

1998

The Effects of Educational Setting and Instructor Type on Interaction Modifications

Katrina Kay McConaughey
Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds



Part of the [Applied Linguistics Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

McConaughey, Katrina Kay, "The Effects of Educational Setting and Instructor Type on Interaction Modifications" (1998). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 6377.
<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.3523>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

THESIS APPROVAL

The abstract and thesis of Katrina Kay McConaughey for the Master of Arts in TESOL were presented November 6, 1998, and accepted by the thesis committee and the department.

COMMITTEE APPROVALS:

[REDACTED]
Marjorie Terdal, Chair

[REDACTED]
Thomas Dieterich

[REDACTED]
Nancy Porter
Representative of the Office
of Graduate Studies

DEPARTMENT APPROVAL:

[REDACTED]
Jeanette DeCarrico
Department of Applied Linguistics

ABSTRACT

An abstract of the thesis of Katrina Kay McConaughey for the Master of Arts in TESOL presented November 6, 1998.

Title: The Effects of Educational Setting and Instructor Type on Interaction Modifications.

The precise role of interaction in the process of second language acquisition and its place in the second language classroom are questions that continue to be important in research for both theoretical and applied linguists. The framework for this study is based on Long's (1983b) Interaction Hypothesis which proposes that input is made comprehensible by the modification of interactional structures. Many studies have looked at the differences between teacher-fronted classroom interaction and small group or dyad interaction without a teacher. The use of tutors and teaching assistants is common but not many studies have looked at how variation among instructor type affects classroom interaction modifications.

The purpose of this study was to determine how a class of university English as a Second Language students and their instructors differ in their use of interaction modifications in three different academic settings: a

professor-led class, a teaching assistant-led class, and a conversation lab with a tutor. One hour of conversation was recorded for each student in each of the three settings and the transcriptions were categorized according to Long's (1983b) taxonomy of Interaction Modifications. Dialogue journals were also exchanged between the researcher and the students to gather some qualitative data about the students' feelings and opinions about general interaction and speaking in class.

The results of this study found that there was a) a significant difference in interaction modification patterns between the instructors and the students, b) there was also a significant difference in IM patterns among the three teacher types, and c) the students showed a significant difference in IM production by teaching situation.

THE EFFECTS OF EDUCATIONAL SETTING AND
INSTRUCTOR TYPE ON INTERACTION MODIFICATIONS

by

KATRINA KAY MCCONAUGHEY

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS
in
TESOL

Portland State University
1998

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In spite of my fascination with second language acquisition, somewhere along the way I got sidetracked with first language acquisition (I had two children!) and as a result this project became a group effort. It fills me with a deep sense of gratitude to reflect on the great number of people who have generously shared their time and talents with me in the long-awaited completion of this thesis. There are a few who deserve special mention. I am grateful to Marjorie Terdal for her very professional advice and encouraging spirit. I always left her office feeling more optimistic than when I arrived. I would also like to thank Kathleen Gathercoal for her invaluable assistance with my statistics and her confidence in my ability to do this. I am so appreciative of Martha Iancu at George Fox University for her encouragement and for going out of her way to help me find students I could observe for my data.

In April when I was ready to give up, Beth Woolsey offered me the gift of several months of free child care because she believed I could finish. Thank you Beth, for loving my children like they were your own. And finally, I would like to thank my family. My extended family has been infinitely supportive of my goal and I love you each for that. Thank you Elsie, for being such a sweet easy-going

baby and for not learning to walk until after I finished. Thank you Jered, for believing that I will play games and read stories to you again soon. Last but not least, I am so thankful for Shawn, my husband and life partner. From start to finish he has always believed that I was capable of completing this program and without his love and support I am quite certain I wouldn't have.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	i
LIST OF TABLES.....	v
CHAPTER	
I	INTRODUCTION..... 1
	This Study..... 3
	Statement of Research Questions..... 3
	Data Collection and Analysis..... 5
	Definitions of Terms Used..... 6
II	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE..... 9
	Introduction..... 9
	The Input Hypothesis.....10
	Support for the Input
	Hypothesis.....13
	Criticisms of the Input
	Hypothesis.....14
	The Interaction Hypothesis.....16
	Support for the Interaction
	Hypothesis.....17
	Criticisms of the Interaction
	Hypothesis.....18
	Production and Comprehensible Output.19
	Classroom Interaction Research.....21

	Summary.....	27
III	METHODOLOGY.....	28
	Participants.....	28
	Students	
	Instructors	
	Setting.....	33
	Procedure.....	34
	Long's Taxonomy of Interaction Modifications	
IV	RESULTS.....	44
	Introduction.....	44
	Quantitative Results.....	45
	Qualitative Results.....	52
V	DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS.....	56
	Findings.....	56
	Limitations.....	65
	Suggestions for Future Research.....	69
	Implications for SLA	70
	Application for the Language Classroom.....	70
	REFERENCES.....	73
	APPENDICES.....	77
	A SAMPLE TRANSCRIPTION.....	77
	B SAMPLE OF CODING.....	88
	C TOTAL IMs FOR EACH PARTICIPANT ON EACH TAPE.....	90
	D DESCRIPTION OF TASK TYPE FOR EACH TAPE.....	93

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I	Frequency of IM Production for Each Student.....	46
II	Frequency of IM Production for Instructors.....	47
III	Frequency of IMs by Teachers and Students.....	49
IV	Student IM Production by Teaching Situation.....	50
V	Total Student IM Production by Group Size.....	51
VI	Frequency of IM Production by Instructor Type.....	52

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to determine how a class of university English as a Second Language (ESL) students and their instructors differ in their use of interaction modifications in three different academic settings. The three academic settings observed in this study were 1) students in a professor-led class, 2) students in a teaching assistant-led class, and 3) students one-on-one with their conversation lab tutor. Interaction modifications are the ways in which speakers change or modify their speech to show their interlocutor that they have or have not understood an utterance. This process is also referred to as negotiation of meaning and is believed by some to be a crucial part of second language acquisition (SLA) (see for example, Long 1983 and Ellis 1990). It is a dynamic process of give-and-take by which language learners can not only modify their own language production but also encourage their interlocutor to modify his or her speech, which in turn may make it more comprehensible to the language learner.

Much of current second language instruction in North America is based on communicative language teaching methods and the assumption that learners need to be actively

involved in gaining input through interaction. But this assumption still often leaves language educators with questions about the best way to get students interacting and who they should ideally be interacting with. This study hopes to add to the growing body of knowledge about classroom interaction and the role of the teacher (as well as other interlocutors) in facilitating second language acquisition.

The second language classroom is very complex and dynamic and has often been compared to a "black box" (Long, 1980). Much of what actually happens in the language acquisition process is still a mystery. Part of what makes language classroom research so complex is that language is both the object of and the medium of instruction. This is not the case in most other fields of educational research. In the field of second language acquisition, students are often studied in experimental or observational research because they are language learners who are readily available in large numbers. However, much of that research is focused on questions of general SLA theory. The present study is classroom process research and is not experimental so much as observational in nature.

Richard-Amato (1996) recently said, "The classroom is not preparation for 'the real world,' as many would have us believe. It is the real world for millions of students around the globe" (p. xii). This research project is interested in what classroom and teaching conditions aid in language learning in order to help language instructors and

program planners as they make decisions about the types of input and interaction opportunities they will provide for their students.

THIS STUDY

In the present study the interaction of an ESL class comprised of three students was observed under a variety of teaching conditions. The teaching conditions included teacher-fronted class time, group work led by a non-native speaker (NNS) teaching assistant, and pair work with an American peer conversation tutor. The students were in a beginning university ESL class and the recordings were done during their Academic Reading class and Speech and Listening conversation lab. The three class members included a Korean male, a Korean female and a Japanese female.

At least two forty-five minute audiotapes were collected of each student in each of the three instructional settings. The tapes were recorded by the researcher during normally occurring class times and conversation labs with the researcher present as an observer.

STATEMENT OF RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This study describes the interaction produced by three university ESL students and their instructors in three different academic settings. Specifically, this study is

intended to describe the kinds of interaction modifications (from Long's 1983b taxonomy) they use to understand one another and how their use of the interaction modifications differed from one setting to another and from one instructor relationship to another. The following research questions served as a guide in the collection and analysis of data:

1. Do the students, as a group, use some interaction modifications more frequently than others? If so, which ones?
2. Do the instructors, as a group, use some interaction modifications more frequently than others? If so, which ones?
3. Are the interaction modification categories that the teachers use most frequently different from the interaction modification categories the students use?
4. Do student interaction modification frequencies vary with teaching situation? Variation in teaching situation, in this study, refers to the training/experience of the instructor, and to the group size.
5. Are the interaction modifications that the professor, the teaching assistant, and the peer tutors use different from one another?

6. How do the students feel about speaking in class and other academic settings? Do they share any common preferences of classroom teaching style that seem most effective or comfortable for them?

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

The interaction that was generated during the class times and conversation labs was tape recorded, transcribed, and subsequently analyzed (see Appendix A for sample transcription). The framework for this analysis was based on Long's (1983b) taxonomy of Interaction Modifications and includes confirmation checks, comprehension checks, clarification requests, self-repetitions, other-repetitions, and expansions. All of the interaction modifications and their definitions, along with examples from the data, are presented in Chapter three. Each transcript was categorized according to the six types of interaction modifications and then tabulated. The frequencies of these types of Interaction Modifications were then checked for statistical significance with respect to the research questions.

To answer the first five research questions, this study reports on quantitative analyses of the interaction modifications from the transcribed recordings. To answer the sixth question, this study also reports on a qualitative analysis of the students' opinions expressed in their dialogue journals as interpreted by the researcher.

In summary, this study is interested in naturally occurring interaction between ESL students and some of the various instructors they commonly interact with in different academic settings. In the chapters that follow, one class of students will be carefully examined as to the effects of the different instructional settings on the type and amount of interaction modifications they use both to understand and be understood in the ESL classroom. Chapter two will give a review of the SLA literature and research focusing on the effects of input, interaction, and output on the language learning process. Chapter three will explain the methodology of this study, including details about its participants and the method used to collect and analyze the data gathered from them. Chapter four will discuss the statistical tests used and their results as well as the qualitative analyses of students' dialogue journals, and chapter five will interpret those results, discussing their possible implications for teaching and further research.

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

Second Language Acquisition - (SLA) The process of acquiring a second language. It can occur in a naturalistic and/or classroom environment. SLA includes the whole field of study, research, and theory surrounding this process.

Teacher-fronted classroom - A traditional classroom style in which the teacher controls and directs the class typically in a lecture format. Even a class discussion can be teacher-fronted if the teacher controls turn-taking, initiation, topic, etc.

Group work - A sub-set of the class. Usually defined as groups of 3-5 students assigned to work together to discuss a topic or complete a project without the participation of the teacher.

Pair work - A sub-set of the class, in pairs. Another method of dividing a class into smaller chunks for discussion, or completing a project.

Input - Any samples of the target language available to the learner through spoken or written avenues. According to Krashen (1985) this input must be comprehensible and slightly ahead of the learner's current state of linguistic competence ($i+1$) in order to be of value.

Interaction - Verbal two-way communication between two or more people.

Interaction Modification - The ways in which speakers change or modify their speech to show their interlocutor that they have or have not understood an utterance. Also called negotiation of meaning.

Professors - In this study, an instructor with an advanced degree and prior teaching experience.

Teaching Assistants - In this study, an instructor in undergraduate study with limited teaching experience who is

responsible for planning (with the professor's assistance) and conducting a class period.

Peer Tutors - In this study, an instructor in undergraduate study who meets weekly one-on-one with an ESL student to assist with homework projects or other academic areas where assistance is needed. No prior education or experience is required.

Teacher Talk - Adjustments made by language teachers, when addressing NNSs, to both form and language function in order to facilitate communication (Ellis, 1985).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

This study is based on a theoretical framework that hypothesizes that interaction is necessary in order to acquire a second language. And while there have been some very strong claims about the role of interaction in this process, there is, to date, no empirical evidence proving that interaction causes language acquisition, nor is there unanimous agreement about its exact effects. This chapter will look at some of the major contributions to second language acquisition research and theory specifically focusing on the role of interaction. It will also review some of the classroom oriented research in this same area with its practical emphasis on the teacher-learner relationship and innovations in teaching methodology. Although the chapter will touch on naturalistic language learning, the primary emphasis will be on classroom or instructed language learning since that is the main focus and interest of the researcher.

Although people have been teaching and learning second languages for centuries, second language acquisition as a serious field of research is quite young, only about forty

years old. Early research was influenced by behavioral psychology and consisted of contrastive analysis between different languages in an effort to discover potential errors by language learners and prevent them. Language learning was seen as a conditioning process, something one *did* to a student.

It wasn't until sometime in the 1960's that research began to look seriously into language acquisition from the learner's role in the process. Both educators and researchers began to ask if and how L2 acquisition was fundamentally different from L1 acquisition (or from learning anything for that matter), and what was actually happening inside of the learner to spark language acquisition.

THE INPUT HYPOTHESIS

Gass (1997) states, "not all input is created equal. Nonetheless, it is an incontrovertible fact that some sort of input is essential for language learning; clearly, languages are not and cannot be learned in a vacuum." Perhaps one of the most influential (and widely debated) theories of second language acquisition is that proposed by Krashen (first described in 1977). It has sparked such speculation and question that many researchers have directly or indirectly devoted themselves either to proving, disproving, or expanding it in some way. Krashen's Monitor Model (1982) is his overall theory of

second language acquisition and consists of five basic hypotheses:

1) *The Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis*. This states that second language learners can learn a language in two independent ways, one way through acquisition and the other through learning. Acquisition occurs naturally the same way that children learn their first language. It is subconscious and is used to produce language. Learning, on the other hand, is conscious, formal knowledge about a language. It is typically gained in the classroom and serves to inspect the acquired system for correctness.

2) *The Natural Order Hypothesis*. This states that language rules are acquired in a predictable order regardless of whether or not instruction is involved. It is a product of the acquired system, without interference from the learned system.

3) *The Monitor Hypothesis*. This hypothesis refers to the manner in which the learned system serves as an inspector or monitor in the production or output of the acquired system. The monitor links the two systems together in production. The three conditions for monitor use are time, focus on form, and knowing the rule.

4) *The Input Hypothesis*. This hypothesis theorizes that if there is a natural order, learners move from one point to another by understanding messages or receiving comprehensible input. Krashen defines comprehensible input ($i + 1$) as bits of language that are slightly ahead of a learner's current level of linguistic knowledge (i).

Language already known as well as language way ahead of a learner's level of knowledge is of little or no use. "We move from i , our current level to $i + 1$, the next level along the natural order, by understanding input containing $i + 1$ " (1985, p.2). This Input Hypothesis is the central part of the overall theory and has two corollaries: a) speech is a result of acquisition and emerges on its own, and b) if enough comprehensible input is provided, the necessary grammar will be automatically provided without overt instruction.

5. *Affective Filter Hypothesis*. But how does one explain individual variation and the fact that some people are simply not successful in learning second languages? Krashen proposes that one explanation would be insufficient comprehensible input and another would be this Affective Filter that can prevent the input from passing through it to become acquisition. These affects are things such as motivation, attitude, self-confidence, defensiveness, or anxiety. On the other hand, if the filter is down or low, the input is able to pass through and become acquisition.

According to Krashen, acquisition can be accounted for by a combination of the Input Hypothesis and the Affective Filter Hypothesis. He refers to them as the true causes of second language acquisition and believes the five hypotheses can be summarized with a single claim,

people acquire second languages only if they obtain comprehensible input and if their affective filters are low enough to allow the input 'in'. When the filter is 'down' and appropriate comprehensible input is presented (and comprehended), acquisition is

inevitable. It is, in fact, unavoidable and cannot be prevented. (1985, p. 4)

Support for the Input Hypothesis

Some of the following evidence or support has been suggested for the input hypothesis: (Long, 1983a) 1) access to comprehensible input is a characteristic of all cases of successful acquisition, both first and second; 2) greater quantities of comprehensible input seem to result in better (or at least faster) acquisition and crucially; 3) lack of access to comprehensible input results in little or no acquisition.

Evidence of simplified or modified speech to language learners is one support for the input hypothesis. The study of foreigner talk and teacher talk, like many other parts of second language acquisition, was modeled after its counterpart in first language acquisition: caretaker talk. Ellis (1985) summarized studies of foreigner talk that pinpointed the linguistic similarities among motherese, foreigner talk, and also fossilized forms of interlanguage. Teacher talk and caretaker talk share several generally accepted characteristics. They both include slower speech with simplification of pronunciation, lexis, and grammar. Studies by Ellis (1985) and Chaudron (1988) on caretaker talk and teacher talk show they have many similarities both in form and their functions of promoting communication, establishing an affective bond between the interlocutors, and serving as an implicit teaching mode. Ellis (1985) also notes that while ungrammatical adjustments are very

rare in motherese, they do occur under certain conditions in foreigner talk.

Freed (1980) compared speech adjustments made by adult NS of English to both young children and NNS adults. She compared baseline data of motherese with her own study of NS adjustments to NNS adults. What she found was that adult speakers' responses to children and foreigners are quite similar in terms of syntactic adjustments (i.e. fewer words per sentence and fewer multisentential utterances) but quite different in terms of their functional meaning in context. A major function of speech addressed to babies is commonly accepted to be the directing of the child's behavior. In contrast, the primary functional intent of foreigner talk seen in the literature is exchange of information and maintenance of the conversation.

Gaies (1983) describes a comparison of the language used by eight ESL teachers in the classroom and outside of the classroom. It showed that the classroom speech was syntactically less complex and that the complexity of the speech was remarkably well fine-tuned to the proficiency level of their students. Along with similar data, the Gaies study lends support to the idea that classroom input, like caretaker speech, may encourage language acquisition by making it more comprehensible to the learner.

Criticisms of the Input Hypothesis

Gass and Selinker (1994) in their analysis of Krashen's Monitor Model offer some of the following

criticisms, most of which have to do with falsifiability of the different hypotheses. There is no empirical evidence for acquisition and learning as two separate systems and no specific criteria or means for determining whether they are separate. The argument against a Monitor and its unique function with learned knowledge is, again, that there are no absolute criteria for determining when the Monitor is in use and when it is not. In order to validate the Input Hypothesis one must know how to define and identify a particular level in order to know whether the input contains structures in that level (i) or if it contains the sought after $i+1$. Gass and Selinker question the power and validity of Krashen's overall theory but acknowledge its significant contribution to the field of second language acquisition.

Chaudron (1985) distinguishes intake from Krashen's definition of input in that intake identifies the learner as an active participant in acquiring the target language. In his investigation of intake as a process, Chaudron criticizes Krashen's Input Hypothesis because it does not include communicative production in the language learner's process of testing and validating internal hypotheses about the target language.

Lee and VanPatten (1995) summarize the input hypothesis quite well suggesting that, "Because not all language learners are equally successful, there must be more at work than comprehensible input. Nonetheless, almost everyone today believes that comprehensible input is

a critical factor in language acquisition"(p.67). What is controversial is the type and perhaps amount of input that is necessary for second language learning and what else is involved in addition to input.

THE INTERACTION HYPOTHESIS

Long (1983a) points out that there seems to be little evidence that input modifications made by NSs for NNSs are actually beneficial. Proof that simplification occurs is not evidence that it promotes learning. So how is input made comprehensible if it is not by modifying or simplifying it? One way is by the use of extralinguistic context to fill in the gaps. Another way, as with caretaker speech, is by focusing the conversation concretely on the "here and now". A third, more consistently used method is modifying not the input itself, but the interactional structure of the conversation through devices such as confirmation and comprehension checks and clarification requests.

From his own, and others' studies regarding the importance of opportunities for a two-way exchange of information, Long has proposed a model of acquisition where

The need to obtain information from the less competent speaker means that the competent speaker cannot press ahead without attending to the feedback he or she is receiving. The option to provide feedback allows the less competent speaker to negotiate the conversation, to force the competent speaker to adjust his or her performance, via modifications, until what he or she

is saying is comprehensible. Comprehensible input, it has already been argued, feeds acquisition. (1983a, p. 214)

Support for the Interaction Hypothesis

As evidence, Long cites his own doctoral study (1980) which compared NS-NNS conversation with baseline NS-NS conversations and found 10 out of 11 measures of interactional modification to be significantly different. In contrast, there were no significant differences on four out of five measures of the input modifications.

Pica, Young, and Doughty (1994) conducted a study in which they compared the comprehension of 16 NNS on directions for a specific task under two conditions: premodified input and interactionally modified input. It was found that interaction had a positive overall effect on comprehension, but that comprehension was best facilitated by the interactionally modified input and that linguistic simplification or complexity was not a significant factor. It was also found that the interactional modifications in the form of comprehension and confirmation checks and clarification requests did indeed modify the input by triggering repetition and rephrasing of content and therefore played a critical role in comprehension. The redundancy brought about by these repetitions seemed to be a key element.

Roulon and McCreary (1986) did a study in which they compared teacher-fronted and small-group interaction generated by a task used within the context of a lesson.

They were looking at both negotiation of meaning and negotiation of content. In comparing the results of the two groups, it was found that the small group produced two times the number of content confirmation checks and 36 times the number of content clarification requests, but no statistical difference was detected in the amount of informational content matter that was covered. The results also suggested that very little negotiation of either content or meaning was actually taking place in the teacher-fronted classes.

Sato (1986) conducted a longitudinal study looking at past time reference (PTR) interlanguage development with two Vietnamese boys over a 10 month period. The boys were audiotaped in conversations with several different interlocutors. She asserts that the conversations her subjects had with NSs facilitated their performance in English but is reluctant to conclude that the PTR acquisition was aided. She provides evidence showing that these conversations helped in the acquisition of some linguistic features, but not with others. And she added that the role of conversation in second language acquisition is a complex one, being influenced by a wide variety of factors.

Criticisms of the Interaction Hypothesis

Ellis (1990) states

There are, however, considerable problems involved in testing this [interactional] hypothesis empirically, not least that of determining what is actually learnt

as a result of engaging in an interactional exchange where there is opportunity to negotiate meaning. The cause relationship between meaning-negotiation and acquisition has not been conclusively demonstrated. (p. 12)

Allwright and Bailey (1991) point out that Krashen's concept of comprehensible input is problematic in several ways. First of all, it is possible that incomprehensible input may be of some value for acquiring things like stress and intonation. Secondly, it is not easy to see how mere exposure to comprehensible input actually promotes language development. They propose a challenging idea that perhaps it is the effort made by learners to comprehend the input that fosters development. Likewise, the intended outcome of negotiation may be comprehensible input, but maybe it is the work required to negotiate interaction that spurs language acquisition. Once again, it may be difficult to test this or disprove it empirically, but it is an interesting idea worth considering.

PRODUCTION AND COMPREHENSIBLE OUTPUT

Some researchers like Krashen (1985) do not emphasize production, or output as it is often called. Krashen's hypothesis states that production will emerge naturally on its own from the acquired system and should not be forced. Another common view is that the purpose of production, for the learner, is a means for providing more comprehensible input. Swain (1985) takes the idea of comprehensible input

one step further. She argues that comprehensible input may well be important for L2 learning, but is insufficient to ensure that native-speaker levels of grammatical accuracy are attained. She believes that the concepts of comprehensible input and the negotiation of meaning must also be connected to what she has termed the "comprehensible output hypothesis." The negotiation of meaning does not just mean the ability to understand a message but should include the ability to convey a message that is precise and appropriate and will be understood. Swain believes that being "pushed" in output, is a concept parallel to that of the "i+1" of comprehensible input. Perhaps simply knowing that one will eventually be expected to produce may be the "trigger that forces the learner to pay attention to the means of expression needed in order to successfully convey his or her own intended meaning" (p. 249). She believes that output has a greater role than just providing more comprehensible input. When a learner receives negative input via confirmation checks, he or she is pushed to seek alternative ways to communicate the message.

Rivers (1994) calls comprehension and production the "interactive duo" and claims they are undividable partners in the two-way process of communicative interaction. She says, "For the learning of a new language, whether or not there is a structured sequence or structured activities, whether the learning is inductive or deductive or a mixture of the two, there must be communication of meanings--

interaction between people who have something to share" (p.78). Rivers wants to move beyond comprehensible input or comprehensible output to an interactive approach that involves both concepts together.

CLASSROOM INTERACTION RESEARCH

Long and Sato (1983) wanted to look specifically at ESL classroom interaction. They compared the classroom conversations of six ESL teachers and their beginning students with 36 informal NS-NNS conversations outside of classrooms on twelve measures of input and interaction modifications. They found a significant difference on almost all of the measures. Of the measures of interest to the present study, they found that the ESL teachers used a significantly greater number of comprehension checks and significantly fewer confirmation checks than did NSs addressing NNSs outside the classroom. The ESL teachers also used fewer clarification requests than did NSs addressing NNSs outside classrooms, but the difference was not statistically significant. What they found was very much a transmission model of education where the discourse was rarely motivated by a two-way exchange of information. One suggestion Long and Sato made was the use of two-way tasks in small group work in an effort to approximate NS-NNS conversation outside the classroom.

Duff (1986) looked at the effect of task type on the input and interaction in NNS-NNS dyads. The study involved Japanese and Chinese speakers in two types of tasks: problem-solving tasks and debates. She found that significantly more interaction and modification took place in the convergent problem-solving tasks than in the divergent debate tasks, but that the divergent debate task produced longer, more complex turns and more overall production by the students. Instead of advocating one task over the other, Duff concluded that the two task types may be complementary in the overall classroom plan.

Cathcart (1986) observed eight ESL children in a bilingual kindergarten class in six distinct classroom activities in order to compare the differences across them and to identify, where possible, the situational variables that might contribute to those differences. She asserts that if there were, in fact, identifiable differences in the language across those real school situations (if they were "linguistically real") the study was likely to be of more direct use to classroom teachers. She reports on her analysis of speech acts used to control or manipulate behavior, in which she found that there were indeed distinct differences in the children's use and production of these acts based on situation. She found that situations where the learner had control of the talk were characterized by a wide variety of communicative acts and syntactic structures, whereas the situations where the teacher had control seemed to produce single-word

utterances, short phrases, and formulaic chunks.

Schinke-Llano (1986) conducted a study in which she compared how teachers explained a specific task to a NS of English and then to a student with limited English proficiency (LEP). She found that the teacher interactions with LEP students are more teacher regulated and the steps more explicit. However, all of the students completed the task and may not have needed the modified input. If one accepts Krashen's theory of optimal input (1982) and Long's position of modified interaction (1983), then one could conclude that overly modified input could impede the students' progress in English. "If one assumes that modifications can be either facilitative or detrimental to linguistic and cognitive skills development, what then is the nature and extent of these adjustments that facilitate L2 acquisition and cognitive development?" (Schinke-Llano, 1986, p. 112).

Pica and Doughty (1985a) compared teacher-fronted and small group communicative activities in an effort to seek empirical evidence in support of communicative activities. They targeted one specific individual and found that significantly more turns were taken by the individual in the group setting than in the teacher-fronted activity. The data also indicated that a greater quantity of language was produced by the individual in the group than in the teacher-fronted activity.

In another study, Pica and Doughty (1985b) compared three ESL classrooms during group vs. teacher-fronted

classroom interaction on decision-making tasks examining grammaticality of input, negotiation of input, and individual input/production. Significantly more grammatical input was found during the teacher-fronted activities and on average, the students' productions were equally ungrammatical in both situations. Unexpectedly, a greater proportion of all conversational adjustments occurred in the teacher-fronted than in group activities, but it seemed low overall for both settings. Also, the students had more opportunities for using the target language in group rather than teacher-directed activities, either through taking more turns or producing more samples of their interlanguage. They suggest that the small number of conversational adjustments may have been due to the decision-making tasks and observe that no matter how potentially communicative the tasks may have seemed to be, they did not guarantee negotiated interaction among the participants because interaction was still optional. One response would be to use information-gap activities in which no one participant has enough information to complete the activity without seeking information from others, in other words, making the information exchange required.

Doughty and Pica (1986) followed up on the two studies above and performed a similar study comparing teacher-fronted and group work on a problem-solving "required" information exchange task. In contrast to their earlier study (Pica and Doughty, 1985b), they found the use of "conversational adjustments" i.e. comprehension checks,

confirmation requests, etc. to be significantly more frequent in the group activities with required information exchange than in the teacher-fronted classroom.

The studies discussed above describe some of what is known about second language classroom input and interaction primarily between teachers and students. There are three main sources of input to the learner: native speakers outside the classroom, teachers, and other learners. Foreigner talk and teacher talk have been studied in more depth than how learners talk to each other (sometimes called interlanguage talk) but this area of research is growing also. One influence of audiolingualism and its concern with L1 transfer was trying to protect the learner from error-filled input that could cause fossilization.

Porter (1986) conducted a study describing the input that learners at two proficiency levels provided to each other and to native speakers during task centered discussions and compared that input with NS input. The study addressed three questions concerning input to learners, productions by learners, and the sociolinguistic appropriateness of the learner language. The findings suggested that learners communicating with other learners in the classroom can have certain advantages over interaction between NNSs and NSs. Even though the learners provided ungrammatical input to each other, their input contained at least two interaction features (repairs and prompts) that may be vital to second language acquisition. Also, the study indicated that learners with similar L1

language backgrounds had no phonological problems and that the input was indeed comprehensible. Miscorrections and error incorporation are a common concern with interlanguage talk, but these were extremely rare in the data. Porter suggests from this that while interlanguage talk may be inferior in many respects, it is not necessarily damaging, and can actually provide more opportunities for meaningful interaction that may promote acquisition.

In regards to the level differences, the results indicate that the learners got more and better input from advanced learners than from intermediates. (This supports Krashen's $i+1$ concept of comprehensible input.) Concerning production, the findings suggest that if quantity and quality of production is a goal, then greater benefit will be gained from learners talking to other learners than to native speakers. The findings indicate that the learners did not provide socioculturally accurate models for expressing opinions, agreements and especially disagreements. The author suggests this indicates the need for communication with native speakers or the need for explicit teaching of the strategies needed to develop sociolinguistic competence.

A groundbreaking study conducted by Ellis, Tanaka, and Tamazaki (1994) established some of the first empirical evidence for the connection between interaction and its link between comprehension and acquisition. They compared the effects of premodified input and interactionally modified input on the acquisition of specific vocabulary

items. They found that while both promoted acquisition, the interactionally modified input led to the acquisition of more word order meanings than did the premodified input. Another interesting result was that the study failed to demonstrate that active participation in the interaction was an advantage for vocabulary acquisition. The learners who listened to others negotiate achieved similar scores to those who were actively involved in the negotiation.

SUMMARY

A great deal of research has been conducted looking at various aspects of ESL classroom interaction including both teacher/learner interaction, learner/learner interaction, and the effects of task type and group size. Almost every researcher (with the exception of Ellis et al., 1994) notes in some way in their conclusion that there is still no empirical evidence that input or interaction cause acquisition, but it is believed they are centrally involved in the process. Another frequent reminder is that comprehension does not equal acquisition, but it does set the stage for it to occur. Perhaps that is the reason for so much interest in the way that interaction indeed seems to facilitate comprehension. Since the use of TAs and peer tutors is common in ESL programs, the present study hopes to contribute some descriptive data to the current research on the differences and similarities of teacher/learner interaction among professors, TAs, and peer tutors.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter gives background information about the participants in the study, the setting of the instructional program they were involved in, a description of the methods employed to gather the data from them and the procedures used to transcribe and categorize that data.

PARTICIPANTS

The eight participants in this study (3 students, 5 instructors) were selected from the English as a Second Language (ESL) program at a small private university in Oregon. It is typical of many private programs in the region that are small and have student populations comprised primarily of Asian students seeking U.S. college degrees or higher education. In addition to the student population, some of the other factors that make it a typical program are fluctuating enrollment, limited permanent staff, and budget constraints. These conditions create challenges requiring the creative use of adjunct faculty, teaching assistants and peer tutors. The program has three levels of instruction which typically take one 15-week semester each to be completed. After completing

the three levels, most students are ready to go on and begin a four year bachelor degree program at the university where they took ESL classes or at another university. This school's program situation is certainly not unique and, therefore, may allow us to understand comparable programs at other schools.

Students

The participants were not chosen randomly, but were an intact class group. Ideally, it would have been preferable to have a larger class group but there was only a small class that was both available and willing to give consent for participation. This particular class was the Beginning level. The three students in the class had entrance TOEFL (Test Of English as a Foreign Language) exam scores between 330 and 400. (This ESL program uses the TOEFL exam for placement and evaluation, but not for entrance or graduation requirements.) The TOEFL is a standardized test with scores that range from 200-677 and the participants' scores are representative of their beginning level. Many colleges and universities use a score of 500 as a guideline for admission as a regular student. In the present study there were one male student and two female students. They attended all of their classes together and knew each other quite well. The male student and one of the female students were Korean. The other female student was Japanese. All three of the students had been in the United States for less than three months at the beginning of the

study. They also had had similar previous English language learning experiences consisting of several years of classroom instruction in secondary school with the emphasis on grammar and writing not on speaking and listening.

Student A, the Korean female, was 22 years old. She had been in the United States for five weeks at the beginning of the study and was living off-campus with her cousin, who was married to an American man. She had been attending a four-year university in Korea studying business and computer science, and had come to the United States just to study English. Her intention was to return to Korea and finish her degree after completing this ESL program.

Student B, the Japanese female, was 20 years old. She also had been in the United States for only five weeks at the time the study began. Her reason for coming to this ESL program was so that upon completion she could enter an American university (possibly the current one) as a traditional student. She never made mention of future educational or career goals for herself in Japan.

Student C, the Korean male, was 21 years old. He also had just arrived in the United States at the beginning of the semester but had cousins who lived in New York and he had visited as a tourist on several previous trips. In Korea, he had been attending a two-year college because he had not done well enough on the entrance exams to get into a university. He wanted to improve his English in order to pursue a career in business or hotel management. It was

unclear whether or not he intended to pursue more education after the ESL program.

Instructors

The other five participants will hereafter be referred to as the instructors because even though they held different roles, they were all fluent speakers of English in positions of giving instruction or assistance. The first instructor was an American ESL professor (shown as "P" on transcriptions and tables) who held a MA in Linguistics with an emphasis in TESOL and 15 years of ESL teaching experience. She taught Academic Reading to these students for three one-hour sessions each week. The general goals of the class were to teach reading-for-content (as opposed to looking up each word in the dictionary) and other reading skills such as skimming, making inferences, and learning how to most effectively use a textbook. An example of a typical class session was an activity where students looked together at a business textbook and learned how to preview it by looking at the table of contents and then how to survey the basic content of the book by following the subject headings through one chapter.

The second instructor was the teaching assistant (TA) for the Academic Reading class. She was Filipino and had lived in the United States for at least four years. She was a Non-native speaker of English. She had a strong accent and made some minor grammatical errors in her speech but she was functionally fluent and spoke with ease and

confidence. TAs are typically graduate students, but she was attending the university as a traditional bachelor's degree student and was close in age to the students. She had no formal theoretical background or training in teaching ESL but did have prior experience tutoring and assisting in this program. It was a paid work-study position. She met with the students for one hour each week. As a teaching assistant, she planned the class time in conjunction with the professor and was responsible for actually teaching a lesson or leading a group work project. An example of a typical class time would be reviewing together for an exam or working together to prepare presentations that each student had to give over one of the chapters in the business textbook.

The other three instructors were traditional college students who served as conversation lab tutors (T). The conversation lab was a required part of the ESL students' Speech and Listening class and met for one hour each week. Each student was paired with a tutor of the same gender. The tutors were all American university students and were the same age as the ESL students. Two of them were in an Introduction to TESOL class but had no prior experience tutoring ESL students. They were volunteer tutors to fulfill one of their course requirements for the TESOL class. The third tutor did tutoring for the ESL department as a work study job. She had no theoretical background but did have some prior experience and on-the-job training as an ESL tutor. She was also an Elementary Education major.

The conversation tutors were given quite a bit of freedom in deciding how to direct the tutorial session. Generally, the priority was first to work together or practice any speech the student was preparing for his or her Speaking and Listening class. If that was not pertinent, the tutor would help his or her student practice learning slang and idioms or read a newspaper article together for pronunciation and comprehension.

SETTING

As mentioned previously, the overall setting for this research project was on the campus of a growing private university. While there are many obvious group dynamics benefits to having a small class size, there can also be some drawbacks in that it is easier (and not unreasonable) for the university to "tuck" the class into small or odd spaces. The Academic Reading class met in the basement of the library in a curriculum resource room. It was not a high traffic area, but there were often interruptions by other students trying to look for library materials. The students met together for Speech and Listening conversation lab in a classroom in the music department. It was a large room which allowed the student/tutor pairs to spread out and thus minimize the distraction level of hearing other pairs and their discussion. The drawback, though, was having both a band and a choir rehearsing in the vicinity

during the same class hour and always having a lot of background noise. This was a difficulty for both the researcher and the students.

The class group was identified and recruited in consultation with the ESL program director. The main criteria for selection, in addition to availability, was a discussion oriented format versus lecture style class since all of the recordings were to be done during naturally occurring class times. The researcher was introduced to the participants at the beginning of the semester with a very brief explanation of the project. They were told that the researcher wished to observe and audiotape their class throughout the semester in order to learn about classroom interaction. The students were all informed that their participation was completely optional, their identity would be kept anonymous, and their decision to participate or not would not affect their class grade in any way. All three students and their instructors signed informed consent forms and agreed to participate in the study.

PROCEDURE

A few pilot recordings were collected with the hopes of familiarizing the participants with the equipment and helping them to feel more comfortable with the researcher's presence in the classroom.

The goal was to collect three forty-five minute tapes of each student in each of the three settings. Recordings were scheduled at the instructor's convenience and on those class days when conversation was planned for the class sessions. The recordings were all collected over a two month period. One factor the researcher found problematic was the size of the class. With only three students in the class, if even one student was seriously late or did not show up, that class recording was not usable. This happened on several occasions. In one class period all three students were present in the class, but the Korean female spoke only once during the entire session. In this case the researcher chose to keep and use that tape in the data because although it was not ideal, it was not atypical. Teachers are faced each day with students who do not make any vocal contributions for a variety of reasons including: personality, motivation, knowledge of content materials, preparedness, or structure of activity.

At least two forty-five minute tapes of each student in each teaching situation were obtained. In total, fourteen hours of conversation were recorded. Three hours of this total sample were excluded due to equipment failure or a student absence. Of the eleven usable hours of conversation, seven and one half hours were transcribed, and five hours were selected, on the basis of tape length and quality, for the final analysis.

Each tape was transcribed for data collection purposes (see Appendix A for sample transcription) and marked in 10

minute sections for early, mid, and late portions of the class. The original intention was to use forty-five minute blocks of time for the data, but the length of some tapes varied so the last thirty minutes was selected from each recording. Then each transcript was categorized according to Long's (1983b) taxonomy of Interaction Modifications which are defined and described below with examples from the researcher's data for the present study.

Long's Taxonomy of Interaction Modifications

1. **Confirmation check:** An utterance designed by the listener to elicit confirmation that a speaker utterance has been correctly heard or understood. The listener often uses a rising intonation while repeating the words of the speaker in order to indicate that it is a question.

Example:

A: I ask my tutor Sarah, she took number

TA: Number one?

A: Number seven.

TA: Oh, number seven?

A: Yeah.

2. **Comprehension Check:** An attempt by the speaker to establish that the listener is following what he or she is saying. It is often a direct question.

Example:

T: Marketing strategies, do you know what that means? Do you know marketing?

C: Marketing, yeah.

3. Clarification Request: An utterance designed by the listener to get the speaker to clarify an utterance which has not been heard or fully understood.

Example:

T: So, you would choose differently than you did?

C: **Excuse me?**

T: You would choose differently?

4. Self-Repetition: The speaker repeats part or all of his or her own previous utterance, typically for the sake of emphasis.

Example:

B: I-I have to um, my-my own two feet.

T: Uhuh. Now that you live in an apartment by yourself, you have to stand on your own two feet. O.K. last one left. The hardest one. What does it mean? O.K., **what do legs do for you? What would happen if you did not have legs? Would you be able to stand? - without legs? Without legs could you stand?**

5. Other-Repetition: The hearer repeats all or part of the speaker's utterance, usually in order to indicate comprehension. In case the hearer has not understood the meaning correctly then there is always potential for further interaction.

Example:

C: Where? Uhh, in the water, in the sea.

P: **Yeah, in the sea,** but in the end we see the boy is someplace.

6. **Expansion:** The speaker expands on the other's previous utterance by supplying missing formatives or by adding new descriptive information.

Example:

P: Pet, what is a pet?

B: Dog.

P: **A dog or a cat. It's an animal that you keep at home.**

Each occurrence of each of the interaction modifications was noted for all participants (see Appendix B for sample coding). In order to measure reliability of coding a 10% sample of the transcribed data was also categorized by an experienced ESL instructor. The inter rater agreement was 46%. A low percentage of agreement may indicate that the coding criteria was too subjective, that the researcher was inaccurate or biased in some way that weakens the reliability of the data, or that the rater was not trained well enough with samples of coded data. This subject will be addressed in more detail in Chapter 5.

Although the researcher was present as an observer during the recordings, the non-verbal communication that was observed between the participants was not taken into account during data analysis. It should also be noted from

the transcriptions and coding that a great deal of other meaningful communication was taking place that does not show up anywhere in the results because the researcher chose to limit herself only to the six interaction modifications listed and described above.

There were many challenges involved in transcribing and coding the audiotapes. The following comments describe the ways in which the researcher tried to deal with the many complexities of classroom interaction and the times when inference and personal interpretation were called upon in the process. One challenge to transcription occurred when more than one person spoke at the same time. When this happened, the researcher's response was to write down all the speech and then underline it to show that it was simultaneous. For example:

P so next week you need to attend Monday and Wednesday
 at 9:00.

C Friday? (clarification request)

P You don't have to go on Friday, but you may.

Most of the intonation was not noted in the transcription, but there were cases in which the intonation seemed to be important or to change the meaning of the dialogue and in these cases, the rising or falling intonation was noted.

Another challenge to transcription was unintelligible speech. There were times when a word or even a whole phrase was unintelligible. In this same category were instances of whispering or when the two Korean students talked in their native language (which was not too often). One

option would have been to completely disregard any unintelligible speech from the data and analysis, but the researcher marked the unintelligible speech in brackets and tried to note as much information as possible to give clues about the intended meaning without guessing any actual words (see example on pp.41-42). Intonation was sometimes noted or sometimes it was clear how many words were in the phrase, but the words were just not distinct enough to understand their meaning.

When it came to coding, there were several instances where a judgment call about a speaker's meaning or intention seemed necessary. For example student C, the male Korean, frequently said "Umm" or "Uhh" especially with the professor. According to the written definitions those utterances would not necessarily be classified as interaction modifications at all. However, after the same pattern occurred several times, it became apparent (to the researcher at least) that this "uhhm" was really a clarification request as in the following example:

P ...Are you looking for information? What are you doing research about? What is your subject?

C Uhhmm.

P You're working on research papers -- for {other prof}?

C Uhh.

P Are you doing research papers?

C Not --

P Not yet? Ok, so never mind. So, marketing research, what is it?

Although not clearly stated in a question form, it seemed to the researcher that the function, and therefore presumably the intent, of the "uhhmms" was that of a request for clarification. Student C apparently did not understand the professor's initial question and his "uhhmm" must have signaled that to her because she kept clarifying her meaning until he indicated understanding, at which point she changed her strategy.

In cases when the researcher knew an interaction modification had occurred but was unable to decide exactly to which category it belonged, the IM was marked with both (e.g. 1/3?). Then on the second reading a decision was forced. There were no instances where an IM was thrown out of the data because a category could not be chosen. In the case of unintelligible speech there possibly could have been some IMs that were simply missed, but most of the time it seemed clear from the context of other interlocutor's responses what the intention of the statement or question was. In the following example the teaching assistant (TA) is trying to help the class arrive at a definition and understanding of the word "convenience":

TA Well, can you guys help? What's convenience?

(some whispering and pages turning)

B Um, is it easy to do something? (**confirmation check**)

TA Uhuhm. That's convenient. Like for example...

B ..[unintelligible]..supermarket...?(**confirmation check**)

TA Yeah, that's right.

B Oh. (laughs)

In this exchange, it seems evident both from the previous confirmation check and from the TA's response that B's second question, although mostly unintelligible, is a confirmation check also.

There were many times when careful consideration of the context was important. One example is with questions asked by the professor. When questions arise they are frequently confirmation and comprehension checks or clarification requests. The professor who participated in this study frequently used questions as a tool to initiate or continue discussion, to make a point (display questions), or simply for classroom management. In the following example the professor is reviewing a survey of a marketing book:

P "B", what is chapter 13 about?

B Marketing strategies.

P Marketing strategies, do you know what that means? Do you know marketing? (**comprehension check**)

C Marketing, yeah. (**other repetition**)

P What is it?

C (sighs) kind of business.

P yeah, its part of business, uhuhm. (**other repetition**)

The first and last questions, in this sample, are display questions. They serve the purpose of continuing the discussion and eliciting a "display" of the students'

knowledge about the subject at hand. These questions were not accounted for anywhere in the data because they were not in response to any of the students and were not interaction modifications in the sense that the professor was not indicating her own lack of understanding nor was she using those questions to modify her own or her partners' speech to enhance understanding.

The researcher also exchanged dialogue journals with the three language learners over the course of the semester. Maintaining a dialogue journal was an assignment for their Grammar and Writing class. Students were not graded at all on journal content, in fact their writing instructor did not even read the journals. The students were graded only on the basis of having written one entry per week of at least one page. Both the researcher and the students were allowed to initiate topics of their choice. In addition to topics of personal interest, the researcher asked specific questions about each students' language learning background, favorite courses, how they felt about speaking with various native speakers, etc. These dialogue journals were used to gain background and demographic information about the students and also to gain some subjective information about their language learning styles and preferences. This qualitative data will be reported in more depth along with the other quantitative results in Chapter 4.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

INTRODUCTION

This chapter will focus on the results of the analysis of the data from the ten classroom transcriptions and the students' dialogue journals. A table of the general information is presented in Appendix C with the totals found for each participant on each transcription.

To answer the first five research questions, this study reports on quantitative analyses of the interaction modifications from the transcribed recordings. The first five questions ask about frequencies. In each case the researcher ran a chi-square test on the nominal data to determine whether the observed frequencies are significantly different from what would be expected by chance. To answer the sixth research question about students' attitudes and preferences, this chapter also reports on a qualitative analysis of the students' comments and opinions expressed in their dialogue journals.

The following key will serve as a guide to the letters and abbreviations that represent the different participants and categories of interaction modifications in

any tables and the discussion about the data:

P/Prof = the professor

TA = the teaching assistant

X,Y,Z = the American peer tutors

A = female Korean ESL student

B = female Japanese ESL student

C = male Korean ESL student

IMs = Interaction Modifications

Conf = Confirmation checks

Comp = Comprehension checks

Clar = Clarification requests

SRep = Self-repetitions

ORep = Other-repetitions

Exp = Expansions

QUANTITATIVE RESULTS

RESEARCH QUESTION #1. Do the students, as a group, use some interaction modifications more frequently than others? If so, which ones?

In order to assess whether the students use some interaction modifications more frequently than others, the proportion of total student interaction modification production that actually occurred for each category was compared to a random pattern of interaction production using a chi-square, one sample test. The IM totals for each student are shown in Table I. It was found that, yes,

the students' pattern of interaction modification production was significantly different than chance, $\chi^2(5)=477.72, p<.05$.

TABLE I
FREQUENCY OF IM PRODUCTION FOR EACH STUDENT

	CONF	COMP	CLAR	SREP	OREP	EXP	TOTAL
Student A	14	0	70	11	12	0	107
Student B	13	1	29	2	9	2	56
Student C	33	1	86	6	11	2	139
Total	60	2	185	19	32	4	302
Adjusted For Time	20	0.66	61.66	6.33	10.66	1.33	100.66

Each student's total represents three hours of recorded class and lab time. The adjusted totals are the totals divided by three. The purpose of the adjusted totals is to have one hour units of time that are comparable with the instructors for research question #3. The students produced a combined total of 60 confirmation checks and 185 clarification requests, which is significantly more than the 50.3 occurrences which would be expected by chance. In

contrast they produced a combined total of only two comprehension checks and four expansions, which is lower than would be expected by chance.

RESEARCH QUESTION #2. Do the instructors, as a group, use some interaction modifications more frequently than others? If so, which ones?

In order to assess whether instructors use some interaction modifications more frequently than others, the proportion of total instructor interaction modification production that actually occurred for each category was compared to a random pattern of IM production using a chi-square, one sample test. The IM totals for each instructor are shown in Table II. Instructors' pattern of interaction

TABLE II
FREQUENCY OF IM PRODUCTION FOR INSTRUCTORS

	CONF	COMP	CLAR	SREP	OREP	EXP	TOTAL
Prof	2	11	1	10	9	18	51
TA	13	19	9	12	3	11	67
Tutor X	2	3	4	13	3	12	37
Tutor Y	5	32	4	11	8	17	77
Tutor Z	10	18	10	10	8	14	70
Total	32	83	28	56	31	72	302

modification production was significantly different than chance, $\chi^2 (20)=49.24$, $p<.05$. Each of the instructors' totals represent one hour of class or lab time. The instructors produced significantly more comprehension checks and expansions, and significantly fewer confirmation checks, clarification requests and other repetitions than would be expected by chance.

RESEARCH QUESTION #3. Are the interaction modification categories that the teachers use most frequently different from the interaction modification categories the students use?

In order to assess whether the pattern of IM production differed significantly between the instructors and the students the same data used in research questions #1 and #2 were compared using a chi-square test. The instructor totals represent one hour of class or lab time so the student totals were adjusted to represent an equal amount of time. The tutor totals were averaged to represent one tutor (this is also the case in Tables IV and VI). The frequency of the six interaction modifications used by instructors and students is shown in Table III. The pattern of interaction modification use differed significantly for the teachers and students, $\chi^2 (5) = 119.82$, $p<.05$. The instructors' production of clarification requests was significantly lower than students', and instructors' use of comprehension checks

and expansions was significantly higher than students'.

TABLE III

FREQUENCY OF IM PRODUCTION BY TEACHERS AND STUDENTS

	CONF	COMP	CLAR	SREP	OREP	EXP	TOTAL
Instructors	20.6	47.66	16	33.33	18.33	43.33	179.25
Students	20	0.66	61.66	6.33	10.66	1.33	100.64

Also, instructors used both more self-repetitions and other-repetitions than students.

RESEARCH QUESTION #4. Do student interaction modification frequencies vary with teaching situation? The main variable being examined in teaching situation is the experience/training of the instructor involved, which ranged from no experience or training, to a professor with 15 years of training and experience. The other variable present in this question is group size. There were four participants in each of the class discussions and two participants in each of the conversation lab tutorials.

In order to assess whether students' interaction modification frequencies vary according to the teaching situation, the proportion of total student IM production that actually occurred for each teaching situation was

compared to a random pattern of IM production, using a complex Chi-square test. It was found that the pattern of the students' interaction modification production varied significantly among the three teaching situations of a professor, a teaching assistant, and a peer tutor, $\chi^2(10)=19.17, p>.05$. Student IM totals by teaching situation are shown in Table IV.

TABLE IV
STUDENT IM PRODUCTION SHOWN BY TEACHING SITUATION

	CONF	COMP	CLAR	SREP	OREP	EXP	TOTAL
W/PROF	13	0	25	5	8	3	54
W/TA	23	0	24	6	7	1	61
W/TUTOR	11.33	0.66	45.33	2.66	5.66	0	65.64

In order to assess whether the students' IM production was affected by group size, each student's total IM production for both the class setting and the pair setting, as shown in Table V, was tested for statistical significance using a chi-square test. The totals in the "w/class" column were adjusted for both amount of time and number of participants (i.e. opportunity to participate) in order to be comparable with the "w/tutor" column. It was

found that yes, the quantity of IM production was significantly different by group size, $\chi^2 (2)=11.62$, $p<.05$. It should also be noted that there was a great deal of individual variation among the students on this point.

TABLE V
TOTAL STUDENT IM PRODUCTION BY GROUP SIZE

	w/Class	w/Tutor	Total
Student A	3.75	92.0	95.75
Student B	6.75	29.0	35.75
Student C	18.25	76.0	94.25
Total	28.75	197.0	225.75

RESEARCH QUESTION #5. Are the interaction modifications that the professor, the teaching assistants, and the peer tutors use different from one another?

In order to assess whether there is a significant difference in the interaction modification use between the different types of instructors, the proportion of total interaction modification use by each instructor type was compared to a random pattern of production. The observed frequencies of IM production for each instructor type are shown in Table VI. It was found that there is a significant difference among the three types of instructors in their use of interaction modifications, $\chi^2 (10)=20.69$,

$p < .05$. In the present study, the professor used 51 total IMs, the teaching assistant produced 67 IMs, and the peer tutors produced a mean total of 61.25 IMs. The professor used significantly fewer interaction modifications than either the teaching assistant or the peer tutors. The professor and the teaching assistant were

TABLE VI
FREQUENCY OF IM PRODUCTION BY INSTRUCTOR TYPE

	CONF	COMP	CLAR	SREP	OREP	EXP	TOTAL
PROF	2	11	1	10	9	18	51
TA	14	19	9	12	3	11	67
TUTOR (mean)	5.6	17.66	6	11.33	6.33	14.33	61.25
TOTAL	20.6	47.66	16	33.33	18.33	43.33	179.25

significantly different in several categories of IM production. Specifically, the professor used significantly fewer confirmation checks and clarification requests, and significantly more other-repetitions and expansions than the teaching assistant. The teaching assistant's pattern of interaction modification use is more similar to the students' pattern than to either the professor's or the conversation tutors' patterns of IM production.

QUALITATIVE RESULTS

RESEARCH QUESTION #6. How do the students feel about speaking in class and other academic settings? Do they share any common preferences of classroom teaching style that seem most effective or comfortable for them?

In order to assess the students' feelings and opinions about speaking in class and in other academic settings, the researcher has included as quotations any remarks on this topic that the students included in their dialogue journals. The comments are listed by student. Note: comments were quoted directly without changing grammar or spelling.

Student A (Korean female): "In Korean, the teaching is similar but students never call their professor's first name. It is very rude action and impossible."

"My experience is same with [student C]. In Korea school my English teacher taught only grammar. Grammar reading and writing. Therefore, I did not like English. I thought English is bore and my pronounce and speech is not good. When I speak a loud or talking with American I am nervous, because many American don't understand my pronunciation. When I talking with international students they are understand my pronunciation and me too, but American don't understand."

"I have many international friends, Chinese, Japanese also American. I have just a few American friends, they are my tutors and I know many international students like

[lists nine names]. They are, include American friends, very kind to me."

"I think many American cannot understand international student's pronouncement. But among international student we understand each other. I do not know that reason but my feeling is that. When I talk with [student B], I am comfortable because we are same level, I think, and my tutor who is a Filipina."

Student B (Japanese female): "Japanese English education is not good. Japanese students think that we have to study English for exam, so teachers teach grammar and they don't teach how to speak English. Many Japanese students know grammar well, but they can't speak English. Now, some students want to enter American university and there are many Japanese students in American university. American English education little bit changed that speaking is important."

Student C (Korean male): "I mean from middle school English is proper form course. But I didn't study English so now my English grammar is bad and I can't express very well in English. Most Korean people grammar is very well. Korea have some problem because we learn just grammar no talking, no conversation. I think [name of university] teaching is more than Korea. I like meet tutor because if I meet tutor I'm happy. I'm not worry about English. I mean another course is give me some care. If I don't pass the exam I can't move C level. So, I like conversation tutor."

"When I went to junior high school and high school I learned just grammar for university. I mean this is important thing for university. If I want to go to university I have to pass English also. So, we learned only grammar and we have listening exam for university but this is not for improve English. It is just for university also. We learned English words but my English teacher told me many Americans don't use this word so, I asked my teacher why we learned this word and he said if you go to America it will be OK, but you have to test English for university. So, you have to learn it, that is why.

"[university name] have three teacher reading, speaking, grammar but in Korea we had just one English teacher. If we go to Korea university maybe we will get more teacher but now is just one teacher. Also it's big problem. Other class here is good but sometimes I got stress because the teacher speak is so fast I couldn't understand but I believe it will be O.K."

"When I learned about English I didn't have any chances because I didn't have foreigners friends but my cousin live in NY, America so sometimes they visited my house during summer vacation or some celebration. They speak English very well because they children were born in America. Hence, I could speak English with them. Absolutely it was really hard for me when I first came to the U.S. I couldn't do anything. My feeling was freezed and I couldn't listen anything. So, my mind was oppressed but I believe I can improve my English."

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

This chapter will focus on the research questions that guided this study. It will include a discussion of the results in reference to each of the six research questions. In an observational study such as this, care must be taken not to over interpret or overgeneralize results. The discussion will address the limitations of this study and suggestions for future research, and then conclude with the possible implications for second language acquisition and applications for classroom language teaching.

FINDINGS

RESEARCH QUESTION #1.

Do the students, as a group, use some interaction modifications more frequently than others? If so, which ones?

Yes, the students showed a pattern of IM production that was significantly different than a random pattern. As a group, they produced significantly more confirmation checks and clarification requests and significantly fewer comprehension checks and expansions. This result is generally what the researcher expected to find and supports

the results of other previous studies (Long & Sato, 1983; Pica & Doughty, 1986). Confirmation checks and clarification requests, by their nature, would be used by the interlocutor who has either less linguistic competence or less information to contribute to the discussion. Likewise, comprehension checks and expansions tend to be used more frequently by the interlocutor with more linguistic competence and or more information. For example, it would be difficult, in most cases, for a beginning L2 learner to notice any missing semantic information in a NS's speech let alone expand on it.

RESEARCH QUESTION #2.

Do the instructors, as a group, use some interaction modifications more frequently than others? If so, which ones?

Yes, the instructors showed a pattern of IM production that was significantly different from a random pattern. As a group, the instructors produced significantly more comprehension checks and expansions, and significantly fewer clarification requests and other repetitions. The instructors also produced significantly more self-repetitions. This pattern is consistent with the literature on teacher talk. Here again, the instructors have more linguistic competence and, in most cases, more information, so it makes sense that they are the ones who would be making sure the other interlocutor has understood

them or would be filling in incomplete information in the way of expansions.

RESEARCH QUESTION #3.

Are the interaction modification categories that the teachers use most frequently different from the interaction modification categories the students use?

Yes, the students and instructors showed very different patterns in their IM production. This is generally what the researcher expected to find and supports the findings of the Long and Sato (1983) study that compared six ESL teachers' speech in class with informal NS/NNS conversations outside of class. The results in the current study were compared to a random pattern while the results in the other study were compared with NS baseline data but the two patterns were strikingly similar. According to Long and Sato this pattern indicates a transmission model of education with most of the flow of information being one-way. Long (1980) points out that conversations involving NNSs produce forms, such as comprehension checks and clarification checks, that do not appear to any significant degree when only NSs are involved.

There is a general consensus among researchers and methodologists, both, that teachers talk significantly more than their students (they generally contribute around 70% of the speech in a classroom) and that they talk to NNSs differently than other NSs do in informal conversations

outside of class. Long and Sato (1983), in comparing teacher-talk with foreigner-talk found that statements accounted for most of the teacher-talk (54 %), followed by questions (35%) and imperatives (11%). In foreigner-talk conversations the percentages were statements (33%), questions (66%) and imperatives (only 1%). Other studies have shown considerable variation from teacher to teacher and also class to class. Although the present study did not analyze total amount of speech by words or turns taken, it is clear from looking at the total interaction modifications that the teachers were using more IMs than the students. Out of 10 transcripts, there were three in which the student produced more IMs than the instructor and those all occurred in the pair setting with their tutors. Although their tutors were all native speakers, they were peers and the nature of a more equal relationship is reflected here.

Cook (1991) describes the COLT (Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching) system for describing classroom events and communicative features and some of the studies that have used this system of analysis. She points out that the supposedly communicative class is often less different from the conventional class than might be supposed.

RESEARCH QUESTION #4.

Do interaction modification frequencies vary with teaching situation for the students? One variable is the

group size and the other is the training/experience of the instructor.

Yes, the students' IM production varied significantly by the teaching situation. The basic pattern and types remained the same, with high confirmation checks and clarification requests and low comprehension checks and expansions, but the students did produce significantly different quantities of IMs . As some might say, the three teaching situations appear to be linguistically "real" or distinct. The quantifiably real situations also seemed real to the students according to their journal comments. In the dialogue journals the students reflected being more at ease with their tutors and the teaching assistant. They seemed to feel less pressure, both from the instructor type and the academic setting, and instead felt more like equals (see Research Question #6 for more detail).

This result supports the Porter (1986) study about NNS/NNS interaction and using advanced learners in the classroom if the TA could be considered similar to an advanced learner. The results of Porter's study suggest that learners communicating with other learners in the classroom can have certain advantages over speaking with NSs and that advanced learners can provide very good comprehensible input, although it may not always be sociolinguistically appropriate.

RESEARCH QUESTION #5.

Are the interaction modifications that the professor,

the teaching assistant, and the peer tutors use different from one another?

Yes, the three instructor types produced significantly different interaction modifications. The greatest difference occurred between the professor and the teaching assistant. In fact, the TA's interaction modification pattern was more like that of the students than that of the professor. The TA produced significantly more confirmation checks and clarification requests than did the professor or the American peer tutors. It is possible this could mostly be due to the NS/NNS difference.

Task type was probably also a factor in these results since none of the three settings had a task that required two-way exchange of information. All of the tasks included in the study were naturally occurring conversations that took place during normal lessons. None of the lessons/tasks were contrived for the purposes of this study. It is possible that the IM production of the professor was simply affected by details of classroom management and the tasks at hand such as the introduction and explanation of a new unit of study. For a brief description of the content of each class or lab time, see Appendix D.

Although assessment of the degree of communicative teaching style was not part of the initial plan, the researcher believed, based on classroom observation, that the professor had a communicative teaching style. The fact that she used a TA and required her students to meet with a

tutor seemed to indicate her desire to provide her students with a variety of academic settings and interlocutors, both NSs and NNSs. Still, Pica (1994) observes about classroom interaction, "Research on classroom interaction has already shown why there is so little negotiation in the language classroom context, much of it related to matters of teacher and student power, to traditions in language teaching, and to expectations about the language classroom." (p. 521)

Again, in the Porter (1986) study that examined NNS/NNS conversations with speakers from two different proficiency levels, she found that in several respects learners seemed to benefit more from talking to other learners than with native speakers. It is possible that the student-like pattern of the TA was due to the fact that she is a NNS, but according to Porter (1986) she could be an ideal type of interlocutor providing a good source of comprehensible input. The role of the NS teacher is still important though, in that the results also reflected that the students were not able to provide each other with sociolinguistically appropriate input.

Pica and Long (1986) conducted an experiment in which they compared the linguistic and conversational performance of experienced and inexperienced ESL teachers. They found that experienced teachers used more other-repetitions than inexperienced teachers did and that the inexperienced teachers used more confirmation checks and clarification requests than the experienced teachers, indicating that the experienced teachers tended more toward a one-way flow of

information and communication. The data in the present study seem to support the results of Pica and Long (1986).

RESEARCH QUESTION #6.

How do the students feel about speaking in class and other academic settings? Do they share any common preferences of classroom teaching style that seem most effective or comfortable for them?

Margaret Mead (1970), the noted anthropologist, describes a culture's educational system as fitting into one of three categories: postfigurative societies in which people learn from wise elders, cofigurative societies in which they learn from their equals, and prefigurative societies in which they learn from their juniors. Cook (1991) applied these concepts to the language classroom and suggested that many cultures (like the Korean and Japanese in the present study) view education as postfigurative and see the classroom as a place where the wise teacher imparts knowledge to the students. They are comfortable with a traditional and what we would call transmission model with a primarily one-way flow of information. When these students are transplanted into a cofigurative (i.e. American) educational system where the teacher designs opportunities for the students to learn from each other through group and pair work, it can produce many conflicting feelings.

Some examples of these conflicting feelings were expressed by the students in the present study in their

dialogue journals. In general, all three of the students preferred the style of their current ESL program, with its emphasis on speaking and listening skills along with grammar and writing, over their earlier foreign language learning experiences in their home countries that just emphasized grammar for the sake of passing university entrance exams. So on the one hand, they stated that they prefer the more communicative and less formal style of the American ESL classroom, but on the other hand they all expressed some anxiety or reservation about speaking in class or with other NSs. Student A (the Korean female) in summarizing the difference between Korean and American education commented that in Korea, students never call a professor by his or her first name. "It is very rude action and impossible", she said. She also referred to feeling nervous when speaking aloud to Americans because they didn't understand her pronunciation. Student C (the Korean male) made a very revealing comment on his feelings about speaking in class versus the conversation lab with his tutor. He said, "I like meet tutor because if I meet tutor I'm happy. I'm not worry about English. I mean another course is give me some care. If I don't pass the exam I can't move C level. So, I like conversation tutor." Student A also referred to her tutors in a positive way and said she preferred conversations outside of class to speaking in class. She said, "I think many American cannot understand international student's pronounceation. But among international student we understand each other. I do

not know that reason but feeling is that. When I talk with [student B], I am comfortable because we are same level, I think, and my tutor who is a Filipina." This reflection lends good intuitive support for NNS-NNS group and pair work.

LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

The first and probably most obvious limitation of this study is the small subject sample that was available for observation. The sample might have been expanded by taking students from several different classes or conducting audio recordings outside of class; however, the desire was for an intact class group in a naturally occurring classroom setting. This unusually small class group was the only one available at the time that was appropriate and willing to participate. The researcher did realize though that this would make the dynamics of the classroom more like that of a small-group than a traditional class. More speech samples were collected than were originally in the research plan in an attempt to compensate for the small number of subjects. However, even though the results of the study may be interesting and even statistically significant, they are not highly generalizable because the sample of teachers and students was so small.

Another limitation of this study is issues surrounding inter-rater reliability and the relatively high level of inference involved in coding the transcripts for the

interaction modifications. Some of these challenges were noted in chapter three. The researcher tried to be careful and consistent, but was surely affected by having been present and observing all of the class sessions. Also as mentioned before, the researcher noticed some patterns and styles associated with particular individuals after transcribing many hours of tape and then reading the transcripts several times. Hopefully the effect of this is a positive one, but it is certainly an advantage that others reading a small section of transcript in isolation would not have. One solution to this problem would have been to have the reader for inter-rater reliability go over a larger sample of the data or to let her listen to the audio-tapes while she read the transcript. Another possible solution would have been to train the rater more thoroughly, working together with the researcher and some samples that the researcher had already coded. For example, there was more discrepancy between confirmation checks and clarification requests than any other categories. This could have possibly been cleared up by additional training. Other researchers have done this in a back-and-forth fashion such that both the researcher and the rater work together taking alternate turns with the data until they reach a high level of agreement. A third possible solution might have been to operationalize the terms of the interaction modifications in a different way that allowed less room for inference or also to use some additional methods to quantify and analyze the data in more

concrete terms such as calculating quantities of speech by number of words, turns, or communication units.

One aspect of this study that was not addressed was the effects of ethnicity and gender. Were ethnicity or gender responsibly for variation in this study? There have been several previous studies on both of these variables

Sato (1981) did a study with Asian students looking for effects of ethnicity on classroom interaction. She observed and recorded two classes of university students in intermediate ESL courses, and their teachers. What she found was that there were indeed significant differences between the Asian and non-Asian students in regards to the distribution of talk in their ESL classes. The Asians took significantly fewer speaking turns overall than their non-Asian classmates. They self-selected (speaking without being called upon) less often and they were also called upon by their teachers less frequently. The results suggest the Asians felt a stronger need to receive permission before speaking. Sato reminds the reader the study should be viewed as preliminary, but suggests that teachers could make explicit suggestions about appropriate classroom discourse and give permission for unbid self-selection during classroom discussions.

Gass and Varonis (1986) conducted a study on the differences in the ways men and women interact in conversation in same-gender and opposite-gender pairs. The men appeared to dominate in conversations with women in ways that provided chances for producing comprehensible

output, whereas women initiated more meaning negotiations than men in the mixed-gender dyads. The results suggest that each used the conversation in different ways. The authors claimed this gave clear implications for the advantages of different kinds of paired situations depending on the purpose of the interaction.

In the present study, the Korean male was clearly the dominant student in the full group settings. He produced an average of 18.25 IMs in each of the group class sessions while the two females produced an average of 4 and 6.5 IMs. However if one looks at the students one-on-one with their tutors there is a very different picture. Student C (the Korean male) produced an average of 38 IMs in a 30 minute period with his tutor. This is a little more than twice what he produced in the group setting, but since there were fewer interlocutors that might be expected. Student A (the Japanese female) increased her average IMs from 4 with the full class to 46 with her tutor and student B (the Korean female) produced an average of 6.5 IMs in the full class in contrast to an average of 13.5 IMs with her tutor. But even though these are interesting comparisons, there were too many variables such as group size, task type, individual personality, and instructor style to be able to tell if gender or ethnicity had any kind of significant effect on the amount or type of IM production.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Because of the limitations discussed above, this study might best be considered as a pilot study. If the three education/instructor settings really are "linguistically real" or distinct, then it would certainly warrant further study of an experimental nature to help isolate some of the variables or to investigate the link between interaction and comprehension as in Ellis et al. (1994). One way this could be approached would be to control the task type and group size and then do a partial replication of Ellis et al. using student/instructor dyads with each of the three types of instructors. The situations could also be controlled for ethnicity and gender.

Another suggestion would be to use this same data, or other similarly gathered data but analyze it in some additional ways such as using communicative acts as in the Cathcart (1986) study or analyze the existing data looking at number and length of turns, complexity of speech involved, etc.

More research and observation could be done about the effects of using NNS as tutors and teaching assistants in American University settings. Bailey (1984) published a report on foreign TAs in the United States, but did not include the dynamics of using foreign TAs in ESL course programs. There seems to be a lot of potential here and not much has been written about this aspect of ESL education.

IMPLICATIONS FOR SLA

Once again, nothing can be shown from this study that the interaction modifications and negotiating for meaning that took place caused either comprehension or acquisition. The purpose of this study was to describe some features of the interaction in one classroom and through that to contribute to the growing depth of knowledge and understanding about the types of classroom interaction that facilitate interaction and hopefully acquisition as well.

Pica (1994) summarizes some of the research on negotiation and reminds the reader that in addition to what negotiation can do for L2 learning, it is important to keep in mind what it has not been able to do. She asserts that, "no one experience, activity, or endowment can account for all of L2 learning," and so it shouldn't be counted on as the "be-all and end-all of L2 learning." (pg. 517)

APPLICATION FOR THE LANGUAGE CLASSROOM

Based on current research, there is a sound basis for communicative language teaching and an emphasis on interaction in the classroom. Overall the results of this particular study indicate that the students produced more interaction modifications, by far, in dyads with their conversation tutors and then with the TA. This could suggest to teachers that when quantity, or opportunity to

negotiate meaning, is the goal, then the use of tutors or advanced NNSs could help accomplish that goal.

Although the students did vary their quantity of negotiation among the three instructors, they did not significantly vary the pattern of IM production over the three situations. This could suggest that they did not have equal amounts of meaningful information to contribute in any of the three settings. This could be due to the tasks in that they were all naturally occurring discussions. What this suggests to the researcher is that meaningful two-way conversations may not be spontaneous in everyday classroom dynamics but that teachers can compensate for that by overtly teaching culture and conversational strategies, and by incorporating a variety of interlocutors into their lesson plans.

Rivers (1994) asserts that

Authentic interaction, in or out of the classroom, depends on human relations with groups. It requires that individuals seek to understand and appreciate other individuals--not manipulating or directing them or deciding how they can or will learn, but encouraging and drawing them out (educating them) by allowing for their individual, and sometimes culturally determined, preferences in how they will learn (p.87).

One intriguing question asked by VanPatten (1987) is whether teachers should *require* all their learners to be active contributors to classroom interaction. He asserts that the learner's level of interlanguage development should determine, in part, the extent to which they should be expected to participate verbally in the classroom (see

also Ellis et al., 1994). At first glance, this assertion may sound contradictory to all of the attention paid to classroom interaction. Instead, it seems that VanPatten is encouraging language educators to have a sound theoretical basis for their teaching decisions and to always remember just how complex and multifaceted is second language acquisition. Each individual learns in a slightly different style and the effects of one's personality, learning style, and culture are quite profound.

The results of this study point to the importance of teacher decision making and being proactive in setting up activities and providing opportunities for learners to interact and negotiate meaning with one another and with the teacher. When teachers, like the one in the present study, are willing to relinquish some of the control of the classroom interaction it can open up new and creative options for NS and NNS interlocutors to provide meaningful input for their students. The researcher believes the variety of input and interaction styles of the three instructor types in the present study were positive for the students.

REFERENCES

- Allwright, D. & Bailey, K. (1991). Focus on the language classroom: an introduction to classroom research for language teachers. Cambridge, Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.
- Bailey, K. (1985). Classroom-centered research on language teaching and learning. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), Beyond basics: Issues and research in TESOL (pp.96-121). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Cathcart, R. (1986). Situational differences and the Sampling of young children's school language. In R. Day (Ed.), Talking to Learn: Conversation in second language acquisition (pp. 118-142). Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.
- Chaudron, C. (1985). Intake: On Models and Methods for Discovering Learners' Processing of Input. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 7, 1-14.
- Cook, Vivian. (1991). Second language learning and language teaching. London, England: Edward Arnold Publisher.
- Duff, P. (1986). Another look at interlanguage talk: Taking task to task. In R. Day (Ed.) Talking to Learn: Conversation in second language acquisition (pp.147-181). Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.
- Ellis, R. (1985). Understanding second language acquisition. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1990). Instructed second language acquisition. Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- Ellis, R., Tanaka, Y. & Tamazaki, A. (1994). Classroom interaction, comprehension, and the acquisition of L2 word meanings. Language Learning, 44, 449-491.
- Freed, B. F. (1980). Talking to foreigners versus talking to children: Similarities and differences. In R.C. Scarcella & S.D. Krashen (Eds.), Research in SLA: Selected Papers of the Los Angeles Research Forum. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.

- Gaies, S. (1980). Learner feedback: A taxonomy of intake control. In On TESOL '80--Building bridges: Research and practice in teaching English as a second language (pp.88-100). Washington, D.C.: TESOL.
- Gass, S. & Varonis, E. (1986). Sex differences in NNS/NNS interactions. In R. Day (Ed.), Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition (pp. 327-351). Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.
- Gass, S. & Selinker, L. (1994). Second language acquisition: An introductory course. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gass, S. (1997). Input, interaction, and the second language learner. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Guthrie, K. (1983). Intake, communication, and second language teaching. Second Language Learning, 4.
- Kelch, K. (1985). Modified input as an aid to comprehension. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 7,1.
- Krashen, S. (1982). Principles and practice in second language acquisition. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Krashen, S. (1985). The input hypothesis: Issues and implications. New York, NY: Longman Group.
- Larson-Freeman, D. (1991). Second language acquisition research: Staking out the territory. TESOL Quarterly, 25, 315-350.
- Lee, J. & VanPatten, B. (1995). Making Communicative Language Teaching Happen. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Long, M.H. (1980). Inside the 'black box: Methodological issues in classroom research on language learning. Language Learning, 30, 1-42.
- Long, M.H. (1983a). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation in the second language classroom. In M. Clarke & J. Handscombe (Eds.), On TESOL '82: Pacific Perspectives on Language Learning and Teaching (pp. 207-228). Washington, DC: TESOL.
- Long, M.H. (1983). Linguistic and conversational adjustments to non-native speakers. Studies in Second language Acquisition, 5, 177-19

- Long, M.H. & Sato, C. (1983). Classroom foreigner talk discourse: Forms and functions of teachers' questions. In Seliger & Long (Eds.), Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Mead, M. (1970). Culture and commitment. London: Bodley Head.
- Pica, T. & Doughty, C. (1985a). Input and interaction in the communicative language classroom: A comparison of teacher-fronted and group activities. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), Input in second language acquisition (pp.115-132). Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.
- Pica, T. (1994). Research on negotiation: What does it reveal about second-language learning conditions, processes, and outcomes? Language Learning, 44, 3, 493-527.
- Pica, T. & Doughty, C. (1985b). The role of group work in classroom second language acquisition. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 7, 238-248.
- Pica, T. & Long, M. (1986). The linguistic and conversational performance of experienced and inexperienced teachers. In R. Day (Ed.) Talking to Learn: Conversation in second language acquisition. (pp. 85-98). Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.
- Pica, T., Young, R. & Doughty, C. (1994). The impact of interaction on comprehension. In James & Barasch (Eds.), Beyond the monitor model (pp. 98-122). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Porter, P.A. (1986). How learners talk to each other: Input and interaction in task-centered discussions. In R. Day (Ed.), Talking to Learn: Conversation in second language acquisition (pp. 200-222). Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.
- Richard-Amato, P. (1996). Making it happen: Interaction in the second language classroom. White Plains, NY: Addison-Wesley.
- Rivers, W.M. (1994). Comprehension and production: The interactive duo. In James & Barasch (Eds.), Beyond the monitor model (pp.71-97). Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle.

- Roulon, K. & McCreary, J. (1986). Negotiation of content: Teacher-fronted and small group interaction. In R. Day (Ed.), Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition (pp.182-199). Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.
- Sato, C. (1981). Ethnic styles in classroom discourse. In M. Hines & W. Rutherford (Eds.), On TESOL '81. Washington, DC: TESOL.
- Sato, C. (1986). Conversation and interlanguage development: Rethinking the connection. In R. Day (Ed.), Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition, (pp.23-48). Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.
- Scarcella, R.C. & Krashen, S.D. (Eds.) (1980). Research in SLA: Selected Papers of the Los Angeles Research Forum. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.
- Schinke-Llano, L. (1986). Foreigner talk in joint cognitive activities. In R. Day (Ed.), Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition (pp.99-117). Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.) Input in second language acquisition. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Van Patten, B., Dvorak, T., & Lee, J. (Eds.) (1987). Foreign language learning: A research perspective. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.

APPENDIX A

SAMPLE TRANSCRIPTION

APPENDIX A

Tape #5 Student B with Tutor Y, side B 2/25/97
"going over homework - how to write a business letter"

T Do you have a speech that is due?
B No--No.
T No speech?
B No, uhuh. I have - maybe
T Maybe you have - (laughs)
B I'm not sure. Ah, no.
T Do you have some place you write down all of your assignments?
B No.
T No?
B Maybe this week, no speech//
T So you have to write a business letter?
B Yeah.
T Just to learn how? / or-
B Huh?
T Just to learn how to write it?
B Yeah.
T Who are you going to write it to?
B Um, any - anybody. // Give me something.
T OK, um, you had your bank statement?
B Yeah.
T Use that. It will have the address.//
B So-
T Now does the name have to be the company name?
B yeah.
T Ok, then. So just copy that. // Uhuh.
B OK, // What does P.O. mean?
T P.O.?
B Uhuh.
T Post office box.
B Ohh.
T So this is post office, that's box. Many times on your letters you might end up with, no you won't end up with a post office box.
B Hmm, yeah.
T You'll end up with an apartment number. /// And probably in here it will tell you the name of the person you would write to-
B Hmm.
T in the bottom of your letter. //
B Hmm, yeah. // Do you have-[one word unintelligible]?
T You wouldn't write to the bank itself, because that is the organization-
B uhuhm.
T -but probably on your letter it says a person's name at the bottom-

B yeah.
T -and that is the person you would write to. // So open your statement. I won't look. I'll close my eyes. (both laugh - paper rustling)
T Just tear. / Does it say to - Ok, see how they have done this?
B Uhuhm.
T it doesn't tell you who the person is you would write to. You make up a name then. Say dear Mr. Jones.
B Jones spelled -?
T J-o-n-e-s. // Now why would you write to someone at a bank?
B Umm -- I have no idea. (both laugh)
T Well-
B I'm not sure about business letter so-
T A business letter, OK a personal is just to a friend.
B Yeah-
T So it can be about anything. A business letter is normally, you have something very important that you need to talk to them about.
B Uhuhm.
T Maybe um, you're writing to - I don't know, a toy company because a toy that you bought your child is broke when it should not break. So you say "Dear Sir or Madam. Pretend that you do not know who it is. Um, I bought your toy such and such and within a week it broke, period. And then you will explain what your child did with it, what it said on the box. Maybe the box said it had a five year warranty which means it will last for five years, well it is supposed to last for five years. You say it had a five year warranty and what you want from them. Maybe you want them to replace it. // Or maybe if it is a bank, on your statement you would say, " I got my statement yesterday and I noticed that you had- um- added a thousand dollars that I did not put in. That'd be nice (both laugh), and so you stated the problem. Then you say / so you say um, on you say maybe the date that it says it has been put in and you say, maybe it says what it is for , or it says a check number if you have checks. Say, this number on this day I did not put in and go on to explain that, or maybe-
B uhuh
T -you put in some money that they did not count all of. So you put that and then at the very end you say um, something about them getting back to you and giving you information as to what happened. //
B So how can I write introduction?
T Well, what do you want your letter to be about?
B Umm--ohh.
T Maybe you should not write it to the bank. Maybe you

should write it to another company.

B Yeah.

T OK, just erase this part here /// What kind of company maybe you would buy--what is a company you might buy something from? // It does not have to be a real company but what kind of thing like maybe a CD player-

B Ohh-

T -or maybe CD

B Yes, a CD player.

T OK, so maybe its - you make up a name and then at the end say electronics.

B So, um-

T Maybe Smith Electronics or Jones Electronics (both laugh) I don't know, you just make up a name. //

B Sony is-?

T You could do that.

B Sony is -ny?

T N-y. Then you'd say electronics at the end.

B Electronics?

T Electronics. E-l-e-c-t-r-o-n-

B i-?

T i-c-s. And I would change some of the um, this part here. Maybe put box 5748 or something.

B Where?

T Here is this part just change this number. Put in a different number, make up a number. / OK, and then change the town, make up a town. //

B Uhh, I don't understand.

T Just make up a name of a - that could be a town.

B Give me an example.

T Um, you could say um, Rocky Road, which is actually ice cream but. Or maybe there is a town called um, Jamesten, um something like that, I mean just anything like even an apple or name a fruit, just name a town after it, or banana. And then change the state, well you don't have to change the state.

B Hmm.//

T Maybe California, C-A. and change the zip code

B (laughs)

T Just write some numbers. A zip code is normally- five numbers.

B Uhuh.

T OK, and so you are writing to Mr. Jones of Sony Electronics. What would the problem be?

B Umm.

T What is a problem you might have with a CD player?

B I bou-, I bought a CD player but it-it doesn't work..

T OK, maybe you could say I bought a CD player, a Sony CD player

B Yes. A Sony CD player?

T A Sony CD player, yes. // but it will not work.

B It--?

T It does not work, maybe./ Now put a comma. What do you want from them? Do you want them to replace it?

B Huh?

T no, you don't write that! (both laugh) Do you want them to replace it or give you your money back?

B Umm, I want another one.

T OK, so you want them to replace it-

B Yeah.

T - to exchange it. You say, I hope / that you-

B What?

T That you / will exchange it or replace it or send me another one.

B -you will-

T You can either say you will send me another one or you can say you will exchange it-

B Hmm.

T -or you can say you will replace it.

B You will send-

T OK

B send--another one?

T send me another one.

B -nother one?

T uhuh.

B why [??2 words unintelligible] - / next is body?

T OK, so you start a new paragraph,

B uhuh

T and in this paragraph you will say, maybe when you bought it. You will say maybe what happened, why it wouldn't play maybe um it just did not play from the beginning.

B Uhuhm.

T You will say, maybe, that you took it to the store and that the store said you had to talk to these people.

B Uhuhm.

T Maybe, um, you will say-you will explain that, at the very end you will explain that it said that it had a five year warranty or a ten year warranty which says that if something happens in those ten years that they have to exchange it-

B Uhuh.

T -and so you will put all those things together, you will take everything that was wrong with it. You will explain what was wrong, how it was wrong, what they should do. //

B Um, do I need to skip a line? This one?

T Wherever you start a new paragraph and you start with a capital letter and its just regular.

B Hmm, I bought-I bought a CD player um February 4th.

T From what store? ///

B Hmm, hmm- //

T OK, from what store?
B Umm.
T Just make up a name-make up a name like you did Apple, find some kind of a name of a fruit, and say from Banana Department Store.
B On February 4 in-in?
T from. yeah.
B From. Um, / banana you spell it b-a-n-a?
T B-a-n-a-n-a.
B Oh, banana store.
T Uhuh. In what town? Say in -- you can say in Portland, Oregon, or like in Beaverton which is closer or even in Newberg.
B Yeah. In Newberg.
T Yeah, and the State.
B In - in Oregon.
T Yeah. Actually you just put Newberg comma Oregon. // OK, then you will say maybe, when I got it home this happened and explain what happened when you got it home.
B Ohh. // First I put-put a CD in CD player and no sound-
T OK, so you say, when I got home-
B -I got home-
T Uhuhm, and just what you said before.
B comma, // I put a CD in CD player
T -in THE player.
B in the player
T -works.
B But no sound is OK?-
T Uhuhm. But there was no sound. What did-? Period.
B Hmm?
T Period. What did you do after that?
B uh, uh.
T After you tried that CD, did you try another CD?
B Umm.
T Or did you stop and try another CD another day?
B After I tried-I tried to put another CD-
T Then - works.
B I tried to pl-
T -tried to play. / e-d.
B tr-i-e-
T tried? i-e-d. I thought you already had the -i.
B Tried-tried to
T to play, or to listen to
B to play another CD?
T Uhuhm. But, and then you will say what happened
B But there was no sound.
T There was STILL -
B There was still no sound.

T Because still just means the action continued. // OK, after there was no sound what did you do then? Did you try to take it back to the store or did you write them the letter?

B I write the letter.

T OK, say, you don't put that ,you say maybe you start a new paragraph.

B Oh, conclusion?

T Uh, not yet. Just about. And in this paragraph maybe you say you- there is a five year warranty-

B Oh.

T -or because - since I just bought this I feel, or you say, well it's kind of a conclusion.

B Uhuh.

T You say there is a five year warran, maybe there is a five year, five, ten, twenty year, lifetime warranty- I don't know. But warranty just means that there is a guarantee that it will work for so many years.

B Uhuhm.

T Say, um, through no fault of my own or say um and the CD player did not work because I did something wrong. It did not- did not not work. Um, but say why you think that you should get a new CD player.

B The CD player was a very old one.

T Uh, is it defective?

B Defective?

T Do you know that word?

B No, I don't.

T Umm, defective means that it is not how it should be, there is something wrong with it.

B Ohh.

T Um, a CD player that does not play music is defective, but if you have a ball, like a volleyball-

B Uhuh.

T -you know volleyball? and it has a hole in it, it is defective. There is something wrong that makes it not work. or if um you have a pair of shoes that the first day you wear them they fall apart, they are defective.

B Hmm.

T I mean, and if you had a car, like a big car and something maybe um, there was a hole in the gas tank where there should not be a hole, that would be defective. There's just something wrong with it.

B Yeah, I see. After I wrote this letter, how can I write this?

T How can you write which?

B Uh, After this sentence.

T After that sentence? What do you want to write after that sentence?

B So, I wrote this letter --

T All you have to do - all you have really left / is, you see you wrote a business complaint. Your last paragraph should say why you think you should get a new CD player and explain that you hope they will honor or respect their warranty, if they have one and just, I mean she says here ask for a / ask for or announce action. Thank the reader.

B Uhuhm.

T So you maybe say, because there or since there is a warranty I would appreciate a new CD player sent to my address. And you list your address. Thank you for your time, or something, but not that short. You will have to add something more to explain why you should get a new CD player, like because the CD player did not work, etc.

B Yeah, / So what -- I want , I want new-new CD player.

T Maybe, I hope you will replace, or I hope you will send me another CD player because // In a business type of letter it is better to say I hope-

B yeah.

T -instead of I want. Because I want is more "right now, give it to me" and I hope is more "please".

B Uhuhm. I hope /

T That you

B That you send

T will send

B Sent or send?

T Send. S-e-n-d. Send what?

B Send another new CD?

T Uhuh.

B How about uh, you will send a?, send a new CD player.

T You have to have 'a' if you are talking about one.

B Oh.

T You could say another which is one word. But if you talk about -if you want to say just this CD player, you say a CD player.

B OK. / Because-

T Because is the next - is probably the next word you would use. You would say because this and this and this and this. But don't put this, this, this. Say because-

B -the CD player was broken.

T That works. // Was broken.

B b-r-o-k-e-n.

T Ok, yeah. You said broke. Period. Or you could say comma and there was a five year warranty which means that you-they have to give you one. If its in five years they *have* to give you a new one.

B Ohh.

T So in that case you put a comma and say and there

B there

T Was
 B Just was?
 T There, there, there, there.
 B There.
 T Yeah, yeah. a five year, fifteen year, ten year, seven year, a
 B Five year-
 T a-a is very important.
 B [unintelligible]
 T uhuh. Then you say five year - warranty
 B Five years or year?
 T Five year.
 B Five year warran--
 T w-a-
 B a
 T r-r
 B R-r-?
 T R-r (laughs) e-n-t-y, I think.
 B n-t-y.
 T And then you put a period. And then you just go down a little bit and this is kind of the next spot, like you would go down one line and make both sides smaller and say thank you for your prompt service, which means your fast service;
 B yeah.
 T or thank you for your time; or thank you for something. So you just go down one line-
 B This line?
 T This line, yeah, start about there.
 B Thank you -
 T for
 B for your time?
 T Uhuhm.
 B Is it OK? Thank you for your time?
 T Uhuhm. Yeah. That's fine. Then you put a period. Then you go down and say sincerely--go down one line--no two lines-
 B uhuh.
 T And you start sincerely about here.
 B Here. Here?
 T Yeah. That's fine. Sin- s-i-n, which sincerely just means good-bye.
 B Ohh. I didn't know that.
 T It um , if you are sincere means you are honest kind of, and honest slash serious kind of both, and so this is just a way of saying good-bye formally.
 B Hmm.
 T To a friend you would not write sincerely.
 B Yeah.
 T You would write bye or see ya later.
 B uhuh.

T But to a formal letter you write sincerely. comma, then you leave a space and go down to about there and just write your name, print it.

B Yeah, um my name or?

T Uhuh, your name and you print it // Then you go to this space and sign it in cursive.

B Here?

T Just this whole space right there.

B Just sign-?

T Uhuh. // OK, That is how you do a business letter. If you were maybe a doctor, you'd write doctor whatever, but that's only if you were or if you were a professor

B Hmm.

T you would write professor

B Uhuh.

T But this is you saying thank you for listening, good-bye, your name. It is not so hard.

B Thank you.

T Did you finish all of your problems in your book?

B No.

T No?

B Umm-

T The ones-the ones we were working on last night. Did you finish them?

B Ahh. I cannot -cannot understand.

T Ok, Last night we worked in a book, a work book?

B Ah yeah! I understand! OK. (both laugh)

T Did you ask about the problems that I said you needed your teacher to do?

B Yeah.

T Did she do them like in class?

B yeah.

T You cannot do them by yourself.

B Its difficult / um our class tutor -tutor she, sometimes she cannot understand how to teach us, she said I will ask Alex-

T Uhuhm.

B -every time.

T What class is that for?

B Huh??

T What class?

B Oh, grammar.

T Grammar. Your favorite class. (both laugh).

B This is today's homework, but I didn't do it. / This, this Friday-?

T Uhuhm.

B -we have a test- grammar test.

T Hmm. Didn't you- I thought you had a test last Friday

B Uhh

T Last Friday, Oh, that was in Reading

B Yeah, reading.
T At least they were not on the same day.
B How difficult! /// It's vocabulary.
T I am supposed to do this? or you are supposed to do
this? Is this another survey?
B yeah, for reading.
T Ahh. Wait, wait, wait.

APPENDIX B

SAMPLE OF CODING

Tape #3, 4/10/97 Group Session with TA(TA=M)
(A did not speak but was there)

- C So how can I do on that?
- M Hmm? (**clar**)
- C How can I do on that? (**self-rep**)
- M Let's see umm, you are chapter seven?
- C Yeah, seven. So read it?
- M Read chapter seven and go over, read all this stuff. And then on Wednesday no Tuesday you're gonna present it in class. I think that's a good day for you., right? (M asks the researcher a question and then they go on)
- B Could you explain one? Number one?
- M Number one? [unintelligible] OK, you have to type in paper right, you know that. (**conf**)
- C Uhuh. Is the title of the chapter main idea of the chapter?
- M What is the title of the chapter?
- C Main idea of the chapter. Main idea is--(B laughs)
- M No, that's title. What - Chapter seven? That's the title. Main idea is you read the whole thing right? (**compr**)
- C Yeah.
- M And then what is the whole thing about? What is the whole thing? (**srep**)
- C Government.
- M Like this one is government? Yeah. So the main idea is like the United States government something. Whatever they do. This one I think is business, the American business is main idea, eh? (**exp**)
- B Hmm.
- M So that's number one.
- B Number one (**orep**)
- M Number one is title and main idea. So you have a piece of paper like this and here you put the title like that and then in here you put the main idea, something like that. OK? You put your name too, you name and stuff, right? OK? That's number one. Number two// OK, number two you can have like vocabulary, like here-
- C That is five?
- M Yeah, you have five -- one, two, three, four, five. When you read the chapter (**exp**)
- C When I read the chapter- (**orep**)
- M And you don't understand a word, you put that in here.
- C This is my vocabulary? Uhhh, I thought this is the very important vocabulary in this chapter? (**clar**)
- M Yeah, in the chapter. (**orep**)

APPENDIX C

TOTAL INTERACTION MODIFICATIONS FOR EACH
PARTICIPANT ON EACH TRANSCRIPT

APPENDIX C

TOTAL INTERACTION MODIFICATIONS FOR EACH TRANSCRIPT

	<u>CONF</u>	<u>COMP</u>	<u>CLAR</u>	<u>SREP</u>	<u>OREP</u>	<u>EXP</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Tape #1							
P	1	11	1	6	6	8	33
A	1	0	2	0	1	0	4
B	0	0	4	1	0	0	5
C	3	0	10	1	6	0	20
Tape #2							
P	1	0	0	4	3	10	18
A	0	0	1	2	0	0	3
B	2	0	0	0	1	1	4
C	7	0	8	1	0	2	18
Tape #3							
TA	3	8	3	6	2	6	28
A	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
B	4	0	5	0	2	1	12
C	10	0	16	2	2	0	30
Tape #4							
TA	10	11	6	6	1	5	33
A	2	0	1	3	1	0	7
B	4	0	1	0	1	0	6
C	3	0	1	0	1	0	5
Tape #5							
Y	2	1	3	4	2	9	21
B	2	1	8	1	4	0	16
Tape #6							
Y	0	2	1	9	1	3	16
B	1	0	11	0	1	0	13
Tape #7							
X	2	11	1	7	2	7	31
A	7	0	33	2	4	0	46
Tape #8							
X	3	21	3	4	6	10	47
A	4	0	33	3	6	0	46
Tape #9							
Z	4	3	3	4	2	1	16
C	11	1	9	0	1	0	22
Tape #10							
Z	6	15	7	6	6	13	53
C	9	0	42	2	1	0	54

Key to Abbreviations:

P = the professor
TA = the teaching assistant
X,Y,Z = the American peer tutors
A = female Korean ESL student
B = female Japanese ESL student
C = male Korean ESL student
IMs = Interaction Modifications
Conf = Confirmation checks
Comp = Comprehension checks
Clar = Clarification requests
SRep = Self-repetitions
ORep = Other-repetitions
Exp = Expansions

APPENDIX D

DESCRIPTION OF TASK TYPE FOR EACH TAPE

APPENDIX D

DESCRIPTION OF TASK TYPE FOR EACH TAPE

TAPE #1: Professor with three students. (62 total IMs)

The students are preparing to visit a business class the following week. They discuss the content of the class syllabus and then survey one chapter from the business class text book.

TAPE #2: Professor with three students. (43 total IMs)

The class is viewing and discussing clips from the movie "The Black Stallion, which they will begin reading the following week. They then work together to produce an outline of what they know about the story.

TAPE #3: TA with three students. (71 total IMs)

The students are preparing speeches. They each have to give a presentation over one chapter from some text book. They have an assignment sheet that outlines the required parts of the speech. It is complicated and the TA is going over each step with them.

TAPE #4: TA with three students. (51 total IMs)

The TA and students are reviewing content and comprehension questions at the end of one chapter in a business text book.

TAPE #5: Student B with Tutor X. (37 total IMs)

They are working on B's homework assignment which is writing a business letter.

TAPE #6: Student B with Tutor X. (29 total IMs)

B has no homework, so they talk about idioms that use body parts such as "you're pulling my leg."

TAPE #7: Student A with Tutor Y. (77 total IMs)

They are reading aloud a Dr. Seuss book for pronunciation and comprehension.

TAPE #8: Student A with Tutor Y. (93 total IMs)

They are reading and discussing a newspaper article about "health foods" that are not really healthy. Next, they read a short article where people shared their most embarrassing moments.

TAPE #9: Student C with Tutor Z. (38 total IMs)

They are going over C's persuasive speech on why students should not be required to take sports or PE in school.

TAPE #10: TAPE C with Tutor Z. (107 total IMs)

They are reading and discussing a newspaper article about bungi jumping.