student would always answer in a very long, slow monologue with a lot of hesitations.

In a similar vein, he said that he feels he actually changes his language patterns depending on which student he is addressing, for example, deliberately choosing yes/no questions in dealing with those students who take a long time in answering or who are likely to answer simply, "I don't know." As an observer in the classroom, I had not noticed any tendency towards favoritism. Roger, however, said his reading of the transcripts confirmed his tendency to avoid interaction with some students and to interact too heavily with others.

Such affirmation of his own teaching seemed to be one of the main values he felt in seeing himself teach or examining the written transcripts of his teaching. Apart from the somewhat negative aspects mentioned above, he told me that he found himself looking for certain teaching techniques that he has cultivated through years of practice and research. Finding these techniques in the written record of the classroom interaction was an affirmation to him that what he tried to make happen in the classroom really did occur. On the other hand, the written record also enabled him to see clearly where his weaknesses lay: in his opinion, in his

discomfort with the more formal types of classroom exercises, and in his tendency to differentiate too much between and among students and to show preferences.

After many sessions of analyzing and discussing the transcripts, Roger took the back and front videos and the transcript of one particular lesson with the intention of picking out specific segments that could be used as illustrations of "how to" or "how not to" reach certain identifiable goals, for example, to get students to elicit, or to get the quieter students to participate more. He discovered that this aim--to identify "mini-lessons"--could not be realized, seemingly because his style of teaching does not lend itself readily to being cut into small segments. He also realized quickly that it was impossible to work with both the written transcript and the videos, because what struck him as significant on the video was quite different from what was significant on the transcript.

He singled out facial expressions, pauses, pacing, and students' nonverbal reactions as particularly interesting. He also remarked on the importance of both cameras, the back focusing on the teacher and the front focusing on the students. To examine all the items he found interesting or significant, he needed to watch both videos to get a full view. He told me that he finally gave up reading the transcript in favor of watching the videos, but he still felt that the different views of the classroom and different

perceptions that result from both media are complementary. The types of features visible in the transcript are not noticeable on the videos, and vice versa. He commented that the transcript seemed less "correct" than the videos, and that the videos were less "embarrassing" than the transcripts. The transcripts magnified faults and made him very critical of himself. Watching the videos, on the other hand, made him feel better about his teaching than he had felt as a result of reading transcripts over a period of several weeks.

Written Comments

The marginal comments written by Roger on this particular lesson show him concentrating heavily on what the students were doing rather than on his own teaching style. He commented particularly on specific segments of the class that highlighted student-student interaction. For instance, he noted that one particular segment would be useful for noting pauses, for showing that the teacher was not dominating the classroom, and for illustrating formulas for sharing the floor in a discussion. He noted too that in places where students dominated the discussion it would be useful to see how many and what kind of errors occurred in their discussion. It would also be useful to look for instances, if any, of students acquiring incorrect language forms or pronunciation from fellow students in such student-dominated discussions. He noted that if indeed there were any instances where students were unable to understand each other, it would be

useful to ask at what point teacher intervention would be justified, and how it should be done.

Roger's marginal comments on the transcripts overall were many and varied. He made 222 marginal comments in all. A rough categorization of these comments shows where his emphasis or attention was focused.

Comments on Teaching Style

Seventy-six of the comments, approximately 35 percent, focused on his own teaching style. Thirty-six were negative; 40 were either neutral or positive. The negative comments may be typified by remarks such as "Did I really say this? [He had said "Alrighty"] Tell me it's a typo"; "Choice of words" (his own); "Don't they question my grammar?"; "Reinforced wrongly!"; and "How can my students understand me?" This last was a comment on some odd syntax he had used that (naturally) looked glaringly wrong on paper but had not been noticeable in class and had not stood out on the video. Typical neutral or positive comments were "Topic shift with natural conversation transition"; "If I get to know students well enough I'm sure I structure questions and comments to them specifically"; and "No lesson plan specifics, just general plan. Fill in as I go along."

Although there were slightly more neutral or positive comments than negative, the negative ones struck me more forcibly when I first read them because as a classroom observer and compiler of the transcripts I had not noticed any

of the negative characteristics or faults that he pointed out. I felt therefore that either he was being overly critical of himself or he was simply interested in "fine-tuning" his teaching, much as a writer picks out the last few minor flaws in a manuscript that was actually quite satisfactory as a whole.

Comments on "Fillers"

The only idiosyncrasy that had struck me as I made the transcripts (though not as an observer) was Roger's use of "OK" and other such fillers. Of the total marginal comments, 19, approximately nine percent, specifically remarked on this usage. The first class session--and thus the first transcript completed--was full of such fillers, and I commented on them when I gave the transcript to Roger. We both then became very aware of and interested in the usage. Roger told me that his use (or overuse) of "OK" had been commented on negatively by an evaluator when he was a beginning teacher. (When I made the study he had been teaching for approximately sixteen years.)

Most of his comments on such phrases as "OK" and "All right" were elucidations of their purpose in context. Here are some examples: "filler," "mark classroom transition," and (on a sequence consisting of "OK. I agree. OK.") "Transition. Affirmation. Marks transition." Other comments consist of remarks about the usage in general, for example, "First time in a long time," "But not really! What message

do I give," and "Not really--I'm lost! But as long as he's OK"

Comments on Teaching Techniques

This last example is also typical of another major type of marginal comment: those remarking on specific teaching techniques. There were 30 of these, approximately 13 percent of the total. These demonstrated that Roger was interested in the data as a means of illuminating specific techniques and strategies of ESL teaching. In this respect he was seeing himself as a teacher trainer and observing his own classroom interaction as a possible tool in training. Several times he picked out an item in order to emphasize the teacher's role: "Want not to rush in case he has more to say. Students say teachers/Americans in general interrupt . . . I know the frustration of Arabic/Korean"; "Mini-lesson digression for perceived need. I see that as one of ESL teacher's major roles"; "Quick to the point. Don't squelch curiosity but get back to communication"; and "I try to teach sarcasm. Important for culture."

Comments on Corrections

Another group of marginal comments with a pedagogical slant were those focusing on techniques of correcting students or explaining usage. About eight percent of the total consisted of these. An example is "I always use this system of correction to allow more participation and chance for discussion--also gets silent Ss talking and encourages peer

correction (help)." Here is another: "Direct intervention. I usually correct when it's pronunciation more than grammar, when I usually repeat back corrected form." Some of these comments are very specifically about his own style, not just about the technique itself: "Sometimes I realize my repeating back is Rogerian [Carl Rogers] listening as much as reinforcement of correct structure"; and "I seem to comment on whatever anyone says--to show them it matters what they say?"

Comments on Community Building

This last comment also typifies another category, marginal comments concerned with community building and rapport. These constitute about nine percent of the total. Several mention connections or inclusion: "Shared experience important part of building 'classroom culture'"; "Include the silent one"; "Try to include others"; and "Humor--for rapport/connection building." In this category, Roger's focus is also on techniques of teaching: "Humor built on what comes up in each class--creates context for L/S [listening/speaking], vocabulary"; and "shared trouble part of rapport building."

Comments on Specific Students

By far the largest category of marginal comments--25 percent of the total, focused on specific students. It was clear to me in all our discussions that one of Roger's primary concerns was that his classroom should be student centered.

In an early discussion he remarked that he has a distinct preference for activities heavily involving the students and feels uncomfortable doing classroom activities that involve monologues on his part. The large number of marginal comments focusing on the students shows this predilection. It is interesting to note too that the majority of these comments (15) were about the student whose presence dominated the classroom, an outgoing, attractive, talkative student (female) with an engaging personality. The second largest number (11) were comments about the student who I found through later discussions was his least favorite--a student whom he found the most difficult to draw out or to communicate with easily.

Here are some of the comments on the "favorite": "Classic B. How naturally she uses if clauses"; "See how quickly and willingly B. picks up new vocabulary"; "She corrects me and I fix it"; and after a particularly rich exchange, "I miss B.!"

Here are some of the comments on the "least favorite": "Shared cultural info. Try to bring G. into--but . . . nothing"; "Only very little from G. like pulling teeth"; "This page is classic! Communicative incompetence!"; and "Of course this never happened to G.!!!" This last was a comment on an exchange about the idiom "to be stood up," when G. said she had never had any experience of it.

I must point out that these marginal comments about G. and remarks that Roger made about her during our discussions

of the transcripts were a complete surprise to me. As an observer of the class, I had seen no indication in Roger's manner of any preference for one student over another. He was always pleasant and even-tempered, and no sign of irritation on his part was ever evident. However, Roger himself was concerned about what he perceived to be a tendency on his part to favor some students over others. One of his comments, for example, was "I'm so overly critical of Y." And in the category of negative comments on his own teaching style, discussed above, he remarked several times on what he perceived to be differential treatment of students. An exchange with one of the less responsive students went like this:

R: All clear for you?
K: Not all clear.
R: But the main idea.
K: Yeah.

Roger commented thus: "Should I have said 'What's not clear?' I probably would have for B."

He also remarked more than once about what he saw as a tendency on his part to ask nonresponsive students yes/no or choice questions, saving the open-ended questions for responsive students who were likely to respond with prompt and interesting answers. One of his harshest comments on himself was this: "I'm amazed at how Y, J, and G take almost no part. I practically ignore them and dominate more than I like."

It must be reiterated that these comments on students reflect Roger's overly critical perception of the situation

and not necessarily the reality of the classroom. Analysis of the interaction focusing on these points could reinforce his suspicion that he ignores the more difficult students, or it could show that in fact he does not differentiate between students as much as he thinks he does.

Structured Interview

The final data gathered from Roger was the result of a structured interview designed to reveal his overall philosophy of teaching. I felt that the answers to broad questions about the teaching process would help reveal his specific interests and thus illuminate what aspects of classroom interaction he would be most interested in seeing. To structure the interview I used the ten questions Diane Larsen-Freeman uses to investigate and assess different methods of teaching ESL in her book Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching (1986). Following are the questions and Roger's answers.

Q: What is your main goal?

A: To provide an atmosphere conducive to acquiring English, and specifically oral communication in English.

Q: What do you feel is the principal role of the teacher and of the students?

A: The principal role of the teacher is to facilitate the process by bringing in topics or activities to allow interaction to take place--especially between students. The principal role of the students is to see themselves as members of a community, with social obligations and responsibilities,

for example, to keep the ball rolling. I tell them directly that because language is a social phenomenon it requires social interaction for learning to take place. I did not do that with this particular class because I already knew all of them, with the exception of Graciella. I don't direct things because the idea of the community should be clear--it should happen. I had talked especially to Jin about this idea, but I almost gave up on him because he would not respond.

Q: What are the characteristics of the teaching and learning process?

A: The "natural language" approach deals with vocabulary and grammar as they happen. I focus on information and use language as a means of talking about the topic. This is learning in context.

Q: What is the nature of the teacher/student interaction and the student/student interaction?

A: Both must be natural--I try to make the students feel that they can talk to me just as human beings, with no distance, in order to relax them and let them express themselves. There must be real communication on a real subject or a real problem.

Q: How are the feelings of the students dealt with?

A: I want the students to feel comfortable. I am extremely concerned about how they feel--for cultural adjustment, feelings of homesickness, and so on. Language is tied to identity, so language learning should be associated with ease.

Feelings are important in all kinds of classroom interaction, between students and between students and teacher. I will intervene if necessary to keep this feeling of comfort. For example, I had a Vietnamese student who was timid, and a Japanese student made a face. I rebuked him for it and he dropped the class. I am ready to assert authority to save hurt feelings and to keep the sense of community. The teacher should be sensitive to students' feelings.

Q: How do you view the role of language and culture in the classroom?

A: I give useful information about pitfalls, but I don't "teach" culture or try to generalize, because that is boring. In an English as a Foreign Language setting I might use culture as subject matter. For example, I might use sarcasm so that they don't suffer from the effect of sarcasm themselves, but I would use it only for that reason.

Q: What areas of language do you emphasize? What skills?

A: I tend to emphasize pronunciation. When I teach explicitly, it's generally for pronunciation, if it happens to come up, as an aid to comprehension. I enjoy teaching pronunciation. In general, what I am emphasizing is listening and speaking skills, with both going on at the same time. If students don't go along with the community philosophy, then they are not active in listening or speaking.

Q: What is the role of the students' native language?

A: I take note of their backgrounds so as not to pair any

student with someone from the same language background. Also it is useful to know what their native language is for phonetic reasons when they make mistakes in pronunciation. It is also good to know a little about the students' cultures to know what to do to avoid offending.

Q: How do you evaluate?

A: I write an evaluation of each student. I generally have little objective data to go on because I give no tests in class. The class is unstructured. There is no cumulative skill learning. I would prefer no evaluation at all. Of course I mention the TOEFL, but that is their own measure, their own goal. I am not a stickler about rules, or attendance, or assignments. This is the natural way. The best exam would be a conversation with each student.

Q: How do you respond to students' errors?

A: I usually respond by restating the utterance in a corrected form, without calling attention to it. I don't use overt correction unless for a communicative reason. For example, in the segment when Koji was talking about the meaning of "synthetic," I had to correct him because the class needed to know the meaning of the word for the exercise. I encourage, but I don't deceive. I wonder sometimes if it is a disservice when I understand what is not expressed clearly and simply restate it. I see myself as a liaison, not an average American listener. I act as the link between (for example) Kuwait and Norfolk, so that my function is to

understand more than the average person could.

Summary and Analysis

It was evident to me, after my examination of Roger's comments and remarks, that he viewed the record of his teaching, and in particular the transcripts, in two different ways. On the one hand, he looked at the transcript as a broad overview of his teaching and as a way of confirming his overall approach to teaching. On the other hand, he constantly zeroed in on specific segments of the interaction that demonstrated particular techniques or propensities.

From the broad viewpoint, he particularly noted the flow of classes and the means he used to ensure that his classes were always student centered. He noted in this respect segments that demonstrated topic shifting, questioning techniques, and the amount of teacher talk versus student talk. Another broad area he showed particular interest in was rapport and community building. Segments he commented on included those that showed indirect correction techniques, ways to make students feel comfortable, the use of shared experiences, and ensuring that all the students were included in class discussions. He also noted on the transcripts episodes showing the class as a social event, emphasizing, for instance, the difference between classroom talk and "real" talk.

The smaller or more specific items he concentrated on were all items that he felt either reinforced or detracted

from these overall aims. He particularly noted pauses, techniques for sharing the floor, topic shifting, fillers and transition markers, and correction techniques.

From the point of view of the teacher himself, then, any methods of analysis of classroom discourse would need to be able to see the classroom as a whole, picking up on the kinds of larger items he was interested in seeing. It would need to be a method of analysis that was heavily oriented to teaching methods and that would differentiate among the kinds of approaches and techniques mentioned above.

Part 2: The Student Teachers

To provide a second perspective on the raw classroom data, I chose two graduate students to examine and comment on the written transcript, and later the video, of one of the lessons. Both students were enrolled in a Master's degree program in English with a concentration in Teaching English as a Second Language. One of the students, Chris, had already taken a Methods class. Chris was 23 years old. The other student, Kate, was just beginning the program and had not yet had the Methods class. She was in her forties and had just recently finished her Bachelor's degree. Both had had some linguistics classes. Neither had had any teaching experience, although Chris had done some tutoring as part of the Methods class. Chris knew Roger personally because she had worked for a time as the secretary of the English Language Center, where Roger taught. Kate did not know him.

To begin my study of the student teacher analysis, I gave them both a transcript of one lesson for "undirected looking." The lesson I chose, from April 19th, consisted of a fairly long, unstructured conversation as the opener, followed by an exercise on reduction, followed by a speaking exercise in which the students worked in pairs. (See Appendix.) I chose this lesson for several reasons: it was not close to the beginning of the course; it was fairly typical of Roger's style, particularly in respect to the long, seemingly unstructured conversation at the beginning; it consisted of segments which I felt could be divided clearly; and most of it was very student-centered. I asked them to examine the transcript and take notes on what they felt was going on in the classroom, without consulting with each other. The three of us then met, and I took notes on their discussion of the conclusions they had reached. Following this session, I gave them a set of guidelines, with questions to answer, for "directed looking." Again, I asked them not to consult with each other. We met again and they discussed that experience. After this second meeting, we watched parts of the videotape of the same lesson, from both the front and back cameras, and I took notes on their discussion.

The First Session: Undirected Looking

For our first discussion, in which Chris and Kate discussed their experience in examining the transcript without direction, Chris and I agreed ahead of time to ask Kate to

start the discussion, because she had the least experience in ESL and thus had no preconceptions.

Kate's Comments

Kate began hesitantly. Her approach was to narrate what was happening in the class chronologically, beginning by saying that the lesson started when the opening conversation ended. She concentrated on describing straightforwardly how Roger performed the reduction exercise, explaining what happened in the exercise, point by point, in narrative form. The purpose of the exercise, she believed, was to test the students' listening skills, though at one point in the exercise, Roger "saw an opportunity to talk about tenses" and did so briefly. She ended her narrative by saying that she could not understand what was happening in the last section of the class because the transcript did not make it clear.

In discussing specific points in the course of her narrative, she noted that Roger began casually, that he frequently used "OK" and "all right" to confirm or affirm what students had said, and that he wrote on the blackboard a lot. She noted that he repeated and rephrased a great deal, making a habit of repeating what students said for reinforcement. She mentioned that he "discussed culture frequently," using as an example a short discussion of the meaning of the word quarter (twenty-five cents). She commented too that he never asked if the students had any questions. Many of her comments were expressed quite diffidently. She felt that she was

questioning much of what he did because she was not sure what she was supposed to be looking for.

Chris's Comments

Chris's first comment was that she was not able to tell from the transcript what the problems were--how long the pauses were, for example. She commented too that the transcript was difficult because she was unable to tell how quickly or slowly he was speaking, so she could not judge whether he was speaking too quickly for the students to comprehend; however, knowing Roger personally helped because she knew that he always spoke slowly. She then remarked that she felt she had missed some of what Kate had pointed out because she herself had been looking for particular items and indeed had found them. In other words, she felt that her perception of what the lesson consisted of had been influenced by her experience of the Methods class.

Chris's way of talking about the lesson was quite different from Kate's. Whereas Kate approached the task as a chronological narrative, Chris commented on many more specific points. She saw the long opening conversation as Roger's way of reinforcing to the students the need for them to attend class. (His opening remark as he walked into the room was "Where's Besant and Jin and Chen?") The conversation, she felt, was a way of softening his criticism of the students for not coming to class. She considered his use of contractions in the opening conversation as deliberate,

a way of leading into the exercise on reduction. She noticed that Graciella used "gonna" and assumed that she had learned it from Roger's deliberate use of the word. Her comment was that "She imitates him very well." Like Kate, she noticed Roger's technique of repeating what students said. She saw this as a way of correcting students subtly. As an example she pointed to an instance where a student referred to taking newly bought clothes back to the store as "changing clothes." Roger simply used the phrase "exchanging clothes" in the next line rather than correcting the student openly. She remarked too on Roger's use of pauses. When he had a long statement to make he "cut it apart with pauses" to make what he was saying easier for the students to comprehend.

It was noticeable that while Kate tended to describe what Roger did, the majority of Chris's remarks were judgments, some positive and some negative. She said, for instance, that too much vocabulary was introduced without illustration, and that Roger drew only one picture (of dice). On the positive side, she remarked on a point in the conversation where Koji and Graciella were talking to each other and Roger "withdrew." This was "good."

This particular part of the conversation consisted of a short exchange between Koji and Graciella about going to church, in which Koji clearly did not understand what Graciella was saying and kept asking her to repeat it.

G: Sunday is the day that you worship the Lord.
K: Something?

G: Sunday.
 K: You can learn something about which one?
 G: Huh?
 K: Excuse me, I don't know.
 G: Sunday is the day that you (pause) worship?
 R: Uhu.
 G: The Lord.
 K: Oh. OK.

It is worth noting that Roger himself had commented on this exchange. His marginal note was "Classic! Communicative incompetence!"

The next part of this same conversation was a short exchange between Roger and Graciella about church services, with a discussion of the choir. Roger then turned to the other students, and this exchange followed:

R: You know choir? In Japan they don't usually go to church, so you have to give more explanation, right?
 G: They need to start going to church.
 R: Hmm? Say? What?
 G: They need to start going to church.
 R: They need to start--(laughs).

Graciella's tone was one of disapproval that the others, and in particular Koji (who was Japanese), did not go to church on Sundays. Roger averted an awkward moment first by hedging and then by stopping himself from repeating what she had said and laughing a little. Roger's marginal comment on this exchange had been "Useful evasive technique."

Chris approached this exchange from a "methods" point of view. She remarked on Roger's later comment to Koji--"You should go sometime to see what it's like"--that Roger was suggesting that the students go out into the culture and do something--"and that's a method." It was not apparent that

either Chris or Kate realized why Roger had stopped himself in the middle of repeating what Graciella had said.

Chris next commented on the point where Roger stopped what she called "conversing" and started the "lesson," pointing out that he used a very definite transition: "OK. Well. Um. Let's go over a little bit of pronunciation, and I guess we're not going to have any more people coming today." Once again focusing on method, she said that she would have done the exercise differently, giving the students more reinforcement and going through the list of sentences as a whole first.

She noted Roger's method of correction, which was to allow the students to correct one other, thus producing constant interaction. She noted that Roger kept both praise and reprimand neutral. As an example of neutral praise she mentioned his habit of saying "correct." She gave no example of a reprimand. On the positive side, she remarked that he kept all the students speaking, letting them talk for a long time before stepping in. She noted that he "took advantage" of a point in the middle of the reduction exercise to teach a little grammar. On the other hand, in commenting on how he got Graciella to correct her own pronunciation, she said, "With shyer students I'd . . ." and described what method she herself would have used.

Chris commented positively on Roger's sensitivity to students' feelings, using as an example the discussion about

the quarter mentioned by Kate as a way of teaching culture.

This was the exchange:

R: "I would've called but I didn't have a quarter."
What's a quarter, Graciella? (pause) Yoshi's new
here. So-- what's a quarter?

G: Twenty-five cents.

R: Twenty-five cents? And how much does a phone call
cost, from a public booth? (pause)

G: I think it's . . .

R: It's just a quarter, right?

Chris commented on this exchange that Roger was giving a real-world reason for defining a quarter--that Yoshi was new to the United States. This reinforced his treatment of them as adults, thus avoiding the pitfall that many ESL teachers fall into, of treating students like children.

Another item that Chris pointed out was that Roger used the students' names continually, thus personalizing the classroom and making sure everyone had a chance to talk. She noted too that in dividing the class into pairs he split up the two Japanese students so that they could not speak their native language together.

Summary

At this first session, I was struck by the difference between the ways Chris and Kate approached the task. Kate had no preconceptions about what to look for. She had been asked simply to comment on what was happening in the classroom and did so in narrative fashion, with very few comments on how Roger taught. She was diffident, assuming that there was a right and a wrong way of looking, and not knowing which was which. Chris, on the other hand, came at the task fresh from

her Methods class. She was looking for methods and also for things to criticize--to an extent that surprised me, because she knew Roger and also knew his reputation as an experienced, excellent teacher. Part of this difference might have had to do with both personality and age. Kate was old enough to be wary; Chris was young enough to be over-confident. In addition, Chris, with a very outgoing personality, was at a point in her life when she was ready to go out and conquer the world--and was sure that she knew how.

The Second Session: Directed Looking

For the second session, I made up a list of issues for Chris and Kate to use as a guide for analyzing the transcript. These were the issues:

1. Divide the class into segments. What are they? How can you tell?
2. Divide the use of the language into categories: (a) language about language (e.g. explanations of grammatical points, vocabulary, etc.); (b) instances of target language being used for communication (real-world); (c) classroom management (language used solely for classroom purposes).
3. Consider the pauses. What, if anything, do they tell you?
4. Look at the questioning. Who does it? What kind of questions are they?
5. Look at the turn-taking (e.g. initiation, response, follow-up). Who initiates? Do the turns always follow the same pattern? What is the prevalent pattern?

6. What do you think is the overall purpose of the class? Is there more than one? Did it work? What did they learn?
7. What is Roger's style? Does he have particular linguistic or teaching habits that you notice?
8. Does he treat everybody the same?
9. How does he correct students? Or does he?
10. Look at the beginning, middle, and end. Where does the actual class begin? Where does it end? What's the function of the beginning and end segments?

Kate and Chris approached the task quite differently. Kate became very anxious because the questions included terminology she was not familiar with and because she thought there had to be a right and a wrong answer to each question. One instance of unfamiliar terminology was the phrase "target language," which she took to mean a certain type of language usage rather than a particular language. Her approach was to take each question and try to work through it carefully. She found the task time-consuming and daunting.

Chris, on the other hand, read through the questions once and then approached the task globally, going through the class as a whole and picking up whatever points she found pertinent as she read through it. This overall difference seemed to be connected with the lack of ESL background on Kate's part and the natural over-confidence on Chris's part. Both, however, said that the set of questions was too complicated. I explained that we would use the questions simply as a jumping-

off point for a free discussion.

Segmenting the Class

Dividing the class into large segments proved to be useful because we were then able to give names to the various parts of the class. However, the divisions were very broad: the "conversation" at the beginning, the "real lesson" in the middle, and the exercise in pairs at the end. Both felt that the second segment, the exercise on reduction, was what the class as a whole was about (although in length it by no means took up the majority of the time).

Turntaking

Chris was particularly interested in discussing turn-taking. She had made a diagram for herself of who was talking and when, with a view to discovering how Roger treated certain students. She said that given more time and more information she would have produced a time chart to see who spoke the most. She felt that Yoshi was not given enough time to speak, whereas Roger "nursed Graciella along." This conclusion was so radically different from Roger's perception that I asked her to elaborate further. She said that Graciella wanted to "talk nonstop," citing as proof that almost every utterance made by Yoshi was followed by one from Graciella. She said that Roger kept "coming in," that is, interrupting both Graciella and Yoshi. Kate suggested that perhaps this was because Yoshi hesitated a lot. Chris's response was that there were eight exchanges between Roger and Graciella, seven

between Roger and Koji, but only four between Roger and Yoshi. She commented that Roger always wanted to be in control and to dominate the conversation. Kate agreed with this.

Chris then brought up other items she had counted: that Roger used Yoshi's name six times, Koji's seven, and Graciella's eight. He also asked more questions of Koji and Graciella than of Yoshi in the reduction exercise. She noticed that he engaged in long dialogues with specific students.

Language Usage

In the matter of the different uses of language, Kate said she regarded everything as classroom management because Roger was in charge the whole time. Chris agreed that Roger was always in control of the conversation to make sure that it was "even" and that everyone got a chance to participate. Both agreed that Roger constantly used "Uhu" during the opening conversation as a way of keeping control of the group. This too seemed so different from Roger's intention and my own interpretation that I asked for an elaboration. Both repeated emphatically that Roger insisted on being in complete control. Chris cited his writing on the blackboard as a way of maintaining control of the classroom as well as of helping the students. Kate agreed that his writing on the blackboard was "so that they don't forget he's in charge and have runaway conversation."

Kate remarked that the level of language he used was

higher than normal use. Chris speculated that his language changed because he was talking to foreigners. She remarked that he used some odd sentence structures.

Pauses

In discussing pauses, Kate said that Roger used them for comprehension, to give the students time to react and to think. As an illustration, she pointed to the exchange during the opening conversation in which Graciella talked about buying clothes for her younger brother. In this exchange, Roger asked Koji if he was allowed to choose his own clothes, and Koji said that when he was fourteen his mother had sometimes made him take clothes back to the store and exchange them. At this point Graciella rejoined the conversation:

R: Fourteen.

G: Yes, and he's not like him.

R: No?

G: No.

R: He won't exchange it.

(pause)

G: Huh?

R: He knows what he wants and he gets it.

G: Yes.

(pause)

R: I'd better be prepared.

This short exchange was typical of the exchanges that Roger had called "pulling teeth" to get Graciella to talk. To lead to a further analysis of pauses, I mentioned the difficulty in deciding where to write the word pause. Should it be on the same line as the utterance just made, or between lines, or at the beginning of the next utterance? Without too much prompting, I wanted to bring up the question of who owns

the pause; however, neither Chris nor Kate considered Graciella to be a pauser or saw this and other similar exchanges as an attempt by Roger to get Graciella to speak. They both described her as a talker and Roger as an interrupter.

Question Patterns

Turning to question patterns and types, Kate remarked on Roger's use of many open-ended questions. Chris, on the other hand, zeroed in on his use of questions as a way of repeating utterances for comprehension and as a way of directing the lesson. She said that the students used questions only to ask about vocabulary, with the exception of Yoshi, who used them normally, for questioning about real-life issues. As support, she pointed to a sequence in which Yoshi, without prompting, had asked about the Azalea Festival, an annual event in Norfolk.

Purpose

In discussing the purpose of the class as a whole, Chris said it was to teach reductions--"That's his one thing for the day." Kate saw the class as a combination, with the conversation as important as the reduction exercise. She said that Roger's overall purpose was to teach English, and he accomplished this with a relaxed yet controlled part and then with a highly technical part. Chris remarked (laughing) that her Methods teacher would have given Roger a bad grade because he had no goals. Kate, however, said that he had a specific

goal and fulfilled it.

Teaching Style

On Roger's style of teaching, both saw it as casual and relaxed. Kate cited his constant use of OK and right as casual usage. She also remarked on his patience and anticipation of students' needs and the fact that he did not "let things go by"--that he always paid close attention to what was being said. Chris saw as characteristic of his style his use of open-ended questions and his technique of separating phrases and sentences with frequent pauses.

Treatment of Students

On his treatment of individual students, Kate said that he was very gentle and never told students they were wrong. He used the technique of turning mistakes into positive items by making them into mini-lessons. Chris, on the other hand, felt that he put Yoshi down. She pointed to the following exchange as support.

- K: What kind of concert?
 Y: I don't know exactly, but Belgian philharmonic will play.
 K: Classical music?
 Y: Yes, classical. Play with Belgian pianist--and--
 R: We don't call it the philharmonic, we call it the symphony.
 Y: Ah, symphony.
 R: Other cities call it the philharmonic, but we don't.
 (pause)
 Y: I am interested in classic--er--classical music or classic music?
 R: Classical.
 Y: Classical music. And--er--I want to go to the symphony to listen to the classical music if I can get chance.

Roger's own marginal comment on this exchange had been, "I'm

so very critical of Yoshi." However, he had also circled Yoshi's use of the word symphony, noting that Yoshi immediately picked up and used the new, more correct word. Chris used this exchange as evidence that Roger treated Yoshi worse than everyone else. Kate agreed, saying that Roger had told Yoshi that his ears were bad. I asked Kate where this had been said, but she could not find it during our discussion. Later, I located the comments she was referring to:

R: Yours [sentences] are hard to hear. You got the sixth one and the hardest one.

R: You got it. You got it. That's right. See, your ears work better than you thought.

Beginning, Middle, and End

In discussing the beginning, middle, and end of the class, Chris said that Roger walked in "running his mouth," saying in effect "Stop everything, here I am." This was the beginning of the transcript:

R: . . . floor and walked in the wrong class. It shows you how I am today. Where's Besant and Chen and Jin?

She took this to be Roger's deliberate way of showing that he was in perfect control but still relaxed and not intimidating. Actually, it was an instance of the videocamera not being turned on quite early enough. They saw the end of the class as very congenial and chatty. This was the end of the transcript:

R: OK. Well, keep those papers because we'll use them another day. OK? I'm not sure when, but keep them with you, OK? Have a nice weekend, and I'll see you Monday morning.

Summary

One thing that struck me quite forcibly about both sessions, though particularly the second, was how quickly the discussion had become a criticism of Roger's style of teaching rather than an objective examination of the classroom dialogue. The level of focus shifted quite quickly from examining teaching techniques to judging the teacher. I had presented the exercise as a descriptive one and had not suggested that they should evaluate the teacher, either positively or negatively. As the discussion progressed I did not encourage evaluation. In fact, if anything, I tried to draw the discussion in a different direction. But I found that in Chris's case particularly, she was looking at the transcript principally with a view to considering how she herself would have taught the same lesson.

The Third Session: Videotapes

When we watched videotapes, this propensity to evaluate became even more pronounced. We first watched portions of the class from both angles, front and back. Both Chris and Kate remarked immediately how different the class seemed once they were able to see it and hear it. I had anticipated that seeing Roger teach would make Chris's attitude more positive. But she immediately said again how badly Roger was treating Yoshi, by ignoring him and turning away from him. Both quickly got so absorbed in simply watching the video--as if

it were a movie--that they were not able to discuss it objectively. This may have been because they had already analyzed the class twice.

To see if this was the case, I had them watch a different class, which they had not already read in transcript. This class consisted of a fairly long opening conversation sequence, followed by a short pronunciation exercise, and finally by a word puzzle (the Island Puzzle) which the students worked on in pairs and then discussed as a whole group.

The opening sequence was a controlled conversation in which Roger had each student introduce and talk briefly about one of the other students, for the benefit of Yoshi, who had started the course on that day. The last segment of the conversation was Yoshi's introduction of himself to the class. Kate described this episode as "just chatting," not teaching. Chris noted that Roger was not supplying the students with vocabulary or corrections or answers. At the end of the sequence, Kate said, "He didn't write on the board at all during that whole conversation." And then Chris said, "If I was a foreign student in Roger's class it would drive me nuts."

In commenting on the second element in the class, the reduction exercise, Chris remarked that it was too informal. They could pick up such a conversation on the street, she said. As a student, she would want something a lot more

formal--oral reports and so on. In response, Kate said that the informality would not bother her so much, because in a foreign country casual, everyday language is very important. She pointed out that Roger had given a reason for the exercise: that reductions might come up on the TOEFL test. In response, Chris commented on his use of OK: "Do you know how many times he's said OK so far? At least twenty. I'll count them."

As he introduced the Island Puzzle, Roger said, "We'll see who can reason best." Kate asked if he did that a lot, and whether it was good to make the students compete. I said it was just a joke on his part, but Chris said he did indeed do it a lot. (She offered no support for the assertion.) This particular exercise included much that was uninteresting on the video, because the students were working quietly together much of the time. Kate remarked that a transcript of the lesson would not have made that clear.

As the video progressed, the discussion became more and more evaluative. Chris said once again how much she hated Roger's informal style. She said the class should have been more formal and that Roger should teach pronunciation more. I commented that with students from several different backgrounds this might not be a good use of class time. In fact, Roger had said that to the students one day when one of them had asked him to teach specific pronunciation problems. Chris's response was that it could be done very easily. She

repeated, "He's driving me nuts!"

Conclusions

It seemed clear to me that without some general guidance about what to look for, the student teachers' observations, from both the transcripts and the videos, had a focus quite different from Roger's or from mine in my discussions with Roger. The student with no teaching experience and no theoretical background was too anxious and too diffident. The student with a little background, on the other hand, was all too ready to make hasty judgments. Both became very evaluative and were not able to look objectively at the transcripts or the videos. They needed some sort of measuring instrument, a method of analysis that could be used as a stepping stone to their seeing as much as possible, as clearly and objectively as possible.

Part 3: Experienced Observer Versus Novices

When Roger's reactions are compared with those of the two students, noticeable differences appear. It is clear that the experience that Roger brought to the classroom, regardless of the fact that he was observing his own class, caused him to "see" in a way quite different from the "seeing" of the students. The salient features that Roger zeroed in on were not what Kate and Chris saw when they examined the transcripts or watched the videos.

When Roger first began looking at the transcripts, he

used them to get a composite picture of the classroom. He was drawn toward noting the overall flow of the classes rather than specific segments. In fact, it is worth noting that, when his conscious intention was to pick out smaller segments, he found it difficult to do so. I believe that this was because he was seeing the class as a social event, as a community, and every piece of it was integral to the whole. Chris and Kate, on the other hand, tended to focus on more conventional notions of "lessons," with definite divisions and segments. Their overall view of the April 19 class was influenced by this outlook. They saw it as consisting of a "real lesson" and "just chatting."

When Roger did note smaller elements, they were not segments of the class in the conventional sense. What he picked out were features pertinent to his intentions as a teacher. For example, he remarked on his language patterns, such as the types of questions he used for different purposes or with different students. He remarked too on various techniques he used, such as a "minilesson digression" for a perceived need. He also often zeroed in on correction techniques or ways of explaining usage to students. The student teachers looked much more at surface elements. They tended to summarize what happened in terms of pure events. Kate in particular began by discussing the class in narrative form, telling what happened point by point, in a much more obviously chronological fashion than any of Roger's

discussions.

Both Roger and the student teachers noted the significance of the amount of teacher talk and student talk. Roger's interest in this aspect of the classroom lay in noting how--or whether--he succeeded in getting the students to communicate more and in ensuring that the classroom was student-centered. Kate and Chris, on the other hand, were interested in the teacher-student interaction for what it showed about who was in control. They concluded that Roger dominated the classroom and insisted on complete control. Roger's interest, in looking at the same classroom dialogue, was to note to what extent he ensured that the students were central to the class. The control he exerted, in fact, was a means of keeping the focus away from the teacher and placing it on the students.

Another aspect of the classroom that both Roger and the student teachers noted was Roger's treatment of individual students. Roger's purpose in observing how he treated students was once again to check the success of his intention to make the class student-centered and fair. Kate and Chris noted some of the same points, for example Roger's treatment of Yoshi. But Roger considered types of utterances and the reasons for them, noting that because Yoshi's excessive hesitations and long monologues held up the class unduly, he (Roger) tended to avoid talking to Yoshi or asking him questions. Chris, on the other hand, wanted to count

utterances simply to support the contention that Roger talked more to one student than another or to note that one student was permitted to dominate more than another. She concluded that Roger was unfair to Yoshi but did not look for a reason for the perceived unfairness. And in the case of Roger's treatment of Graciella, she was led to a conclusion that was completely off the mark. Whereas Roger went out of his way to force Graciella to speak, both Chris and Kate perceived him as cutting her off and interrupting her.

Both Roger and the students noted pauses; however, once again it was evident that novice observers reached conclusions quite different from those of the experienced teacher. Roger's observations of the pauses showed that he was well aware of who the pauses belonged to. For example, on the many occasions when Roger tried to get Graciella to contribute to the class, he noted the significance of the pauses as part of his deliberate teaching technique. As mentioned above, Kate and Chris misinterpreted these considerably.

One specific aspect of the classes that both Roger and the student teachers noted was the use of questions; however, once again, their observations were quite different. As an experienced teacher, Roger was interested in types of questions, sequencing of questions, and the pedagogical purposes of questioning techniques. The students, on the other hand, noted questions only to consider who asked more or who was asked more.

Overall, Roger was interested in looking at his own teaching in order to note propensities and techniques--what worked and what did not. The student teachers, on the other hand, quickly became critical, to an extent that surprised me, since the intention of the exercise was simply to look, to see what was happening in the classroom. In the first exercise, with undirected looking, Kate, as a student with no background knowledge of teaching at all, made observations purely about the surface--remarking simply on events. Chris, with a little theory behind her, reacted with "book" notions, looking for "methods" that she had read about. When they were given a set of questions as guidelines for looking, they both quite quickly became critical and judgmental rather than more discerning.

These differences between Roger's observations and those of the student teachers mirror the differences between expert and novice reactions that have been extensively documented in educational research. A 1994 article by Willis Copeland et al. is illustrative of this research. Copeland and his fellow researchers examined the results of an experiment in which 28 participants reacted to a videotaped vignette of classroom life. The participants were divided into neophytes, apprentices, and masters, depending on the level of their experience and expertise in education. A fourth group, labeled laics, were successful professionals but had no experience at all in education. The researchers found that

the differences among the participants "could be interpreted from an orientation offered by cognitive psychology," and that their level of understanding could be seen as "resulting from the degree of match between what an individual observes and the knowledge that is brought to the observation" (Copeland et al. 1994, 175). They found that the most experienced participants "tended to focus on a consideration of educational purpose which casts learning as an interactive process of discovery and creative thinking." Those with the least experience, on the other hand, "expressed their understanding of educational purpose as a concern for teacher control of students and for eliciting students' correct answers" (Copeland et al. 1994, 177).

These findings are in accord with the differences between Roger's perception of the class and those of Chris and Kate. While Roger focused on ways in which the classroom discourse showed cooperative interaction between teacher and learner, both Chris and Kate quickly focused on the issue of teacher control. Both said they saw Roger constantly asserting control, and yet at the same time Chris saw lack of control as an issue, expressing her irritation at Roger's extreme informality and (seeming) lack of order.

In the study conducted by Copeland et al., the participants were asked simply to comment on the videotaped interaction in a way very similar to the unguided looking used in the present study. It is clear that different people see

differently when they are observing the same event or phenomenon, depending on the background that they bring to what they are observing. The novice teachers tended to concentrate on peripheral aspects of the classroom interaction or to misinterpret what they saw.

They needed to be led to look at the classroom interaction in ways similar to Roger's looking, which of course was the result of many years of ESL teaching experience. If the systems of classroom analysis devised by linguists can be seen to focus on and illuminate the issues of interest to experienced teachers such as Roger, then they could be used to focus the perceptions of student teachers and thus to increase their understanding of teacher-student interaction and ESL classroom methods.

CHAPTER V
USING SYSTEMS FOR ANALYZING CLASSROOM DISCOURSE

Part 1: Choosing Systems

With the plethora of systems already devised for analyzing language at the level of discourse, deciding which ones to concentrate on was an interesting exercise. I decided to pick out three systems, principally because three seemed a manageable number for a study of this size. In my examination of various different systems, I realized that there were at least three major groupings or types that needed to be represented: the comprehensive, hierarchical type; the multiple-perspective type; and the holistic, larger dimension type. I finally settled on the following three systems: Sinclair and Coulthard's system described first in Towards an Analysis of Discourse and later in Coulthard's Introduction to Discourse Analysis; Fanselow's FOCUS, described in his book Breaking Rules; and Roger Shuy's system of holistic analysis of classroom discourse, described in his chapter on "Identifying Dimensions of Classroom Language" in Multiple Perspective Analyses of Classroom Discourse. I chose these three because they typify those three very different approaches, representative of broad general categories.

Sinclair and Coulthard's system is a comprehensive,

hierarchical system, purporting to describe every aspect of the classroom language much as a system of grammar describes language at the syntax level. Sinclair and Coulthard were influenced by earlier systems devised by researchers such as Bellack and Flanders. Thoroughly grounded in discourse theory, theirs is a seminal approach, which has been used and reused, with adaptations, for a variety of different circumstances.

Fanselow's system relies heavily on both Bellack and Sinclair and Coulthard. Fanselow says, in fact, that he "borrowed the move and source directly from Bellack" (Fanselow 1987, 50). Like these earlier systems, Fanselow's is comprehensive in that it sets out to describe all of the discourse. Unlike the earlier systems, however, Fanselow's is meant to be used on an everyday level, by teachers, as a tool for discovering more about their own teaching styles and techniques. He describes it as

an observation system to generate and explore alternatives in language teaching . . . to discover rules, generate alternatives, and see the extent to which rules I break raise questions about my preconceived notions. (Fanselow 1987, 19)

Also unlike Sinclair and Coulthard's system, FOCUS is not hierarchical. It is instead multidimensional, describing diverse aspects of the discourse all existing together. As such it typifies the many systems that emphasize the complex and multidimensional nature of classroom interaction. It is similar to the earlier systems in that it is meant to be

purely nonjudgmental, being a means to describe and observe rather than evaluate.

The third system, that devised by Shuy, contrasts with these comprehensive, descriptive types of analysis. It is not a grammar of the discourse but rather a system that can take a holistic glance at one, or several, or many dimensions of the classroom language. I found Shuy's method pertinent for two major reasons: It is geared specifically toward language classrooms, although the classrooms examined in his study were not second-language classes; and it focuses on the larger dimensions of the classroom and several specific techniques of language teaching. Unlike the other two methods, Shuy's is evaluative. He specifically says that the chapter "discusses where the talk takes place and how the talk takes place, and suggests some bases for evaluating the effectiveness of classroom discourse" (Shuy, 115). He does warn, however, that it is dangerous to isolate elements as either "good" or "bad" methods: "To isolate any one language feature from the overall task and from other language features is not possible in the usual quantitative paradigm" (Shuy, 134).

These three choices are by no means comprehensive, even though they do broadly represent particular trends. They are based to an extent on my own particular interests. I chose Sinclair and Coulthard at least partly because I am interested in the hierarchical approach to discourse analysis that is based on an attempt to identify a "grammar" of discourse. I

chose Fanselow's system in part out of scepticism: I felt intuitively that his system would be a lot more difficult to use for everyday analysis of discourse than it appeared on first reading. And I chose Shuy's in part because it seemed to fit Roger's style and interests so well. It emphasized styles of questioning, which is one of Roger's--and my--interests, and it is flexible enough to enable the observer/researcher to take one or more broad dimensions rather than analyze every aspect of the discourse.

Obviously, other researchers or teachers might be interested in other systems for a variety of different reasons. However, I felt that choosing three such different systems would produce results that could be extrapolated to fit the needs or interests of researchers examining very different classrooms or very different teaching styles. The kinds of difficulties I would be likely to encounter, and the kinds of issues that would be raised, would be relevant to picking out any type of system of analysis for use in analyzing the language of a variety of classroom types.

Part 2: Sinclair and Coulthard

The first system I decided to use, that devised by J. Sinclair and R.M. Coulthard, is described in their book Towards an Analysis of Discourse: The English used by Teachers and Pupils (1975). It is discussed further in Coulthard's An Introduction to Discourse Analysis (1977). Sinclair and Coulthard use a rank scale for their system, mainly for its

flexibility. The system is hierarchical, and the method of presentation is closely modeled on Halliday's "Categories of a Theory of Grammar" (1961). Their terminology is Halliday's. Structure, system, rank, level, delicacy, realization, marked, unmarked--these are some of the terms they use that derive from Halliday's methods.

Description of the System

Their description of the system is extremely complex and detailed, but it can be summarized fairly simply. They identify five levels of classroom discourse from top to bottom: lesson, transaction, exchange, move, and act. Their largest element is the lesson. The lesson is made up of transactions, which in turn are made up of exchanges. Exchanges are made up of moves, and moves are made up of acts, the lowest level. Their system is a rank scale, the basic assumption of which is that a unit of any rank consists of one or more units of the rank below it. For instance, an exchange consists of one or more moves, and a move consists of one or more acts. The main element of their hierarchy seems to be the exchange, the most important type of which is the teaching exchange, consisting of moves which play the functional roles of initiation, response, and feedback. This is the basic pattern, which occurs again and again in their data. The initiation consists of an opening move, the response consists of an answering move, and the feedback consists of a follow-up move.

They identify five types of move: opening, answering, follow-up, framing, and focusing. Of these five, the three principal ones are those used in the teaching exchange. The other two--framing and focusing--make up the other type of exchange, the boundary, which is used, as its name suggests, as a way of putting a frame around the heart of the transaction--establishing boundaries and providing transitions.

At the lowest level, they identify twenty-two acts, the most prevalent of which in their data seem to be those that play the functional roles of elicitation, directive, and informative (parts of an opening move); reply, react, and acknowledge (parts of an answering move); and accept, evaluate, and comment (parts of a follow-up move). (See Chart 1 for a synopsis of the system.)

Here is an example of a small piece of dialogue analyzed according to their system. The dialogue is extracted from the lesson they used for their analysis. As part of the initial transcript of a lesson, it might look like this:

Teacher: Now. I've got a piece of what?
 Pupil: Wood.
 Teacher: What cuts the piece of wood?
 Will the scissors cut the piece of wood?
 Pupil: No.
 Teacher: Let's try.
 No, it won't.

It appears in their book in diagrammatic form as part of a diagram of the whole lesson. For transformation into a diagram form, it has been divided into two exchanges, which are

LESSONS consist of a series of TRANSACTIONS		
Types of transaction:	PRELIMINARY	(boundary)
	MEDIAL	(teaching)
	TERMINAL	(boundary)
TRANSACTIONS consist of a series of EXCHANGES		
Types of exchanges:	BOUNDARY	
	TEACHING--informing	
	--directing	
	--eliciting	
EXCHANGES consist of MOVES		
Types of moves:	OPENING	
	ANSWERING	
	FOLLOW-UP	
	FRAMING	
	FOCUSING	
MOVES consist of ACTS		
Types of acts:	marker, starter, elicitation,	
	check, directive, silent stress,	
	prompt, clue, cue, bid,	
	nomination, aside, acknowledge,	
	reply, react, comment, loop,	
	evaluate, informative,	
	metastatement, conclusion, accept	

Chart 1: Synopsis of Sinclair and Coulthard's System

elements of the larger transaction. Both exchanges are teaching exchanges, consisting of opening, answering, and follow-up moves. Both exchanges are classed as elicitation exchanges because their purpose is to elicit a response from the pupils. Here is the extract diagrammed:

Exchange Type	Opening	Act	Answering	Act	Follow-up	Act
Elicit	Now I've got a piece of what?	m el	Wood	rep	∅	
Elicit	What cuts the piece of wood? Will the scissors cut the piece of wood?	el el	No	rep	Let's try. No it won't	z e

Chart 2: Dialogue analyzed using Sinclair and Coulthard's System

In the first exchange, the teacher's opening move consists of two acts. "Now" is a marker (m), the function of which is to mark boundaries in the discourse. "I've got a piece of what?" is an elicitation (el), the function of which is to request a linguistic response. The next element in the first exchange is the pupil's answering move, the word "Wood," which consists of one act, a reply (rep), the function of which is to provide a linguistic response appropriate to the elicitation. The last element in this exchange is the follow-up move, which in this case consists of silence.

In the second exchange, the teacher's opening move again consists of two acts. "What cuts the piece of wood?" is an

elicitation (el), and so is "Will the scissors cut the piece of wood?" The next element in the exchange is the pupil's answering move, "No," which is a reply (rep). The third element in the exchange is the follow-up move from the teacher, consisting of two acts. "Let's try" is an aside (z), which is an utterance not really addressed to the class, and covers items difficult to classify, when the speaker seems to be talking to himself. "No it won't" is an evaluate (e), which is a comment on the quality of the reply, react, or initiation.

Sinclair and Coulthard acknowledge that the higher up the scale they go, the more speculative their system is. At the transaction level, and even more so at the lesson level, their categories become less defined and more difficult to specify. They do emphasize that their system is particularly--in fact only--applicable to classroom discourse, in which the relationship among the participants is a highly rigid one.

It is important to note too that their data came from an elementary school classroom, very unlike the classroom from which my data are derived. In spite of these differences, I felt I ought to use their system. Since their system has been extremely influential and has been used by many classroom discourse analysts as a basis for later work, I felt it would be interesting and fruitful to use their system to examine parts of my data.

Using the System

I chose to examine an excerpt from the lesson of April 19th. (See Chart 3). I decided to look at the section in the lesson where Roger had been trying to elicit conversation from Graciella about how she spent her weekend--the section that Roger had commented on as "classic--communicative incompetence." Using Sinclair and Coulthard's definition of a transaction as a guide, I picked up the excerpt at the point where Roger was beginning to wind up Graciella's segment of the conversation by saying "So that's what you do on Sunday afternoon, huh?" This led to a chunk of discourse that ended with Roger's comment: "OK, so we know what you're doing." The whole transaction is a discussion of churchgoing. It is a three-cornered discussion among Roger, Graciella, and Koji.

Since one of the guiding principles of my research was an estimation of the everyday usefulness of systems of classroom interaction analysis, I looked for ways to avoid many of the complications inherent in Sinclair and Coulthard's diagramming while remaining faithful to their basic system. I thus simplified their system and modified their diagramming. To begin the analysis, I wrote out the excerpt, dividing it into lines which I felt would probably turn out to be moves--mainly by looking at separate utterances by the different participants and then at sentence boundaries within those utterances. I felt that during the course of the analysis I would be able to reconsider these decisions and change some of

			Move type	Act type								
Exchange 1 Boundary	R: So that's what you do Sunday afternoon, huh? G: Uhu. And at night we go to church again.	init. resp.	opening answering	elicitation comment								
Exchange 2 Eliciting	K: Again? G: Uhu. K: Wow. (pause)	init. resp. feedback	opening answering follow-up	? reply comment								
Exchange 3 Informing	G: Because Sunday is the day that you worship the Lord. K: Something. G: Sunday.	init. resp. feedback	opening answering follow-up	informative react? comment?								
Exchange 4 Eliciting	K: You can learn something about which one? G: Huh? K: Excuse me, I don't know. (pause)	init. resp. feedback	opening answering follow-up	elicitation? react? comment?								
Exchange 5 Informing	G: Sunday is the day that you . . . <table border="1" data-bbox="371 1308 757 1521"> <tr> <td>worship?</td> <td>init. elic. (open)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>R: Uhu.</td> <td>resp. reply (answer)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>G: the Lord.</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>K: Oh, OK. (pause)</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	worship?	init. elic. (open)	R: Uhu.	resp. reply (answer)	G: the Lord.		K: Oh, OK. (pause)		init. resp.	opening answering	informative acknowledge
worship?	init. elic. (open)											
R: Uhu.	resp. reply (answer)											
G: the Lord.												
K: Oh, OK. (pause)												
Exchange 6 Informing? Directing? Eliciting?	R: But you're surprised that she goes twice. K: Yes. (pause)	init. resp.	opening answering	elicitation? reply								

Chart 3: Extract from April 19, analyzed using Sinclair and Coulthard's System

			Move Type	Act type
Exchange 7 Eliciting	R: You go in the morning. G: Uhu. (pause)	init. resp.	opening answering	elicitation reply
Exchange 8 Eliciting	R: And what's the morning? How's the morning different from the night? G: In the morning is more formal and in the night (pause) is more like choirs, my friend is in choir and my nephews are in choir. (pause)	init. resp.	opening answering	elicitation reply
Exchange 9 Eliciting	R: You know choir? (pause)	init. -	opening -	elicitation -
Exchange 10 Directing	R: In Japan they don't usually go to church, so you have to give more explanation, right? G: They need to start going to church. R: They need to start going-- (laughs)	init. resp. feedback	opening answering follow-up	informative elicitation? react? accept? evaluate?
Exchange 11 Informing	G: Well, it's a group of people who--- sing? singing? init. elic. R: Sing. resp. reply G: Uhu. feedback ackn.	init. - -	opening - -	informative - -
Exchange 12 Informing	(R. writes on board) G: That's right.	init. resp.	opening answering	informative comment

Chart 3 (continued)

			Move type	Act type
Exchange 13 Informing	R: It's called a choir. Choir. (pause)	init. -	opening -	informative
Exchange 14 Eliciting	R: So in the afternoon it's choir practice and--	init.	opening	elicitation
	G: Uhu. R: --less formal ceremony. G: There is a short ceremony. (pause)	resp. -	answering	comment
Exchange 15 Directing	R: You should go sometime to see what it's like. (pause)	init.	opening	directive?
	K: (laughs)	respond	answering?	comment
Exchange 16 Informing	R: You don't have to go to see what it's like--just if you want, for the experience.	init.	opening	informative
	K: Uhu.	respond	answering	comment
Exchange 17 Eliciting	R: Right, Graciella?	init.	opening	elicitation
	G: Uhu. (pause)	respond	answering	reply
Exchange 18 Boundary	R: OK, so we know what you're doing.	focus	focusing	conclusion

Chart 3 (continued)

the line breaks if necessary. I then went through the script, drawing lines at what appeared to be boundaries of exchanges, using the notions of initiation, response, & feedback as guides.

The system names two types of exchanges: boundary and teaching. A boundary exchange acts as a frame beginning or ending a transaction. A teaching exchange may be informing, directing, or eliciting. I found it relatively easy to assign exchange boundaries, although some of my decisions are slippery enough for me to be arguing with myself still about whether a different decision would make more sense.

Consider again the following sections of the dialogue: exchanges 8 through 10, 13 and 14, and 15 and 16.

Exchange 8 Eliciting	R: And what's the morning? How's the morning different from the night? G: In the morning is more formal and in the night (pause) is more like choirs, my friend is in choir and my nephews are in choir. (pause)	init. resp.	opening answering	elicitation reply
Exchange 9 Eliciting	R: You know choir? (pause)	init. -	opening -	elicitation -
Exchange 10 Directing	R: In Japan they don't usually go to church, so you have to give more explanation, right? G: They need to start going to church. R: They need to start going--(laughs)	init. resp. feedback	opening answering follow-up	informative? elicitation? react? accept? evaluate?

Exchange 13 Informing	R: It's called a choir. Choir. (pause)	init. -	opening -	informative
Exchange 14 Eliciting	So in the afternoon it's choir practice and--			
	G: Uhu.	init.	opening	elicitation
	R: --less formal ceremony. G: There is a short ceremony. (pause)	resp. -	answering	comment

Exchange 15 Directing	R: You should go sometime to see what it's like. (pause)	init.	opening	directive?
	K: (laughs)	respond	answering	comment
Exchange 16 Informing	R: You don't have to go to see what it's like-- just if you want, for the experience.	init.	opening	informative
	K: Uhu.	respond	answering	comment

Exchange 9 is a very unorthodox exchange by the system's standards, consisting as it does of an opening move with no response and no feedback. My separation of it as an exchange may have been influenced by the presence of the pause. Exchange 13 is similar, as is exchange 15 to a lesser extent, since it does have a (nonverbal) response from a student. But in all of these cases, the following utterance clearly seems

to be the opening move of a new exchange, making my divisions unorthodox but logical.

I noticed too that the boundaries between exchanges are not always neat. Consider Exchanges 5 and 11, for example.

Exchange 5 Informing	G: Sunday is the day that you . . . worship? init. elicit (open)	init.	opening	informative
	R: Uhu. resp. reply (answer)			
	G: the Lord.			
	K: Oh, OK. (pause)	resp.	answering	acknowledge

Exchange 11 Informing	G: Well, it's a group of people who--- sing? singing? int. elicit	init.	opening	informative
	R: Sing. respond reply	-	-	-
	G: Uhu. feedback ackn.	-	-	-

These exchanges have other exchanges embedded in them, both being instances where Graciella turned to Roger for clarification in the middle of an utterance and then continued with the original exchange.

Having assigned the divisions between exchanges, I then decided what type of exchange each was. I saw the final exchange as clearly a boundary. I initially classified the first exchange as a teaching exchange until I finished the analysis (as much as it ever is finished), but I then began to see it as more of a boundary, both summarizing what had gone before and initiating the new transaction.

In dividing the teaching exchanges into informing, directing, or eliciting, I found myself hesitating with

Exchanges 6, 7, and 14. I realized that all three consisted of the same type of utterance: a clarification on Roger's part of something that had been said or implied earlier.

Studying these exchanges

Exchange 6 Informing? Directing? Eliciting?	R: But you're surprised that she goes twice. K: Yes. (pause)	init. resp.	opening answering	elicitation reply
Exchange 7 Eliciting	R: You go in the morning. G: Uhu. (pause)	init. resp.	opening answering	elicitation reply
Exchange 14 Eliciting	R: So in the afternoon it's choir practice and-- G: Uhu. R: --less formal ceremony. G: There is a short ceremony. (pause)	init. resp.	opening answering	elicitation comment

made me aware of how much of a habit this is with him and made me think consciously about it as a teaching technique.

Sinclair and Coulthard's system was developed from data in an elementary school. Thus, almost all exchanges in their data are initiated by the teacher. In fact, in their diagramming, teacher initiations are taken for granted. Initiation by a pupil is rare enough for it to be marked (P). In this particular piece of my data it is by no means untypical for a student to initiate. Thirteen exchanges are

initiated by the teacher and seven by students. According to the system, a typical teaching exchange consists of teacher initiation, student response, and teacher feedback; however, in this excerpt, fourteen of the exchanges consist of initiation and response only, with no feedback. Of these, eight end with a significant pause.

Moving on in the analysis, I found it relatively straightforward to assign move and act types to each of the items in the exchanges; however, my examination of some of the exchanges brought up interesting questions. Consider Exchanges 1 and 2, for example.

Exchange 1 Boundary	R: So that's what you do Sunday afternoon, huh? G: Uhu. And at night we go to church again.	init. resp.	opening answering	elicitation
Exchange 2 Eliciting	K: Again? G: Uhu. K: Wow. (pause)	init. resp. feedback	opening answering follow-up	? reply comment

According to Sinclair and Coulthard's system, Exchange 2 is a very unorthodox exchange. It consists of an opening move by a student, for one thing, which is uncommon in their data. In addition, I found it difficult to choose from the types of acts the system allows for an opening move. The system lists elicitation, directive, informative, and check as possible acts in an opening move. Is Koji's remark ("Again?"), which

is obviously spoken with a tone of surprise, an elicitation? It could hardly be called a directive, an informative, or a check. Perhaps it is simply a comment on what Graciella has just said. If it is a comment, then is my boundary between exchanges 1 and 2 inaccurate? It seemed logical to classify Koji's remark as the beginning of an exchange, even though to do so does not fit the system. Graciella's reply and Koji's next comment ("Wow") are undoubtedly a part of the same exchange. Then, too, what kind of an exchange is this? It is not a boundary. But can it really be classified as a teaching exchange? Is Koji really eliciting a response or simply commenting on Graciella's remark about going to church? Perhaps after all my initial exchange division is inaccurate and Graciella's remark is the opening move of a new exchange. Such difficulties and questions perhaps show the limitations of some of the classifications of the system to fit classroom discourse which is so clearly different from that used to construct the system in the first place.

Exchanges 3, 4, and 5 are similarly fuzzy. These contain the chunk of dialogue between Graciella and Koji in which Koji clearly has no idea what Graciella has just said, and Graciella just as clearly does not realize that Koji does not understand. In this piece of the interaction, Roger simply holds back and does not participate. In Sinclair

Exchange 3 Informing	G: Because Sunday is the day that you worship the Lord. K: Something. G: Sunday.	init. resp. feedback	opening answering follow-up	information react? comment?
Exchange 4 Eliciting	K: You can learn something about which one? G: Huh? K: Excuse me, I don't know. (pause)	init. resp. feedback	opening answering follow-up	elicitation? react? comment?
Exchange 5 Informing	G: Sunday is the day that you . . . worship? init. elicit R: Uhu. resp. reply G: the Lord. K: Oh, OK. (pause)	init. resp.	opening answering	informative acknowledge

and Coulthard's system, this is quite uncharacteristic of the teacher's role, and fitting this piece of the dialogue into the system was therefore quite difficult. It was particularly difficult to assign act types to most of the utterances. With Exchange 4 in particular, after a great deal of thought, I am still at a loss. In addition, Exchanges 3 and 4 can hardly be called teaching exchanges. Exchange 5 perhaps can, although in this case it is a student doing the teaching. Some other systems of classroom discourse analysis might find nothing odd in this; Sinclair and Coulthard's I think does.

These two exchanges are in fact particularly difficult to fit into the system at all. Graciella's remark about

worshipping the Lord can be seen as informative. But since Koji had no idea what she said, his one-word reply ("Something") can only be seen as equivalent to an expression of bewilderment. In the system, what type of act is this? A react perhaps? Graciella's reply to Koji is actually a clarification of sorts. It means "I said 'Sunday' not 'something.'" The system can only classify this as a comment, which is not particularly illuminating in terms of explaining what is going on in the discourse.

Exchange 4 is even more confusing. Koji's question shows that he still has no idea what Graciella originally said, and now he elaborates on what he thinks he has heard, something about learning. His elaboration is so confusing to Graciella that she simply says "Huh?" Is Koji's opening move an elicitation? Is Graciella's answer a react? And is Koji's despairing "Excuse me, I don't know" simply a comment? For such an exchange, the categories set up by the system seem inadequate.

Exchange 5 is the last of the three consecutive exchanges between the students with Roger deliberately not participating. This one shows Graciella realizing that Koji has not understood and repeating what she had said previously in Exchange 3. She seems to wonder why Koji had not understood and doubts the word worship. This gives rise to what I have called an embedded exchange, in which Graciella briefly turns to Roger for confirmation, gets it in the form

of "Uhu" and finishes her sentence directed to Koji. Koji's response shows that he has finally understood. With the exception of the embedded aside, this exchange fits neatly into the system. Graciella's sentence is informative, and Koji's response acknowledges it.

At this point, Roger comes back into the conversation. The next three exchanges--6, 7, and 8--consist of initiation and response, opening and answering moves, and elicitation and reply acts.

Exchange 6 Informing?	R: But you're surprised that she goes twice. K: Yes. (pause)	init. resp.	opening answering	elicitation ? reply
Exchange 7 Eliciting	R: You go in the morning. G: Uhu. (pause)	init. resp.	opening answering	elicitation reply
Exchange 8 Eliciting	R: And what's the morning? How's the morning different from the night? G: In the morning is more formal and in the night (pause) is more like choirs, my friend is in choir and my nephews are in choir. (pause)	init. resp.	opening answering	elicitation reply

It is interesting to note the lack of feedback in these exchanges. If the exchanges are considered with no understanding of Roger's teaching techniques and intentions, they may initially be seen as nonresponsiveness on his part.

Feedback is generally considered to be a positive teaching technique. Lack of feedback leaves the student hanging. However, it is clear from my analysis of Roger's teaching style and from the analysis of exchanges 3, 4, and 5, that his nonresponsiveness in this case is deliberate. He keeps himself out of the dialogue as much as possible in an effort to achieve a truly student-centered classroom.

In exchanges 6 and 7, his elicitations are couched in the form of statements, allowing both Koji and Graciella to treat them as yes/no questions and respond in one word--in Koji's case with "yes" and in Graciella's case with an even more unresponsive "Uhu." At the end of both these exchanges there is a significantly long pause, a deliberate attempt on Roger's part to give them both time to say something else. Neither does. In Exchange 8, Roger's opening move is an information question. Graciella is thus forced into a longer response. Even this exchange, however, ends with a long pause, as Roger leaves time for her or Koji to say something else. Neither of them does.

What I have classified as Exchange 9 does not fit neatly into the scheme.

Exchange 9 Eliciting	R: You know choir? (pause)	init. -	opening -	elicitation -
----------------------------	-------------------------------	------------	--------------	------------------

To have put Roger's whole utterance together would have been

impossible, because the question about the word choir is directed specifically to Koji, while the following remark is directed specifically to Graciella. I thus opted to view Roger's question to Koji as an exchange in itself, with the pause--Koji's nonresponse--as a sort of negative reply. This small (non)exchange highlights the continued difficulty Roger is having here in causing conversation to take place between Graciella and Koji, neither of whom was particularly talkative at any time.

I found Exchange 10 also quite elusive to classify. This is the exchange in which Graciella remarked that the Japanese ought to go to church, and Roger covered up a possibly awkward situation by laughing. I found it difficult to classify Roger's opening remark:

Exchange 10 Directing	R: In Japan they don't usually go to church, so you have to give more explanation, right?	init.	opening	informative? elicitation?
	G: They need to start going to church.	resp.	answering	react?
	R: They need to start going-- (laughs)	feedback	follow-up	accept? evaluate?

Is it an informative or an elicitation? Perhaps it contains a little of both. It could even be seen as a directive. Then Graciella's following remark seems to have little or nothing to do with Roger's, although it could be said that she is responding simply to the first clause in his sentence and ignoring the second. In this case, it can be classified as a react. Roger's follow-up starts out as an accept, a

repetition of what she has said, until he apparently realizes exactly what she has said and stops himself short, turning what she has said into a joke. Is his laugh then a comment, or perhaps an evaluate? Regardless of the final classification of these acts, a close examination of this exchange, I think, leads to a consideration of what is going on in terms of teaching techniques and thus is useful in itself.

Exchange 11, with the embedded exchange extracted, I first classified as straightforward--opening, answering, follow-up. However, there is another way of interpreting what is happening in Exchanges 10 and 11. Graciella's explanation of what a choir is can be classified as a response to the second clause of Roger's opening remark in Exchange 10.

Exchange 10 Directing	R: In Japan they don't usually go to church, so you have to give more explanation, right? G: They need to start going to church. R: They need to start going-- (laughs)	init. resp. feedback	opening answering follow-up	informative? elicitation? react? accept? evaluate?
Exchange 11 Informing	G: Well, it's a group of people who--sing? singing? R: Sing. G: Uhu.	init. - -	opening - -	informative - -

From this viewpoint, Graciella's remark about going to church more often, and Roger's reply to it, could be classified as an aside within an exchange.

Exchanges 11-14 can be seen as a mini-transaction on the subject of choirs. When a long pause occurs, at the end of Exchange 14, Roger goes back to the question of church-going, opening the next exchange by suggesting that Koji should go. I see this remark as indicative of the discomfort he felt at Graciella's earlier remark. It is another attempt, like his earlier laughter, to mitigate a possibly awkward situation.

Exchange 11 Informing	G: Well, it's a group of people who-- sing? singing? init. elicit R: Sing. resp. reply G: Uhu. feedback ackn.	init. - -	opening - -	informative
Exchange 12 Informing	(R. writes on board) G: That's right.	init. resp.	opening answering	informative comment
Exchange 13 Informing	R: It's called a choir. Choir. (pause)	init. -	opening -	informative
Exchange 14 Eliciting	So in the afternoon its choir practice and-- G: Uhu. R: --less formal ceremony. G: There is a short ceremony. (pause)	init. resp.	opening answering	elicitation comment

He persists in this attempt through three exchanges, 15-17, finally bringing Graciella into Exchange 17.

Exchange 15 Directing	R: You should go sometime to see what it's like. (pause) K: (laughs)	init. respond	opening answering?	directive? comment
Exchange 16 Informing	R: You don't have to go to see what it's like--just if you want, for the experience. K: Uhu.	init. respond	opening answering	informative comment
Exchange 17 Eliciting	R: Right, Glorian? G: Uhu. (pause)	init. respond	opening answering	elicitation reply

In typical fashion Graciella simply says "Uhu." This examination of Exchanges 9 through 17 shows that the discourse is extremely complex, containing fold after fold of embedded or closely related exchanges.

This excerpt overall turned out to be an excellent example of Roger's insistence as a teacher on making his classroom a student-centered one and on giving the students as much room as possible to talk to each other, not just to him. With these particular students, the task was a difficult one, and Roger was well aware of the difficulties. The passage shows him doing his best to elicit not only responses but opening moves from two very unresponsive students. Exchanges 2 through 5 show an instance where most teachers--both novice and experienced--would have found it difficult not to jump in.

After Koji says "Excuse me, I don't know," there is a significant pause. Roger waits for the two students to work the difficulty through, rather than solving it for them. He confines his contribution to the "Uhu" in Exchange 5.

The passage also shows Roger's concern for students' feelings. He averts a potentially awkward situation when Graciella wants to dictate churchgoing. He also makes sure later that a suggestion to go to church is viewed as simply an optional, interesting cultural experience. And above all, he ensures that both students are brought into the conversation. Exchange 6 is with Koji, then 7 and 8 with Graciella. He then turns again to Koji in Exchange 9, and though Exchange 10 is with Graciella, he includes Koji by making the subject matter Japan. After the discussion about choirs, all with Graciella, he turns again to Koji to bring him in, in Exchanges 15 and 16.

Analysis of the passage also brought out the significance of the pauses as a teaching technique. Until I began dividing the text into exchanges, the significance of the pauses was not clear. However, once the text was segmented, the pauses came to the fore. The eleven marked pauses are all clear instances of Roger's deliberately leaving a space open--an opportunity for a student to speak. In almost all the cases, it is Graciella's opportunity. And in seven of the cases, she does not use the opportunity, forcing Roger at last to break the silence and end the pause. Exchange 7, for instance,

shows Roger trying to get Graciella to talk about church.

Exchange 7 Eliciting	R: You go in the morning.	init.	opening	elicitation
	G: Uhu. (pause)	respond	answering	reply

She simply says "Uhu." And at the end of Exchange 8, he again gives her a chance to elaborate, which she does not take.

Exchange 8 Eliciting	R: And what's the morning? How's the morning different from the night?	init.	opening	elicitation
	G: In the morning is more formal and in the night (pause) is more like choirs, my friend is in choir and my nephews are in choir. (pause)	respond	answering	reply

Some of the pauses show his persistence paying off. At the end of Exchange 2 he holds back. Eventually, Graciella speaks, beginning Exchange 3.

Exchange 2 Eliciting	K: Again?	init.	opening	elicitation?
	G: Uhu.	respond	answering	react?
	K: Wow. (pause)	feedback	follow-up	comment?

At the end of Exchange 4 the same thing occurs.

Exchange 4 Eliciting	K: You can learn something about which one?	init.	opening	elicitation?
	G: Huh?	respond	answering	react?
	K: Excuse me, I don't know. (pause)	feedback	follow-up	comment?

The whole transaction ends with Graciella's "Uhu" followed by a pause. At this point Roger finally moves on.

Analyzing this excerpt using Sinclair and Coulthard's method was an interesting exercise. I initially found their system difficult to grasp. It seemed tremendously complex at first but proved itself easy to boil down to a basic framework and express in a clear, easy-to-understand diagram. In this form, it was relatively easy to take a piece of discourse and apply the system to it. Because the system was developed using an extremely different classroom from the one I used, much of my data did not fit neatly. However, the very untidy and incomplete nature of the analysis was in itself interesting. Many of the questions that arose were significant in themselves and worth pursuing.

Many significant elements of Roger's teaching style came to the fore through this analysis. The points that the system made clear were invariably points that Roger himself was interested in or had commented on. Thus, it seems likely that this particular system of analysis could be used as an exercise for student teachers, as a way of getting them to see things that they might not have seen otherwise--as an exercise in directed looking. Both Kate and Chris, for instance, had seen Graciella as a talker and Roger as an interrupter. This passage, analyzed using Sinclair and Coulthard's system, clearly shows the opposite. It shows Roger standing back giving plenty of space for the students to initiate

conversation, and it shows the many occasions on which Graciella clearly did not pick up on these opportunities. The system enables the observer to "see" in a way that corresponds quite closely with the insights of the teacher himself.

Part 3: Fanselow

The second system that I decided to use was that devised by John Fanselow, discussed at length in Breaking Rules (1987). He named his system FOCUS (Foci for Observing Communications Used in Settings). Unlike Sinclair and Coulthard, Fanselow mentions a specific pedagogical use for his system. His book is meant to be, among other things, a practical guide for student teachers to use in examining communications. As he says,

I will invite you to take two steps in the following pages, over and over again. First, I'll ask you to transcribe some actual communications or find exchanges or exercises in texts or tests that you want to explore. Then I'll ask you to code them. (p. 3)

It is worth noting in passing that this directive to "transcribe some actual communications" is typical of the casual way in which so many of the texts on classroom discourse analysis treat the transcription process. As this study has already pointed out, transcription is extremely time-consuming and difficult. If the amount of text transcribed is to be long enough to be significant, then the process requires at least audio recording followed by tedious transcription. If it is done off the cuff and casually, as Fanselow appears to suggest, the amounts of data gathered

could not be more than one or two sentences without severe inaccuracies appearing. It is worth noting too that Fanselow sometimes uses invented dialogue in his book rather than real-life communications. The value of invented dialogue is debatable if the purpose of an analysis is to see how classroom dialogue really works.

Description of the System

Fanselow's system distinguishes between five different characteristics of communications, answering two main questions: WHAT is being done, and HOW it is being done. (See Chart 4.) The first two characteristics, answering what, are source/target and move type. The three characteristics that answer how are medium, use, and content. Unlike Sinclair and Coulthard's system, it is not hierarchical. Each characteristic can be considered separately.

Characteristic 1: Source and Target

The first item of analysis, the source and target, refers to who is communicating and to whom. Fanselow gives three possibilities: teacher, student, and other. Teacher means either an actual classroom teacher or someone who assumes the role of a teacher by acting as if he or she is "in charge" or by showing or telling.

Student means an actual student or someone who assumes the role of a student in relation to another who has the role of teacher as defined above. If the dialogue is between peers,

THE FIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF COMMUNICATION	
SOURCE/TARGET (1) & MOVE (2) tell WHAT is being done	
MEDIUM (3), USE (4), and CONTENT (5) tell HOW is it being done	
(1)	<u>SOURCE/TARGET:</u> TEACHER, STUDENT, OTHERS
(2)	<u>MOVES</u>
	<u>STRUCTURE (str):</u> announcements of what is going to be done or has been done
	<u>SOLICIT (sol):</u> setting tasks by using questions, commands, or requests
	<u>RESPOND (res):</u> replying to solicits
	<u>REACT (rea):</u> comments
	<u>BEAR (bear):</u> idiosyncratic things such as scratching
(3)	<u>MEDIUM:</u> LINGUISTIC, NONLINGUISTIC, PARALINGUISTIC, SILENCE
(4)	<u>USE</u>
	<u>ATTEND (a):</u> receptive activities, attending to content
	<u>CHARACTERIZE (c):</u> indicating something is right or wrong, using category labels, commenting
	<u>SET (s):</u> items referred to to characterize content, communicating models or other examples
	<u>REPRODUCE (d):</u> repeating the model or example that has been set
	<u>RELATE (r):</u> using a medium to make inferences or generalizations about content
	<u>PRESENT (p):</u> any medium not clearly used for characterizing, relating, reproducing or setting content
(5)	<u>CONTENT</u>
	<u>STUDY (s):</u> when target language is being set apart, communicated as area of study, practiced as information for its own sake
	<u>LIFE (f):</u> personal feelings, personal information, greetings, general knowledge
	<u>PROCEDURE (p):</u> call roll, discipline students, give directions, give rationale for exercises
	<u>UNSPECIFIED (u):</u> anything that does not fit neatly anywhere else

Chart 4: Synopsis of Fanselow's System (Focus)

Fanselow characterizes both as students. Other means a source or target that is not a person.

By Fanselow's definition, then, the teacher is not necessarily or only the classroom teacher. In a chunk of dialogue between two students, one of the students might be coded as teacher. Although Fanselow does say that in a dialogue between peers both would be coded student, this seems to negate the underlying notion that teacher is defined by role assumed rather than by official position. Using the definition by role, consider again the chunk of dialogue between Graciella and Koji, where so much miscommunication took place.

- | | |
|-----|---|
| 1. | G: Sunday is the day that you worship the Lord. |
| 2. | K: Something. |
| 3. | G: Sunday. |
| 4. | K: You can learn something about which one? |
| 5. | G: Huh? |
| 6. | K: Excuse me, I don't know. |
| 7. | (pause) |
| 8. | G: Sunday is the day that you . . . |
| 9. | worship? |
| 10. | R: Uhu. |
| 11. | G: . . . the Lord. |
| 12. | K: Oh, OK. |
| 13. | (pause) |
| 14. | R: You go in the morning. |
| 15. | G: Uhu. |

In lines 1, 3, 8, and 11, Graciella is fulfilling the role of the teacher since she is explaining Sunday to Koji. In lines 9 and 15, however, she is fulfilling the role of the student in relation to Roger, the teacher. This definition of teacher and student by role rather than by official position is an interesting idea, and it makes Fanselow's system a flexible

one. It allows for another, different, way of looking at and coding the complex exchanges in that small piece of dialogue and no doubt others like it.

Characteristic 2: Move

The second item of analysis is the move. There are four move types: structure, solicit, respond, and react. A structure move is an announcement of what we are going to do or have done. A solicit move sets tasks by asking questions, issuing commands, or making requests. A respond move is a reply to a solicit. And a react move is a comment on what others have communicated. To these four, which are based directly on Bellack's categories, Fanselow adds what he calls bearing moves, which he defines as the idiosyncratic communications people make, such as scratching their heads, touching their ears, or smoking (his examples). He suggests that a move one cannot categorize otherwise might be coded as a bearing move. To an extent, it seems to be a catch-all for doubtful categorizations.

Let us look again at the same piece of dialogue and consider some of the move types. Soliciting moves are quite easy to pick out. Lines 4, 5, 6, and 9 are solicits, since they are all requests for information. Responds are similarly easy to see. Line 8 is the response to line 6. Line 10 is the response to line 9. Line 4, however, received a response ("Huh?") which is also a solicit in that it is a request for clarification. Lines 2 and 12 are also responds since they

are clearly responses to what has just been said. However, they do not fit Fanselow's definition of respond as a reply to a solicit, since the utterances they respond to do not seem to be solicits. In fact, using Fanselow's definitions, it is difficult to fit in statements of fact or items of information such as Graciella's statement in line 1 ("Sunday is the day that you worship the Lord.") In a very loose definition of react, it could be seen as a comment on whatever led up to her making the statement. A glance at the dialogue previous to the excerpt shows that it is in a way a comment on Roger's bringing up the subject of Sunday in the first place. On the other hand, an examination of some of the pieces of dialogue analyzed by Fanselow in various sections of his book shows that items of information and statements of fact are generally coded as structure. Here are some examples:

From page 28:

MC: Here's your big chance, Cookie Monster.

Cookie Monster: No can do.

These are coded as structure and react.

From page 27:

Flight Attendant: There are designated areas for smokers
and nonsmokers. Rows fifteen through
thirty are reserved for nonsmokers.

This is coded structure.

In discussing the usefulness of the move as a unit, Fanselow suggests that if the move seems too small one could use groups of moves, cycles of moves, or sequences of cycles.

But underlying everything, his definition of a move is somewhat vague. He calls it "the smallest unit in FOCUS." However, this begs the question: "What is the smallest unit in FOCUS?" The answer, of course, is the move. At one point, Fanselow says that his move roughly corresponds to the move in Sinclair and Coulthard's system. But this is as close as he gets to a workable definition.

The vagueness of definition has ramifications for using the system. It makes the segmenting of a piece of dialogue for analysis quite difficult. Consider, for example, the following excerpt, which contains quite long utterances by the teacher.

R:	OK. Here's three A's. You're talking to someone and they say a question to you. "Do you know where I can catch the bus downtown?" And you just say yes. Is that sufficient?
B:	No.
R:	"Do you know where I can catch the bus downtown? Yes." That's not enough, right? OK. You don't just answer the question. You have to add some information, right? "Yeah, you catch it right down at the corner opposite--er--what's the name of that place? 4400? Something like that. OK. And then you might ask a question--er--"Are you in a hurry?"
B:	"Where are you gonna go?"
R:	"Where are you gonna go?" Good. That way you can continue a conversation and it doesn't just die. OK? I would like to try this now, the four of us, in a circle . . .

Given the four different types of move defined by Fanselow, it is clear that these long utterances by Roger need to be segmented for any kind of meaningful analysis. But exactly how should they be segmented? How many moves are there in Roger's first utterance? It could be one long solicit. It could be a structure followed by a solicit. It could be a bearing move (OK), followed by a structure, followed by a

solicit. Roger's other two long utterances could likewise be divided into moves in several different ways. The final sentence in the last utterance, in fact, ends a transaction (using Sinclair and Coulthard's terminology) and begins a new one.

It might be argued, of course, that these very difficulties could give rise to interesting discussions and insights into the classroom interaction. However, the more choices and different interpretations there are, the more time it takes to do an analysis, thus making the system less useful on an everyday, practical basis. Simply putting the segment of transcript down on paper becomes difficult. Each utterance probably needs to be written in its entirety, with no divisions, as I transcribed the segment above, in order not to impose more divisions onto it before the analysis is thought out. But then the segment needs to be rewritten for the practical purpose of continuing the analysis into the next three characteristics of communications, answering the question "How." And the examination of these characteristics might lead to new thoughts on move divisions.

Characteristic 3: Medium

The next characteristic of Fanselow's system is medium. Medium has four subcategories: (1) linguistic, that is, language in any form; (2) nonlinguistic, that is, objects, noise, music, and so forth; (3) paralinguistic, that is,

gestures, body language, and tone of voice; and (4) silence, that is, the absence of all the others or simply the passage of time. Fanselow further subdivides medium into aural/oral, appealing primarily to the ear; visual, appealing primarily to the eye; and other.

These subcategories of medium are thought-provoking because they focus the attention on a facet of communication that is often taken for granted. It is interesting, for example, to consider how a particular teacher uses body language, that is, a paralinguistic medium. Considering the use of silence is also significant. In Fanselow's system, this category leads the analyst to think about pauses.

Consider again Roger's utterance from the previous segment of dialogue:

R: That's not enough, right? OK. You don't just answer the question. You have to add some information, right? Yeah, you catch it right down at the corner opposite--er--what's the name of that place? 4400? Something like that. OK.

There are four points in this utterance where Roger asks a question and gets no response. Are the students being nonresponsive? Or did they smile, or nod, or otherwise indicate that they were participating? Whatever the case, this subcategory of medium causes the analyst to think once more about move boundaries.

Characteristic 4: Use

The next category, use, answers the question "How is the medium being used to communicate content?" Fanselow divides

use into six subcategories: attend, characterize, reproduce, relate, present, and set. Attend refers to engaging in receptive activities, such as silent reading or looking at pictures. Characterize refers to indicating whether something is right or wrong, using category labels, or in other ways commenting about language or people. Reproduce refers to the repetition of a model, referent, or example that has "already been set," for example, repeating what the teacher says or copying sentences from the blackboard. Relate refers to using a medium to make generalizations or inferences about content, for example, finding the main ideas in a paragraph. And present refers to the use of a medium for anything other than characterizing, relating, reproducing, or setting content. This category includes asking questions and stating information. It seems to be a fairly large catch-all category, somewhat similar to the bear category mentioned earlier.

Finally, sets are items we refer to when we characterize content. Communications are coded as set when mediums are used to communicate items referred to by words such as this, that, or it. Set is the most difficult of Fanselow's categories to use or to understand. First of all, the word is used interchangeably as both a noun and a verb. At times it is difficult to tell which, since the names of the various categories in the system look like verbs but are used as nouns in most cases. Consider the way Fanselow explains sets

(numbers in brackets are added):

Some items we refer to when we characterize content are examples of what I call sets [1]. I say we can use mediums to set [2] content to form another category of use. Print is used to set [3] the words he going, chalk, and walked in the examples above. In a solicit such as Repeat this: I'm hungry as a lion, the sentence referred to by this I'd classify as setting [4] content also. (Fanselow 1987, 35)

Item 1 is a noun. Items 2, 3, and 4 are verbs. In addition, Fanselow never characterizes a whole move as a set in the use category, which means the category is unlike the other subcategories of use. Finally, the examples he gives of actual communications rarely if ever include set in a way that would make the meaning of the term clear. The usefulness of this category is not apparent to me.

Characteristic 5: Content

Content is the fifth and last characteristic of communications, according to Fanselow's scheme. He differentiates between three major categories: life, procedure, and study. Life refers to personal feeling, personal information, formulas such as greetings, and general knowledge. Procedure refers to classroom management or business, such as roll-calling, discipline, giving directions, or giving the rationale for exercises. Study refers to the target language being communicated as an area of study--as information set apart and studied, tested, or practiced for its own sake.

He further differentiates the components of this fifth characteristic, content, into more than forty subcategories.

For example, he divides study into study of language and study of other areas. He then divides study of language into context, dialects, discourse, grammar, and so on. Finally, to this fifth characteristic, content, he adds another category, unspecified, for cases where one "cannot determine for sure what content is being communicated" (Fanselow 1987, 281). This category is not included in his primary overview of the system.

Using the System: Analysis One

My first decision was to pick out a "chunk" of dialogue to analyze. I first considered using the same piece of classroom discourse that I had analyzed using Sinclair and Coulthard's system. I decided not to do this because I felt that decisions I had already made in using Sinclair and Coulthard's system would influence me unduly in my use of Fanselow's. I decided that the advantages of using a segment of a different lesson, which I had not yet touched or considered, outweighed the advantages, if any, of examining the same piece. Having decided to analyze a different segment, I looked for one that had a well-defined beginning and end and that was short enough to be manageable, given the complexity of the system of analysis.

I chose a segment that was an introduction to and explanation of a specific classroom exercise. (See Chart 5.) My next decision entailed arranging the dialogue on the page in order to begin analyzing it. Fanselow's system is defined

	Source/ Target	Move	Medium	Use	Content
1. T: I wanna get your tongues--ah--in good condition after a long weekend.	T/Sg	Str	In	p	p
2. Maybe you haven't been speaking English much although I know you've probably been very responsible.	T/Sg	rea?	In	p	lp?
3. OK, this, I think we talked about it before.	T/Sg	rea?	In	p + s	p?
4. Let's see if we--if you can remember it. The three A's I mentioned before in class?	T/Sg	sol	In	p + s	p?
5. This is a secret formula for keeping conversations with Americans moving.	T/Sg	str?	In	c + s	l?
6. How do we do--what do I mean by this?	T/Sg	sol	In	p	p?
7.	S/Tq	rea	s	a	-
8. If you have a conversation that is one-sided where the American talks and you just say yes, no, he probably--or she--will go away. You have to keep your part of the conversation and this is a secret way of remembering.	T/Sg	str?	In	c	p?
9. OK?	T/Sg	sol	In	p	p
10.	S/T	rea	s	a	-
11. (Writes formula on blackboard)	O/Sg	str	lv	s	s
12. OK.	T/Sg	str?	In	p	p?
13. Here's three A's. You're talking to someone and they say a question to you. "Do you know where I can catch the bus downtown?" And you just say yes.	T/Sg	str?	In	p	p?s?
14. Is that sufficient?	T/Sg	sol	In	p	
15.S: No.	S/T	res	In	c	
16.T. "Do you know where I can catch the bus downtown?" "Yes."	T/S	rea	In	d	s
17. That's not enough, right?	T/Sg	sol	In	c	
18.	S/T	rea	s	a	

Chart 5: First Excerpt Analyzed Using Fanselow's System

	Source/ Target	Move	Medium	Use	Content
19. OK.	S/T	rea	la	c	p
20. You don't just answer the question. You have to add some information.	T/Sg	str?	la	c	p?s?
21. right?	T/Sg	sol	la	p	
22. "Yeah, you catch it right down at the corner opposite-	T/Sg	str?	la	p	s
23. er--What's the name of that place? 4400?	T/Sg	sol	la	p	l
24.	S/T	rea	s	a	
25. Something like that. OK.	T/T	rea	la	p	
26. And then you might ask a question--er-- "Are you in a hurry?"	T/Sg	str	la	p	p/s
27.S: "Where are you gonna go?"	S/T	sol	la	p	s
28.T: "Where are you gonna go." Good. OK.	T/S	rea	la	r	s
29. That way you can continue a conversation and it doesn't just die.	T/Sg	str	la	p	p?l?
30. OK.	T/Sg	sol	la	p	
31.	S/T	rea	s	a	
32. I would like to try this now, the four of us, in a circle, and we'll look at the questions that I gave you for discussion.	T/Sg	str	la	p	p
33. Can I ask you to move this, please, Graciella?	T/S	sol	ia	p+s	l
34.	S	rea	oi	r?	l
35. And I'll join you.	T/Sg	rea	po	r?	l
36. OK.	T/Sg	str	la	p	p

Chart 5: (Continued)

in terms of moves, but as mentioned earlier the move itself is not clearly defined. It is not synonymous with "turn" because in some of his examples a chunk of language spoken by one person (two sentences perhaps) is divided into more than one move. The move is defined more in terms of what it does. Thus, deciding how to arrange the dialogue on the page would depend on my analysis of the moves. I decided simply to start a new line for each sentence. However, this decision would still be a guess until much of the analysis was done.

I also had to decide how detailed and accurate the transcription would need to be. Fanselow comments on his own method of transcription that

the transcriptions are not extremely detailed. I spell the words normally and so don't note actual pronunciation; nor do I note stress or pauses. I indicate some gestures or body language when it is necessary to illustrate a point, but otherwise omit detailed descriptions of movement. In addition, I have edited some transcriptions so that they more clearly illustrate a particular point, keeping close to what seemed the intention of the speaker and not essentially changing the communication, but not reflecting it exactly either. (Fanselow, 50)

As already mentioned, a number of the examples he uses in the book are not "real"; they have been invented for the purpose of illustrating points. He marks these with an asterisk.

Analyzing Source and Target

Column 1, the source/target column, was easy to work out, since all it entailed was noting who was talking and to whom. For almost every move, it was teacher to student group (T/Sg), teacher to student (T/S), or student to teacher (S/T). In

this particular excerpt, there were no instances where a student took on the role of teacher by Fanselow's definition.

Analyzing Move Types

Column 2, move type, was much more difficult to deal with. I found that decisions needed to be made about what and how to transcribe. Moves 7, 10, 18, 24, 31, and 34 are "empty" moves that I found it necessary to add after I noticed solicits not followed by reacts. I felt that "no reaction" might be meaningful in the classroom and needed to be noted, particularly since Roger had commented on the significance of silences and pauses. I marked these invented moves as student to teacher, react, with silence as the medium.

However, the videotape obviously might show quite definite reactions, for example, nods or smiles or puzzled looks, rather than simply silence.

Some of these empty moves were difficult to categorize. Consider moves 6, 7 and 8, for example.

6. R: How do we do--what do I mean by this?
7.
8. R: If you have a conversation that is one-sided . . .

Move 6 could be simply a rhetorical question and thus not a solicit. It could also be a filler, a device to let what Roger says about the "secret formula" sink in before he moves on to the explanation. If that were the case, then move 7 would be teacher to student, structure. Another way to analyze it would be to omit move 7, making moves 5 through 8 essentially one move, a structure.

A similar argument could be raised against move 24.

22. R: Yeah, you catch it right down at the corner opposite--
 23. er--What's the name of that place? 4400?
 24.
 25. Something like that. OK.

At this point the teacher was indeed fumbling for the name of a real place, the 4400 Club, but without a record of pauses or reactions it is not clear whether he was actually hoping for an answer to his question or just helping his own memory along--talking to himself rather than asking the students a real question. I coded move 25 as teacher to teacher (T/T) precisely for that reason. However, if move 24 were not added, moves 22, 23, and 25 might be coded as one move.

Some of the other added empty moves were coded more straightforwardly. Move 31 I felt needed to be there because the "OK" of move 30 is definitely a marker between the structuring moves of the explanation and the structuring move 32, which opens up a new topic.

29. R: That way you can continue a conversation and it doesn't just die.
 30. OK?
 31.
 32. I would like to try this now, the four of us . . .

It would be difficult to call move 30 anything other than a solicit. Thus, a react needed to be noted, even if it took the form of a non-reaction. Move 34 obviously entailed the movement of a physical object.

33. R: Can I ask you to move this, please. Graciella?
 34.
 35. And I'll join you.

The move needed to be coded, because moves 33 and 35 were separate moves, and move 35 was obviously either a reaction or a response. In either case, there had to be something that it was a response or a reaction to.

This discussion of the rationale behind adding empty moves demonstrates that decisions made about what to include in a transcription are often arbitrary and, because of their arbitrariness, could color the overall "look" of the analysis. It could be said, for example, that there are six empty moves, or silences, out of a total of 36 moves in this segment. But does this show a pattern of nonresponsiveness on the part of the students? Or does it simply say something about the style of the analyst? In only two instances, moves 31 and 34, was the case for these empty moves too strong to argue against.

Column 2, move type, was considerably less straightforward than column 1. For one thing, the decisions to be made for this column depended very heavily on decisions already made in choosing boundaries for each move. For example, what were the criteria that led me to separate moves 1 and 2?

1. R: I wanna get your tongues--ah--in good condition after a long weekend.
2. Maybe you haven't been speakinng English much . . .

Move 2 could easily be viewed as part of move 1. Both give the reason for Roger's wanting to get the students' tongues in good condition. Was my decision influenced by the punctuation? Punctuation in itself is a somewhat arbitrary

decision made at the time of transcribing the data. Moves 3 and 4 too could have been coded as one move, but I left them as separate.

3. R: OK, this, I think we talked about it before.
4. Let's see if we--if you can remember it. The three A's I mentioned before in class?

On the other hand, move 8 consisted of two sentences, and move 13 consisted of three sentences.

8. R: If you have a conversation that is one-sided where the American talks and you just say yes, no, he probably--or she--will go away. You have to keep your part of the conversation and this is a secret way of remembering.

13. R: Here's three A's. You're talking to someone and they say a question to you. "Do you know where I can catch the bus downtown?" And you just say yes.

All these decisions had to be made after the transcription was already on the page.

The discussion of empty moves also shows the arbitrariness of some move boundaries. Moves 16 and 17 could have been coded as one move.

16. R: "Do you know where I can catch the bus downtown?" "Yes."
17. That's not enough, right?

Moves 20 and 21 could have been divided in a different way.

20. R: You don't just answer the question. You have to add some information,
21. right?

The divisions could have been "You don't just answer the question" and "You have to add some information, right?" Move 28 also could have been coded differently.

28. "Where are you gonna go?" Good. OK.

This could be seen as two moves: "Where are you gonna go?"

and "Good. OK." In fact, "Good. OK" could also be coded as two moves: "Good" as a response or react and "OK" as a structuring move. This last instance, seemingly a minor distinction, could be of some significance because it concerns Roger's use of fillers such as "OK." If Fanselow's system were being used simply to look for and examine this one characteristic, such move divisions could be quite important.

Analyzing Medium

With column 3, medium, I found once again that the empty moves posed a problem. They would need to be filled in with information from the videotape, because what I coded as silence (s) could actually be paralinguistic (p) if the students were nodding their heads or smiling or producing any response in addition to silence. Silence as a category began to seem in many respects a catch-all for anything that did not fit neatly into the other categories.

Analyzing Use

The categories in column 4, use, varied tremendously in clarity. I called all the empty moves attend, because the students were (apparently) simply receiving input from the teacher. The examples Fanselow gives for attend are silent reading and looking at pictures, but I assumed that listening to the teacher without responding would fit into this category rather than any of the others. However, an examination of Fanselow's explanation of the categories in this column shows present (p) as a major catch-all: "any mediums that are not

clearly characterizing, relating, reproducing, or setting content" (p. 36).

Once again the empty moves caused a problem, particularly with the dialogue transcribed as broadly as Fanselow says he prefers. Reproduce (d) seemed to entail a straightforward choice. I found only one instance, move 16, where the teacher repeated what he had already said.

13. R: Here's three A's. You're talking to someone and they say a question to you.
 "Do you know where I can catch the bus downtown?" And you just say yes.
14. Is that sufficient?
15. No.
16. "Do you know where I can catch the bus downtown?" "Yes."
17. That's not enough, right?

Characterize (c) was somewhat more difficult to assign. I chose it for move 5 because the teacher was commenting on the formula he was about to introduce, characterizing it by defining it.

5. R: This is a secret formula for keeping conversations with Americans going.

I chose it for move 8 because I saw this as a characterization of a different sort: a general comment on how Americans converse.

8. R: If you have a conversation that is one-sided where the American talks and you just say yes, no, he probably--or she--will go away . . .

Move 15 seemed even more clearly to be a characterize because it was the answer to a question and thus a judgment of what had just been said. Move 17 contained a comment and a question and thus could fit into the present category. However, I saw this move more as a comment by the teacher on

what he had just said than as a question; thus, I coded it as characterize.

14. R: Is that sufficient?
 15. B: No.
 16. R: "Do you know where I can catch the bus downtown?" "Yes."
 17. That's not enough, right?
 18.
 19. OK.

I tentatively coded the "OK" of move 19 as the teacher's reaction to the students' nonreaction, although it could also have been coded as a structuring move. Coded as a react, its use would be to characterize, because it is a comment on the students' react. Coded as a structure, as a means to indicate closure and move on, it was less easy to code as characterize, because it was difficult to see the "OK" as a comment or an indication of whether something was correct or incorrect. Like move 36, it seemed to be more of a present than a characterize.

33. R: Can I ask you to move this, please, Graciella?
 34.
 35. R: And I'll join you.
 36. OK.

The difficulties of move 19 crop up again in move 28, which I had initially seen as one move, a reaction to the students' solicit.

26. R: And then you might ask a question --er-- "Are you in a hurry?"
 27. B: "Where are you gonna go?"
 28. R: "Where are you gonna go?" Good. OK.

I had coded its use as reproduce. But the "Good. OK" is clearly not reproduce, so perhaps move 28 is two moves, or

even three. "Where are you gonna go" is clearly react/reproduce. "Good" could be coded as react/characterize. And the final "OK" could be considered as a structuring move, meaning "Let's move on," and might be coded, like moves 12 and 36, and possibly move 19, as present, the catch-all category.

<p>11. R: (Writes formula on blackboard) 12. OK.</p>
--

<p>35. R: And I'll join you. 36. OK.</p>
--

<p>17. R: That's not enough, right? 18. 19. OK.</p>

These were all untidy and inconclusive codings, but it is interesting that the tricky decisions had to do with the use of fillers such as "OK," which Roger had expressed an interest in and which are clearly a major part of his teaching style.

The fourth column, use, also contains the problematic category set (s). An overview of Fanselow's examples did not uncover any instances where he used set alone. And as a category of use, it did not immediately present itself to me as fitting any of the coding decisions in this excerpt. Fanselow defines set as "items we refer to when we characterize content." By this, does he mean that set occurs only in conjunction with characterize? But he also says that set is involved when mediums are used to communicate items referred to by words such as this, that, or it. If set is a

verb (as all the other items in the use category are), then it seems to refer to the use of language to "fix" meaning. If it is a noun, as it so often appears to be in Fanselow's use of it, then it seems to be used rather like the word set in mathematics--assigning items to a particular group, or sorting them into piles.

I looked again at each move in the excerpt to see if set might be applicable. Move 3 seemed to be a possibility, even though I felt its use was not to characterize.

2. R: Maybe you haven't been speaking English much although I know you've probably been very responsible.
3. OK, this, I think we talked about it before.
4. Let's see if we--if you can remember it. The three A's I mentioned before in class.
5. This is a secret formula for keeping conversations with Americans moving.

"I think we talked about it before" seemed to be a statement of information rather than a labeling. But the word this seemed to fit Fanselow's notion of a set. With move 4, too, this same situation seemed to apply. The first part, "Let's see if we--if you can remember it," was clearly a solicit. But the "it," which was immediately defined by Roger as "the three A's I mentioned before in class," might fit the set category. Were there then two separate moves? Was the second move a characterize/set? Move 5 also seemed relevant to the set category: "This is a secret formula." But it also seemed to be a characterize.

So if set always implies characterize, what is its function as a category? I turned again to move 33.

33. R: Can I ask you to move this, please, Graciella?

The presence of the word this, according to Fanselow's definition, seemed to warrant calling this move a set, but as a question--a genuine, real-life request--it should clearly be coded as present, which according to Fanselow includes asking questions and stating information. And even if one were to argue that a request in the form of a question is not really a question, the move would still fall into the present category, since it did not fall into any of the others. The result of my looking for sets was that I found myself forcing the data into a category that did not seem to have a meaningful function.

Analyzing Content

With the fifth column, content, I found myself leaving many of the moves uncategorized, unable to fit the content into life, procedure, or study, and unwilling to resort to the catch-all category, unspecified. And in many of the instances where I did opt for a category it was with much hesitation (indicated by a question mark). Was move 5, for example, simply a continuation of the previous moves, which I had labeled procedure?

4. R: Let's see if we--if you can remember it. The three A's I mentioned before in class.
5. This is a secret formula for keeping conversations with Americans moving.

Or was the difficulty of categorizing the content in these first five or six moves closely connected with the choices

made in dividing the long teacher utterances into moves? Could this whole first utterance by Roger (almost half the excerpt) have been coded procedure? Or study? In fact, in a listening-speaking ESL class, isn't every utterance an instance of study, since the only reason for the students and the teacher to be in the classroom is to study the language? In other words, the medium is the message, and the message is study.

Since such a conclusion means to abandon Fanselow's content categories altogether, I tried again to fit each move into a category. I wondered how to categorize the "no" of move 15, which was clearly a separate move.

14. R: Is that sufficient?

15. B: No.

Was it perhaps life, an expression of the personal feeling of the student toward what the teacher had just said? And what was the content of "OK" in move 30?

29. R: That way you can continue a conversation and it doesn't just die.

30. OK?

Was this too life? And might we not then find ourselves using life as a catch-all category as broad as study? Finally, what was the content of the empty moves? I could fit these into life only because they did not fit into either study or procedure. I found myself turning to Fanselow's fourth category, unspecified, but very reluctantly, because it seems to have been invented simply as a category for items that did

not fit neatly anywhere else.

On the other hand, I found the distinction between life and study interesting for moves 22 and 23 because these moves brought to the fore Roger's use of a real-life example for the item being studied.

22. R: "Yeah, you catch it right down at the corner opposite--
23. er--What's the name of that place--4400?"

In these two lines he was presenting material as an example. But while in move 22 the content was clearly study, in move 23 the content was clearly life because it referred to a real place across the street from the university and because the question was a genuine one (even if he was asking himself), not a "classroom" one. In this respect it is different from questions such as that in move 14, which the teacher already knew the answer to, and the students knew the teacher already knew the answer to.

13. R: Here's three A's. You're talking to someone and they say a question to you.
"Do you know where I can catch the bus downtown?" And you just say yes.
14. Is that sufficient?

Dividing the content into study and life in this instance helped highlight the extent to which language was being used in more than a "classroom" sense.

Consider move 5 again.

5. R: This is a secret formula for keeping conversations with Americans moving.

It was also significant in this respect because coding it as life rather than study indicated that it was a genuine piece of real-life information about American life for the students

to note and use later. And perhaps move 29 was yet another instance of this distinction.

29. R: That way you can continue a conversation and it doesn't just die.

With move 2 I also found the distinction useful.

1. R: I wanna get your tongues--ah--in good condition after a long weekend.
2. Maybe you haven't been speaking English much although I know you've probably been very responsible.

My first impulse was to code it as life. It seemed to be a personal comment about the students. But it could also be seen simply as part of move 1, a discussion of the procedure--"rationale for exercises," in Fanselow's words.

Such decisions on the coding of content could give rise to two (or more) interpretations of Roger's style. Did he or did he not include much "real" (i.e. non-classroom) communication--English used purely for everyday communication? Was move 2 a personal comment on the students' behavior (everyday language use) or was it a rationale for an exercise (classroom procedure)?

Discussion of the Analysis

In comparison with Sinclair and Coulthard's system, Fanselow's, in this excerpt at least, seemed to be more difficult to understand and to apply. On the other hand, I wondered if my method of using it had given rise to much of the complication. I had made a point of delving into the minutest details of this one short excerpt. I had found the exercise an interesting one, but it had primarily been a means

to discover what Fanselow's system was all about. The questions that arose had more to do with understanding the categories than with understanding the classroom discourse. Fanselow himself does not use the system to such a comprehensive degree. Instead he looks at pieces of dialogue in a more selective way, picking out certain moves or certain aspects of the content with a view to answering particular questions. For example, his content subcategory life is a useful one because with it one can ask whether or to what extent a teacher brings in "real-life" language, useful outside the classroom. A quick overview of a longer piece of discourse with a view to simply looking for instances of life could certainly be a useful exercise, particularly for the discourse in a language class.

Using the System: Analysis Two

Since Fanselow's system was quite difficult to grasp, I decided to analyze a second piece of classroom discourse with his method. I wanted to see whether my having done one analysis would help me use the system more quickly without getting bogged down by difficult decisions about small items. Many of Fanselow's own analyses are "incomplete," as he concentrates on one item or another in his system. I decided with this second excerpt to be similarly selective, concentrating on what I felt was significant and ignoring less pertinent items, such as medium.

I chose an excerpt that contained more "conventional"

classroom discourse than most of Roger's teaching seemed to have. (See Chart 6.) Part of it was a short exchange with one student in which Roger directly taught pronunciation. The excerpt also contained some interesting uses of "OK" and other "fillers" which Roger and I had noticed and commented on during our earlier discussions. I was interested in finding out whether Fanselow's system could be used to illuminate these usages.

The Analysis

I found it valuable first of all to divide the excerpt into segments larger than the move, which is Fanselow's largest category. (Above the level of move, he suggests only cycles of moves and sequences of cycles.) I set off moves 3 through 15 as one larger segment, since it is an exchange of moves between the teacher and one particular student all on one topic, the pronunciation of the word thirty. This is followed by a shorter sequence, moves 16 through 18, again between the teacher and one particular student. In move 19, Roger begins another sequence by calling on a third student, but this sequence is different in that the student addressed in the previous sequence continues the utterance in move 17 ("I'm not sure") with move 20 ("I didn't get it"), which allows the third student the safety of saying "Me either" (move 20) rather than having to volunteer that she did not know the answer.

I found that working through Fanselow's categories of

			Source/ Target	Move	Medium	Use	Content
1.	R:	OK.	T/S				
2.		Correct.	T/S			Ch	
3.		Want to do number seven?	T/S	sol		pre	
4.	K:	Three hundred thirteen thousand	S/T	res		rel?	st
5.		and thirty.					
6.	R:	Thirty	T/S	sol			st
7.	K:	Thirty	S/T	res		rep	st
8.	R:	Thirty	T/S	sol		rep	
9.		Give me more "er"	T/S	sol		pre	st
10.		Thirty.	T/S	sol		pre	
11.	K:	Thirty.	S/T	res		rep	
12.	R:	OK.	T/S	rea			
13.		Thirty	T/S	rea?			
14.		OK.	T/Sg	res		pre	
15.		Three hundred and thirteen thousand.	T/Sg	res		pre	
16.		Do you agree with that, Besant?	T/S	sol		pre	
17.	B:	I'm not sure.	S/T	res			
18.	R:	You're not sure.	T/S	rea		att	
19.		Graciella?	T/S	sol		pre	
20.	B:	I didn't get it.	S/T	res			
21.	G:	Me either.	S/T	res			
22.	R:	You're not sure either	T/S	rea		att	
23.		OK.	T/Sg	bea?			
24.		I agree.	T/Sg	rea?		ch	
25.		That's good.	T/Sg	rea?		ch	
26.		OK.	T/Sg	rea?			
27.		You wanna try reading one, Besant?	T/S	sol		pre	

Chart 6: Second excerpt analyzed using Fanselow's System.

move types helped clarify these sequences. Moves 3 and 4 and moves 6 and 7 are traditional teaching sequences, with teacher solicit and student response. Then the third sequence, moves 8 through 15, shows teacher solicit, student response, and teacher react. These first two sequences are not typical of Roger's teaching, or at least they are not what Roger would like to be typical of his teaching. His marginal comment here had been "overt teaching," a comment which is confirmed by the analysis.

The next sequence is a little more complex.

16. R: Do you agree with that, Besant?
17. B: I'm not sure.
18. R: You're not sure.
19. Graciella?
20. B: I didn't get it.
21. G: Me either.
22. R: You're not sure either.

Roger addresses one student, Graciella, but before she answers Besant continues with her previous response, elaborating on "I'm not sure" with "I didn't get it." Roger neatly combines the two sequences by saying "You're not sure either." These two responses of Roger's ("You're not sure" and "You're not sure either") demonstrate a technique that Roger uses frequently to comment on students' utterances without judging them. In Fanselow's use category these ought to be coded as either respond or react. But they could be more precisely categorized as attend, in that Roger is attending to content without judging. According to Fanselow's definition, attend refers to "moves in which we simply take in mediums, as when

we read silently." In this case, Roger is simply acknowledging that he is listening. This is a significant differentiation made visible by a consideration of Fanselow's move categories. Finding it here might lead the researcher or teacher to look for it in other lessons, highlighting it as a teaching technique used deliberately to suspend judgment of students.

The short sequence following this one, moves 23 through 26, I found very difficult to categorize originally.

23.	R:	OK.
24.		I agree.
25.		That's good.
26.		OK.

It seems at first sight to be nothing but a string of fillers. However, it takes on more clarity following the analysis of the first parts. Move 23, "OK," is a bearing move, addressed to the whole group. Move 24, "I agree," goes back to the original response of the first student to question seven of the exercise, move 4.

3.	R:	Want to do number seven?
4.	K:	Three hundred thirteen thousand and thirty.

As a move type it is a react, and its use is to characterize. Another way of categorizing its use would be as a reproduce, since what Roger is doing here is demonstrating what the students were supposed to do after they had heard a particular response. He had tried to get this response from both Besant and Graciella, but when both said they were not sure, he

supplied the response himself. With this interpretation, the next line, "That's good," can be seen as a react to the first student's original answer, already affirmed by the previous line, "I agree." The final "OK," in move 26, can then be categorized as a bearing move, used to characterize the content of the whole excerpt, consisting of asking for and receiving a correct response to an exercise item, while at the same time teaching an item of pronunciation and bringing in and accepting the contributions of two other students. It characterizes the sequence of segments as complete and leads to the next move, move 27, which begins a new segment of the lesson.

Discussion of the Analysis

I was led to this particular excerpt partly because I was looking for sequences of "fillers," and moves 23 through 26 stood out. Fanselow's method of analysis illuminated the teaching exchange that led up to this short sequence, which at first sight seems to consist merely of an overabundance of reassuring murmurs.

How had Roger viewed this sequence? The particular lesson from which this excerpt was taken occurred very early in the course. My first long discussion with Roger was about this and the two following lessons. He mentioned that over the years he had developed particular teaching techniques and learned to use them effectively through years of practice and research. Reading the transcripts enabled him to recognize

these techniques, which were deliberately acquired but now used unconsciously. We discussed in particular his interest in using techniques to make students feel comfortable, get them to respond, leave space open for students to communicate, and hold back so that he did not dominate.

With this particular sequence, these were his marginal comments:

22.	You're not sure either.	
23.	OK	<i>transition</i>
24.	I agree.	<i>affirmation</i>
25.	That's good.	<i>praise</i>
26.	OK.	<i>transition</i>

His comments are affirmed by the interpretation of the sequence using Fanselow's move categories. Move 23, as a bearing move, is a transition addressed to the group as a whole. Move 24, as a reproduce, affirms the correct response for the students. Move 25 is a react, in this case praising the students. And finally, move 26 is a bearing move, marking a transition to the next sequence.

With this particular excerpt I felt that my decision to concentrate on particular items rather than on every detail was a sound one. My analysis demonstrated that Fanselow's method could be used effectively in the way he apparently wished it to be used: to highlight certain aspects of the classroom discourse of interest to the teacher or to other observers such as student teachers. The system was more useful when it was used selectively rather than comprehensively. It is worth noting that the system worked

well to illuminate Roger's use of so-called fillers, which are seen to have a pedagogical purpose, not just to fill pauses or act as transition markers.

Conclusions

Overall, I found Fanselow's system quite difficult to grasp initially. The difficulty was exacerbated probably by the extremely unconventional layout of his book Breaking Rules. The book is meant to be used as a workbook, not as a reference, and it is thus quite hard to pick up the gist of his system without practicing its use extensively. In fact, Fanselow himself says that the book "requires activity and action on the part of readers" and that "the generation and exploration of alternatives that I am advocating is a multi-year undertaking" (Fanselow 1987, 14). It would be quite difficult--and unfair, I think--to use his method for student teachers in anything less than a full course because of the difficulty in figuring it out. However, with the reservations already made--the obscure meaning of set and a few other terms, or the overuse of "catch-all" categories--his system is a comprehensive means of illuminating classroom discourse.

Part 4: Shuy

For the third system of analysis I turned to one devised by the linguist Roger Shuy to study thirty-six language arts lessons taught in six different classrooms. Shuy's approach in this study was very broad. He (or more probably his

research assistants) viewed the videotapes of all the lessons and identified the linguistic features that were most marked in each lesson by each teacher. He then summarized the features of the six lessons taught by each teacher and compared the classes with one another. His analysis addresses function, content, and style by identifying large dimensions of the discourse.

I chose this system partly because it is so different from the other two. Sinclair and Coulthard's system approaches discourse in the way that a grammatical system approaches a sentence, seeking to break it into its component parts in a hierarchical way. Fanselow's system is similar to theirs in that the discourse is divided into segments and each segment is identified according to its function. Both are designed to produce a comprehensive analysis of the discourse. The major difference between the two is that Fanselow's has an overtly pedagogical purpose and is much more complicated than Sinclair and Coulthard's. Shuy's system, unlike the others, approaches the classroom as a whole. It does not purport to be a comprehensive analysis of all the discourse. Rather, it looks at the teacher's overall style of teaching by focusing on certain significant dimensions of the classroom interaction. Unlike the other two systems, it is meant ultimately to be evaluative. Shuy identifies criteria that constitute effective teaching and discusses the six teachers' styles according to these criteria. He enumerates "traps"

into which teachers can fall and suggests that his system provides a way by which these traps can be seen and thus avoided.

For the purposes of this study, I used the system very selectively. I felt that the dimensions of language Shuy identified were interesting in themselves, regardless of whether they were used for evaluative purposes or not; I wanted to use the system to describe without necessarily judging. In addition, I decided to use the system with the transcript of one lesson rather than videotapes of many, even though the system is particularly suited to the analysis of large amounts of data. I confined myself to one because on a practical level neither teachers themselves nor teacher trainers have the time to collect and examine the large amounts of data dealt with in Shuy's study. I used the written transcripts because, although they do not have the multifaceted nature of videotapes, the transcripts "freeze" the action and thus make a closer examination more feasible.

Like the vast majority of reports of classroom research, Shuy's article does not enumerate the enormous difficulties involved in examining large amounts of discourse. He does not explain how he or his assistants examined the videotapes or how long it took. Since I had already discussed the April 19 lesson in depth with the two student teachers, I decided to use it again for this analysis, with a view to considering to what extent the dimensions identified by Shuy could have been

useful in shaping the "seeing" of the student teachers. Since this system of analysis is so different from the other two, I did not feel my previous examination of it would unduly influence the conclusion I reached.

Description of the System

Shuy's examination of the six classrooms led him to identify six main dimensions of classroom discourse. These are the six:

- (1) question-asking strategies
- (2) use of language for management of the classroom
- (3) topic manipulation
- (4) self-referencing
- (5) suprasegmentals
- (6) naturalness of language use

I decided to examine five of these six dimensions, omitting only suprasegmentals (that is, intonation, stress, pitch, juncture, and pace), which would have involved a close examination of videos rather than of the written transcript. While the use of suprasegmentals can tell a lot about a teacher's style and effectiveness, this was a dimension that I had deliberately chosen not to focus on in this study.

Analysis: Question-Asking Strategies

In discussing the dimension of question-asking strategies, Shuy divides questions into types according to their usefulness in teaching. He then looks at the way

teachers sequence their questions. He discusses four main types of questions: open-ended questions, wh- questions, yes/no questions, and tag questions.

Although these terms are generally used to identify formal rather than functional categories, in Shuy's system these various types of questions are categorized more according to function than form. Open-ended questions, as the name implies, are those that do not restrict the response. Their form varies. For example, "Tell me about your weekend" looks like a command, but in the classroom it functions as a question designed to elicit a broad response. Similarly, "What did you do on the weekend?" has the form of a wh-question (that is, a question beginning with what, who, why, when, where, or how), but it is actually broad enough to function as an open-ended question. A question that has the form of a yes/no question may also be open-ended in function. "Can you explain that?" is an example. The answer expected is not simply yes.

Wh- questions limit the boundaries of the response, because the focus of the questions is narrower. "Where do you go to rent the tapes?" is an example. Yes/no questions limit the response even more. For example, "Do you have a VCR?" is likely to elicit a very short answer, either yes or no. Tag questions, as the name implies, are tags added to a statement to elicit a yes or no in response. They are designed to limit the response to a specific reply, depending on how the

questioner frames the tag. "Convenient, huh?" is designed to be answered with a yes. "You're not leaving, are you?" is designed to be answered with a no.

According to Shuy, in good probing, teachers tend to move in a sequence from open-ended, to wh-, to yes/no, and finally, if necessary, to tag questions. They start at the top to give the student a chance to show what he or she knows, then give more help or more clues in the questions as needed. Since there are many reasons for classroom questioning, however, this sequence is not always the most appropriate. For instance, if the purpose of classroom questioning at some point is to draw everyone in and give every student a chance to speak, questions with a narrower focus may be the most desirable choice. In any case, it is instructive to look at question types and patterns to see how a particular classroom works.

Looking at the lesson as a whole, I began by counting the number of questions Roger asked, and classifying them according to their type. This was not as straightforward as it might seem, because decisions had to be made about the function of utterances rather than their form. This was my first count:

Total:	122
Open-ended:	13
Wh- questions:	33
Yes/no:	44

Tag questions: 31

Choice (a category not identified by Shuy): 1

Because categorization of questions is so problematic and so subjective, I decided to go through the process again, looking at the questions with a fresh eye. This was my second count:

Total: 76

Open-ended: 10

Wh- questions: 28

Yes/no: 25

Tag questions: 12

Choice: 1

What caused this discrepancy? A fairly long section of the lesson consists of an explanation of a point of pronunciation. During this monologue, Roger's habit of saying "OK" is very prominent. In form, these fillers are either yes/no or tag questions. Here is an example:

R: In rapid speech, it reduces even more to this.
(Writes on blackboard). I coulda, I shoulda, I woulda. OK?

This "OK" is technically a yes/no question, meaning "Are you following?" or "Do you understand?" Here is another example:

R: Let's see if you can hear them in context, OK?

This "OK" seems to function as a tag question (meaning "Let's see . . ., shall we?") with much less chance that a student could respond (if at all) with anything other than "Yes."

A closer examination of this segment showed that these phrases elicited no response at all from the students, except

when Graciella once said "Uhu" in response to Roger's saying "We say sorta or kinda, OK?" Thus, in my second count I decided not to consider these tags, because upon reflection I saw them as simply reassurances or encouraging grunts, or simply a periodic "Are you with me so far?" To count them as real questions I felt gave a false impression of Roger's style of classroom questioning. This reclassification reduced the total of tag questions (a weak form of questioning) from 31 to 12.

I also found myself doubting my original classification of open-ended and wh- questions. For instance, I had originally counted Roger's question to the class "What're you gonna do?" as an open-ended question and his immediate follow-up to Koji "D'you have any plans, Koji?" as a yes-no question. But "D'you have any plans," rather than eliciting a yes or no, gave rise to a completely open-ended response on Koji's part: "Maybe I'll stay home and watch a movie." I reclassified it as an open-ended question. Also on my first count I had classified "Check out with them and see what they're going to do" as an open-ended question. On second thought, I decided that its function is identical with its form, which is a request. It simply means "Ask them an open-ended question."

As a matter of fact, Koji did not even respond to the request, since the next utterance is Graciella's: "I'm gonna clean the house." I took this request out of the total altogether.

Such difficulties point to the subjectivity involved in classifying questions; however, the process involved in making these decisions and thinking them through is in itself an insightful exercise in classroom discourse analysis. It makes the analyst look closely at the techniques behind questioning.

Assuming that my second count was a better one than my first, since it involved more introspection, what can be deduced from the totals, if anything? I had expected Roger's classroom questioning to contain many open-ended and wh-questions and much fewer yes/no and tag questions. (A complete analysis of all twelve lessons might still show that to be the case.) I decided to look for patterns of questioning, first of all to see whether different sections of the lesson contained a preponderance of certain types of questions for specific purposes, and second, to see whether Roger used sequences of questions like those described by Shuy in his description of appropriate probing techniques.

A rough division of this lesson into its major segments shows that it consists of a long opening segment of conversation, a middle segment discussing and practicing reductions (pronunciation), and a closing segment in which the students discuss assigned topics of conversation in pairs. In the third segment, Roger is acting as Koji's conversation partner and thus is no longer functioning as the "teacher" of the class. The transcript I made of this lesson did not include the conversation in most of this final segment. I

found that neither of the two microphones had picked up what Roger was saying as he sat in one corner of the class with Koji while Graciella and Yoshi were conversing closer to the microphones.

For the purpose of this analysis, then, the first two segments were the relevant ones. It seemed worthwhile to see if the types of questions Roger used in the conversation segment were different from those he used during the pronunciation exercise. The differences were immediately apparent.

In the second segment, the pronunciation lesson and exercise, there are no open-ended questions at all. Of the several wh- questions, all are "classroom" questions. Some are the type where the teacher knows the answer and assumes that the student knows the answer too. Here are some examples: "A cuppa coffee. A glassa milk. What am I saying?" "I'm kinda tired. What does that mean?" Others are the type where the teacher knows the answer and is asking what answer the student has reached. Here are some examples: "What did you hear for that, Graciella?" "How do I spell that?" "Where's the reduction here, Koji?" The yes/no questions all concern the exercise: "Hear the difference?" "You have the same?" "You think there has to be an object?" Finally, the many tag questions are all of the type discussed earlier: "A lotta sand, OK?" "This drops out and we get that, OK?" "The other dorm mates say this all the time, right?" "A cuppa coffee,

right?" "The v sound drops out for gimme, right?" The function of all of these tags is not to elicit a response but to elicit agreement or simply to encourage.

In contrast, the opening segment, the conversation, contains all the open-ended questions. It also contains many of the other types of questions. What is interesting here is the sequencing. The segment consists of several identifiable sequences, in which Roger opens a topic by asking an open-ended question, then moves on as necessary to wh-, yes/no, or tag questions to keep the conversation going. A good example is the exchange with Graciella about what she does on Sunday:

- R: What are you going to do on Sunday?
 G: We go to church on Sunday--um--Sunday morning.
 R: Excuse me, you go where?
 G: To church [. . .] I take a nap [. . .]
 R: You like to sleep during the day?
 G: Yeah.
 R: And you can't during the week.
 G: No.
 R: So Sunday's a good day.
 (pause)
 G: I play with them games, you know, table games?
 R: For example?
 G: Um--um--they have Clue. Clue?
 [. . .]
 R: You like that one?
 (pause)
 R: It's fun.
 G: Yes.
 R: What kind of game? Explain that for Koji and Yoshi.
 [. . .]
 R: It's a detective game, right?

This sequence shows Roger grappling with Graciella's tendency to answer in monosyllables and not pick up on conversation topics. An examination of his questioning strategy shows how he deals with this. He begins with an

open-ended question, then works down through a wh- question to yes/no questions in an attempt to open up topics to Graciella. When she mentions a game, he uses the opportunity to go back to an open-ended question: "For example?" When Graciella answers his yes/no question "You like that game?" simply with a "yes," he tries another open-ended question: "What kind of game? Explain that for Koji and Yoshi." The topic, which Graciella apparently does not want to pursue, ends with a tag question: "It's a detective game, right?" Graciella does not answer this. Yoshi says "Oh." Roger tries another tag: "That would be fun to do in class, don't you think?" After a long pause, Graciella cuts this off by saying "Not today." It is worth noting that Roger's question is a tag expecting the answer yes. Graciella does not give the expected answer, which might have led to drawing her into explaining and perhaps even playing the game. Instead of "yes" she cuts off the conversation by replying "Not today." The patterning in this segment of the class shows Roger's technique of using open-ended questions to get a topic started. He then uses wh- or yes/no questions when they are needed to help a student along. And he seizes opportunities to go back to open-ended questions when possible.

It is clear that looking at question patterns can tell a lot about teaching techniques and about what types of questions are useful in particular circumstances and for particular students. It is also clear that simply counting

numbers of questions without regard to where they are used or for what purpose could give a distorted picture of a classroom and a teacher's style.

Analysis: Classroom Management

Shuy observes that "one of the keys to good management is in knowing where we are and where we are about to go" (Shuy, 124). He describes several techniques of classroom management as they appeared in the classrooms observed in his study. One teacher made it clear to the students where they were in the lesson by using clear sequence markers--openings, continuation indicators, and closings. For example, she typically began a segment by relating a personal anecdote. She would begin with a pause, observe a short silence, relate the anecdote, then ask a leading question. Another of the teachers controlled the content of the students' questions and set rules for the classroom talk by making the students raise their hands to get permission to say something. Another way of managing the classroom was to use highly ritualized classroom language, unlike everyday speech. Whatever the method of using language to manage the classroom, the important thing, according to Shuy, was how clear and how useful the strategies were.

In Roger's case, the main characteristics of his classroom management techniques are naturalness and subtlety. His style is one of indirect management, allowing the class to flow smoothly like a chat among friends. This goes along with what he explicitly says he sets out to do: to establish a

community and build a classroom culture. As he put it in his discussion with me, he feels that the role of the teacher is to facilitate, to allow interaction to take place. At several important junctures of the class, this technique is evident.

Although he begins the class by directly stating that he has two things planned, he moves immediately into the opening conversation in a way that is so natural it is no wonder Chris and Kate saw it as outside the main purpose of the class. He opens the topic thus:

R: While we're waiting for the others, in case they do come, tell me what you're gonna do this weekend.

Then at the juncture where he chooses to stop the conversation and move on to the pronunciation segment, he says:

R: OK. Well. Um. Let's go over a little bit of pronunciation, and I guess we're not going to have any more people coming today.

This has the appearance of a "real life" rather than "classroom" reason for doing the exercise.

When he moves from the pronunciation segment to the final exercise, where the students worked in pairs, he says:

R: OK. Alright. Take a look at these things a second. This too has a similar tone of a real-life, friendly suggestion rather than an order from a teacher. These examples are typical of Roger's classroom management style.

I felt that this aspect of his teaching was interesting in two respects. First of all, I could understand Roger's comment that his classroom style was sometimes off-putting to Asian students. They might be unable to see the teaching

taking place because their expectations of a classroom tend to be quite rigid. Second, given the extreme subtlety of Roger's management style, it is difficult to understand the comments by both Chris and Kate that he insisted on being in charge all the time. An exercise in which the student teachers were asked to focus specifically on classroom management techniques might have led to a more insightful analysis on their part.

Analysis: Topic Manipulation

The third dimension of the classroom mentioned by Shuy, topic manipulation, was particularly relevant to this analysis, not only because of Roger's preference for a student-centered class but because of the nature of the classroom--a course in listening/speaking skills. It was relevant also because of Roger's particular emphasis--on oral conversation skills. Topic manipulation is particularly important in conversation.

Shuy explains topic manipulation in terms of topic introduction, branching, maintenance, and resolution. Topic introduction concerns how and by whom topics are introduced. Topic branching is concerned with how verbal interaction is steered in a particular direction. This is particularly relevant to the classroom because the teacher, as "discourse director," needs to steer the discourse in order to reach the goals of the particular lesson or the course as a whole. The interesting aspect, of course, is how such branching is accomplished. Techniques mentioned by Shuy include rephrasing

a student's answer, asking a question that moves the topic in a new direction, and achieving an overall "safe" class atmosphere that makes students willing to venture into introducing a new topic. Topic maintenance concerns ways in which the teacher keeps the lesson on track. And topic resolution has to do with techniques of winding down and moving on.

The opening segment of the April 19 class is particularly rich in topic manipulation techniques. To analyze what is going on, I found it useful to divide the conversation into its main topics and then to examine how each topic is introduced, branched, maintained, and resolved. The overall topic of conversation is weekend activities, which Roger introduces with an open-ended question: "Tell me what you're gonna do this weekend." From that point, the conversation branches into subtopics related to possible weekend activities:

1. Watching videos--introduced by Koji.
2. Cleaning house--introduced by Graciella.
3. Shopping--introduced by Graciella.
4. Children choosing clothes--introduced by Roger.
5. Churchgoing--introduced by Graciella.
6. Playing games--introduced by Graciella.
7. More churchgoing--introduced by Graciella.
8. Going to concerts--introduced by Yoshi.
9. Getting to the airshow--introduced by Koji.

10. The Azalea Festival--introduced by Yoshi.

The most noticeable feature of this list is that all the new topics, with the exception of number 4, are introduced by the students, not by the teacher. This is direct evidence of Roger's insistence on keeping the classroom student-centered. The introduction of most of these new topics is achieved through open-ended questions or solicitations for such questions: "Check out with them and see what they're going to do"; "What else can he do?"; "What are you gonna do on Sunday?"; "OK, so we know what you're doing. Check with him." It is also noticeable that, out of ten topics, Graciella introduces five. Without further analysis one could simply assume that Graciella puts herself forward in class and enjoys participating. This, in fact, is what the two student teachers apparently saw. But on this particular day, the other two students in the class were both Japanese, and both very quiet students. An examination of Roger's manipulation of turn-taking shows that he persists in giving Graciella the opportunity to introduce topics, and the other, quieter students do not intervene. In other words, it is not that Graciella is particularly forthcoming but that Roger is particularly skilled.

Roger's way of ensuring that students introduce topics is simply to stand back and wait rather than jump in with a new topic himself. When Graciella has apparently finished talking about going to church, Roger simply pauses, after saying "So

Sunday's a good day." Graciella finally begins the next topic: "I play with them games, you know, table games." He does this again at the end of the discussion of games. He simply says "So that's what you do on Sunday afternoon, huh?" This leads Graciella to say "Uhu. And at night we go to church again."

At the end of the conversation about concert going, Roger allows space for students to enter the conversation through the use of a string of comments about falling asleep at the symphony. He says, "No, please, no. I don't think so. I don't think you will." The videotape shows that his pace here is very slow and deliberate. The utterance is simply a means of giving the students time to think of what they would like to say next. Koji finally comes in with the question about the air show. Roger uses a similar technique at the end of this short discussion. He leaves two significantly long pauses to enable students to say something. His final comment, "It'll be easy to get there," is not a conversation opener but simply a filler as he gives space for students to speak. At this point Yoshi asks about the Azalea Queen.

The richness of this analysis is augmented even more when one looks into how these topics are manipulated. In the segment on shopping, for example, the topic is introduced by Graciella. Roger maintains the topic with an open-ended question: "Why do you have to go with him?" The answer to this question leads to a branch, as Roger asks Koji, "Did you decide on your clothes at 14?" After a short exchange, Roger

brings the topic back to Graciella by simply saying "Fourteen," giving her the chance to talk again about shopping for her brother. Two substantial pauses show that Roger is putting the responsibility for developing the topic onto Graciella. Only when it is clear that Graciella is not prepared to take the topic any further does Roger move on to a new topic.

There is a similar point in the segment about games. After Graciella introduces the topic, Roger sustains it with open-ended questions: "For example?"; "What kind of game? Explain that for Koji and Yoshi." Then he stands back to allow for an exchange between Yoshi and Graciella. There are six major pauses during this short exchange--all highlighting the fact that Roger is insisting on not dominating the topic.

It is interesting too to see how Roger resolves each segment. He ends a topic by referring directly back to the main subject: things to do at the weekend. For example, he ends the topic of videos with "It's a rainy weekend. What else can he do?" He ends the segment about games with "So that's what you do Sunday afternoon, huh?" And he ends the segment about church going with "OK, so we know what you're doing."

It is interesting to note how this analysis supports Roger's view of the conversation as an integral part of the class. It also demonstrates the inadequacy of the student teachers' views of the class. Both of them zeroed in on the

pronunciation exercise as the "real" lesson and dismissed the opening segment as just chatting. The analysis shows that the conversation segment is deliberately designed and manipulated by Roger in a way that is not evident at first sight. It is actually as carefully controlled as more conventional classroom exercises are. This method of analysis brings to the surface all the various techniques that Roger uses to make the situation more natural.

Analysis: Self-Referencing

The classes analyzed in Shuy's study were elementary-level language arts classes. One of the dimensions Shuy found significant was the way the different teachers referred to themselves. One teacher, for example, tended to refer to herself in the third person: "Mrs. Brown is thinking about a teacher at X school" (Shuy, 128). He noted also the use of "we" in the unnatural classroom usage shown in an utterance such as "What do we know so far about this animal?" (Shuy, 128). Such a usage is reminiscent of the unpleasant hospital question: "How are we feeling today?" which undoubtedly has a similar function: the use of pronouns as separating social indicators.

In Roger's case, this usage is conspicuous in its absence. An examination of his use of "we" shows that it always has its normal everyday meaning, as in "We've gotta think of some other activities," or "We should play that in

class sometimes," or "When we're speaking quickly we'll probably say, oh, I really shoulda gone." Undoubtedly the age of the students and the type of classroom play a large role in the relationship between the teacher and the students. However, it is not uncommon to hear teachers of this level of classroom fall into the trap of using pronoun use to talk down to the students. A conscious look at this dimension of classroom language is surely useful.

Analysis: Naturalness of Language Use

The last dimension identified by Shuy is naturalness of language use. As Shuy himself says, this dimension is difficult to separate out because "naturalness of talk underlies questions, management, topic cycling [and] self-referencing" (Shuy, 131). Some of the important aspects mentioned by Shuy are introducing topics naturally, letting students ask and answer questions, and asking for repetition to get real information rather than for its typical didactic use. Shuy sees one of the traps that teachers fall into as "failing to build on the natural conversation style" (Shuy, 133).

Many of Roger's techniques in this respect have already been pointed out. He introduces the opening conversation subtly and naturally by saying: "While we're waiting for the others...tell me what you're gonna do this weekend." He uses students' names in a friendly, conversational manner. He uses typical conversational style syntax: "Convenient, huh?" and

"Let's go over a little bit of pronunciation." Finally, he assiduously avoids "fake" classroom questions. When they happen, he backs them up with a real-life reason. Here is a typical example:

R: What's a quarter, Graciella? (pause) Yoshi's new here.

Conclusions

I found Shuy's method of analysis of classroom discourse very suitable for Roger's style of teaching and for illuminating the aspects of the classroom that were most important to Roger himself. Because Roger was very interested in classroom style as a whole--in methods rather than techniques--the broad brush style of this method of analysis was very useful. While the other two types of analysis allow the researcher or student teacher to concentrate on subtle or quite detailed aspects of the classroom, this method allows one to get an overview of the classroom as a whole quite quickly. Because of the broadness of its approach, too, it requires no extensive learning of the system itself. It uses few, if any, technical terms and thus is easy to grasp. One drawback, perhaps, is that it is so overtly evaluative. I found it difficult to stop myself from making judgments about how "well" or how "badly" Roger was performing on each of the dimensions. The conclusions are easier to jump to and perhaps for that reason likely to be more subjective. Novice teachers, who are likely to jump to conclusions anyway, might

find the very ease of this system a drawback. Experienced practitioners, on the other hand, are likely to find it more readily useful than a more complex or technical system. I found the system valuable for its illumination of the techniques inherent in Roger's manipulation of apparently loose conversation. The analysis of question-asking strategies could be a very useful exercise for student teachers, particularly for analysis of a listening/speaking class.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The primary purpose of this study was to discover whether systems of analysis developed by linguists support the intuitive insights of experienced teachers of English as a Second Language. If indeed they do, then such systems might be useful for teacher development and enrichment. Besides answering these concerns, the study also illuminated the rewards and difficulties inherent in analyzing classroom discourse in general.

The Problem of Practicality

One of the main insights gained from conducting this study was that gathering classroom data involves tremendous practical difficulties. While the examination and analysis of classroom interaction may be very useful, its usefulness must be weighed against the problems of producing high-quality, effective videotapes and written transcripts. The process is difficult and time-consuming. It requires equipment, time, and expertise which may not be readily available in a typical ESL program in an urban university. Although for the actual analyses I used relatively few of the many class hours I transcribed, there was no way of knowing in advance which particular classroom sessions would be useful to such a study

and which would not. I had posited, for instance, that in the earlier sessions the presence of the cameras and the researcher would make a big difference to the classroom. This was not the case, but with a different teacher, a different set of students, or a different researcher, this might not be true. For another such study I would still feel it necessary to videotape as many classes as I did for this one.

I also felt that it was necessary to make written transcripts of all the classes because my discussions with Roger about the transcripts and his marginal comments on them were an invaluable means of discovering what he was particularly interested in and what he saw in his own classes. Although the process of transcribing the lessons was so time-consuming and difficult, the vagaries of juggling day-to-day schedules would have made working purely from videotapes inconceivable. With the transcripts, Roger was able to take them away, write marginal comments on them, and then discuss his reactions with me when we could find periods of free time overlapping in our two busy schedules. This kind of situation would be the case if such methods were to be used by teachers or by student teachers as part of their everyday professional life rather than as a special research project.

Many of the linguists who have developed systems of analysis apparently base their findings purely on videotaped material. Having tried to work with both videotapes and written transcripts, I do not believe that it is feasible to

work with accuracy purely from videotapes, unless one has an enormous amount of time, enough time to look at and listen to the same piece of interaction over and over again, and from at least two different angles, the students' and the teacher's. Under normal everyday circumstances, neither student teachers nor experienced teachers would have the time necessary to devote to such extensive and difficult viewing. My experience with this study convinced me that written transcripts supplemented by videotapes are the only feasible way to analyze discourse for practical purposes.

The Usefulness of Guided Looking

In spite of the many practical drawbacks, I concluded that the analysis of classroom discourse is an insightful and valuable exercise for teachers and students. Simply looking at the interaction and taking it to pieces was valuable. However, undirected looking has its disadvantages: it is useful only if the person doing the looking has the kind of experience and insight needed to make the looking worthwhile. An experienced teacher can look at a transcript of his or her own classroom or that of another teacher and notice interesting aspects of the discourse and examples of valuable teaching techniques. Inexperienced students or teachers might look at the same interaction and fail to see or understand what the teacher is really doing. For this reason, directed looking can be a valuable tool. This study has shown that systems of analysis developed by linguists can provide such a

tool. The analyses that I did, to varying degrees, illuminated what Roger himself found pertinent and what the novice teachers had either misunderstood or failed to notice.

In terms of the particular systems I examined, I found distinct differences between the three. That developed by Sinclair and Coulthard is representative of the comprehensive, hierarchical approach. Their system is an attempt to describe discourse in the way that a grammatical system can describe a sentence. That developed by Fanselow is representative of the multi-dimensional approach, which views discourse as a complex whole with layer upon layer of overlapping facets. His system is also representative of the recent trend in the ESL field to encourage the teacher to be the researcher. Fanselow's aim is for student teachers and experienced teachers to examine their own classrooms with a view to improving their teaching. Roger Shuy's approach is representative of systems that look at larger elements in the discourse rather than attempting to describe every aspect of it. His approach and others like it consider the importance to teachers of various broad dimensions of classroom language.

I discovered several ways in which Sinclair and Coulthard's system could be useful. I found that simply dissecting the classroom discourse and thus putting order onto it, was a valuable exercise in itself. And since their system can be presented fairly succinctly, it could easily be used as part of an exercise in a methods class, simply to get student

teachers to look clearly at the interaction in a classroom and see what is going on.

Unlike Sinclair and Coulthard's system, Fanselow's is quite difficult to grasp and to synthesize. I found it harder to work with because with each added dimension my view of previously worked dimensions changed. This of course can also be seen as one of its merits, since the rationale behind such systems is to demonstrate the multidimensional, complex nature of discourse. I found that Fanselow's method would be a useful and insightful tool for dissecting either very small pieces of discourse in detail or very large pieces of discourse in a more selective way, looking quickly through the discourse for examples of a previously chosen dimension. For a comprehensive view of a large piece of dialogue such as a whole class, Fanselow's system would be impractical because it would require an enormous amount of time. The diagramming and re-diagramming would be unwieldy and time-consuming. For such an exercise, Sinclair and Coulthard's would be much more practical. But for an in-depth examination of one exchange, Fanselow's method would be ideal for demonstrating the complex nature of classroom interaction. It would also be ideal for quick discussions of specific teaching techniques or discourse questions.

Unlike both of these methods, that developed by Roger Shuy is neither descriptive nor comprehensive. It is meant rather to examine the larger dimensions of classroom language.

It would require the transcript or videotape of at least one complete class to be used effectively. Its main advantage is that it is very easy to understand, with little or no difficult terminology to be grasped. Thus, it would be ideal for class discussion of particular teaching techniques such as questioning strategies.

Overall, I found that the results of all three methods of analysis bore out the intuitions and insights of the experienced teacher. Each one allowed the researcher to concentrate on different aspects of the classroom, and all three were useful in illuminating aspects of the interaction that the student teachers either had not noticed or had misunderstood. I felt that all have the potential to be used as teaching tools, although the more complex a system is the less useful it would be because of time and resource constraints. Any of the three systems, and undoubtedly others similar to them, could certainly be used to replace or at least supplement the approach to teacher enrichment that simply asks the teachers to comment on what is happening in a classroom being observed. All three systems would enable teacher trainers to replace the vague questions about what is happening in a classroom with specific suggestions to look for and discuss the importance of certain items of interaction or dimensions of language.

Limitations of the Study

The study was necessarily limited in scope, because it

focused on one class, one teaching method, one teacher, one researcher, and only three methods of classroom analysis. For all of these reasons it is difficult to make large generalizations from it.

Every classroom has its own ethos, and each group of students develops its own social norms and behavior patterns that make it different from every other. The interaction that developed among the students in this class and between the students and the teacher made it different from every other and may have affected the results of the study. The nature of this particular classroom, for example, made it difficult to work with some of the elements of Sinclair and Coulthard's system. Their categories arose out of the particular classroom that they examined, which was not an adult ESL classroom.

Similarly, the types of systems of analysis that I chose undoubtedly affected the conclusions I reached concerning their practicality and ease of use. For example, Roger's style of teaching lent itself easily to analysis by Shuy's method, because Roger's method of teaching was more easily analyzable in terms of larger elements like those concentrated on by Shuy. For this reason, the study may have overemphasized the accessibility of Shuy's method. It is also true that in qualitative research, the biases of the researcher are likely to affect the results. My particular linguistic interests and my knowledge of Roger's personal

characteristics undoubtedly affected my choice of Roger as teacher/collaborator and my choice of particular systems.

These limitations, however, do not detract from the study as a preliminary examination of the feasibility of using researchers' analyses of discourse for practical purposes. In fact, it is interesting that the system developed primarily to be practical--Fanselow's--proved to be the least immediately accessible. This may have been the result of the time constraints on my use of the methods. As I pointed out in my examination of Fanselow's method, he himself had directed the reader--or rather the user--to take plenty of time to learn the system. Each one of the systems examined, of course, merited a much closer look. But that would have been a different study. In fact, studies that sample only superficial aspects of many classrooms do not provide the depth of insight that this study does.

Implications of the Study

The main implication of this study is that theory is very pertinent to practice. The growing trend towards teacher/researcher collaboration is a useful one. As this study showed, such collaboration is both practical and insightful. In particular, the collaboration between the two experienced teachers--Roger and me--proved to be very worthwhile. The discussions that we had as a result of our looking at the lesson transcripts together were wide-ranging. We discussed not only the particular lessons we were looking

at but also teaching methods in general, how to deal with particular classroom problems, insights gained by both of us over the years, and a variety of other pedagogical subjects. Such free-ranging discussions were the inevitable result of collaboration in a study such as this one. Their effect is unquantifiable but real in terms, for example, of increasing one's self-awareness when teaching and of increasing one's alertness in planning and executing particular lessons.

The immediate usefulness of the videotapes showed me that there is a definite need for such real-life materials in ESL programs. The videos have been used again and again in a variety of contexts. Within weeks of our having made them, for example, visitors to the English Language Center from Japan asked specifically whether Roger's teaching had ever been recorded. We were able to choose one of the lessons, taking into account the type of classroom situation that the Japanese visitors were most interested in examining. The videotapes have also been used several times in a TESOL Methods class, as an exercise in classroom observation. The students were shown one segment of a class and asked to comment on it from a variety of different perspectives. They have been used too for teacher enrichment seminars, not just in the program itself but also in diverse circumstances such as an enrichment course for Brazilian teachers of English. And on a somewhat smaller level, Chris, one of the student teachers who helped me with the study, started her teaching

career in an ESL program in Korea and deliberately tried out some of the techniques she had seen Roger use.

Recommendations

Looking at and discussing a particular classroom, whether one's own or someone else's, is a way of working on teacher enrichment without resorting to judgment or criticism. It is a way for colleagues to cooperate rather than for practitioners to be judged by observers. As Fanselow succinctly puts it,

As we explore our craft by describing . . . rather than by seeking prescriptions and judgments from others, rules are broken that say we teachers must seek alternatives from those in charge, rather than ourselves or our peers, and that we must work alone within our autonomous but isolated and lonely classrooms, rather than with colleagues. (Fanselow, 7)

Action research ought to become a priority. Teaching practices can be investigated through the analysis of classroom discourse that direct the viewer's observation toward elements of pedagogical value. Analyzing another teacher's classroom or one's own can raise one's level of awareness of the effect of various techniques and assumptions.

I recommend that graduate courses in TESOL should incorporate some data gathering. Gathering the amounts of data used in this study would not be feasible; however, the analysis and discussion of even small amounts of real classroom data would be a valuable exercise for beginning teachers. Looking at discourse that has already been

transcribed is valuable, but it does not replace producing one's own. The decision about how to divide the discourse on the page--the pauses, for example--leads the researcher to think carefully about what is going on and what decisions are being made by the teacher. Over time, such materials--videotapes, pieces of lesson transcripts, or exercises in guided looking--can be gathered for the libraries of Intensive English programs or graduate programs in TESOL.

In terms of the material this study investigated, the three systems examined are only a small portion of the many that have been developed. It would be worthwhile to look at other systems with a view to seeing whether their use would be feasible in teacher training and enrichment. Such an investigation could further close the gap between theory and practice and provide materials to help raise the level of expertise among ESL practitioners.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allwright, D. "Classroom-centered Research on Language Teaching and Learning: A Brief Historical Overview." TESOL Quarterly 17 (1983): 191-204.
- Allwright, R. L. "Turns, Topics and Tasks: Patterns of Participation in Language Teaching and Learning." In Discourse Analysis in Second Language Acquisition Research, ed. Diane Larsen-Freeman, 165-87. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1980.
- Bellack, A, H. Kliebard, R. Hyman, and F. Smith, Jr. The Language of the Classroom. New York: Teachers College Press, 1966.
- Bikmay, Amy Tsui. "An Analysis of Different Types of Interaction in ESL Classroom Discourse." IRAL 25 (Nov 1987): 336-53.
- Brock, C. A. "The Effects of Referential Questions on ESL Classroom Discourse." TESOL Quarterly 20 (1986): 47-59.
- Brophy, E. Jere, and Thomas L. Good. Teacher Student Relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974.
- Cazden, Courtney B. Classroom Discourse: The Language of Teaching and Learning. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1988.
- Chapelle, Carol. "The Discourse of Computer-Assisted Language Learning: Toward a Context for Descriptive Research." TESOL Quarterly 24 (1990): 199-225.
- Chaudron, C. "A Descriptive Model of Discourse in the Corrective Treatment of Learners' Errors." Language Learning 27 (1977): 29-46.
- _____. "The Interaction of Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches to Research: A View of the Second Language Classroom." TESOL Quarterly 20 (1986): 709-17.
- Cherry, L. J. "A Sociolinguistic Approach to the Study of Teachers' Expectations." Discourse Processes 4 (1978): 374-93.
- Cohen, L. and L. Manion. Research Methods in Education. London: Croom Helm, 1985.

- Copeland, Willis D., Carrie Birmingham, Lisa DeMeulle, Marianne D'Emidio-Caston, and Dottie Natal. "Making Meaning in Classrooms: An Investigation of Cognitive Processes in Aspiring Teachers, Experienced Teachers, and Their Peers." American Educational Research Journal 31.1 (1994): 166-196.
- Coulthard, Malcolm. An Introduction to Discourse Analysis. Applied Linguistics and Language Study, ed. C. N. Candlin. London: Longman, 1977.
- Davidson, Judy Arlene. "Modifications of Invitations, Offers and Rejections." In Interaction Competence. Studies in Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis No. 1. ed.
- George Psathas. 149-79. International Institute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis and University Press of America, Washington, DC., 1990.
- Delamont, Sara. Interaction in the Classroom: Contemporary Sociology of the School. Methuen: London, 1976.
- Dunkin, Michael J. and Bruce J. Biddle. The Study of Teaching. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974.
- Edwards, A. D., and V. J. Furlong. The Language of Teaching: Meaning in Classroom Interaction. London: Heinemann, 1978.
- Fanselow, John. "Beyond 'Rashomon'--Conceptualizing and Describing the Teaching Act." TESOL Quarterly 11 (1977): 17-39.
- _____. Breaking Rules. Generating and Exploring Alternatives in Language Teaching. New York: Longman, 1987.
- _____. "'Let's See': Contrasting Conversations About Teaching." TESOL Quarterly 22 (March 1988): 113-30.
- Fine, Jonathan. Developmental Issues in Discourse. Norwood NJ: Ablex, 1983.
- Flanders, N. A. Analyzing Teaching Behavior. Reading MA: Addison-Wesley, 1970.
- Freeman, D. "Observing Teachers: Three Approaches to In-Service Training and Development." TESOL Quarterly 16 (1982): 21-28.

- Frohlich, M., N. Spada and P. Allen. "Differences in the Communicative Orientation of L2 Classrooms." TESOL Quarterly 19 (1985): 27-57.
- Gaies, S. J. "The Investigation of Language Classroom Processes." TESOL Quarterly 17 (1983): 205-17.
- Gebhard, J. G., S. Gaitan and R. Oprandy. "Beyond Prescription: The Teacher as Investigator." Foreign Language Annals 20 (1987): 3.
- Good, T. L. and J. E. Brophy. "Changing Teacher and Student Behavior: An Empirical Investigation." Journal of Educational Psychology 66 (1974): 390-405.
- Green, Judith L. and Judith O. Harker. Multiple Perspective Analyses of Classroom Discourse. Advances in Discourse Processes, ed. Roy O. Freedle, no. 28. Norwood NJ: Ablex, 1988.
- Green, Judith L. and Cynthia Wallat, eds. Ethnography and Language in Educational Settings. Norwood NJ: Ablex, 1981.
- Gumperz, John J. "Conversational Inference and Classroom Learning." In Ethnography and Language in Educational Settings, ed. Judith Green and Cynthia Wallat, 3-23. Norwood NJ: Ablex, 1981.
- _____. Discourse Strategies. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Heap, J. L. "On Task in Classroom Discourse." Linguistics and Education 1 (1988): 177-98.
- Hernandez, H. "English-as-a-Second-Language Lessons in Bilingual Classrooms: A Discourse Analysis." Ph. D. diss., Stanford University, 1981.
- Hines, Mary Elizabeth. "The Relationship Between Teacher Behavior and Student Language in Fourteen ESL Lessons." Ph. D. diss., Teachers College, Columbia University, 1982.
- Jackson, Philip W. Life in Classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.
- Klinghammer, Sarah J. "Teacher as Researcher." Paper presented at the TRI-TESOL Conference, Bellevue, WA, 14-16 November 1985.

- Kluwin, T. N. "An Analysis of the Discourse Structure of the English Classroom." Ph. D. diss., Stanford University, 1977.
- Krashen, S. D. Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition. Oxford: Pergamon press, 1982.
- Larsen-Freeman, Diane. Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- _____, ed. Discourse Analysis in Second-Language Acquisition Research. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1980.
- Long, M. "Inside the 'Black Box': Methodological Issues in Classroom Research on Language Learning." Language Learning 30 (1980): 1-42.
- Long, M. and Graham Crookes. "Three Approaches to Task-Based Syllabus Design." TESOL Quarterly 26 (1992): 27-56.
- McCutcheon, G. "On the Interpretation of Classroom Observations." Educational Researcher 10 (1981): 5-10.
- McHoul, Alexander W. "The Organization of Formal Turns at Talk in the Classroom." Language in Society 7 (August 1978): 183-213.
- Mills, J. R. "A Guide to Teaching Systematic Observation to Student Teachers." Journal of Teacher Education 31.6 (1980): 5-9.
- Milroy, Lesley. Observing and Analysing Natural Language: A Critical Account of Sociolinguistic Method. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987.
- Moskowitz, Gertrude. "The Classroom Interaction of Outstanding Foreign Language Teachers." Foreign Language Annals 9 (1976): 135-57.
- Nunan, David. "Communicative Tasks and the Language Curriculum." TESOL Quarterly 25 (Summer 1991): 279-95.
- Piper, David. "ESL Classroom Dynamics. Towards a Discourse Processing Interpretation." TESL Canada Journal 2.1 (1984): 41-52.
- Politzer, R. L. "Some Reflections on 'Good' and 'Bad' Language Teaching Behaviors." Language Learning 20 (1970): 31-43.
- Politzer, R. L., A. G. Ramirez and S. A. Lewis. "Teaching Standard English in the Third Grade: Classroom Functions

- of Language." Language Learning 31 (1981): 171-193.
- Psathas, George, ed. Interaction Competence 1990. Studies in Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis. No. 1. International Institute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis and University Press of America, Washington DC, 1990.
- Putnam, J. "Perceived Benefits and Limitations of Teacher Educator Demonstration Lessons." Journal of Teacher Education 36.6 (1985): 36-41.
- Ramirez, Arnulfo. "Analyzing Speech Acts." In Multiple Perspective Analyses of Classroom Discourse, ed. Judith L. Green and Judith O. Harker, 135-63. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1988.
- Richards, J. C. "The Dilemma of Teacher Preparation in TESOL." TESOL Quarterly 21 (1987): 209-26.
- _____ and Graham Crookes. "The Practicum in TESOL." TESOL Quarterly 22 (March 1988): 9-27.
- Sacks, H., E. Schegloff and G. Jefferson. "A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turntaking for Conversation." Language 50.4 (1974): 696-735.
- Sato, Charlene J. "Ethnic Styles in Classroom Discourse." In On TESOL 81. ed. Mary Hines. Selected Papers from the Fifteenth Annual Conference of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Detroit, March 3-8, 1981.
- Savignon, Sandra J. "Communicative Language Teaching: State of the Art." TESOL Quarterly 25 (Summer 1991): 261-77.
- Seliger, H. W. and M. H. Long, eds. Classroom-Oriented Research in Second Language Acquisition. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1983.
- Sevigny, Maurice J. "Triangulated Inquiry--A Methodology for the Analysis of Classroom Interaction." In Ethnography and Language in Educational Settings, ed. Judith Green and Cynthia Wallat, 65-81. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1981.
- Shaw, Philip. "Variation and Universality in Communicative Competence: Coseriu's Model." TESOL Quarterly 26 (Spring 1992): 9-25.
- Sheal, Peter. "Classroom Observation: Training the Observers." ELT Journal 43.2 (April 1989): 92-104.

- Shuy, Roger W. "A Holistic View of Language." Research in the Teaching of English 15 (1981): 101-12.
- Simon, Anita and E. Gil Boyer. Mirrors for Behavior III: An Anthology of Classroom Observation Instruments. Wyncote, PA: Communication Materials Center, 1974.
- Sinclair, J. and Malcolm Coulthard. Towards an Analysis of Discourse. The Language Used by Teachers and Pupils. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975.
- Smith, Frank. Comprehension and Learning. New York: Rinehart and Winston, 1975.
- Spada, Nina. "Relationships Between Instructional Differences and Learning Outcomes: A Process-Product Study of Communicative Language Teaching." Applied Linguistics 8.2 (Summer 1987): 137-61.
- Speier, M. How to Observe Face-to-Face Communication: A Sociological Introduction. Pacific Palisades, CA: Goodyear, 1973.
- Stubbs, Michael. Discourse Analysis. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press, 1983.
- _____. Language, Schools and Classrooms. London: Methuen, 1976.
- Tannen, Deborah, ed. Analyzing Discourse: Text and Talk. Washington, DC: Georgetown University press, 1982.
- Tenenberg, Morton. "Diagramming Question Cycle Sequences." In Multiple Perspective Analyses of Classroom Discourse, ed. Judith L. Green and Judith O. Harker, 165-93. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1988.
- Van-Lier, Leo. "Analyzing Interaction in Second Language Classrooms." ELT Journal 38.3 (July 1984): 160-69.
- Wallat, Cynthia, et al. "Issues Related to Action Research in the Classroom--The Teacher and Researcher as a Team." In Ethnography and Language in Educational Settings, ed. Judith Green and Cynthia Wallat, 87-113. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1981.
- Watson-Gegeo, Karen ann. "Ethnography in ESL: Defining the Essentials." TESOL Quarterly 22 (December 1988): 575-92.
- Wilkinson, Louise Cherry, ed. Communicating in the Classroom. New York: Academic Press, 1982.

_____. "Analysis of Teacher-Student Interaction--
Expectations Communicated by Conversational Structure."
In Ethnography and Language in Educational Settings, ed.
Judith Green and Cynthia Wallat, 253-68. Norwood, NJ:
Ablex, 1981.

Wolfson, Nessa. "Research Methodology and the Question of
Validity." TESOL Quarterly 20 (December 1986): 689-99.

APPENDIX

TRANSCRIPT APRIL 19TH

R: . . . floor and walked in the wrong class. It shows you how I am today. Where's Besant and Chen and Jin? Friday they got an early weekend. OK. Well, I've got two things planned for you this morning. Um. While we're waiting for the others, in case they do come, tell me what you're gonna do this weekend. (pause) It's already starting, right? What're you gonna do? D'you have any plans, Koji?

K: It will be raining Saturday and Sunday, so maybe I will stay home, and watch a movie.

R: Do you have a VCR?

K: Yes.

R: And where do you rent the tapes?

K: Blockbuster Video.

R: On 21st St?

K: Yes.

R: How many do you usually watch in a week?

K: Maybe--

R: On a regular--

K: Three cassettes. That's enough.

R: That's enough, right? And do you cook popcorn or anything?

K: I buy.

R: You buy.

K: Yes.

R: Do you have any suggestions for him? It's a rainy weekend. Three movies take six hours. What else can he do?

G: Clean.

(laughter)

K: Clean!?

R: That's not--

K: ??? clean your room.

R: Do you wanna do that?

K: No. I don't care.

R: You don't care if it's dirty or clean. OK. We've gotta think of some other activities. Maybe they have some suggestions. You can hear what they're gonna do. Check out with them and see what they're gonna do.

G: I'm gonna clean the house.

(laughter)

G: Saturday is the day for cleaning. And I go to the mall. My oldest nephew is going to Orlando, Florida, with the band and he wants new clothes.

R: He wants new clothes?

G: Yes, for ???
R: For him.
G: Yes.
R: Why do you have to go for him?
G: Because maybe he will buy something for me. (laughs)
R: Oh, I see. Convenient, huh? Do you advise him on what clothes he should wear?
G: No, he already--he's old enough for--to know what he wants to wear.
R: How old is he?
G: Fourteen.
R: Did you decide on your clothes at fourteen?
K: Yes.
R: You did?
K: But sometimes my mother said it's not for--it's not good for me, so I have to go change the clothes with her.
R: Exchange it for something else, huh? that she liked.
K: But she gave me money, so I have to--I have to-- (pause) depend on her.
R: Uhu. So you have to respect her wishes.
K: Yes.
R: Her taste, even though you didn't like them. Fourteen.
G: Yes, and he's not like him.
R: No?
G: No.
R: He won't exchange it.
(pause)
G: Huh?
R: He knows what he wants and he gets it.
G: Yes.
(pause)
R: I'd better be prepared. My son's twelve now, and--um--he wants to go by himself to the mall, but that usually means disaster, so we--I mean--he always buys Ocean Pacific items for beach wear--you can't wear it to school, so we have to help him still. What are you going to do on Sunday?
G: We go to church on Sunday--um--morning.
R: Excuse me, you go where?
G: To church.
R: To church?
G: Uhu. And--no--I don't know, when we come back (pause) I take a nap because it's the only day I can do it.
(pause)
R: You like to sleep during the day?
G: Yeah.
R: And you can't during the week.
G: No.
R: So Sunday's a good day.
(pause)
G: I play with them games, you know, table games?
R: For example?
G: Um--um--they have Clue. Clue?

R: Clue. Uhu.
K: Clue.
 (R. writes on board)
R: You like that one?
 (pause)
R: It's fun.
G: Yes.
R: What kind of game? Explain that for Koji and Yoshi.
Y: What is Clue?
 (long pause)
Y: What do you use?
 (pause)
Y: Card? Or coins?
 (long pause)
G: We use cards. (pause) But they have pictures. (long
pause) We didn't--um--someone get kill?
R: Killed.
G: Another one. And you need to solve who was the murder?
R: Uhu.
Y: Solve?
G: And what the murderer used.
 (pause)
R: It's like the game we played in class, remember? With the
objects that I showed you. The corkscrew and--
G: It's the same idea.
R: It's the same idea. It's a detective game, right?
Y: Oh.
 (pause)
R: We should play that in class sometime, because that has
lots of vocabulary, that would be fun to do in class, don't
you think?
 (pause)
G: Not today.
R: No? OK. (laughs)
 (pause)
R: I enjoy that game too.
K: It's easy to play?
R: Yeah.
G: Uhu.
R: But it's not only a child's game, it's an adult's game.
G: Uhu.
Y: Oh. Don't you use any tools, or just a game?
 (pause)
G: Tools?
Y: Yes.
G: Yes, just a little piece. I don't know what its name.
 (pause, laughter)
G: No, when you-- (long pause, laughs a lot)
R: It looks like, right, it looks like this. (draws on
board) what's it called? (writes) Tell us.
 (pause)
R: Dice.

Y: Dice.
G: Dice, well, yes.
R: OK. And there's a murder--there are different murder weapons.
G: Uhu.
R: I remember. There's a candle--candle holder and--
(pause)
R: What other things? Guns?
G: Uhu.
R: Knives. And you have to decide what it was that was a rope for hanging.
K: Huh.
R: So that's what you do Sunday afternoon, huh?
G: Uhu. And at night we go to church again.
K: Again?
G: Uhu.
K: Wow.
(pause)
G: Because Sunday is the day that you worship the Lord.
K: Something.
G: Sunday.
K: You can learn something about which one?
G: Huh?
K: Excuse me, I don't know.
(pause)
G: Sunday is the day that you--worship?
R: Uhu.
G: --the Lord.
K: Oh, OK.
(pause)
R: But you're surprised that she goes twice.
K: Yes.
(pause)
R: You go in the morning.
G: Uhu.
R: And what's the morning? How's the morning different from the night?
G: In the morning is more formal and in the night (pause) in the night is more like choirs, my friend is in choir and my nephews are in choir.
(pause)
R: You know choir?
(pause)
R: In Japan they don't usually go to church, so you have to give more explanation, right?
G: They need to start going to church.
R: They need to start going--(laughs)
G: Well, it's a group of people who--sing, singing?
R: Sing.
G: Uhu.
(R. writes on board)
G: That's right.

R: It's called a choir. Choir.
 (pause)
 R: So in the afternoon it's choir practice and--
 G: Uhu.
 R: --less formal ceremony.
 G: There is a short ceremony.
 (pause)
 R: You should go sometime to see what it's like--just if you want, for the experience.
 K: Uhu.
 R: Right, Graciella?
 G: Uhu.
 (pause)
 R: OK, so we know what you're doing. Check with him. Yoshi.
 G: What you gonna do?
 Y: Hmm. On Sunday I'll go to concert at Chrysler Church.
 (pause)
 R: Isn't that Chrysler Hall?
 Y: Oh, yes, Chrysler Hall, Chrysler Hall.
 (R. writes on board)
 K: What kind of concert?
 Y: Er. I don't know exactly but Belgian Philharmonic will play.
 K: Classical music?
 Y: Yes, classical. Play with Belgian pianist--and--
 R: We don't call it the philharmonic, we call it the symphony.
 Y: Ah, symphony.
 R: Other cities call it the philharmonic, but we don't.
 (pause)
 Y: I am interested in classic--er--classical music or classic music?
 R: Classical.
 Y: Classical music. And--er--I want to go to the symphony to listen to the classical music if I can get chance. And I--er--when I read the paper and--er--this week Azalea Festival is held, is held now. And Saturday--er--Friday night, Saturday night, they have a concert--er--country's festival, so I buy, I buy ticket.
 (pause)
 R: Good. I hope you enjoy it. I think you will. Have either of you been to the symphony, since you've been here?
 (pause)
 R: You should go. You should go just like you think he should go to church, you should go to the symphony.
 (laughter)
 G: I don't like the symphony.
 R: But you should experience that.
 G: No, I think I going to sleep there.
 R: I don't think so.
 K: Me too.
 R: No, no. We'll hear your report on Monday. And I think

that you won't.

Y: Maybe I'll falling asleep. (laughs)

R: Too? No, please, no. I don't think so. I don't think you will.

K: You told me on Monday, on Sunday air show will take place somewhere, so where?

R: Yeah, I'm not sure, I know where it's supposed to take place, but I'm not sure if it's going to take place because of the rain.

K: Ah.

R: If it's going to be raining all the time I'm not sure if they're going to have it. I--I don't--all the information I put on the bulletin board in front of the English Language Center office.

K: Uhu.

R: There's a bulletin board. Check that out. It's got all the times and the days and where. There's also phone numbers, and you might want to call and see. One year I wanted to take my children to see the Blue Angels, jets,

K: Oh.

R: perform, and it rained, so it was postponed until another weekend. So you'd better call. But all the information is up there, opposite the office. Try to go. It will be worth it.

K: Uhu.

(pause)

R: And I think it's all at the naval base, up at the end of Hampton Boulevard.

(pause)

Y: So you--

R: It'll be easy to get there.

Y: Do you know Queen Azalea? How is Queen Azalea is selected?

G: Huh?

R: How is the queen, OK, Azalea Queen? I think they call her Queen Azalea, don't they? But--er

Y: Queen Azalea.

(R. writes on board)

R: Because we have the Azalea Festival and this--they select a representative of a different country each year.

Y: Oh.

R: Last year it was Iceland, I think. This year it's Belgium.

(R. writes on board)

R: And it's usually--um--someone who's living here, I think, isn't it? Like the ambassador's daughter or something like that, maybe--um--this year's a 17-year-old woman from Belgium, right? Her picture was in the newspaper. And they're all members of NATO.

(R. writes on board)

Y: Oh.

R: Of NATO countries, OK?

Y: Ah.

(pause)

R: And they have, at the Botanical gardens they usually have a big celebration. I don't know if this weekend, because it's such bad weather. OK.

(pause)

R: Well, I'm sorry it's raining, it seems like it always rains for the Azalea Festival. I don't know why. Because April is a rainy month, right? (pause) OK. Well. Um. Let's go over a little bit of pronunciation, and I guess we're not going to have any more people coming today. (writes on board) Let's look at some more reduction. Reduced forms. How we change in pronunciation from of or have to just /ə/, OK? There's two--these are the two basic ways, two basic forms that reduce to the /ə/ sound. As in these examples. A cuppa coffee. A cuppa coffee. A glassa milk. What am I saying? Glass of milk, but glassa milk. Pitcher-a water. Can-a fruit. Pound-a butter. Quart-a milk. D'you hear it? Yeah? A yard-a cloth. Full-a water. A lotta sand. OK? We reduce it to just /ə/. So I don't say a lot of people, but I say a lotta people, a lotta. OK? If you're listening for this, you'll just hear /ə/. Now. How about this one? Have. (writes on board) All of these reduce to (writes), right? I could've, I should've, I would've. But in rapid speech it reduces even more, to this. (writes). I coulda, I shoulda. I woulda. OK? So when we're speaking quickly, we'll probably say, oh, I really shoulda gone, but I couldn't. I really shoulda gone. So this drops out, and we get that, OK? Those are the two major ways this happens. We have two words that we use a lot in everyday speech. (writes on board) and they both mean (writes) OK?

G: Uhu.

R: For example, how's the weather today? It's kinda cloudy. It's sorta wet. You hear--you hear your--er--the other dorm mates say this all the time, right? How're you feeling today? Oh, I'm kinda tired. And what does that mean? It means somewhat, or quite, or pretty tired. OK. (pause) OK. So there's three different ways that we can reduce this way. Let's try some dictation of sentences and see if you can hear them in context, OK? Open your ears, Yurio. (laughs) Try it. OK? Here we go. It's gonna be kinda rough. It's gonna be kinda rough. (pause) Number two. I coulda given ya a cuppa coffee. I coulda given ya a cuppa coffee. (pause) Number three. Gimme half a pound, gimme half a pounda Swiss cheese. Gimme half a pounda Swiss cheese. (long pause) OK? Number four. I woulda called but I didn't have a quarter. I woulda called but I didn't have a quarter. (pause) OK? Number five. She really shoulda tried harder. She really shoulda tried harder. (pause) Number six. This is a tricky one. Listen carefully. (pause) You shouldna told me. You shouldna told me. (long pause) OK. Let's just review them one more time. Number one. It's gonna be kinda rough. Number two.

I coulda given ya a cuppa coffee. Three. Gimme half a pounda Swiss cheese. Four. I woulda called but I didn't have a quarter. Five. She really shoulda tried harder. And six. You shouldna told me. OK? Today and since we have only three, why don't you come up and write them on the board? Koji, you wanna do one, two, and Graciella three four, and Yoshi, last two. Here you go.

(students write on board) (laughter)

R: You got it. You got it. That's right. See, your ears work better than you thought.

G: Is that--no.

R: ???? to you.

G: Oh.

(students writing on board still)

R: OK. So. You all have good ears, for the most part. Let's look at number one here. And--er--read it for me, Koji, and Graciella will correct it if there's any--

K: It's gonna be kind or rough?

R: Something like that. OK. What did you hear for that, Graciella? Here. (pause)

G: Rough.

R: Rough. How do I spell that?

(pause)

G: Well, I think it's R O U H--no--G H.

R: Correct. And what does it mean in this sentence? (pause)

What does it mean? (pause)

G: Hard?

R: Right. It means hard or difficult. (writes on board) It's gonna be hard or difficult. He's having a rough time with this exam preparation--difficult, OK? In--in--kind of everyday English sentence. Rough also means not smooth. He didn't shave for five days so his face is very rough. (pause) OK, where's the reduction here, Koji?

K: It's gonna be.

R: All right. So we have it's, right? And then gonna be, and?

K: Kinda.

R: OK. Good. Read the next one.

K: I coulda--I couldn't give you a cuppa coffee.

R: OK. Coulda given you a cuppa coffee. What do you think? Do you agree, Graciella? (long pause) Hello, Graciella?

G: Well--(pause) I don't know--I have (long pause) I couldn't give a cup of coffee.

R: So you have different, huh?

G: Uhu.

R: You have couldn't.

G: Uhu.

R: OK. Wh--did you have give or given?

G: Give.

R: OK. So grammatically you were alright. Actually this is what I said.

G: OK.

R: But you could say (writes on board) What's the difference in pronunciation of this? Say this for me, Koji.

K: I couldn't give you.

R: OK. I couldn't give you. Or I couldn't give ya. And this one?

K: I could've give you--given you. I could've given you.

R: Couldn't 've given. Couldn't. What you don't have, Kio, you don't have a negative here, so.

K: I couldn't--

R: Couldn't? OK. You could say could've, and even--reduce it even more.

K: I coulda given you.

R: I coulda given ya. Alright? I coulda given ya. OK. So this reduces either to this or to this.

K: Ah. Coulda.

R: I coulda given ya. And where else is the reduction?

K: A cup a

R: OK. A cuppa coffee, right? Listen to people when they talk in--if you're at MacDonald's maybe they say gimme a cuppa coffee. They don't say a cup of coffee, right? A cuppa coffee. OK. (pause) OK, Graciella, so you need to hear the N to make it negative. And I said I coulda, coulda, I didn't say could'na, right? Then it would be, or couldn', couldn', this is couldn' and this is coulda. Hear the difference?

G: Uhu.

R: The N has to be there for the negative. We never leave the N out. The N sound. OK? How about three here? Graciella? Read it. (long pause) Read it as it is, you don't have to--

G: Give me half a pound of sweet cheese.

R: OK, alright.

G: Cheese.

R: Yoshi, you've the same. (pause)

Y: Give me half a pound.

R: OK.

Y: Half a pound. Sweet. I hear Swiss--Swiss cheese.

R: OK, good.

G: Oh.

R: I don't--I've never eaten sweet cheese--maybe it exists.

G: No, me either.

R: Maybe it exists, but I've never had it. Swiss cheese. How's the spelling of cheese here, Yoshi?

Y: Oh, she didn't--C H E E S E.

R: Right. OK. Alright. Good. Graciella, where's the reduction when I say gimme--gimme half a pound of Swiss cheese? (pause)

G: Give me--gimme?

R: OK. OK. The V sound drops out for gimme, right?

G: Halfa, halfa?

R: OK. Linked here. Halfa. (long pause)

G: That one.

R: (laughs) That one too. Halfa pounda Swiss cheese, right?

OK. What happens to the f--just kinda drops out. OK. Next one? (pause) Read. (long pause)

G: I will--will call--but I didn't have? quarter?

R: I didn't have a quarter.

G: Quarter.

R: OK. Um. Yoshi. You have the same?

Y: Um. I would've called--called--the numbers--no. I would have--I would have--cold--C O L D. Cold.

R: Oh. Oh. OK. This is cold, and this is called.

Y: Called.

R: Your dictionary shows this, Yoshi. (writes on board) or maybe this. I don't know which your dictionary uses.

Y: Number--number--????--sentence

R: Oh, OK, alright, well, she got--you got this right and she got this right. I would've called but I didn't have a quarter. What's a quarter, Graciella? (pause) Yoshi's new here. So--what's a quarter?

G: Twenty-five cents.

R: Twenty-five cents? And how much does a phone call cost, from a public booth? (pause)

G: I think it's--

R: It's just a quarter, right? Well, actually, that's a lot of money, right? It used to be a dime. OK. I would've called but I didn't have a quarter. Would--have--called. Graciella, if I say I--as you say--I would call, what time am I talking about? (long pause) I--you have "I would have called but I didn't have a quarter." It's finished, right?

G: Uhu.

R: And they didn't call. But if I say "I would call" what am I talking about? What time am I talking about? (long pause)

G: That is the past, that is-- (pause)

R: This is the past.

G: Uhu.

R: But the other way is not the past. I would call, but (writes on board) I would call, but I don't have a quarter. I would've called but I didn't have a quarter. This is finished, and this is now. (pause) Yeah?

G: Uhu.

R: OK, so--er--because we have this here, it's already finished, and it has to agree with this did. OK? OK. Where's the reduction then? (pause)

G: I would--would? I woulda called.

R: Good. I woulda--I woulda called, or I would've called. You hear both. Some people say would've. Some people say woulda. OK? OK. How about number 5? Read it for me.

Y: She really shoulda tried harder.

R: What do you say, Koji?

K: I have the same.

R: You have the same. OK. You too, Graciella? (pause)

G: Uhu.

R: Yeah? OK. I did. I don't remember saying this.

G: Well.

R: I just--I just said--er--She really shoulda tried harder.

Y: Oh, so I don't--er--have this time, but, in grammar, I need this.

R: You think there has to be an object?

Y: Object.

R: OK. Alright. OK. Actually, grammatically it would be possible to say tried it harder, but you don't need it (pause) in the sense of tried to pass the exam, tried to succeed, you don't need the it. And I didn't say it anyway. (laughs) OK? What--what's the reduction here?

Y: Er--shoulda.

R: OK. And it could be should've or shoulda. Either way. OK? She really shoulda tried harder. And last one. You got very well, um, you should'na told me. How does it reduce?

Y: Er--shouldn've

R: OK, you can say shouldn've, where it looks like this. Shouldn've. Or you can just say--you could even write it like this, should'na--should'na. (pause) OK? Alright. Any questions about these? You don't have to talk like this, Yoshi, you just have to understand it when you hear it, OK? Because if you wait for people to say you should not have told me, you'll never hear it, OK? (pause) Part of English, spoken English, is just that we run things together and we reduce them. OK. Koji? No problems?

K: Oh yeah.

R: Yeah? Yes?

K: No problem.

R: OK. Alright. Take a look at these things a second. I may have already given you but I don't know if you have the sheet with you. I'm gonna put some, these question points on the blackboard, and I want you to use some of these phrases. Go through the list and see which ones you've never used before, and mark them and see if you can use them today for a practice exercise.

(long pause. Writes on board)

R: OK. Let's take a few minutes now to discuss these. Choose one, or two if you run out of things to say, of these topics, and I would like you to give each other your--Graciella, you and Yoshi, can you, you can discuss, use some of these things, I want you to not agree with each other necessarily, OK? If you don't think if you, I want you to come up with a different opinion so that you can use some of these, if you happen to agree then you can use from this category, OK?

Y: OK.

R: Here's the topics.

Y: Oh.

R: Yeah. Choose one or two that you think interesting. You start out, Graciella, OK? And then you can react to her and give her your own opinion. Koji, you and I can work together.

K: I should use these ones?

R: Definitely. OK? Graciella, have you chosen one? (pause)

I'll leave it up to you.

Y: First we have to choose one of--um

R: Correct. And then offer your opinion and some information about that, and then you can--you have some formulas that you can use to agree or disagree. OK? What do you say, Kcji?

(students work in pairs. R. works with Koji)

(Long interval not transcribed)

R: OK, Yoshi, Graciella, I think we have to leave the room now, but I hope you found some points to agree on and disagree on, yeah? No fights?

Y: No fights.

G: I need to be careful with him. He likes the violence.

(laughter)

R: Oho, watch out. Watch out.

G: Yeah.

R: Watch out. Actually, he does too, so we'd better be careful.

G: And both are from Japan.

R: Does he like rugby?

G: What?

R: Does he like rugby?

G: What is it? I don't know.

Y: We were talkinng about sports question. Boxing.

R: Boxing. Oh, I see. Well, he likes rugby, he likes boxing, so be careful. We both better be careful.

G: (laughs)

R: OK. Well, keep those papers because we'll use them another day. OK? I'm not sure when, but keep them with you, OK? Have a nice weekend, and I'll see you Monday morning.