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COMMUNICATIVE ORIENTATION IN THE LANGUAGE CLASS AND THE EFFECT OF ACTIVITY TYPES ON INTERACTION

MUGE GUNDUZ

ABSTRACT

This study explores the nature of oral interaction in language classes in English and Turkish secondary schools in order to reflect upon the effect of different communicative orientation in two different contexts. That is, it focuses on quantitative and qualitative differences that may exist between the ways that teaching and learning of the spoken language are handled pedagogically in language classrooms in both contexts by analysing oral interactions between teachers and students. Another major aim of this piece of research is to investigate the influence of different inputs (activities) on the nature and the quality of interaction.

This thesis presents a detailed examination of the theoretical and empirical literature to provide a basis for the current research study.

Year 9 and Year 10 classes were observed using a systematic observation scheme - the Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching (COLT) Observation Scheme (Allen et al., 1984). The participants were foreign language teachers and non-native speaking students.

The findings of this research study provide evidence that some activities intrinsically lead to more communicative interactions in language classrooms. This study also shows that language teaching and classroom interaction have some differences as well as similarities, despite classroom culture differences, in the two countries.

The results of this research study, however, should be seen as suggestive rather than conclusive since they are derived from a relatively small sample.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 THEORETICAL BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

As Richards and Rodgers (2001) point out, the history of language teaching has been characterised by a search for the most effective way in which students can learn a second or a foreign language. Particularly in the twentieth century language teaching has been the subject of frequent change and innovation and the development of competing language teaching ideologies. Much of the impetus for change in approaches to language teaching came about from changes in teaching methods.

In the early decades of the nineteenth century the Grammar Translation Method, which was based on describing the rules of grammar was popular in language teaching. Towards the end of the nineteenth century, as a result of increased opportunities for communication in Europe, the Direct Method became the most widely used method in language teaching. The Audiolingual Method arose out of the need for interpreters and translators in the United States during the Second World War (Richards and Rodgers, 2001). Finally, in the early 1980s, the Communicative Approach reached its peak, particularly in North America and in the UK. Professional meetings were replete with presentations on designing curricula based on communicative objectives, developing communicative activities and evaluating communicative programs, and many applied linguistics books and ESL texts published at this time were guaranteed to have the word 'communicative' in their titles. There was no doubt that the theory of 'communicative competence', originally proposed by Hymes (1972), had an enormous impact on the field of second language (L2, from now on) teaching and learning. This theory was based on the claim that knowing a language includes much more than knowledge of the rules of grammar (linguistic competence). Hymes drew attention to the importance of knowledge of the rules of language use (communicative competence). Models of communicative competence were proposed (e.g. Canale and Swain, 1980) and efforts were made to empirically validate them (Allen et al. 1982; Bachman and Palmer 1981).
Communicative language teaching curricula (Breen and Candlin 1980; Munby 1978; Yalden, 1983) and notional functional syllabuses (Wilkins, 1976) were developed, and these provided a framework for the specification of the communicative needs of L2 learners. As Spada and Frohlich (1995) points out, there was also considerable effort put into into the creation of classroom techniques and activities to encourage more realistic use of language in the classroom (e.g. Littlewood, 1981) and proposals were made for an overall methodology of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT, from now on) (Brumfit 1984; Widdowson 1978).

A major impetus to the development of learner-centred language teaching came with the advent of communicative language teaching...

A great deal has been written in the last few years about the theory and practice of communicative language teaching. However, a basic principle underlying all communicative approaches is that learners must learn not only to make grammatically correct, propositional statements about the experiential world, but must also develop the ability to use language to get things done. These two aspects of language are captured in the distinction between the prepositional and illocutionary (or functional) levels of language (Widdowson, 1978). It was recognised that simply being able to create grammatically correct structures in language did not necessarily enable the learner to use the language to carry out various real-world tasks...

(Nunan 1988, p.24-25)

'Although CLT was widely accepted and implemented, there were early indications that it did not mean the same thing to everyone. There were also different interpretations of how CLT could be implemented in L2 classrooms' (Spada and Frohlich 1995, p.3). A number of models and frameworks were proposed - some of which did not pay attention to language form while others paid attention to both form and meaning. The prevailing view was that instruction which emphasised opportunities for learners to communicate ideas would lead to more successful learning. Unfortunately, there was little in the way of empirical research to support these claims (Spada and Frohlich, 1995).
As Pica et al. (1993) point out, second language researchers devote a great deal of their time to getting learners to talk. For many years, teachers have relied on language lessons, which direct learners to repeat and practise L2 sounds, words and structures, or calling on them to answer questions in order to display what has been learnt through instruction. More recently, teachers have also started using other activities such as debates, discussions, role-plays, and other activities to focus on functional and strategic aspects of L2 use. After introducing the Communicative Approach in language teaching, the learning of language through use has become a crucial issue. Theoretical arguments have been put forward encouraging students to use the target language in the classroom. Allwright (1984) claims that CLT relies heavily on the value of interaction, and the main reason for 'getting learners communicating' is that communication practice in the classroom is pedagogically useful because it represents a necessary and productive stage in the transfer of classroom learning to the outside world' (p.156-57). The theoretical perspective which supports the use of communication tasks and activities, is that language is best learnt and taught through interaction. Such activities are structured so that learners will talk, not only for the sake of producing language, but also as a means of sharing ideas and opinions (Pica et al., 1993). It is assumed that learners could learn a foreign language by using it, and that activities which involve real communication promote learning. Learning activities should be selected according to how well they engage the learner in meaningful and authentic language use (rather than mechanical practice of language patterns) (Richards and Rodgers 2001, p.161).

While these developments were taking place in applied linguistic theory, research and pedagogy, there were other developments in second language acquisition (SLA, from now on) research, which also provided support for the movement away from a focus on form to a focus on communication and meaning. One of the strongest advocates for such a communicative approach was Stephen Krashen (1981; 1982; 1985) who argued, on the basis of SLA research findings, that L2 learning was similar to first language (L1, from now on) learning and that efforts were needed to create environments in L2 classrooms similar to those which learners would be exposed to in the target language. While Krashen's proposal for successful L2 learning emphasised input, other researchers (e.g. Long 1983b) claimed that interaction was also crucial in promoting acquisition (Ellis, 1997a).
1.2 THE OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Since the 1980s, CLT, which is based on communicative competence theories introduced by Hymes (1970) and Canale and Swain (1980), has had an enormous effect on the field of L2 teaching and learning, as discussed above. Theoretical arguments have been put forward encouraging students to use the target language in the classroom; meaning-based instruction and learner-centred curricula have been favoured (Spada and Frohlich, 1995).

Many have taken the view that classrooms in which the focus on meaning-based instruction, group work and creative language-use opportunities are 'good' and teacher-centred classrooms with a focus on forms, correction and restricted language use are 'bad'. Today, the research findings on this issue are somewhat controversial. Some research results have shown that while an exclusive focus on meaning does lead to higher levels of fluency and communicative abilities in the L2, it does not lead to high levels of linguistic accuracy or more retained knowledge. Indeed, one process-product study conducted by Spada (1984) provided strong evidence that the combination of a product and a process component is essential in second language classrooms. Other researchers (for instance, Harley and Swain 1984; Spada 1984; Lightbown 1990; Spada and Lightbown 1993) also suggested that it could be more beneficial to language learning if a focus on form is provided within an overall communicative context rather than instruction with an exclusive focus on meaning (Spada and Frohlich, 1995). A number of studies (e.g. Doughty and Varela 1998; Harley 1989; Lightbown and Spada 1990; Lyster 1994; Spada 1997; Norris and Ortega 2000) also provided strong evidence in favour of the inclusion of focus on form in the CLT classroom (Lightbown, 2000). However, as Mitchell (2000) notes, the evidence is mixed, and the value of grammar instruction should be examined more closely if any specific advice is to be offered to policy-makers and practitioners.

British language education in the 80s was substantially influenced by applied linguistic developments in English as a foreign language, especially the emergence and promotion of the 'communicative approach' (see Brumfit and Johnson, 1979). Educators and applied linguists all shared a commitment to 'language in use', and to a view of 'communicative competence' as the ultimate objective of FL teaching. They put a great emphasis on the rich complexity of language use (Mitchell, 2000).
Grenfell (1999), however, has documented the dissatisfaction with the current National Curriculum (NC)/General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE) framework in England. There is a growing perception among the Modern Foreign Language (MFL, from now on) professional community in England that learning outcomes are disappointing because they focus too narrowly on pragmatic communicative goals in the present curriculum. This approach to language teaching might offer insufficient educational challenge whilst having a negative impact on pupil motivation (Mitchell, 2000). In particular, it is evident in the Chief Inspector's report that a disappointing portion of pupils are making the transition to creative control of the target language system despite the focus on communication:

For example, few pupils show confidence and independence in the use of language outside controlled situations or the ability to apply language previously learned to new situations. Apart from vocabulary acquisition, the range of language used by many pupils does not widen sufficiently, and their grasp of grammar, particularly the ability to manipulate tenses, is not strengthened.

(Dobson 1998, p.8)

As Mitchell (2000) argues, it is not clear whether the recent interest in grammar pedagogy among MFL policy-makers and professionals in the UK is influenced by applied linguistic sources. Rather, it seems to involve to some extent the revival of craft beliefs about the worth of explicit grammar teaching, which have their roots in "pre-communicative" traditions of pedagogy' (Mitchell 2000, p.289). This recent revival of grammar pedagogy has been reflected in a stream of professional conferences and publications for both English and MFL teachers (for example, Biriotti 1999, who revives traditional explicit instruction in French morphology, for early learners in UK schools) (Mitchell, 2000).

The Turkish Ministry of Education, on the other hand, has based its teaching objectives on the general goal of developing communicative abilities as well as on developing student awareness of the target language. The MFL program in Turkey, which will be detailed in Chapter 4, is centred on the use of the language and on developing the communication skills of the students in order to enable them to use the language for real purposes. It emphasises that this program is based on a learner-
centred approach and the students' classroom participation is essential. However, it is not clear to what extent these objectives are implemented in actual classroom practice since learners' communicative competence, particularly in non-selective schools, have generally been regarded as 'poor'. For example, as Dogancay-Aktuna (1998) states, it seems that students' competence does not develop beyond the basics in most cases. 'Many of the graduates of public schools can only be categorised as false beginners, even after English language instruction for 3-6 hours a week throughout high school' (Dogancay-Aktuna 1998, p.32). Akunal (1992) also states that lack of classroom interaction in Turkish educational system is evident since student involvement in class activities is quite limited. She reports that majority of students, even at university level, lack the ability to engage in any meaningful, communicative activities in English.

English is not an official language, a national lingua franca, or a second language in Turkey, therefore, there are few opportunities outside of school to practice the language in everyday communication (Dogancay-Aktuna, 1998). Consequently, it is considered as important to provide a real life situation in the classroom and encourage the students to use the target language.

The MFL program in Turkey appears to put relatively more emphasis on grammar teaching and form-focused instruction than the one in England. This will be discussed fully in Chapter 4. Through the MFL syllabuses, language teachers in Turkey were encouraged to teach grammar explicitly to develop student understanding of language structures of the target language. The program provides a list of structures by topics and it emphasises that teaching structures of the target language can help students to produce correct and appropriate sentences. Furthermore, language exams in secondary schools in Turkey are mainly designed to assess learners' grammatical knowledge.

English is taught as a foreign language in Turkey. In the state-owned mainstream schools, the study of a foreign language is compulsory and students choose one language out of several offered in their schools, such as English, French or German. The formal classroom is the most common domain for the acquisition of English where it is widely studied from the age of 11 onwards, though with quite different results. There are great discrepancies in the quality and extent of instruction available. Moreover, the instruction of English varies across types of schools because of
differences in the amount of time dedicated to it in the curriculum. In non-selective secondary schools, students generally study English 3-6 hours a week, while others receive intensive instruction 9-12 hours a week, especially in private schools. In Anatolian Lycees and Super Lycees (highly competitive state schools), the students have to attend a preparatory class (prep. class, from now on) for one year, where a foreign language (English, French or German) is taught intensively (30 hours a week) (Dogancay-Aktuna, 1998). Two types of schools were observed in Turkey for this study: selective and non-selective schools. These selective and non-selective schools were state schools, as mentioned earlier. However, the way teachers give instructions and the classroom activities, materials they use in these two types of schools are predicted to show great diversity, due to the reasons outlined above. In selective schools, students in their first year (prep. class) have 30 hours of English classes per week whereas, the students in non-selective schools have only 4 hours of English classes a week. In this study, the 13-14 year age group and 14-15 year age group will be investigated.

As described above, both MFL syllabuses in Turkey and England emphasise communicative objectives for the teaching of languages in schools. The aim of this thesis is to investigate the implementation of these 'communicative' objectives to see what is actually happening in these different classroom settings. Since Turkish and British MFL syllabuses assign different emphases on grammar teaching and form-focused instruction, as mentioned above, the hypothesis put forward for this study is that the communicative orientations of the classrooms observed in the two countries will be different and this difference will impact on classroom interaction. Therefore, investigating the communicative orientations of language classrooms in these two countries will provide data to compare the differences and the effects of these differences in classroom interaction. This piece of research focuses on whether the different natures of foreign language learning and teaching, different orientations of classrooms, and their relative emphasis on communication and forms have different effects on classroom interaction and language production which has been a recent point of debate in language teaching research.
In sum, this study explores the nature of oral interaction in language classes in order to reflect upon the effect of different communicative orientation in two different contexts.

Because research in Turkey has not been well funded and organised, there is a dearth of empirical classroom-based data to establish what teachers are actually doing in the classroom and how they are implementing the objectives of language teaching and learning, which are detailed in the syllabus, in the classroom context. Therefore, it is particularly important for this study to establish the type of classroom-based data which might provide directly relevant information for language teachers in both types of schools in Turkey. Investigating communicative language teaching as such in present second language teaching (i.e. in England) might provide interesting results especially for educators and professionals in Turkey, who have been concerned with developing students' communicative skills.

As discussed earlier, agencies such as the school inspectorate in England are actively promoting the debate regarding teaching methodologies. These discussions are focusing on (a) the promotion of monolingual target language (TL) medium teaching (Mitchell, 1999); (b) the promotion of pupils TL production, especially speaking; and (c) a revived interest in explicit grammar pedagogy (Mitchell 2000, p289). As Mitchell (2000) points out, applied linguistics should have much to offer on all three themes in England. It is hoped that this study might provide a perspective on what happens in a classroom which focuses on more explicit grammar teaching by considering the Turkish context. It is also predicted that results from selective schools might present useful implications for educators in England, since student oral target language production in this type of schools are predicted to be high due to intensive language teaching, which is described above.

Since the type of activity the teacher and the learners engage in is considered a good criterion to use to assess and compare the communicativeness of foreign language lessons (N'Zian 1991; McKay 1994), it might be valuable to categorise and study some classroom activities in order to examine verbal interaction patterns within these activities. Teachers' choices of activities are believed to have effects on the nature of interaction and student language production.
As Nunan (1987) puts it, it is necessary to have a realistic awareness about what is happening in the classroom in order to assist teachers in their professional development. This research aims to provide research-based assistance to teachers and researchers on different orientations to language teaching and on the effectiveness of these differences for classroom language learning by analysing oral interactions between teachers and students. Research such as this study might provide directly relevant information for teachers and educators and might be valuable to teachers who can identify with it.

A comparative study is conducted between modern language classes in Turkey and in England. In this piece of research, systematic observation along with the field notes taken while recording the observations form a large part of the data collection. A systematic observation scheme - the Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching (COLT, from now on) Observation Scheme (Allen et. al., 1984) - is used in this research study. In brief, the COLT scheme offers a model of observing instructional practices and procedures in L2 classrooms. The categories in the scheme are defined in order to describe as precisely as possible some of the features of classroom interaction in language classrooms. It provides a general description of what is happening in language classrooms (Spada and Frohlich, 1995). As Tucker (1990) puts it, 'clearly, it is important that we have some scheme to observe, to capture and to characterise what goes on in the classroom, because teachers are always in dynamic interaction with their students, their materials, and their programs' (p.222). All the lessons are audio recorded as a part of the COLT observation scheme. The participants are foreign language teachers and non-native speaking students (NNSs, from now on).

The first two chapters of this thesis give a theoretical and empirical framework covering the significant issues and main concepts, challenges and ideas, which the current research study addresses. The communicative approach to language teaching is examined to provide a basis for the investigation of the communicative orientation of language lessons. Chapter 3 provides an overview of the variables of interaction defined in the COLT scheme and the research studies focused on these variables, which are believed to influence the interaction process in language classrooms.
After building the theoretical framework of the study, the research design will be explained describing the methods of investigation in relation to the main issues such as validity and reliability as well as the strengths and limitations of the research methods.

Chapter 5 of this thesis will present the findings of the research study. Then, the findings will be analysed and discussed in relation to the theories, ideas and challenges outlined in the previous chapters.

The concluding chapter will discuss the results to provide a tentative explanation for the findings presented in Chapter 7. This scheme also provides evaluative comments on the COLT scheme and some suggestions for the improvement of the COLT scheme for future research.

It is hoped that language teachers can find implications from the findings of this study for their classroom teaching. This study is also expected to provide a trigger for many more classroom-based studies into foreign language teaching and learning in schools, particularly in Turkey.
CHAPTER II

THE COMMUNICATIVE APPROACH

2.1 THEORETICAL AND RESEARCH BASES FOR COMMUNICATIVE APPROACH

2.1.1 INTRODUCTION

In the 1950's and 1960's, with the growing interest in global communication, especially in the business sector, the emphasis of language courses moved towards effective writing and speaking. Grammar was regarded as an abstract subject and a widespread reaction against grammar teaching in schools began (Richards and Rodgers, 2001). The 1970s brought a world-wide shift towards teaching methods that focused on communication and Communicative Language Teaching (Communicative Approach) emerged (Cook, 2001).

The Communicative Approach has arisen out of a number of co-occurring and co-dependent movements in first and second language acquisition theory and research, and in language teaching theory. The influences can be considered as coming from two main sources: Firstly, the developments in theory and research in applied linguistics which had a less direct influence on pedagogy, but have provided an important theoretical and research framework which has informed and perhaps confirmed developments in the Communicative Approach. Secondly, the communicative competence movement which arose initially from developments in sociolinguistics in Britain had a big and direct impact on language teaching pedagogy (McKay, 1994).

The Communicative Approach is supported by these developments in second language acquisition theory and research, which have influenced the goals and notions of proficiency in language teaching (Zotou, 1993).
Since this study aims to investigate the communicative orientation of language classrooms in Turkey and in the UK the main data collection method is rooted in communicative language teaching. Firstly, this chapter will focus on the recent developments in language teaching in order to give a perspective on what led to the move towards communicative language teaching. Then, the Communicative Language Teaching Approach will be analysed in detail through this chapter.

2.1.2 THE COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE MOVEMENT

The Communicative Approach in language teaching starts from a theory of language as communication. According to this approach, the goal of language teaching is to develop what Hymes (1972) referred to as "communicative competence" (Richards and Rodgers 2001, p.159). Hymes used this term in order to contrast a communicative view of language and Chomsky's theory of competence. Chomsky's criticism (1959) of Skinner's theory of verbal learning (1957) and his theory of transformational grammar led to a new movement which undermined Skinner's behaviourism theory, the theoretical basis of audiolingualism. Chomsky hypothesised that sentences are not learned by imitation and repetition but 'generated' from the learner's underlying competence, and he proposed that a Language Acquisition Device (LAD) enables learners to acquire grammar subconsciously with the learner focuses on meaning. Chomsky (1965) emphasised on the abstract knowledge and he proposed that language acquisition occurs as a result of innate language-specific cognitive processes possessed by all individuals.

A number of important studies in L1 acquisition undertaken in the 1960s and 1970s (e.g. Bloom 1970; Brown 1973) were influenced to some extent by Chomsky's theories of language learning. Many L1 studies were conducted on the assumption that young children learn their first language through interaction. The fact that first language learners have greater opportunities to focus on meaning suggested that similarly, attention to meaning rather than form will promote success in acquisition of a second language. It was presumed from these studies in L1 acquisition that, since learners would learn a second language without any formal instruction, learners can acquire a second language in the same way. That is, learners do not need to study
grammar and they should be immersed in communicative activities in which the focus is firmly on meaning rather than form (McKay, 1994).

In the 1970s, through the impetus of sociolinguists (e.g. Fishman 1972; Hymes 1972; Erwin-Tripp 1973; Halliday 1973), the importance of the contexts of discourse and situation were recognised and the definition of language competence was developed further from Chomsky's 'linguistic competence'.

Another linguistic theory of communication favoured in CLT is Halliday's functional account of language use. 'Linguistics...is concerned...with the description of speech acts or texts, since only through the study of language in use are all the functions of language, and therefore all components of meaning, brought into focus' (Halliday 1970, p.145). Halliday developed a powerful theory of the functions of language, which complements Hymes' view of communicative competence for many writers on CLT (e.g. Brumfit and Johnson 1979; Savignon 1983).

Hymes (1972) also argued that Chomsky's view of linguistics was inadequate and he claimed that the combination of community diversity and differential competence make it necessary to look at linguistic theory from a wider perspective incorporating communication and culture. The notion of communicative competence, 'an ability when to speak, when not and...what to talk about, with whom, when, where, in what manner" adapted and built on Chomsky's "competence" which deals primarily with the speaker's abstract knowledge' (McKay 1994, p.13). In other words, according to Hymes, producing grammatical sentences was not enough to be 'competent'; Hymes (1972) argued that 'there are rules of use without which the rules of grammar are useless' (p.278). In sum, Hymes drew attention to the importance of the conventions governing the use of language and he offers a definition of what a speaker needs to know in order to be communicatively competent in a speech community (Coulthard 1985; Richards and Rodgers 2001). As Wilkins (1976) formulates,

People who speak the same language share not so much a 'grammatical' competence as a 'communicative' competence. Looked at in foreign language teaching terms, this means that the learner has to learn rules of communication as well as rules of grammar.

(p.11)
The proponents of CLT regarded learning a second language as acquiring the linguistic means to perform different kinds of functions (Richards and Rodgers, 2001). Widdowson (1978) is another theorist who put forward his views on the communicative nature of language in his book *Teaching Language as Communication*. Widdowson (1972) claimed that,

*...Knowing what is involved in putting sentences together correctly is only one part of what we mean by knowing a language, and it has very little value on its own: it has to be supplemented by a knowledge of what sentences count as in their normal use as a means of communicating.*

(p.16)

Canale and Swain (1980), who viewed communicative competence as the relationship and interaction between minimally three main competencies propose a more pedagogically influential analysis of communicative competence:

1. **Grammatical competence** includes knowledge of lexical items and rules of morphology, syntax, sentence-grammar semantics, and phonology.

2. **Sociolinguistic competence** is made up of two sets of rules: sociocultural rules of use and rules of discourse. Sociocultural rules of use will specify the ways in which utterances are produced and understood appropriately with respect to the components of communicative events outlined by Hymes (1967, 1968).

3. **Strategic competence** consists of verbal and non-verbal communication strategies that may be called into action to compensate for breakdowns in communication due to performance variables or to insufficient competence.

(Canale and Swain 1980, p.29-30; Canale 1983, p.7-8)

Canale (1983) also introduced *discourse competence*, which he believed should be included in the framework outlined above. According to Canale, discourse competence is the ability to combine meanings with unified and acceptable spoken and written language in different genres. It is concerned with cohesion (grammatical links) and coherence (appropriate communication of communicative functions), that is knowledge of different speech events and the rules for relating form to function.
The notion of communicative competence had an enormous effect on the field of L2 teaching and learning, however there were some problems in communicative competence theory (Spada and Frohlich, 1995). As Hymes (1970) and Halliday (1970) summarise, it was a reaction against the view of language as a set of structures and this reaction crystallised itself into the 'Communicative Approach' which will be discussed further in the following sections in this chapter.

2.1.2.1. THE CRITICISM OF COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE

The problems related to the communicative competence arise from the lack of clarity in the theoretical evidence. In other words, it is claimed that theories and approaches are inconsistent, the results of research are invariably conflicting because of multidynamic nature of the process of learning. There are a large number of variables involved in it and it is not yet clear how learners learn a language, what their motivation is, what they actually need to learn, and so on. It can be said that professionals are doubtful if it can be taught to learners (Zotou, 1993).

From the sociolinguistic perspective, despite the fact that Hymes' contribution has been the provision of a descriptive framework, there is still the problem of lack of concern in showing how such rules can be realised for communicative purposes as use through empirical observations (Brumfit and Johnson 1979; Brumfit 1984) (Zotou, 1993).

Hymes' work, however, proved to be of substantial influence in the language teaching field, coinciding as it did with growing dissatisfaction with the predominantly structural approaches in the 1960s and 1970s. This movement made an important contribution to the development of communicative classrooms (Hedge, 2000) and also provided an insight regarding the distinction of competence/performance (Zotou, 1993).

2.1.3 THE INPUT AND INTERACTION HYPOTHESES

While these developments, underlined above, were taking place in applied linguistics theory and research, there were other developments in SLA research which also provided support for the movement from a focus on form to a focus on meaning
(Spada and Frohlich, 1995). For example, Krashen (1981; 1985) proposed The Input Hypothesis, which became highly influential in the promotion of communication, cited as compatible with the principles of CLT. Although, in fact, Krashen's work was not directly associated with the Communicative Approach, it provided considerable support for this movement in language teaching (Richards and Rodgers, 2001). Krashen's comprehensible input theory stated that humans acquire language in only one way - by understanding messages, or by 'receiving comprehensible input' (Krashen, 1985). Learners should be exposed to input that contains grammatical structures that are a little beyond their current level of competence. Krashen refers to a learner's current state of knowledge as ('i') and the next stage as ('i+1'). He hypothesises that learners acquire language only when they understand the message which contains a new grammatical rule, or receive comprehensible input ('i+1'). Krashen, 1982).

Many analysts in SLA research have taken the view that the learner should be actively involved in the process of controlling the input rather than being a passive recipient to make the input comprehensible. For example, Long (1983a), in his study, showed that NS-NNS pairs were much more likely to make use of conversational tactics. Long (1983a) also emphasises the importance of comprehensible input but he considers in more detail how input is made comprehensible in other words, his theory differs from the input hypothesis in the way it attaches importance to one particular method of making input comprehensible. According to Long (1983b) there are three ways of making input comprehensible:

1. by means of input simplifications;
2. through the use of linguistic and extra-linguistic context; and
3. through modification of the interactional structure of conversation.

(quoted in Ellis 1990, p.107)

Long (1981) refers to (1) as 'input features' and (3) as 'interactional features'. In formulating The Interaction Hypothesis, Long argues that acquisition is made possible and is primarily facilitated when interactional adjustments are present.

Swain (1985) also proposed The Output Hypothesis as an addition to the input/interaction hypotheses, arguing that 'comprehensible output is a necessary
mechanism of acquisition independent of the role of comprehensible input' (p.252). Output has generally been viewed not as a way of creating knowledge but as a way of practising already-existing knowledge. According to Swain (1985), output may have several learning outcomes: not only providing practice opportunities that encourages automatisation of linguistic knowledge but also promoting learners to notice the gap between that they can say/write and what they want to say/write. It also enables learners to test out hypotheses about the target language that permits learners to control and internalise linguistic knowledge. Swain also argues that production, as opposed to comprehension, may encourage learners to move from purely semantic (top-down) analysis of the language to a syntactic (bottom-up) processing. It is possible to comprehend input (i.e. to get the message) without any syntactic analysis of it since there is no demand on the learners to produce the language, whereas production forces learners to pay attention to the means of expression. Swain (1985) suggests that "Being 'pushed' in output...is a concept parallel to that of the i+1 of comprehensible input. Indeed, one might call this the "comprehensible output" hypothesis' (p.249).

Finally, the role of input in L2 acquisition has proved to be a controversial issue. It is probably fair to say that there has been too much theorising and not enough empirical research done. Only a limited number of studies actually investigated how input and interaction affect acquisition and much of the research was descriptive in nature (Ellis, 1994). More research is needed on how access to modified interaction affects second language acquisition in the long term (Lightbown and Spada, 1999).

2.2 THE COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING (CLT)

The developments in second language acquisition theory and research that influenced Communicative Approach have been discussed so far. Although the relationship between SLA research and the classroom is still ambiguous as Lightbown (2000) indicates, 'the influence of SLA research is now evident in textbooks and teacher training programs and in proposals for curriculum design (see, e.g. Long and Crookes 1992)' (p.438). It is suggested that SLA theories and research 'may play an "illuminating" and a "confirmatory" role in language teaching' (Ellis 1991, p.204). As Lightbown (1985) emphasises it is fairly obvious that language teaching methodology
has not waited for SLA research to signal a movement from traditional, form-based approaches to meaning-based approaches which encourage communicative language use. Communicative Language Teaching emerged independently on the basis of discourse analysis, hypothesis of communicative competence, and pedagogical experience, with little or no knowledge of or regard for the current acquisition research (see Wilkins 1974; Brumfit and Johnson 1979; Brumfit 1980; Breen and Candlin 1980).

Accordingly, in all of these developments, there was support for the promotion of communication in language learning (McKay, 1994). As Allen and Widdowson (1979) put forward, there was a need for a new approach to language teaching which will shift the focus of attention from the grammatical to the communicative features of language.

Although the movement began as a largely British innovation, since the mid-1970s the scope of CLT has expanded. Both American and British proponents proposed that this new approach to language teaching aims to (a) make communicative competence the goal of language teaching and (b) develop procedures for the teaching of the four language skills that acknowledge the interdependence of language and communication (Richards and Rodgers 2001, p.155).

Some language experts claim that CLT means little more than an integration of grammatical and functional teaching. Littlewood (1981) states 'One of the most characteristic features of CLT is that it pays systematic attention to functional as well as structural aspects of language' (p.1). There is another group of language experts who suggest that CLT means using procedures where learners work in pairs or groups employing available language resources in problem-solving tasks. Simultaneously, the notion of communicative competence which involved not only knowledge but also the ability to put that knowledge into use in communication, as discussed earlier, was attractive to teachers who tried to express language teaching syllabuses in terms that reflected language in-use (Richards and Rodgers, 2001). 'The notion of communicative competence was so widely accepted by the early 1980s that the most programs could be said to incorporate some elements of communicative competence' (Bowen et al. 1985, p.48). It was assumed that learners could learn a foreign language
by using it. Communicative activities, such as playing games and solving problems began to be used more (Richards and Rodgers, 2001).

The Communicative Approach was mainly based on developing learner's effective speaking and writing ability rather than their grammar knowledge. The CLT movement tended to reduce the value of grammar in language teaching. This approach redefined what the student had to learn in terms of communicative competence. The crucial aim was the ability to use the language appropriately rather than to have grammatical knowledge (Richards and Rodgers, 2001). As McKay (1994) points out, however, it might be suggested that the Communicative Approach had sometimes been overstated in the ELT literature as a result of writers and teachers' overreaction to previous language teaching methods. Some researchers, (e.g. Rutherford and Sharwood Smith 1988; Ur 1988; Terrell 1991), therefore, attempted to renew the role of grammar in teaching in the second and foreign language classroom.

A few research studies were conducted to investigate learning outcomes of programs following the Communicative Approach (e.g. Bloomfield, 1992) and also actual features of communicative language practices in language classes (e.g. Nunan, 1987). Bloomfield (1992) concluded that it is necessary to implement more focus on language form into school foreign language programs. However, at the same time, other studies (e.g. Nunan, 1987) reported that some school programs continue to emphasise language form and accuracy over meaning in their teaching. In his classroom-based research, Nunan (1987) summarises that 'there is growing evidence that, in communicative classes, interactions may, in fact, not be very communicative after all' (p.144). Long and Sato (1983) also report that 'ESL teachers continue to emphasise form over meaning, accuracy over communication' (p.283).

The picture of classroom-based research demonstrated that the classroom practices of CLT were varied and as Howatt (1984) suggests that it is possible to take a 'strong' and a 'weak' position in CLT. He states that:

*There is, in a sense, a 'strong' version of the communicative approach and a 'weak' version. The weak version which has become more or less standard practice in the last ten years, stresses the importance of providing learners with opportunities to use their English for*
According to the 'weak' interpretation of CLT, grammatical explanation, error correction, and drills are valuable for language teaching. The proponents of the 'weak' approach (e.g. Littlewood, 1981) suggest that drill and controlled practice have a valid place in the language class since they provide learners with the necessary prerequisite skills for more communicative language work (Nunan, 1987). Nunan (1991a) also acknowledges the necessity of form-focused instruction in communicative language classrooms. According to Stern (1981; 1990) the main issue in language teaching pedagogy concerns the relative role of communication and language form-focused instruction in the classroom.

The communicative behaviour of native speakers was used as the basis for syllabuses that incorporated language functions, such as 'persuading someone to do something', and notions, such as 'expressing a point of time', which gave priority over grammar and vocabulary teaching, which had been accepted as the appropriate specification of the syllabus. The rationale for teaching was now very different, not grammatical knowledge but ability to use grammar for a purpose. Communication was considered in terms of processes that people use to carry out specific tasks, and therefore, some syllabuses were designed around the processes or tasks that students use in the classroom (Cook, 2001).

Language learning in the Communicative Approach is the same as language using. Information gap exercises and role-play techniques imitate what happens in the world outside the classroom in a controlled form, rather than being special activities leading language learning. Learning a language means practising communication within the four walls of the classroom; L2 learning arises from meaningful use in the classroom. Many of the techniques used in the Communicative Approach seem to originate from the expansion phase of the Audiolingual Method, in which students used the language actively for themselves through active practice. This phase was regarded as essential by all the commentators on audiolingualism, such as Lado (1964) and Rivers (1964). 'It consisted of "purposeful communication" ' (Lado, 1964) such as role-playing, and games which are considered to be the core activities of the Communicative Approach.
The difference in communicative teaching is that there is no previous phase in which the students are practising dialogues and drills in a highly controlled fashion (Cook 2001, p.216). Many proponents of CLT have advocated the use of 'authentic', 'from-life' materials, such as signs, magazines, advertisement, or graphic and visual sources in the classroom (Richards and Rodgers, 2001).

As Cook (2001) stresses, the communicative classroom was a very different place from classrooms using other language teaching methods. The teacher is no longer a dominating, controlling figure. The teacher hands the responsibility to the students for the activities, encouraging them to make up their own conversations in pairs and groups. That is to say, the students should be forced to learn the target language by using it. A key difference from other methods is that the students are not expected to produce speech with a minimal number of mistakes in native terms. Instead, they can use whatever forms and strategies they can to express themselves and to solve their communication problems. The teacher provides some feedback and correction, however, this forms a much less integral part of his or her classroom duties (Cook, 2001). The teacher has little control over the students' learning and evidence shows that students can have access to a foreign language through reading and listening without the need for the teacher's description of what is learnt. Willis (1990) assumes that 'it is possible to develop an approach to language teaching which takes advantage of the learner's natural tendency to make sense of language and to learn for himself' (p.iv).

Overall, the key principles of the Communicative Approach can be summarised as follows:

- A second language is best learnt as the mother tongue has been learnt i.e. by using it in real life situations. An emphasis on learning to communicate through interaction in the target language.

- Authentic and meaningful communication should be the goal of classroom activities. Communication is 'based on meaning', in other words, sentences do not need to be grammatical to be understood. Real-life should be brought into the classroom in the form of 'authentic materials'.

- Explicit study of grammatical structure of the language and appeal to the students' cognitive skills should be discarded or kept to a minimum. Grammar should be taught, if at all, not as an end in itself, but as a means of carrying communicative intent.
Fluency is an important dimension of communication.

Communication involves the integration of different language skills. Students should be focused deliberately on various language forms, skills, and strategies, in order to support the process of language acquisition.

Students are exposed to sociocultural data and direct experience of the culture(s) embedded within the target language. They become aware of the role and nature of language and culture.


2.2.1 THE DEBATE OVER COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING

A crucial element of the Communicative Approach to language teaching is the adoption of a methodology which will encourage learners to use the language they are learning, as discussed above. The assumption is that if learners use the language in this way, then they will learn it as a natural consequence. It is not difficult to see why its principles should be so appealing, however, it also has its problems (Widdowson, 1990b).

A major difficulty in the Communicative Approach in the classroom is that there is an absence of a well-defined framework (Allen 1983; Canale 1983). The Communicative Approach has therefore been anything but a coherent body of doctrine, and teachers and syllabus writers have been following many different paths in terms of the degree of communication and focus on form within the teaching (McKay, 1994). Nunan (1989b) comments that the Communicative Approach is a 'family of approaches, each member of which claims to be communicative... There is also frequent disagreement between different members of the communicative family' (p.12).

Furthermore, as van Lier (1988) points out, instead of following a specifically described 'method', teachers have instead often been exhorted to ensure the quality of activities and interaction by observing a specific set of essential principles, loosely bundled together under the name 'Communicative Approach' (p.72). A criticism is that as a result, the pedagogy, and teaching materials to match, may be put together 'not so much by principle, but by expediency, rule-of-thumb, and the uncoordinated efforts of individual writers' (Allen 1983, p.24). Thus, the Communicative Approach,
which cannot be described explicitly other than through its fundamental principles, encourages exchanges of real information in an authentic discourse context. The focus on form within the approach is varied and essentially teachers have been obliged to make major interpretations to bring the Communicative Approach to classroom reality (McKay, 1994).

As Cook (2001) points out, using pair/group work often leads to frequent code-switching between the mother and the target language. It might also lead to the dangerous assumption that any activity is justified that gives students the opportunity to use the target language, with no criteria applied other than getting the students talking. The teacher needs to question whether the time is being well-spent or whether the students are learning as much from the activity as they would from other types of activities (Cook, 2001).

Another problem with the Communicative Approach is 'natural language learning': It seems that learners do not very readily infer knowledge of the language system from their communicative activities. Learners must obviously acquire grammar somehow as a necessary resource for use. Otherwise, learners might acquire a fairly patchy and imperfect repertoire of performance which is not supported by an underlying competence (Widdowson, 1990b).

The whole point of pedagogy is that it can make arrangements for learning to happen more easily and more efficiently than it does in 'natural surroundings'; that is precisely what schools are for. If the conditions of the outside world were exactly imitated in the classroom there would be no point in pedagogy at all (Widdowson, 1990b).

Swan (1990) also indicates that,

_The Communicative Approach has directed our attention to the importance of other aspects of language besides prepositional meaning, and helped us to analyse and teach the language of interaction. At the same time, it has encouraged a methodology which relies less on mechanical teacher-centred practice and more on the simulation of real-life exchanges._

(p.98)
Swan (1990), however, claims that The Communicative Approach is not a revolutionary approach to language teaching, as it is claimed. '...we cannot prove that a single student has a more effective command of English than if he or she had learnt the language by different methods twenty years earlier' (p.99). Widdowson (1990a) challenges Swan by claiming that The Communicative Approach 'has new information and insights to contribute (for instance about the language of social interaction)' (p.101). He believes that The Communicative Approach recognises the importance of both lexis and grammar as essential communicative resources.

In sum, to try to imitate the conditions of natural communicative use of language in classrooms is mistaken for two basic reasons: First, to do so is to ignore the whole purpose of pedagogy, which is to provide more practical and more effective means for language learning than is provided by natural exposure and experience. Second, 'natural language use typically deflects attention from language itself and presupposes a knowledge of the language system as a basic resource which learners have, by definition, yet not acquired' (Widdowson, 1990b).

Bax (2003) has raised the issue of the role of CLT in language teaching. According to Bax, although CLT has served a useful function in the language teaching profession, it is now having a negative effect, and needs to be replaced. One of the reasons for its popularity - as described particularly by Mitchell (1994), for example - was its function as a corrective to shortcomings in previous methodologies, such as Grammar-Translation and the Direct Method. However, Bax (2003) argues that CLT has always neglected one key aspect of language teaching: The context in which it takes place. According to Bax, the discourse of CLT constantly sends out the message that context is less important, or incidental, or to be taken for granted - 'the CLT works, no matter where you are, no matter what the context' (p.281).

Bax (2003) claims that it is now necessary to demote CLT as a main paradigm in language teaching and adopt something more similar to what he terms a 'Context Approach'. According to the Context Approach, the social context in which learning takes place should be the very first thing to be considered before any methodological or language system decisions are taken. Therefore, identifying key aspects of that context (i.e. an understanding of individual students and their learning needs, wants, styles, and strategies, etc.) is crucial.
A Context Approach considers methodology as an important element however, it insists that methodology is just one factor in successful language learning. Many aspects of the context, such as students' attitudes, cultural expectations, etc. are clearly at least as important as the teaching method adopted. Bax (2003) emphasises that the Context Approach does not introduce something completely new. Context and contextual factors are high priorities for good teachers who naturally take account of the context in which they teach - the culture, the students, and so on - even when they assume that CLT is essentially the answer. In the ELT literature, too, context has long been recognised as crucial to language learning, (e.g. Bowers and Widdowson 1986; Breen 1986), and yet neglected. Briefly, Bax (2003) claims that CLT, in particular, has been applied inappropriately in all sorts of situations around the world. If the context in which learning takes place had been given greater priority, CLT would have lead to better outcomes, in other words, it would have been more effective.

Harmer (2003), on the other hand, disagrees with Bax on the basis that the learning context is not necessarily the first place to start in any educational exchange. He argues that methodology is of vital importance to the learning of language in classrooms where teachers are working. Prioritising contextual factors over methodological aspects of language teaching threatens to damage an essential element of a teacher's 'make-up', in other words, what they believe in, and what they think they are doing as teachers. Milton et al. (2000) investigated teachers' principles and he found that 'overall, there were many similarities between all the teachers in the principles that guided their pedagogic practices, regardless of their teaching circumstance.' (p.ii).

Harmer (2003) agrees that application of a set of teaching practices into inappropriate circumstances is probably counter-productive. However, there is little empirical evidence to suggest that language teaching is being widely used in this way. Good teachers all around the world take account of the circumstances, in which they are operating, regardless of the teaching method they are applying.

Finally, Harmer (2003) acknowledges the problem with the term CLT that it has always meant a multitude of different things to different people. Teachers all around the world have been using different activities, which are claimed to be 'communicative'. As Gupta (2004) reports, in the absence of the prescribed CLT
methodology, classroom methodology in many schools in India remained the same, teacher-centred and dull in format. Thus, learners are unable to gain what CLT promised. The early advocates of communicative methodology suggested, for example, that second language acquisition would somehow occur if students were involved in communicative events, but such claims have been significantly modified over the years (Harmer, 2003). Nowadays, modern versions of task-based activities do not only involve problem-solving, discussion, role-play tasks but also include a range of language-focused tasks at various stages of the task-based cycle, which may or may not be 'traditional'. It is a fact that dialogue-making, discussion, role-play, and information gap activities are widely in use in western-based classrooms. However, students in those same classrooms are now regularly involved in drill-like or grammar discovery activities. This is despite the fact that the debates of the 1990s about presentation, practice, and production (PPP) specifically criticised the anti-communicative nature of controlled practice (Harmer, 2003).

Liao (2004) also argues that the 'context approach' might not be practical in many Asian countries. For example, in China, neither every school teacher has the time to conduct a needs analysis that is reliable and valid; nor do they have enough knowledge to choose an appropriate method. Liao (2004) notes that in the recent history of English language teaching in China, western methods such as the 'grammar-translation method', or the 'audiolingual method' have been commonly used by teachers. He claims that by introducing CLT, teachers can keep up with developments in English teaching methods outside China rather than following the traditional way of teaching, namely, merely teaching grammar and vocabulary. CLT can help learners to develop greater competence in the use of English for communication. Gupta (2004) agrees with Liao and adds that a new generation is aware of the growing need for both linguistic and communicative proficiency in English. As a result of socio-economic developments, the reality of the context in India now requires more communicatively competent learners than it did 10 years ago.

It is a fact that classroom situation is vital in any educational decision taken however, I also believe that curriculum planners and teachers' enthusiasm for keeping up with recent developments in language pedagogy and their passion for changing the learning context for the better is also crucial, as has been discussed so far. I am
convinced that CLT still has much more to offer especially for teachers who wish to create an alternative learning environment for learners who are considered 'communicatively incompetent'. The situation constraints can be addressed by educational authorities, as Liao (2004) suggests, and also teachers can be assisted in implementing CLT effectively into their teaching context.

2.3 TASKS AND ACTIVITIES IN THE COMMUNICATIVE APPROACH

Tasks and activities have long generated considerable interest among SLA researchers.

The use of tasks in SLA has been closely linked to developments in the study of second language acquisition. 'Communicative views of language learning and teaching as well as a growing body of SLA research have significantly enhanced the status of "task" as an important building block within the curriculum' (Nunan 1993, p.66). In the strongest interpretation of this 'task is primary' viewpoint it is suggested that tasks will inevitably trigger acquisitional processes. According to CLT language that is meaningful to the learner supports the learning process. Tasks are proposed as useful means for applying these principles. Learning activities are, therefore, evaluated according to how well they engage the learner in meaningful and authentic language use (rather than merely mechanical practice of language patterns) (Richards and Rodgers, 2001). A weaker interpretation of the 'task is primary' viewpoint, on the other hand, would be based on Long's (1992) focus on form proposal (Skehan and Foster, 1997), which will be discussed in the following chapter.

Since activity types are used as segment of the data analysis in this study, it is necessary to define and differentiate the terms 'activity' and 'task' while highlighting the terminological and conceptual ambiguity concerning the use of 'task' and 'activity'. This section also aims to demonstrate how the term 'task' has evolved in CLT to where it is today.
2.3.1 THE DEFINITION OF TASKS AND ACTIVITIES

'Task' and 'activity' in language teaching pedagogy and research have been characterised in a variety of ways:

One early application of a task-based approach within a communicative framework for language teaching was the Bangalore project (Prabhu, 1987). Prabhu's definition of 'task' in the Bangalore project (1987) was fairly abstract, and oriented towards cognition, process and (teacher-fronted) pedagogy (Long and Crookes, 1992): 'An activity which required learners to reach an outcome from given information through some process of thought, and which allows teachers to control and regulate that process', was regarded as a "task" (Prabhu 1987, p.17). Reading train timetables and deciding which train one should take to get to a certain destination on a given day is an appropriate classroom task according to this definition (Richards and Rodgers, 2001).

Crookes (1986) defines a task as 'a piece of work or an activity, usually with a specified objective, undertaken as part of an educational course, at work, or used to elicit data for research' (quoted in Kumaravidevelu 1993a, p.70). This definition would lead to a very different set of 'tasks' from those identified by Prabhu and it includes any classroom work or activity that teachers use to attain their teaching objectives, such as, drills, dialogue readings, etc. Crookes and Chaudron (1991) note that 'activity' is probably the most commonly used general term for the units of which a lesson consists. The term 'activity' has also been used as an alternative for 'task' (e.g. Richard, Platt and Weber, 1985). As Coughlan and Duff (1994) notes, these two terms are often employed interchangeably in SLA research. However, in recent literature, the term 'task' is used to refer those less controlled activities which produce realistic use of the target language.

The main distinction regarding the description of tasks in language teaching and research is whether 'tasks' should be meaning-focused or form-focused language use. While some believe that the term 'task' should be restricted to activities where the learners' attention is primarily focused on message conveyance, others argue that it should include any kind of language activity including those designed to get learners to display their linguistic knowledge which enables them to make correct sentences (Ellis, 2003). Long (1985) refers to task as 'a piece of work undertaken for oneself or
for others, freely or for some reward...by 'task' is meant the hundred and one things people do in their everyday life, at work, at play, and in between, such as filling out a form, making a hotel reservation, etc.' (p.89). Richards and Rodgers (2001) also describe 'task' as an activity or goal that is carried out using language, such as finding a solution to a puzzle, reading a map and giving directions, making a telephone call, writing a letter, or reading a set of instructions and assembling a toy.

Bygate (1999), in his research, describes tasks as 'bounded classroom activities in which learners use language communicatively to achieve an outcome, with the overall purpose of learning language' (p.186). As the definition implies, tasks set two challenges: to use language (for whatever communicative purpose) and to contribute in some way to language learning (Bygate, 1999). According to Lee (2000) a task is a classroom activity or exercise that has: a) an objective obtainable only by the interaction among participants, b) a mechanism for structuring and sequencing interaction, and c) a focus on meaning exchange' (Ellis 2003, p.4-5). Bygate, Skehan, and Swain (2001) also define task 'as an activity which requires learners to use language, with emphasis on meaning, to attain an objective' (p.11).

Nunan (1989b) and Skehan (1996; 1998) apply Long's description to the classroom and restrict the use of term to activities where meaning is primary. Breen (1989), however, adopts a broader definition and defines tasks as any kind of language activity that learners do in the classroom, including 'exercises'. His definition seems synonymous with the term 'activity'. According to Ellis (2003), on the other hand, task does not include 'exercises' which are activities that call for primarily form-focused language use. He defines 'tasks' as activities in which learners' attention is primarily on meaning-focused language use. However, Ellis recognises that the overall tasks and exercises have the same purpose (i.e. learning a language), but the means they use to achieve this purpose are different.

Another main difference between 'task' and 'exercise', as Widdowson (1998) notes, is whether linguistic skills are viewed as developing through communicative activity or as a prerequisite for carrying out the task that learners are engaged in. In other words, a 'task' requires participants to comprehend, produce and interact in the target language as 'language users' do in real-world activities. In contrast, an 'exercise' requires participants to function primarily as 'learners' since the focus is on
manipulating the forms involved. However, during the task performance, learners do not always focus on meaning as language users do. While a task requires learners to give primary attention to message conveyance, it allows for the secondary focus to be placed on code in order to decide what forms to use. Ellis (2003) concludes that the extent to which a learner acts as language user or language learner and attends to message or form during tasks and exercises should be viewed as variable and probabilistic rather than categorical.

Ellis (2003) also draws attention to another distinction regarding 'perspective'. It refers to whether a task is seen from the task designer's or the participants' point of view, which is relevant to the distinction between meaning-focused or form-focused. A task initially may be designed to encourage a focus-on-meaning but, during the task performance this primary attention may switch to language form therefore, it may result in display rather than communicative language use.

Finally, Ellis (2003) identifies the following features of a task (p.9-10):

- A task is a workplan. A task constitutes a plan for learner activity. This workplan takes the form of teaching materials or of ad hoc plans for activities that arise in the course of teaching.
- A task involves a primary focus on meaning.
- A task involves real-world processes of language use.
- A task can involve any of the four language skills.
- A task engages cognitive processes. The workplan requires learners to employ cognitive processes such as selecting, classifying, ordering, reasoning, and evaluating information in order to carry out the task.
- A task has a clearly defined outcome.

2.3.2 TASK COMPONENTS

According to Nunan (1989b) tasks are comprised of three components: input, activities, and goals. Ellis (2003), on the other hand, proposes a more complex framework than that drawn by Nunan. He identifies five components of tasks (p.21):

1. **Goal**: The general purpose of the task.
2. **Input**: The verbal or non-verbal information supplied by the task, e.g. pictures; a map; written text.

3. **Conditions**: The way in which the information is presented, e.g. split vs. shared information, or the way in which it is to be used, e.g. converging vs. diverging.

4. **Procedures**: The methodological procedures to be followed in performing the task, e.g. group vs. pair work.

5. **Predicted outcomes**: a) The 'product' that results from completing the task, e.g. a route drawn in on a map; a list of differences between two pictures. b) The linguistic and cognitive 'processes' the task is hypothesised to generate.

### 2.3.3 TASK AND ACTIVITY TYPES

The definition and the categorisation of task and activity types are particularly important for this study since one of the main objectives of this study is to investigate the effects of activity types on learners' language production in a classroom setting. This section will illustrate the various tasks and activity types developed through SLA research, and also how the activity types are classified in this piece of research.

Prabhu (1987) developed an innovative curriculum project (the Bangalore Project) in secondary schools in southern India in order to replace the traditional, structural method which was the predominant method at that time. He devised a series of 'meaning-focused activities' (e.g. working out diagrams and formations, reading train timetables, etc.) that required students to understand, convey, or extend meaning, and where attention to language forms is only incidental (Ellis, 2003).

The tasks used by Prabhu in the Bangalore Project (the Bangalore tasks) were mostly similar in the many variants of CLT, discussed earlier in this chapter. CLT is not 'task-based' in analytic sense, but occasionally employs problem-solving 'communication' activities in the 'practice phase' of lessons or as a means of covering the linguistic items of various kinds which still make up the hidden syllabus content. The activities in the Bangalore Project are not necessarily activities students will ever need to do in the target language outside the classroom. They were, as Long and Crookes (1992) indicates, *pre-set pedagogic tasks*, in other words, they are not related to a set of *target tasks* determined by an analysis of a particular group of learners' future needs. Similarly, 'CLT started to recognise the importance of the classroom itself as a communicative educational setting in its own right and to organise the

31
activities that occurred there in terms of educational tasks rather than tasks that necessarily relate to the world outside the classroom' (Cook 2001, p.221). Long and Crookes (1992) also propose that it is necessary to conduct needs analyses which identify target uses of language, allowing tasks which have a meaningful relationship to such language use to be designed for the classroom. As Skehan (1998) notes, 'in this way, the tasks themselves are meant to have pedagogical value' (p.96). Skehan (1998) also suggests that

One could generalise and claim that if information is of the right quantity (so that it represents a reasonable challenge, and does not overload learners) and is of appropriate interest level (so that involvement is promoted, and the task can be said to resemble real life), more natural discourse is produced which may relate to underlying interlanguage systems in a more dependable way.

(p.115)

Skehan (1998) believes that it is desirable for tasks to have real-world relevance but this is difficult to obtain in practice.

As Hedge (2000) puts it, 'one issue of great interest has been how to create the "gap" of information or opinion which exists between the speakers in the real world, and which creates the unpredictability of normal discourse. What kind of activity requires learners to negotiate?' (p.58). Prabhu (1987) used three major task types in the Bangalore Project: 1. information-gap tasks, which involves a transfer of information from one person to another through negotiation. For example, a pair-work activity in which each participant has a part of the total information (such as a picture comparison) and attempts to convey it verbally to the other. 2. reasoning-gap tasks, which involves deriving new information from given information through the process of inference, deduction, etc. For instance, working out a teacher's timetable on the basis of given class timetables. This kind of task necessarily involves comprehending and conveying information, as an information-gap task, but the information to be conveyed is not identical with that initially comprehended. There is a piece of reasoning which connects the two. 3. opinion-gap tasks, which simply involves students identifying and articulating a particular preference, exchanging ideas for which there is no right or wrong answer, as in 'the discussion of a social issue'. The
task may involve the use of factual information and formulating arguments to justify one's opinion, but there is no requirement for demonstrating outcomes as right or wrong, and no reason to expect the same outcome from different individuals or on different occasions (Prabhu 1987, quoted in Hedge 2000, p.58-59; Cook 2001, p221). According to Prabhu, reasoning-gap tasks were most successful in generating useful language as well as being interesting to students (Skehan, 1998). However, Ellis (2003) notes that there is no empirical research to prove Prabhu's claim.

Prabhu's definition of tasks involve 'some processes of thought'. In other words, 'tasks should ideally involve learners in "reasoning" - making connections between pieces of information, deducing new information, and evaluating information' (quoted in Ellis 2003, p.7). Ellis (2003) also claims that one of the strengths of Prabhu's classification is derived from the fact that he used this classification system to construct a task-based syllabus for a specific teaching context.

Pica et al. (1993) propose a typology of tasks, which helps to understand how learners need to interact on individual tasks (Lambert, 2004). Pica et al. (1993) classify tasks according to the type of interaction that occurs in task accomplishment: 1. Jigsaw tasks, learners combining different pieces of information to form a whole. Task participants are expected to achieve a single outcome; 2. Information-gap tasks, a participant holds some information but the other/s must negotiate and find out the information in order to complete a task; 3. Problem-solving tasks, participants much reach a solution to a problem given through a piece of information; 4. Decision-making tasks, participants are expected to work toward one possible outcome through negotiation and discussion. 5. Opinion-exchange tasks, learners engage in discussion and the exchange of ideas (p.20-22). As Pica et al. (1993) notes, problem-solving, decision-making and opinion exchange tasks are less restrictive than jigsaw and information-gap tasks.

Yule (1997), on the other hand, develops a typology of tasks (i.e. descriptive, instructional, and narrative tasks), which provides a basis for sequencing tasks developmentally (Lambert, 2004). As Lambert (2004) points out, the typologies proposed by Pica et al. (1993) and Yule (1997) provide a basis for L2 instruction, and they are relatively representative of current understanding and research.
Nunan (1989b) also divides tasks into two categories: 'communicative tasks' and 'non-communicative' tasks. It has been hypothesised that communicative tasks require learners 'to rehearse, in class, the sort of skilled behaviour they might be expected to display in genuine communicative interaction outside the classroom' (Nunan 1989b, p.59). Communicative tasks have been considered one of the most promising features of the 'Communicative Approach' (Loschky and Bley-Vroman, 1993), as it will be discussed in the following section.

### 2.3.3.1 COMMUNICATION TASKS AND ACTIVITIES

Discussions on the usefulness and importance of communication tasks have had a long tradition in literature on CLT (see Crookes 1986; Nunan 1989b). The term, 'communication task', therefore, is already familiar to many teachers and researchers. However, it has not always been clear what features exactly constitute a communication task and make it distinctive from other activities used in teaching and research (Pica et al., 1993). As Nunan (1989b) points out it is not always easy to draw a distinction between 'communication' and 'non-communication' tasks. One of the reasons for this is the fact that meaning and form are closely interrelated. Teachers generally use different grammatical forms to signal differences of meaning and indeed good oral grammar exercises should be both meaningful and communicative. The Communicative Approach to language teaching is based on the hypothesis that, if the development of communicative language ability is the goal of classroom learning, then communicative practice must be part of the process, as discussed earlier in this chapter (Hedge, 2000).

Communication tasks have often been considered principally as devices which allow learners to practise using the language as a tool of communication rather than as a device to get learners to focus on grammatical features of the language (Loschky and Bley-Vroman, 1993).

In a recent work, Lambert (2004) defines communication tasks as 'pedagogic tasks which operate through a planned diversion in the information held by learners, and which usually approximate to some degree to a real-world task which learners may have to complete outside class' (p.18). Therefore, communication tasks help learners in two ways: They require learners to communicate functionally in the target
language, and also the real-world connection assists them to acquire task-specific language and skills. When they are well planned, communication tasks also provide an opportunity for learners to communicate actively on topics of interest and meaningful to them (Lambert, 2004).

Stern (1992) offers a comprehensive classification of 'communicative activities', such as classroom management activities, talking on topics related to the students' private life and on substantive topics drawn from other subjects on the school curriculum, as in immersion programmes. Stern arranges these activities in descending order with those closest to communicative reality (real-world activities) at the top and those furthest removed at the bottom (Ellis, 2003).

Brumfit (1984) also argues for 'natural language use' and suggests the need for what he calls 'fluency activities'. In his definition, the aim of a fluency activity 'is to develop a pattern of language interaction within the classroom which is as close as possible to that used by competent performers in the mother tongue in real life' (p.69).

As Chaudron (2003) points out, communication tasks vary considerably, from map reading, real-world sales exchanges and information-getting tasks, and problem-solving discussions, to narrower searching for differences in pictures, picture description, or sorting out the order of unordered picture sequences. Many researchers (e.g. Gass and Mackey 1998; Shehadeh 1999; Van den Branden 1997; Norris, Brown, Hudson, and Yoshioka 1998; Yule 1997) used these types of tasks in their studies. These tasks have been used to study the effects of interaction on SLA and recently such tasks also have been used to elicit learner production data for SLA analysis. For example, Wode (1999) used a complex problem solving task to examine grade seven English FL learners' lexical development (Chaudron, 2003).

As noted above, communication tasks have been employed to study the effects of interaction on learners' acquisition, along with more global measures of fluency, complexity, and accuracy, respect to their improvement following task performance (Chaudron 2003). Thus, for example several studies have examined the effects of strategic planning (i.e. pre-task planning; planning prior to performance) on all three dimensions of production - fluency, complexity, and accuracy: For example, Skehan and Foster (1997), using information exchange and decision making tasks; Wendel
Despite their variety, some characteristics of communication tasks have been simultaneously suggested by some writers and can be summarised as follows:

- There must be a communicative purpose (i.e. not just a linguistic goal).
- There is some sort of relationship to comparable real-world activities.
- The focus should be on meaning not on form, although participants may need to attend to form from time to time.
- The content should be determined by the learner who is speaking or writing. The learner has to formulate and produce ideas, information, opinions, etc.
- There must be opportunity for negotiation of meaning between the speakers when performing the task.
- In order for the previous criterion to function, what a learner hears should not be predictable, i.e. there must be a kind of gap (e.g. an information or opinion gap).
- The normal processes of listening, reading, speaking, and writing will be in play, for example improvising and paraphrasing in speech; in other words, students will practise and develop strategic competence.
- Teacher intervention to correct should be minimal as this distracts from the message.
- The assessment of the task should be in terms of outcome.


As Hedge (2000) points out, in Brumfit's view, fluency activities will provide students the opportunity to produce and understand structures which they have gradually acquired during activities focused on linguistic form, which he calls 'accuracy work'. Ellis (1997a) also emphasises that individual tasks can be more or less communicative depending on whether all or only some of these features are present.
comprehend, and ultimately internalise L2 words, forms and structures are believed to be most available during activities in which students and their interlocutors, whether teachers or other students, can exchange information and communicate ideas. Such activities are organised in order to enable students to talk in the target language, not for the sake of producing language as an end in itself, but as a means of sharing ideas and opinions, collaborating toward a single goal, or competing to achieve individual goals (Pica et al., 1993).

As Kumaravidevelu (1993) notes, learning-centred approaches (e.g. Communicative Approach) seek to provide opportunities for learners to practise pre-selected, presequenced notions and functions through communication-focused activities. Learning-centred approaches also enable learners to participate in open-ended interaction through meaning-focused activities in class, assuming that learners can develop grammatical ability through those meaning-focused activities.

2.3.4 PERSPECTIVE ON TASK AND ACTIVITY FROM PEDAGOGY AND RESEARCH

Drawing on the earlier characterisation of what tasks and activities are, it is necessary to ask what rationale underlies their role in instruction in language teaching.

As Ellis (2003) points out, 'the use of tasks in SLA has been closely linked to developments in the study of second language acquisition' (p.21). Tasks have played a crucial role in both descriptive and more theoretically based research and have recently become a focus of research in their own right (Ellis, 2003). Richards and Rodgers (2001) suggest that the role of tasks received support from some researchers who are interested in developing pedagogical applications of second language acquisition theory (e.g. Long and Crookes, 1993), as mentioned earlier.

An interest in tasks as potential building blocks of second language instruction emerged when researchers turned to tasks as SLA research tools in the mid-1980s. SLA research has focused on the strategies and cognitive processes employed by second language learners. This research has suggested a reassessment of the role of formal grammar instruction in language teaching.

(Richards and Rodgers 2001, p.223)
Within a general cognitive theory of SLA, such as outlined by McLaughlin (1987; 1990), there are two important acquisitional processes: 'automatisation' and 'restructuring', which are central to cognitive theory. Cognitivist theories view the learner as a 'grand initiator' and they emphasise the importance of the learner's 'black box'. According to cognitive theory, second-language learning, like any other complex cognitive skill, includes the gradual integration of sub-skills as controlled processes initially predominate and then become automatic. Automatisation or automatic processing involves 'a learned response that has been built up through the consistent mapping of the same input to the same pattern of activation over many trials' (McLaughlin 1987, p.134). Input is seen as a 'trigger' for the internal mechanisms controlling the language acquisition process that sets off the internal mechanisms (Ellis 1985a; 1994). In this conceptualisation, complex tasks consist of sub-tasks and their components. As Levelt (1978) notes, speaking is a very good example of a hierarchical task structure as illustrated below (Levelt 1978, quoted in McLaughlin 1987, p.135):

**First order goal**: to express particular intention  
**Second order goal**: to decide on topic  
**Third order goal**: to formulate a series of phrases  
**Lower order goals**: to retrieve lexicon needed  
   - to activate articulatory patterns  
   - to utilise appropriate syntactic rules  
   - to meet pragmatic conventions

**Figure 1 The Hierarchical Task Structure of Speaking**

As McLaughlin (1987) notices, each of these component skills needs to be completed before the higher-order goal can be noticed, although there may be some parallel processing in real time.

In order to function effectively humans develop ways of organising information. Some tasks require more attention; others that have been well practised require less. The development of any complex cognitive skill involves building up a set of well-learned, automatic procedures so that controlled processes will be freed for new tasks.

(McLaughlin 1987, p.136)
In sum, according to cognitivist theory, automatisation occurs through practise and the concept of automatisation seems very close to the traditional belief that 'practice makes perfect'. However, research showed that simply practising a given language structure does not necessarily lead to a gradual approximation to 'perfect performance' (e.g. Lightbown 1983; Pienemann 1989). Nevertheless, automatisation is an important benefit of most tasks (Loschky and Bley-Vroman, 1993).

Restructuring, on the other hand, accounts 'for a second language learner's perceptions of the "sudden moments of insight" or "clicks of comprehension" ' (McLaughlin 1987, p.138). It is presumed that at such moments the learner can be said to understand the new material in a new way. Learners often report that this experience is followed by rapid progress, as old linguistic information and skills are placed into this new way of understanding (McLaughlin, 1987).

As Schmidt (1990) puts forward, one of the most controversial issues in applied linguistics concerns the role of conscious and unconscious processes in second language learning. There are many who believe that conscious understanding of the target language is necessary in order to produce correct forms and use them appropriately. Others, on the other hand, believe that language learning is essentially unconscious (e.g. Krashen 1981; Seliger 1983). McLaughlin (1987) argues against Krashen's 'learning-acquisition' distinction because it is based on what he considers to be the insupportable distinction between conscious and unconscious knowledge.

If restructuring and automatisation are important aspects of the learning process, and if tasks are components of the language curriculum, then it is necessary to investigate how tasks contribute to these cognitive domains. Loschky and Bley-Vroman (1993) presented a model which focuses on task types and their relative contribution to automatisation and restructuring. They classified tasks along a continuum from essential tasks to useful tasks to natural tasks, dimensions marked by the involvement of a particular structure in a task. In essential tasks, the task cannot be successfully performed unless the structure is used. In useful tasks, the targeted structure is useful to the completion of the task but not essential; in natural tasks, the targeted structure may appear naturally during the performance of a particular task (Loschky and Bley-Vroman 1993, p.132). Loschky and Bley-Vroman hypothesised that tasks which are at the essential end of the continuum will involve more restructuring since the task
designer has more control over where a learner's attention will be placed; the grammatical point itself is the essence of what is to be attended. At the other end of the continuum are the natural tasks. As Loschky and Bley-Vroman (1993) emphasise, there is no guarantee that a task in which a structure naturally arises will trigger the acquisition of that structure. However, if natural tasks by nature involve components of a particular structure, both in the input to the task and in the implementation of the task, then they can contribute to achieving automatisation.

According to Ellis (2003), the challenge from the research and also from the teaching point of view has been that of designing structure-based communication tasks that make the target structure 'natural', 'useful', or 'essential'. Can it be achieved, and if so, to what extent can it be achieved in production tasks? What evidence is there that learners do produce the targeted structure as 'behaviour' when they perform a structure-based production task? There are a number of studies, which have focused on these issues: For example, the studies carried out by Sterlacci (1996) and Mackey (1999) show that it is possible to design tasks that successfully target the use of specific grammatical structures. Mackey's study provides evidence that learners can actually learn the target structure as a result of performing a structure-based production task. However, there has been little research investigating this issue (Ellis, 2003).

Schmidt (1990) also claims in his 'consciousness hypothesis' that unconscious language learning is impossible, as Krashen proposes, and attention to input is a necessary condition for any learning; intake is what learners consciously notice. Paying attention to language form is hypothesised to be facilitative in all cases. When the learners 'notices' a 'gap' in their representation of the relationship between linguistic form and its function, restructuring occurs. It appears that 'noticing' must include some degree of conscious attention in order to be successful. Schmidt points out that carefully designed tasks can be used to bring about such noticing. Schmidt (1993) also adds that specifically focused tasks are exactly what is needed to promote language acquisition in the classroom.

However, Willis (1993), one of the strongest advocates of a task-driven approach to instruction, proposes that 'tasks which meet what might be termed a "naturalness" condition, which are not conformity-based or display-oriented for any particular
structure, will lead learners to develop language effectively' (quoted in Skehan 1998, p.124). Long (1985; 1998) also proposes that if tasks are designed for real-world needs they will generate interactions which engage acquisitional processes and lead to interlanguage development.

When communication is primary the central difficulties are that (Skehan 1998, p.125):
- It cannot deal with the fact that overemphasising communication increases the risk of a greater reliance on communication strategies and lexically-based language.
- There is no easy means of assuring systematic language development.

Like researchers, language teachers, material writers, and course designers have also recognised the value of tasks. However, they differ considerably in the way they use tasks in language teaching. Some methodologists treat tasks as supportive to the language teaching, in other words, they simply incorporate tasks into traditional language-based approaches to teaching (e.g. PPP). Other methodologists have been more radical in their treatment of tasks and have used tasks as units of teaching in their own right and have designed whole courses around them (e.g. TBLT) (Ellis, 2003).

In the weak version of CLT although the syllabus is 'communicative', which introduces a list of notions and functions, the methodology is traditional and non-communicative. In other words, the weak version of CLT uses tasks as a tool providing communicative practice for language items that have been introduced in a more traditional way, such as the PPP approach. That is, a language item is first presented to the learners then practised in a controlled manner using what is called 'exercises'. Finally, in the 'production' stage, learners are given opportunities to use the item to produce free language (Ellis, 2003). According to Ellis (2003), PPP can deliver what it promises, that is, it can provide learners with the opportunity to use the structures taught in real communication. In sum, the weak version of CLT is 'task supported', in other words, tasks are used along with other material. Grammar is taught (usually inductively) and there is error correction by the teacher at appropriate times. The weak version of CLT is eclectic.

The PPP approach to language teaching has been heavily criticised since it views language as a series of 'products' that can be acquired sequentially. However, SLA
research has shown that learners do not acquire a language as 'accumulated entities' (Rutherford, 1987). They actually construct a series of systems (interlanguages), which are gradually grammaticised and restructured when learners are given new features.

The other problem with PPP is that it is necessary to use 'grammar tasks', i.e. tasks that will elicit the feature that is the target of the lesson in the production stage. However, as Ellis (2003) notes, it is not easy to design tasks that require learners to use a targeted structure and there is always a danger that those tasks might turn into exercises which encourage learners to focus primarily on language form.

Despite these criticisms and problems, PPP has proved to be highly durable, as Ellis (2003) puts it. As Skehan (1996) suggests, this approach allows teachers to maintain the control of the classroom and thus they can reinforce their power over students. The other reason Skehan puts forward is the fact that the procedures themselves are highly trainable. As Harmer (1996) points out, despite all its limitations PPP is not dead and it will always play a role in language teaching and learning. PPP seems to be an entirely appropriate model for clearly defined rule-based grammar for students with low ability. As the students' level increases, various forms of task-based procedures appear to provide valuable options for language teaching (Harmer, 1996).

As Ellis (2003) points out, task based language teaching constitutes a strong version of CLT. The strong version of CLT is 'task-based' that is, 'tasks provide the basis for an entire language curriculum' (p.30). However, Ellis notes that a strong version of CLT can be achieved in a variety of ways, using tasks is not the only way to do it. For example, Stern (1992) offers a comprehensive classification of 'communicative activities' and what he calls 'communicative exercises', i.e. tasks, as discussed earlier. Nevertheless, Ellis (2003) acknowledges the value of tasks for planning a communicative curriculum. He indicates that tasks can function as a useful device, particularly in contexts where there are few opportunities for more authentic communicative experiences (e.g. FL situations). In the strong version of CLT, the teacher does not intervene to correct and there is no room for explicit teaching of grammar.

Both teachers and researchers have been concerned to find those tasks that work best for learning, in particular, those which draw learners' attention to L2 forms and
structures as well tasks that promote fluency (Ellis, 2003). There have been growing debates on the roles of tasks in language teaching. For example, Skehan (2002) disagrees with Bruton’s argument (2002) for a non-central role for tasks and claims that tasks have a much greater role than Bruton assigns to them, namely, that communication tasks ‘only serve for oral language practice’ (p.286). In a recent classroom research study, Hampshire and Anoro (2004) provide some evidence which supports Bruton’s reservations about the capacity for tasks and they conclude that although task-based instruction (TBI) foster fluency it does not have any effect on accuracy or complexity: ‘Negotiation of meaning does not improve accuracy in homogeneous classes’ (p.72). Hampshire and Anoro argue that learners can get their message across in TBI only if they use suitable vocabulary. Indeed, Skehan (1996) himself also acknowledges this aspect of TBI which he calls ‘lexicalized communication’ (p.42). He points out that task-based language teaching is likely to encourage learners to rely on vocabulary rather than the niceties of grammar to communicate their message therefore, it teaches learners to engage in lexicalized communication (Hampshire and Anoro, 2004).

According to Seedhouse (1999a), it remains to be proven whether task-based interaction is more effective than other varieties of classroom interaction despite the strong theoretical arguments put forward to promote task-based learning. He claims that it would be ill-founded to take a ‘strong’ task-based approach which takes ‘task’ as the basis for an entire pedagogical methodology and promotes task-based interaction at the expense of other varieties: ‘There are a multitude of different varieties of interaction in the world outside the L2 classroom, where there is certainly a lot more to communication than "performing tasks" ’ (p.155). As Ellis (2003) also argues, there is no guarantee that tasks will promote the kind of communication which is required for acquisition to take place or simulate the kinds of communicative acts that learners will experience in real-life contexts. Therefore, it would be a more realistic approach to concentrate on trying to understand how this classroom discourse can be made to work for acquisition instead of trying to replicate naturalistic communication in the classroom (Ellis, 2003).

As Seedhouse (1999a) points out, ‘task-based interaction is a particularly narrow and restricted variety of communication, in which the whole organisation of the
interaction is geared to establishing a tight and exclusive focus on the accomplishment of the task' (p. 155). Several writers also proposed various different varieties of communication which can occur in the L2 classroom, such as 'contexts', 'activity types', or 'interaction types' (Seedhouse, 1999a). Seedhouse (1999a) notes that each variety has some advantages, as well as some disadvantages, and limitations from a pedagogical and interactional point of view.

As discussed in the previous chapter, recent language teaching and research literature emphasise the value of realistic-communication activities, including more open-ended activities, such as discussions, games, etc. Thus, Crookes and Chaudron (1991) used a fairly broad classification of activity types, which are categorised on a continuum from 'controlled' to 'free' (i.e., with respect to the degree of teacher versus student control), or 'mechanical' to 'meaningful', to 'communicative'. According to the proponents of CLT, less controlled activities are believed to lead to more communicative, realistic use of language. In other words, learners often use the target language in a less restricted way in order to communicate with each other during this type of activities. Valcarcel et al. (1991) used an adaptation of Crookes and Chaudron (1991)'s system in their studies, in which they defined 38 activity types (for a more detailed description of the system see Valcarcel et al., 1991).

In this study, Ellis' (2003) definition of 'task' will be used throughout. The term 'activity' in this piece of research, on the other hand, refers to any classroom activity which is oriented towards a goal. A wider definition of 'activity' is used in this research in order to be able to cover all types of activities which might occur in the classrooms observed. It is predicted that language-focused activities will be used alongside meaning-focused activities in these classrooms. Moreover, modern versions of task-based activities also include a range of language-focused tasks at various stages of the task-based cycle, along with problem-solving, discussion, role-play tasks, as mentioned earlier.

In this study, an adaptation of Valcarcel et al.'s scheme (1991) will be used in order to categorise and analyse the types of activities observed in language classrooms.
CHAPTER III

INTERACTION IN LANGUAGE CLASSROOMS

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The previous chapters of this study have focused on how SLA research and the developments in the second language teaching field lead to the Communicative Approach in language teaching and have also illustrated some prominent features of this approach which affect classroom instruction and interaction. Since this study is based on classroom interaction research, this chapter will investigate some of the variables which are believed to influence the interaction process in language classrooms.

As Allwright (1984) puts it, there has been a bulk of research devoted to classroom interaction, 'explaining the management of interaction and its relationship with the management of learning' (p.169). Researchers, in particular, have tried to establish which classroom conditions result in the kinds of conversational adjustments that Long (1983) has hypothesed are important for acquisition. To this end, some researchers have compared the interaction that takes place in small-group work with that occurring in teacher-led lessons. Others have also investigated the effect of task design on interaction and found that certain kinds of tasks appear to result in more modified interaction than others (Ellis, 1994).

In this study, the COLT (Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching) Observation Scheme, which will be discussed in detail in the following chapters, is used to collect data. This scheme combines individual categories of language classroom interaction into an observation scheme; these categories find their origin in pedagogic and SLA research, as well as in classroom process research (McKay, 1994)

The COLT observation scheme used in this study contained categories derived from theories of communicative competence, from the literature on communicative language teaching, and from research in first and second language acquisition, which suggests a number of factors thought to influence the language learning process.

(Frohlich et al. 1985, p.27)
This chapter starts by focusing on the prominent features of classroom interaction. Then, it provides an overview of some important variables of interaction which are also described as the main parameters of the COLT observation scheme. This chapter is intended to provide a more intensive context to the study by presenting the variables of interaction defined in the COLT scheme and the research studies focused on these variables, which are believed to influence the interaction process in language classrooms.

3.2 CLASSROOM INTERACTION AND SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

'Interaction' is an important process in language teaching. Learners are exposed to the target language and language samples become available to the learner for interlanguage construction through the classroom interaction process (Ellis, 1990). Tsui (1995) also defines 'classroom interaction' as the interaction between the teacher and students, and amongst the students in the classroom. Allwright (1984) refers to classroom interaction as 'the fundamental fact of classroom pedagogy - the fact that everything that happens in the classroom happens through a process of live person-to-person interaction and successful pedagogy involves the successful management of classroom interaction' (Allwright 1984, p.156). Allwright (1984) also points out that CLT relies heavily on the value of interaction.

This study is concerned with interaction and the learning derived from it. Therefore, the COLT observation scheme, which aims to identify the significant aspects of L2 classroom discourse, is used in this study, as indicated earlier. Moreover, the hypotheses discussed so far (i.e. Input, Interaction, Output and Discourse Hypotheses) testify to the importance which researchers have attached to investigating 'interaction' as the matrix of L2 acquisition. They also testify to the lack of agreement regarding how classroom interaction promotes the acquisition of new linguistic knowledge. There has been no agreement on these two major questions: 1. What kind of communication is best for language learning? 2. How much communication (of whatever kind) is needed for learning? (Ellis, 1990).

Initially research was not informed by any underlying theory of L2 acquisition (Ellis, 1994) and earlier studies of L2 classroom interaction focused on the language used by
the teacher and learners and the way they affected interaction (Tsui, 2001). However, attention focused increasingly on examining instructional events in relation to the kinds of interactional theories discussed in Chapter 2. In particular, Long’s claims about the value of interactionally modified input has supported a number of studies investigating the extent to which the negotiation of meaning occurs in different instructional contexts. The bulk of L2 classroom research has focused on specific aspects of interaction; some of these studies will be discussed in the following sections (Ellis, 1994). Furthermore, recent studies have begun to investigate the underlying factors which shape interaction in the classroom and those studies brought further insights into the complexities of classroom interaction (e.g. teacher and learner talk, social and cultural background of the teacher and learners, teacher and learner beliefs and the psychological aspects of second language learning, etc.) (Tsui, 2001).

3.2.1 ASPECTS OF CLASSROOM INTERACTION

It has been recognised that successful outcomes in a classroom may depend on the type of language used by the teacher and the type of interactions occurring in the classroom. There has been a growth of interest in the analysis of teacher language and interaction in language classrooms and many believe that classroom interaction is one of the major variables affecting SLA in formal settings. Since this piece of research is based on classroom interaction it might be useful to look at the general nature of L2 classroom discourse and some features of classroom interaction.

3.2.1.1 THE NATURE OF SECOND LANGUAGE CLASSROOM DISCOURSE

Classroom discourse mediates between pedagogic decision-making and the outcomes of language instruction, as illustrated below (Allwright and Bailey 1991, p.25):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLANNED ASPECTS</th>
<th>THE LESSON</th>
<th>CO-PRODUCED OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Syllabus</td>
<td>Classroom Interaction</td>
<td>Practice Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Classroom Interaction</td>
<td>Receptivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atmosphere</td>
<td>Input</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 2 The Relationship Between Lesson Plans and Outcomes*
As illustrated above, in general, teachers plan their lessons, more or less explicitly, by making selections with regard to what to teach (syllabus), how to teach (method) and the nature of the social relationships they would like to create in their classrooms (atmosphere) (Allwright and Bailey 1991; Ellis 1994). When acted upon, their plans result in 'classroom interaction'. This is not planned in advance, but rather is 'co-produced' with the learners. The interaction provides learners with opportunities to encounter input (input opportunities) or to practise the L2 (practice opportunities) (Ellis, 1994). As Allwright and Bailey (1991) notes, these two types of learning opportunities often occur together. The interaction also creates in the learner a 'state of receptivity', defined as 'an active openness, a willingness to encounter the language and the culture(s) it represents' (Allwright and Bailey 1991, p.23).

'Instruction' has been defined as the interaction that takes place inside the classroom. It is possible to view the same instructional sequence in two different ways -as 'interaction' and 'formal instruction', which can be defined as an attempt to interfere directly in the process of interlanguage construction by providing samples of specific linguistic features for learning (Ellis, 1990).

It is important to make it clear that it is not intended to suggest that there are some classroom processes that can be classified as 'interaction' and others as 'formal instruction' (Ellis, 1990). Ellis claims that this way of looking at classroom process would be misleading. All classroom discourse, regardless of whether it derives from form or meaning-focused instruction, is considered as interaction of one kind or another. It is important to recognise that teaching intended as formal instruction also serves as 'interaction'. Learners may respond to form-focused instruction as 'interaction' and can acquire features in that way. 'Although it is unclear exactly in what way instruction contributes to the learner's language development, it is clear that instruction makes a difference' (Tsui 1995, p.12).

As van Lier (1988) puts it, 'if the keys to learning are exposure to input and meaningful interaction with other speakers, there is a need to investigate what input and interaction the classroom can provide' (p.94). Despite the fact that it is difficult to define what appropriate input is, the only concrete requirement placed on input is that it must be comprehensible. Moreover, interaction might come in many shapes and fashions in a classroom: Repeating after the teacher, answering questions, and acting...
out a dialogue, or discussing are all examples of interaction. There is a need to do research in order to show if and how learning comes about through the different ways of interacting in the classroom (van Lier, 1988). Overall, as Ellis (1990; 1994) points out, the research done so far has given some insight into how interaction shapes L2 learning and has made a real contribution to improving language pedagogy. But it has failed to show how interaction affects acquisition.

As van Lier (1988) indicates, classroom interaction is not random and it has its own regulations or conventions. Classroom discourse often follows a well-defined structure, consisting of ‘initiating’ ‘responding’ and ‘follow up’ (IRF) pattern, which is introduced by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975). Although IRF exchanges tend to dominate, other kinds can also be found. A number of researchers have shown that classroom discourse is often organised so that there is a strict allocation of turn in order to cope with potential transition problems and that who speaks to whom at what time is firmly controlled. As a result, there is less turn-by-turn negotiation and competition, and individual student initiatives are discouraged (Ellis 1994; van Lier 1988). Some approaches to language teaching, such as the Communicative Approach, encourage student initiatives and try to maximise learning potential in.

3.3 THE VARIABLES IN CLASSROOM INTERACTION

PROCESS

In this section, a detailed discussion of the main parameters of the COLT scheme and some important research studies focused on these variables will be presented. The COLT observation scheme refers to essential classroom interaction variables as 'activities', 'participant organisation', 'focus on form/meaning', 'teacher talk', 'student talk' and 'the use of L1 and L2' in classrooms and these features will be looked at in turn below.

3.3.1 ACTIVITIES AND TASKS

Activities and tasks are important variables in classroom interaction. As Ellis (1994) states, there has been increased research interest on activity and task types in recent years.
Researchers have been investigating a variety of task variables and a common distinction among task types appears to be between 'open' (divergent) and 'closed' (convergent) tasks (Duff 1986; Loschky 1988; Long 1989; Pica et al. 1989; Berwick 1990). Closed tasks appear to produce more negotiation of meaning and lead to more learner speech modifications towards target language (TL) norms than open tasks (Loschky and Bley-Vroman 1993; Ellis 1994; Manheimer 1995; Skehan 1998). Skehan (1998) suggests 'the evidence on the utility of different types of task goals is equally intriguing' (p.115). Duff (1986) found that the discourse which these two types of task produce have different characteristics. Specifically, her results show that convergent tasks lead to frequent exchange of turns and more communication units, whereas divergent tasks lead to longer units of greater syntactic complexity. However, as Jones (1991) points out, open-tasks might provide learners with greater interactive freedom to practise conversational skills such as topic selection and change (Ellis, 1994).

Several studies also examined the effects of interaction on tasks that involve a 'one-way' and 'two-way' exchange of information (e.g. Long 1980a; Gass and Varonis 1985; Doughty and Pica 1986; Newton 1991). One-way tasks and two-way tasks are information exchange tasks that are distinguished in terms of whether the information is held by a single person or between two or more people. The participant who holds the information in one-way tasks has the major role in completing the task successfully, although other participants can contribute by demonstrating when they comprehend and when they do not. Two-way tasks, on the other hand, require all the participants to participate in order to complete the task (Ellis, 2003).

Long (1981) found that two-way information-gap tasks prompted significantly more linguistic/conversational adjustments than one-way tasks (Ellis, 1994). The study by Doughty and Pica (1986) gives further support to the differences discovered between one-way and two-way tasks with respect to talk between non-native speakers (NNS). However, as Ellis (2003) suggests, such conclusions must be treated with caution 'as no study to date has actually investigated whether any difference in learning results from the use of one-way and two-way tasks' (p.89). Foster (1998) also reported that although there was an obvious trend for dyads doing a two-way task to produce more negotiated interaction in her research, it was the dyad set-up that was better at getting

The findings of research focusing on task types showed that jigsaw and information-gap tasks provide the greatest opportunity for students to interact in seeking comprehensible input and modify their output for communication. 'Another value of this kind of task is the motivation engendered by bridging the information gap to solve a problem' (Hedge 2000, p.281). However, although information-gap tasks assist language acquisition, they do not necessarily involve students in conversational strategies in the same way as role-play or discussion tasks (Hedge, 1995).

Other researchers have been more reluctant to suggest that one particular task type is desirable and have argued that different tasks contribute to acquisition in different ways. Tong-Fredericks (1984) argues that one task type is not necessarily better or more effective than another. According to his viewpoint different types of tasks elicit different kinds of responses, which can promote acquisition in different ways (Ellis 1990; 1994).

Finally, the relationship and the distinction between 'task' and 'activity' are examined in a study by Coughan and Duff (1994). They showed how a picture description task is interpreted and conceptualised variably by five different learners in actual performance. Coughan and Duff (1994) observed that the activities resulting from this task varied greatly. The learners established different goals for the same task and the kind of talk they produced also differed considerably. Coughan and Duff (1994) concluded that 'the picture description task does not constitute a "natural communicative activity" and that the primary activity is, therefore, "speaking for the sake of speaking"' (quoted in Ellis 2003, p.186). As Ellis (2003) notes, it is not
surprising that different learners react very differently to such a task. Some learners might attempt to make the task more genuinely communicative by seeking out appropriate interactional roles, whereas others can treat it in a more mechanical fashion. Coughan and Duff (1994) urge researchers not to treat 'task' as a constant in research, as "the activity it generates will be unique" (p.190).

N'Zian (1991) concludes that some activities are intrinsically more communicative or they lead to more communicative interactions and are more likely than others to bring about language acquisition. Games and simulations, for example, are usually thought to be more communicative and more effective for language acquisition than formal drills or substitution exercises and it would be contended that such activities facilitate the acquisition of the foreign language, rather than the learning.

The scheme refers to activity type as an open-ended unit of analysis of classroom interaction in order to include all varieties of activities that occur in a classroom setting. Therefore, in this study, an adaptation of Valcarcel et al.'s scheme (1991) is used in order to categorise and analyse the types of activities observed during the observation period, which will be discussed further in the next chapter.

3.3.2 PARTICIPANT ORGANISATION

Participant organisation is a major variable in classroom interaction, and it should be included in any observation scheme in classroom-based research. There is much evidence that interaction patterns in language classrooms are also affected by participant organisation (McKay, 1994). The category of participant organisation in the COLT scheme refers to three basic patterns of organisation for classroom interactions: 1. 'whole-class work' 2. 'group-work' 3. 'individual work'.

The use of group-work in language teaching has been advocated by methodologists who believe in the Communicative Approach to language learning (Bejarano et al., 1997), that is, group-work is often considered as a basic component of CLT (Brumfit, 1984). Foster (1998) adds that group work helps the teacher to create a positive and relaxed learning environment by reducing the anxiety which prevent some students from speaking up in front of the whole class.
As Ellis (1994) points out, the nature of classroom discourse 'will depend on the roles the participants adopt, the nature of the learning tasks, and the kind of knowledge that is targeted' (p.580). If it is widely recognised that the input and interactional modifications are important for L2 acquisition, then there are grounds for believing that the classroom does not typically constitute an acquisition-rich setting. As Nunan (1991a) puts it, teacher-led lessons are often described as 'lock-step', and are often criticised for lacking interactive features since teachers appear to be interested in only getting the right answer rather than conducting a meaningful discussion. Some researchers (Gremmo, Holec and Riley 1978; Long and Sato 1983; Pica and Long 1986) also claim that teachers typically dominate the talk in a classroom and the talk that results is generally of poor quality in comparison with that which takes place outside the classroom. In the Bangalore Project, there was considerable emphasis on 'receptive language', classes were 'teacher-centred', group-work was discouraged 'because of the fear that learner-learner interaction will promote fossilisation' (Prabhu 1987, p.82), and there was little or no student-student communication. In a recent analysis of participant organisation in four French L2 immersion classrooms and four French L1 classrooms using Part A of the COLT observation scheme, Fazio and Lyster (1997) found that 62% of the time in the L2 classrooms was spent in teacher-led whole-class activities.

Many believe that small group interaction maximises the amount of time each student has available for using the target language. It is argued that, as opposed to lock step situations small group interaction can provide students with more opportunities to speak, with increased exposure to different types of interaction, as well as with the need to engage in meaningful communication (Long and Crookes 1993; Macia and Caimons 1999). Since a special emphasis has been laid on the use of group-work and peer interaction in the language classroom by the advocates of Communicative Approach (e.g. Cohen 1986; Chaudron 1988; Nunan 1989b; Allwright and Bailey 1991; and Olsen and Kagan 1992), there has been a considerable body of research which has attempted to supply answers to the question of how group tasks might be linked to language development and acquisition: the input/interaction perspective of SLA - focusing on negotiation of meaning and possible links to language acquisition (Macia and Caimons 1999; Courtney 1996).
Applied linguistics research into oral language development and group work has been in several distinct traditions, and many of these approaches have, been narrow and exclusive (Yule and Tarone, 1991) possibly for reasons associated with the design complexities of more holistic attempts (Courtney, 1995), or perhaps as a result of deterministic beliefs in linkages between certain types of communicative activity - e.g. negotiated meaning - and SLA.

(Long and Porter 1985, quoted in Courtney 1996, p.319)

These studies supported that modifying interaction through the negotiation of meaning provides comprehensible input (Krashen, 1985) to the learner's subconscious language processing mechanisms. Thus, it is argued that the development of the learner's interlanguage system is based on two processes resulting in interaction - first, the need for comprehensible input to the learner; and second, the challenge for learners to grammatically structure their output (Swain, 1985). The psycholinguistic rationale for classroom group work is derived, therefore, from the theory that group work should increase both the quantity and quality of comprehensible input available to students (McKay, 1994), in other words, it provides the kind of input and opportunities for output that promote rapid L2 acquisition (Ellis, 1994).

Since fluency activities came into common use in ELT, some researchers aimed to investigate which activity and task types might be the most useful in second language acquisition in relation to providing negotiation of meaning and the conversational adjustments which push students to more accurate output. Doughty and Pica (1986) set up a study in which they hypothesised that if students worked in pairs ('dyads'), with a task which requires information exchange between the participants, they would engage in more negotiation of meaning than with tasks where such modification is optional, such as free discussion, or activities with more participants. Their study confirmed this hypothesis and showed the usefulness of pair-work information-gap tasks for language acquisition (Hedge, 2000).

Pica and Doughty (1985) investigated in what ways language input and output differed in a class using tasks in small groups and in teacher-fronted lessons. They collected data from three classroom discussions and they found that the students
produced more output and they were also exposed to more input in group-work; there was no difference in the level of accuracy in the students' output in both situations however, the input learners get from other learners in group/pair work is found to be less grammatical than that received from teachers. Moreover, but there was little evidence of negotiation of meaning in either situation. This last result was surprising since Pica and Doughty used those tasks as typically used in communicative classrooms, which aim to stimulate negotiation of meaning. However, a few students seemed to dominate the group-work in this study (Hedge, 2000). Storch's recent study (1999), on the other hand, has been supportive of the use of small groups and pair-work in the language classroom.

Swain (1985) reported that although the students in her study understood the target language perfectly they had not achieved an equal proficiency in producing it. Swain proposed that the students were not under pressure to speak or write with precision and coherence (see Swain's Output Hypothesis). A subsequent study by Pica et al. (1989) suggested that group-work could produce such pressure. Some other empirical studies (e.g. Varonis and Gass 1985; Gass and Varonis 1985; Doughty and Pica 1986, etc.) also showed that NNSs indeed use interactional adjustments to generate a supply of comprehensible input, and that such negotiations of meaning often occur during group work, especially in a dyad setting, where NNSs are required to exchange information (Foster, 1998).

In a study, Martyn (1996) investigated the influence of certain task characteristics on the negotiation of meaning in small group work. The results seem to indicate that while task variables appear to have an effect on the amount of negotiation of meaning, there appears to be an interaction between task variables, factors and interactional dynamic.

Bygate (1988) also suggests that group/pair work promotes acquisition by providing opportunities for learners to build up utterances through satellite units (i.e. words, phrases, or clauses that constitute either moodless utterances that lack a finite verb or some kind of syntactically dependent unit, such as 'yes in the same door I think', 'behind him', 'at the door', etc.). Bygate (1988) found numerous examples of such units in the speech produced by learners working in small groups. He argues that the use of satellite units gives flexibility in communication, allows the learner to formula
messages, and allows messages to be built up collaboratively thus helping to extend
learners’ capabilities (Ellis, 1994). However, Bygate did not obtain comparable data
from teacher-directed lessons, therefore, it is not clear whether satellite units are a
special feature of group work.

Wong-Fillmore (1985), on the other hand, with regard to class organisation she
reported that the most successful classes for language learning were the ones that
made the greatest use of ‘teacher-directed activities’ and, conversely, the least
successful ones were open in their structure and those that made heavy use of
individual work (Ellis, 1994).

Jacobs (1998) also provides a comprehensive list of potential advantages of group
work with those of teacher-centred instruction:

- The quantity of learner speech can increase
- Motivation can increase
- Enjoyment can increase
- Students can learn how to work together with others
- Learning can increase (p.172-175).

Nunan (1989b), however, concludes that learners often tend to favour teacher centred
over learner-centred participatory structures. Some researchers (e.g. Wells, 1999)
challenged group/pair-work on the grounds that it does not ensure the conditions
needed to achieve satisfactory task outcomes or language learning (Ellis 2003, p.266).

I believe that pair/group work can be very beneficial if they are planned very
carefully.

3.3.3 FOCUS ON FORM / MEANING IN CLASSROOM INTERACTION

One of the crucial issues in second language learning and teaching is whether the
primary focus on instruction should be on language form or meaning. A review of the
research into interaction relating to focus on form and meaning in classroom
interaction deals with the features of interaction included in the COLT observation
scheme, corresponding broadly with Stern's 'analytic' and 'experiential' features of interaction (McKay, 1994). The relationship between form-focused (analytical) and meaning-focused (experiential) activities in the classroom has recently emerged as one of the key issues in second language pedagogy. According to some researchers (e.g. Krashen 1982) form-focused activities are of minimal benefit, since conscious 'learning' cannot be converted into the central process of unconscious L2 'acquisition'. Other researchers (e.g. McLaughlin), on the other hand, have argued that guided or 'controlled' processes may precede, or accompany, the development of 'automatic' processes, as discussed in the previous chapter. That is, there is no reason to exclude grammar teaching from the L2 classroom since it is appropriate to the communicative goals of second language teaching. Although recent approaches to L2 instruction (e.g. Communicative Approach) emphasise the need for a more meaningful and natural use of language, it is still not clear what the precise differences are in practice and outcome which distinguish these recent approaches from more traditional approaches. First, there is need to establish a conceptual distinction between analytical and experiential activities (Allen et al., 1989).

Stern (1987) suggested that the experiential features of classroom interaction are activities based on a substantial topic; students get engaged in real-world activities; teachers focus on meaning. The features of the analytical approach, on the other hand, are that the teacher focuses on form; opportunities are provided for students to practise specific structures; attention is paid to accuracy rather than fluency (Allen et al., 1989). Stern's study will be discussed further in the following chapter. The COLT observation scheme which is designed to address these differences will also be analysed in detail in the next chapter. Throughout the history of language teaching, different principles have been introduced for language classrooms. The predominant earlier language teaching methodologies were the ones which took grammatical structures as the basic unit of analysis. According to these methods, language learning involves the acquisition of conscious knowledge and specific grammatical points should be explained in metalinguistic terms. These approaches suggest that it is not necessary to give explicit grammatical instruction and explicit error correction to learners, with the concomitant
argument that what is needed for acquisition to take place is sufficient quantities of input (Gass, 1997).

Long (1997) suggests that, according to the Interaction Hypothesis, negotiation for meaning can occur in certain interactions, depending on the kinds of tasks in which speakers are engaged and the prevailing task conditions. Modifications to the interactional structure of conversation through negotiation (Yano, Long and Ross, 1994) increase input comprehensibility without taking away learners access to unknown L2 vocabulary, and grammatical forms, as tends to occur through linguistic 'simplification' (Long and Ross, 1997) and provide important information about L2 form-function relationships (Doughty and Williams, 1998). Negotiation work also elicits negative feedback, including recasts (corrective reformulations of learner's utterances that preserve the learner's intended meaning) and such feedback draws learner's attention to mismatches between input and output, which forces them to focus on form (see Pica 1994; Long 1996; Pica et al. 1996).

It can also be drawn from SLA theory, as discussed earlier, that focus on forms in SLA can provide the practice necessary for control and automatisation, which might lead to reorganisation of the internal representational framework. Focus on structures, vocabulary, pronunciation and discourse features through practice in the classroom will allow the learning process to take place.

VanPatten and Cadierno (1993) contribute to the debate about the role and nature of focus on form in instructed SLA by suggesting that learners need to develop input processing strategies, 'those mechanisms that promote form-meaning connections during comprehension' (p.226). VanPatten and his colleagues (VanPatten 1995, 1996; VanPatten and Cadierno 1993; VanPatten and Sanz 1995) have introduced the term 'input processing', which basically deals with presentation and timing of input (Gass, 2003). The basis for this position begins with the assumption that comprehensible input is the key element in language acquisition, and therefore that traditional grammatical instruction which involves explanation and output practice may not be converted to intake, and therefore may not facilitate language acquisition. In other words, VanPatten and his colleagues' research 'relies on the concept of attention to form and its role as a learner moves from input to intake and then to output' (Gass 2003, p.231). According to VanPatten (1996), there is an important difference
between comprehension-based and processing-based approaches to input. The former is dominated by the need to elicit meaning, and as a result, it may or may not lead to any focus on form, since the primary focus is on the comprehension. The latter is more concerned with the control of attention during comprehension, and the way different cues can be focused on, such as exploiting the presence of past tenses and time adverbs to build prepositions when language is used for past-time reference (Skehan 1998, p.47). VanPatten suggests that processing approach aims to make learners more able to notice relevant cues in the input. Thus, form-meaning links during comprehension can be promoted (Skehan, 1998). VanPatten and Cadierno (1993), in their interesting study, report that the subjects who experienced processing instruction performed better in comprehension tests than those who received traditional instruction. They reached the conclusion that 'traditional grammar presentation and practice do not enhance how learners process input and therefore do not provide intake for the developing system' (p.238).

A number of studies into immersion programs in Canada reported some significant results regarding the role of form-focused instruction in second language learning. Swain (1985) reported on one study in which the proficiency of French learners in French immersion classes in Canada was measured and compared with the proficiency of native-speaking French learners. It was found that although the learners (the ones who passed content exams as successfully as the native-speakers) had many opportunities to receive comprehensible input, they were still behind native-speakers in terms of their grammatical and sociolinguistic competence. Through her output hypothesis, Swain (1985) points to the need to focus on form within interaction in the classroom, as discussed in Chapter 2.

As Sheen (2002) points out, one of the current debates in applied linguistics focuses on the most effective form of grammar instruction in the communicative classroom (Doughty and Williams 1998; Lightbown 2000; Norris and Ortega 2000). The debate revolves around the degree to which teachers need to direct learners' attention to understanding grammar whilst retaining a focus on the need to communicate' (Sheen 2002, p.303). Thus, on the one hand, there are those who advocate separate and explicit attention to grammar and teaching of discrete points of grammar (e.g. De Keyser, 1998). There are other researchers, on the other hand, who advocate minimal
interruption to communication by limiting attention to grammar (Doughty and Varela, 1998) (Sheen, 2002).

These two different views have been encapsulated by Long's proposal (1988; 1991) that grammar instruction can be presented in two ways: 'focus on form' and 'focus on forms' (Sheen, 2002). 'The former refers to drawing '...students' attention to linguistic elements as they arise incidentally in lessons whose overriding focus is on meaning, or communication' (Long 1991, p.46). This approach assumes that 'comprehensible input is best experienced through classroom interaction, which is supported by attention to form provided incidentally when justified by communicative need' (Sheen 2003, p.225). The latter, on the other hand, is associated with the traditional teaching of linguistic points in separate lessons, and as such also includes the approach advocated by DeKeyser (1998) (Sheen, 2003).

Long (1991) notes that teaching grammatical forms in isolation usually fails to develop the ability of learners to use forms communicatively; he also suggests that purely communicative syllabuses were equally inadequate, because of their neglect of grammar instruction. According to Long, integrating grammar instruction with communicative language learning provides an opportunity for learners to recognise the properties of target structures in context, and also help them to develop accuracy in their use.

An underlying assumption of the focus on form approach is that every classroom activity needs to be designed as a communicative task, and that any treatment of grammar should arise from difficulties in communication. Moreover, that treatment preferably takes the form of corrective feedback allowing for minimal interruption in communication (Sheen, 2003).

Long's ideas have stimulated extensive research on this issue (Williams 1995; Robinson 1996; Doughty and Williams 1998). A number of studies (e.g. Doughty and Varela 1998; Harley 1989; Lightbown and Spada 1990; Lyster 1994) have compared student language development in CLT with no focus on form to that which is achieved in CLT with focus on form. The results provide strong evidence in favour of the inclusion of a focus on form in the CLT classroom (Lightbown, 2000). A recent piece of research (Spada 1997; Norris and Ortega 2000) has also shown that learners
in communicative and content-based classrooms benefit from opportunities to focus on form. Norris and Ortega (2000) conducted a meta-analysis of experimental and quasi-experimental studies which investigated the effectiveness of L2 instruction published between 1980 and 1998. They concluded that Focus on Form and Focus on Forms interventions result in equivalent: 'Instruction that incorporates a focus on form integrated in meaning is as effective as instruction that involves a focus on forms' (Norris and Ortega 2000, p.500).

Samuda (2001) also concludes in her study that 'an important role for the teacher may be to complement the task by guiding attention towards form-meaning relationships (p.137). Samuda also suggests that temporary focus on form may be achieved by drawing learners' attention to usefulness of specific forms in the task they are performing (Ellis, 2003).

Sheen (2003), however, disagrees with this developing assumption in language pedagogy that a focus on form is a more effective teaching strategy than focus on forms and he argues that 'advocacy of focus on form as the most effective teaching strategy is only theoretically motivated, and lacks credibility in terms of the empirical evidence available' (p.225). He claims that Norris and Ortega's conclusion '...a focus on form and focus on formS are equally effective' (p.501) should be treated with scepticism since they excluded all pre-1980 comparative studies, and they also made a number of puzzling omissions among those published after that date. Sheen (2002; 2003) also claims that Norris and Ortega's use of the terms 'focus on form' and 'focus on forms' is ambiguous. He points out that some studies used in their meta-analysis do not use Long's criteria to differentiate a focus on form from a focus on formS. Sheen (2003) concludes that 'if Norris and Ortega had used Long's criteria to decide what does and what does not constitute a focus on form, and had they included all relevant studies, their conclusion would have been in favour of a focus on formS' (p.226). Sheen (2003), therefore, concludes that both Lightbown (2000) and Long (2000) fail to acknowledge the authors' positive findings in favour of a focus on formS and therefore provide an unrepresentative and misleading characterisation of the conclusion of Norris and Ortega's work.

Fotos (1998) also contributes to the discussion by claiming that the strong version of form-focused instruction, where learners are only exposed to a target grammatical
form through modified communicative input is not appropriate for the EFL situation. She suggests that there are few opportunities for communicative use of the target language outside the classroom and also target language use in the classroom might be surprisingly low in many language classrooms. However, if teachers modify the focus-on-form approach in such a way that formal instruction is given before communicative activities and feedback are introduced, this might provide many opportunities for learners. Fotos (1998) also proposes that interactive communicative tasks based on pair/group participation patterns enable learners to be engaged in meaning-focused interaction where they must both comprehend and produce the target language. Even within large classes, task-based activities give an opportunity for learners to maximise their language use.

In order to achieve the highest degree of effectiveness, the approaches to classroom instruction outlined above should be considered as complementary, rather than alternative to each other. I believe that each of these approaches can contribute to language acquisition in a different way.

3.3.4 TEACHER / STUDENT TALK, AND INTERACTION IN THE CLASSROOM

3.3.4.1 TEACHER TALK

Research shows that teachers talk most of the time in classrooms and control classroom interaction. Chaudron suggests that 'theoretical attention to comprehensible input and formal instruction has led to a substantial amount of research on L2 teacher speech, often referred to as "teacher talk" (Chaudron 1988, p.8). Most observation schedules, as Edwards and Westgate (1994) note, give specific attention to teacher talk, mainly because of the assumption that it is what the teacher says that determines the course of classroom interaction.

As Nunan (1991a) points out, it is the teacher who does the most talking in a classroom. Chaudron (1988) summarises some figures from various studies about teacher talk: teacher talk takes up 77 per cent of the time in bilingual classrooms in Canada, 69 per cent in immersion classes, and 61 per cent in foreign language classrooms. Hullon (1989) also found that 75 per cent of the classroom utterances in
language classrooms are provided by the teacher. A massive amount of the language the student hears came from the teacher. Several teaching methods have tried to maximise the amount of speaking by the student. The audiolingual method used the language laboratory because it increased each student's share of speaking time. Task-based teaching methods support pair-work and group-work which are believed to give each student the chance to talk as much as possible. The other teaching methods do not agree that teacher talk should be minimised. Listening-based teaching methods see most value in students extracting information from what they hear rather than in speaking themselves (Cook, 2001).

Other researchers also conducted studies on the specific functions of teacher talk served by general pedagogical moves. As Bialystok et al. (1978), Shapiro (1979) and Ramirez et al. (1986) report, although there is considerable evidence of variability among teachers and programs, generally teachers are likely to explain, question and command and learners to respond; teacher also take up about two-thirds of the total talking time. Milk (1982) used an adaptation of Sinclair and Coulthard's scheme in which eight types of functions of teacher utterances were identified and he found that 'elicitation', informatives', 'reply', and 'follow-up' were the ones most commonly used by the teachers in a grade 12 bilingual education civics classroom. Finally, Frohlich et al. (1985) used the COLT scheme which they analyse in terms of several of their communicatively oriented dimensions.

The length of the teacher talk has also been proved to be important in second language learning. Some resarchers (e.g. Seliger, 1983) claim that the quantity of input have some effect on language learning: If the teacher exposes the learners to extended speech, it will increase not only the quantity of of input, but also the quality of input, in terms of complexity (N'Zian, 1991).

As Ellis (1994) emphasises, although teacher talk has attracted interest because of its potential effect on learner's comprehension, little is known about what constitutes optimal teacher talk. The COLT observation scheme refers to teacher talk as 'giving predictable/unpredictable information' and 'making pseudo/genuine request'. There are also categories considering the length of teacher talk (i.e. minimal, sustained)
3.3.4.1.1 Teacher Questions

One aspect of teacher talk which has attracted attention in SLA research is that of teacher questions (Nunan, 1989a). As many researchers have reported, teachers typically ask many questions. For example, Johnston (1990) observed a total of 522 questions of various kinds in three-hours of language-content teaching. Similarly Long and Sato (1983) observed a total of 938 questions in six elementary level ESL lessons (Ellis, 1994). Mizon (1981) reported that questions constituted only between 20% and 40% of the major syntactic types in classrooms.

Mizon (1981) and Early (1985) also found that teachers are using more questions with NNSs than with native-speaking students. Long (1981) argued on the basis of this result that questions might facilitate interaction by clearly establishing both the topic and who is expected to speak. However, the nature of the question might significantly limit the possibilities for students to respond at any length (Chaudron, 1988). Research findings also suggest that in classroom discourse ungrammatical teacher talk is rare and declaratives and statements are used more than questions in comparison to natural discourse.

Other studies (e.g. Barnes 1969; Long and Sato 1983; Pica and Long 1986; Ramirez et al. 1986; Johnston 1990; White 1992) also showed that display/closed questions are more common than referential/open questions in the ESL classroom. They point out that this result contrasts with native speaker behaviour outside the classroom where referential questions are predominant (Ellis, 1994).

Long and Sato (1983) suggest that display questions not only tend to elicit short answers but also such questions 'are pervasive in ESL instruction, where a focus is on formal accuracy rather than communicative use of language (p.271). Ellis (1994) also argues that teachers' questions may affect L2 acquisition in terms of the opportunities they provide for learner output. According to the comprehensible output hypothesis, 'pushed output' helps learners to reconstruct their interlanguages. Therefore, the key issue is whether teacher questions cater for such output. Some researchers (e.g. Brock 1986; Long and Crookes 1987; Nunan 1990; White 1992) found that responses to referential questions were significantly longer than responses to display questions and he concludes that referential questions may increase the amount of learner talk in the
classroom (Nunan, 1989). However, as White (1992) shows in his study, not all display questions produce short responses (Ellis, 1994).

There are only a few studies which have investigated the relationship between a teacher's choice of question and learners' proficiency level. Ellis (1985a) did not find any difference in the question types (closed and open questions) used by a teacher with two learners over a nine month period. However, White (1992) reported that one of the teachers he observed used more referential questions with a high-level class and more display questions with a low level class, but he also reported that the other teachers in his study followed the opposite pattern (Ellis, 1994). Wells (1999) and Nassaji and Wells (2000) illustrate in their recent study that teacher questions which 'introduce issues for negotiation are more likely than known information questions to elicit substantive student contributions and encourage a variety of perspectives (Nassaji and Wells 2000, p. 400).

In the COLT observation scheme teacher questions are categorised as 'pseudo requests' and 'genuine requests'.

3.3.4.1.2 Teacher Feedback

Teacher feedback is another important feature of classroom interaction. One view common to many cognitive approaches to learning is that 'the function of feedback is not only to provide reinforcement, but to provide information which learners can use actively in modifying their behaviours' (Chaudron 1988, p.134). The other models of L2 acquisition (e.g. Schachter 1983) suggest that learners should be able to make a comparison between their internal knowledge of a rule and the information about the rule in the input they engage with (Chaudron, 1988).

According to interactionist theories, feedback through interaction can facilitate SLA, the input being provided by all interlocutors, not excluding the learner himself/herself (Ellis, 1985). The output hypothesis also attributes considerable importance to feedback, both direct and indirect (Ellis, 1994). In an updated version of the interaction hypothesis, Long (1996) focuses on negative feedback and suggests that negative feedback obtained during negotiation or elsewhere may facilitate L2
development. More recently, Mackey and Philp (1998) and Ayoun (2001) have also investigated the effect of negative feedback on acquisition.

Teachers tend to require students to produce the target language correctly in terms of both content and form and teacher feedback on the responses given by students is seen as a key feature of classroom interaction (Tsui, 1995). Chaudron (1988) defines 31 different types of corrective reactions (e.g. interrupt, negation, prompt, clue, etc.) which a teacher can make. Chaudron (1977) found an advantage in repetitions of student errors with reduction or emphasis (either questioning tone or stress) to result in correct student responses, and a combination of these modifications was said to be even more successful. Two other studies, on the other hand, indicated that teacher treatment helped learners by providing them with correct responses. Salica (1981) found that ESL students supplied correct responses to 64% instances of teacher corrective treatment. Wren (1982) concluded that the learner she observed was able to correct 83% of utterances after she received correction, as opposed to only a 14% rate of self-correction. Moreover, Hullen (1989) found that the feedback move was prominent with about 30 per cent of teacher's remarks consisting of 'right', 'ah', 'OK' and so on (Cook, 2001).

As Ellis (2003) points out, one type of feedback that has been the subject of a good deal of SLA research in CLT classes is the 'recast'. Recast can be defined as 'an utterance by a teacher or other, usually more proficient, speaker which rephrases the utterance of a learner, preserving the original meaning, but correcting the error(s) that occurred in the original utterance' (Lightbown 2000, p.446). Laboratory-based studies and also studies where learners interact with a more proficient participant (e.g. Leeman 2000; Long et al. 1998; Mackey and Philip 1998; Oliver 1995) have provided evidence for the beneficial effects of focused recasts (i.e. a single linguistic feature is targeted for recasting) (Lightbown, 2000). However, as Lightbown (2000) reports, findings from classroom studies have failed to provide such evidence.

In a review of the research on recasts, Nicholas, Lightbown, and Spada (2001) report that recasts appear to be most effective when they function as explicit corrections of learner utterances. Samuda (2001) also supports these findings and he reports that it might be necessary to give explicit feedback to students.
Seedhouse (1997), on the other hand, investigates whether it is possible to establish 'a dual focus' (i.e. simultaneous focus on accuracy and fluency, on form and meaning) through 'camouflaged repair' techniques (i.e. repair work by the teacher that does not interrupt the flow of the interaction). A feature of this kind of unobtrusive repair work does not involve any explicit negative evaluation and this technique may work best with 'slips' which do not interfere with communication (Seedhouse, 1997).

Seedhouse (1999b) also emphasises that it is necessary to distinguish self-initiated repair (I prompt repair of my mistake) from other-initiated repair (somebody else notices my mistake and initiates repair) and also self-repair (I correct myself) from other-repair (somebody corrects my mistake). Therefore, he suggests that there are normally four possibilities: (1) self-initiated self-repair, (2) self-initiated other-repair, (3) other-initiated self-repair, and (4) other-initiated other-repair (p.64). Van Lier (1988) notes that, it is widely agreed that self-repair is more contributory to acquisition than other repair, as it is likely to result in a negative effective response. However, Seedhouse (1999b) finds out in his piece of research that 'repair is generally initiated by the teacher (other-initiation), and the focus of the repair is on the production of specific sequences of linguistic forms' (p.76).

Based on the argument developed so far, it might be suggested that using a more detailed framework of teacher feedback in the COLT scheme would be more adequate. The COLT scheme developers used only one category for teacher correction, which might be considered as a weakness of the observation scheme.

3.3.4.1.3 Modifications in Teacher Talk

Research suggests that teachers modify their speech when addressing L2 learners in the classroom in a number of ways according to their learner’s general proficiency level. For instance, Hamayan and Tucker (1980) looked at the interactional modifications of a teacher’s speech and they concluded that teachers use more self-repetitions with L2 learners, in particular when they are low level proficiency. Ellis (1985) also reported that the teacher switched from asking questions that required simple object identification to questions that required student comment. This study opens up the possibility that some interactional features might be more important at one stage of a learner’s language development and others at later stages.
Similarly, several studies (for instance Pica and Long, 1986) showed that teachers tend to use shorter utterances with less proficient learners, but some studies which use words per utterance as a measurement report no modifications. As Ellis (1985) points out, another interesting issue in teacher talk is how the teacher determines what level of adjustments to make in a classroom. Teacher talk occurs in one-to-many interactions, where the learners may vary in their level of proficiency and there is likely to be only limited feedback from a few students in contrast with foreigner talk which normally occurs in one-to-one interactions and there is plenty of feedback from the learner. However, as Henzl (1979) showed, teachers manage to vary their adjustments to suit the linguistic competence of the class they are teaching. Teachers make more frequent adjustment with beginners than with advanced students (Ellis, 1985). Ellis (1994) suggests that many of these modifications are very similar to those found in foreigner talk, but some of them seem to reflect the special characteristics of classroom settings, in particular, the need to maintain orderly communication.

3.3.4.2 TEACHER-STUDENT INTERACTION

3.3.4.2.1 Negotiation of Meaning in the Classroom

The Input and Interaction Hypothesis have also motivated several studies that researchers wanted to find out the feature of tasks were most likely to lead to the kind of meaning negotiation hypothesised to facilitate language acquisition. Negotiation of meaning involves teachers and their students making interactional adjustments.

Long’s ‘Interaction Hypothesis’ emphasises the importance of comprehensible input and it also considers in some detail how input is made comprehensible, as discussed in Chapter 2. Long claims that it is most effective when it is modified through the negotiation of meaning when a communication problem arises. As Ellis (1999) suggests negotiation of meaning concerns the conversational exchanges that arise when interlocutors seek to prevent a communicative breakdown. These exchanges involve what Long has called interactional modifications (i.e. changes to the structure of a conversation to accommodate potential or actual problems of understanding). Interactional modifications are spontaneous and mainly affect how topics are talked about. They are referred to as ‘tactics’ such as ‘confirmation checks'
'clarification requests', 'comprehension checks' and 'modification of interactions'. They can involve simplification (e.g. shorter utterances and the use of less complex syntax and lexis), elaboration, and also redundancy (e.g. through paraphrase, restatements or use of synonyms) (Plough and Gass 1993, p.39-41; Ellis 1997, p.109; Foster 1998, p.8)

Long (1980a) hypothesised that language learning is facilitated through the interaction of learners and their interlocutors, particularly when they negotiate toward mutual comprehension of each other's message meaning, as discussed in the previous chapter. To achieve this goal, learners request their interlocutor's help in comprehending unclear or unfamiliar linguistic input, and obtain interlocutor feedback on the comprehensibility of their own interlanguage form and content. Then they respond accordingly, through modification and use of acquired L2 structures, as Swain (1985) proposed (Pica et al., 1993).

In particular, the opportunities to negotiate meaning are rare in a classroom setting (Ellis, 1997a). In early language teaching methodologies most of the classroom activities were consciousness raising. These methodologies provided a direct means of alerting learners to the language but at the expense of spending classroom time in practice activities' (Gass 1997, p.158). These activities include, for example, studying rules of grammar and memorising vocabulary words. However, metalinguistic awareness can be raised in other ways. Learners can be aware of errors in their speech (whether in grammar, pronunciation, content, or discourse) through the questioning and clarification that often takes place in negotiation. In other words, negotiation makes learners aware of incongruity between the forms they are using and the forms used by the native-speaking community. In order to respond to an incongruity of nonunderstanding, non-native speakers must modify output. Once the learner becomes aware of a problem and s/he seeks to resolve it, s/he modifies his/her output, in other words, the modification takes place. Although there is a limited evidence of the effects of these modifications, it is believed that it leads to negotiation, ultimately leading to increased knowledge of the second language (Gass, 1997).

A body of research following the work of Long (1980a) has been carried out to investigate the ways in which learners and their teachers seek clarification or check comprehension of each other's message meaning in classroom SLA (e.g. Doughty and
Pica 1986; Pica and Doughty 1985; Pica et al. 1987; Pica 1987). The results of such research showed that these input and interactional adjustments through which learners carry out tasks facilitate comprehension (Pica et al., 1993). Pica et al. also concluded that opportunities for learners to work towards collective goals and to negotiate meaning or exchange information are also limited since information flows in only one direction - from answer-supplying learner to question-asking teacher or researcher. They propose that in order to engage in the kinds of interaction believed to activate acquisition processes, classroom activities must be organised to provide a context whereby students not only talk to their interlocutors, but negotiate meaning with them as well.

As Ellis (2003) notes, there has been very little research to illustrate that negotiation of meaning actually promotes the acquisition of grammar. According to Braidi (1997), one of the reasons why researchers have failed to show that interaction promotes the acquisition of grammar is that researchers have tended to focus on the nature of interaction rather than on the grammatical structures (Ellis 2003). However, as Ellis (2003) points out, there have been several studies managed to show that negotiation of meaning facilitates grammar acquisition. For example, Mackey (1999) concludes that interactional modifications lead to SL development and more active involvement in interaction that offers opportunities for negotiation of meaning to take place. Some researchers also demonstrate that engaging with a narrative and an argumentation task (Bygate, 1999) and also varying a task condition (i.e. if the information is shared or split) (Nobuyoshi and Ellis 1993; Takashima and Ellis 1999) influenced learners' choice of linguistic forms. Some other studies also showed that task procedures can be manipulated to encourage the learners to use specific features (Ellis, 2003).

Nobuyoshi and Ellis (1993) and Takashima and Ellis (1999) also found that pushed output promotes language acquisition. However, van den Branden (1997) failed to support these findings and he concluded that modifying output through negotiation had no significant effect on syntactical complexity or accuracy (Ellis, 2003).

Foster (1998), drawing on SLA research on negotiation and interaction, proposes that the task is the key element for stimulation of input-output practice and negotiation of meaning. In other words, it is the task itself that can create the opportunities for
extended negotiation. Thus, task types should be designed to promote negotiated interaction. An examination of the language of these tasks is needed to understand which tasks are more beneficial. Varonis and Gass (1985) showed that there is less need for negotiation in a 'natural' conversation since the participants can rely on shared knowledge and experience. 'So one of the challenges of language teaching in the "unnatural" classroom setting is to design or adapt communication tasks in such a way as to require negotiation of meaning' (Lynch 1996, p.10). Some researchers also investigated the effect of task design on interaction. Certain kinds of tasks appear to result in more modified interaction than others. For instance, Long (1981) found that two-way information-gap tasks prompted significantly more linguistic/conversational adjustments than one-way tasks. Duff (1986) also found that convergent tasks produce more adjustments than divergent tasks. Closed tasks appear to lead to more negotiation of meaning (Loschky, 1988) and more learner speech modifications towards target language (TL) norms (Pica et al., 1989). However, Ellis (2003) argues that closed tasks may be less beneficial if other aspects of discourse are considered more important for acquisition (e.g. the opportunity to produce long turns, etc.).

A common distinction appears in language pedagogy between information gap tasks and opinion gap tasks. Foster (1998) compared the amount of negotiation that occurred when learners performed information gap tasks and opinion gap tasks in both pairs and in groups. She concluded that 'the dyad setting, coupled with the obligation to exchange information, was the "best" for language production, negotiations and modified output' (Foster 1998, p.18). Finally, a study by Nakahama, Tyler, and van Lier (2001) also found that information gap tasks resulted in more negotiation. However, they claim that students' exchanges in this type of tasks are rather mechanical, centring on lexical items, whereas the interactions derived from a conversation task resulted in significantly longer and more complex turns and wider use of discourse strategies, significantly longer and more complex turns and wider use of discourse strategies (Ellis, 2003).

In light of these results 'one could generalise and claim that, other things being equal, tasks are more effective if they contain information distributed amongst the different participants, so that interaction is more likely, and may become of better quality' (Skehan 1998, p.114). The strong version of this view would argue for the importance
of negotiation of meaning as a key element for SLA, however, there is some mixed evidence regarding the beneficial effect of interactionally modified input on comprehension (e.g. Pica 1992; Foster 1998), as discussed above (Skehan, 1998).

Skehan (1992), on the other hand, assumes that if students are encouraged to express what they want to say in peer communication, they will be forced to negotiate meaning. However, Hampshire and Anora (2004) claim that 'learners can only go beyond their individual competences if the checking, clarifying, and feedback they receive from their peers has a minimum level of acceptable quality' (p.72-73).

To sum up, there is mixed evidence regarding the value of linguistically simplified input for promoting comprehension (Ellis 1990; Ellis 1994; Foster 1998).

In the COLT observation scheme there are 7 categories which feature teacher-student interaction: 'correction', 'repetition', 'paraphrase', 'comment', 'expansion', 'clarification request' and 'elaboration request' (see Appendix II).

### 3.3.4.2.2 Use of the Target Language in the Classroom

Though the popular teaching methods of the twentieth century differed in many ways, they nearly all tried to encourage target language (L2) use in the classroom. With the exception of the Grammar-translation Method, the other language teaching methods (e.g. Direct Method, the Audiolingual Method and Task-based Approach) insist that the less the first language (L1) is used in the classroom, the better the teaching (Cook, 2001). The use of the first language was rarely mentioned as a possibility and for example Willis, one of the strongest advocates of TBLT, suggests that the mother tongue should not be banned, especially in the early stages of language learning, but students should be encouraged to use the target language' (Willis 1996, p.130). In the 1990s the English and Welsh National Curriculum emphasised this in such dicta as:

'...Communication in a foreign language must thus involve both teachers and pupils using the target language as the normal means of communication' (DES, 1991, p.C1).

'The natural use of the target language for virtually all communication is a sure sign of a good modern language course' (DES, 1990, p.58; quoted in Cook 2001, p.153).
There has been debate over the use of L1 and L2 in language classrooms. 'As a consequence of these quite different viewpoints, investigations of teachers' language choice in L2 classrooms have taken distinct positions upon discovering the extent of L1 or L2 use' (Chaudron 1988, p.121). Ernesto Macaro (1997) observed a number of language teachers at work in classrooms in England to see when they used L1. He found 5 instances in which L1 is commonly used:

- for giving instructions/clarifications for activities
- giving feedback to pupils
- translating and checking comprehension
- individual comments to students
- using the first language to maintain discipline (for disciplinary interventions).

In terms of frequency, Franklin (1990) found that over 80 per cent of teachers used L1 for explaining grammar and for discussing objectives; over 50 per cent for tests, correcting written work, and giving background information; under 16 per cent for organising the classroom and activities and for speaking informally (Cook, 2001).

Krashen's comprehensible input hypothesis implies that there is no place for L1 use in language classrooms. Canale and Swain (1980), in providing theoretical bases for developing approaches to L2 teaching, do not commit themselves to L2 exclusively. However, they put emphasis on communication which involves the continuous negotiation of meaning. Dickson (1992), in his review, concludes that the quantity of teacher L2 input may not be beneficial as the quality of teacher L2 input and also L2 input without interaction cannot guarantee intake (Macaro, 1997). According to Franklin (1990), 90 per cent of teachers think teaching in the target language is important (Cook, 2001).

'In a typical language classroom, the common belief is that the fullest competence in the target language is achieved by means of the teacher providing a rich target language environment, in which not only instruction and drill are executed in the target language, but also disciplinary and management operations' (Chaudron 1988, p.121). However, as Atkinson (1993) notes, researchers failed to provide the evidence
for L2 use in a classroom. The few empirical studies which were conducted on the quantity of teacher L2 use were also inconclusive. Although Mitchell et al. (1981) found high positive relationship between opportunities for speaking and learner proficiency growth, they concluded that evidence seems to indicate that there is not a direct causal relationship between mere production of correct target language utterances and learning (McKay, 1994). Dickson (1992) in his review, concludes that the 'quantity of teacher L2 input may not be as beneficial as quality of input; L2 input without interaction cannot guarantee intake' (quoted in Macaro 1997, p.74).

Cook (1991) also argues that there is no evidence that code-switching is inappropriate in a language classroom and he argues that there should be some principles for code-switching. Hagen (1992) refers to code-switching as a fundamental language skill which needs to be acquired because it is normal part of the interactive process. Kharma and Hajjah's (1989) summarised their findings as follows:

- 93 % of teachers used L1 to some degree in the classroom in order to explain 'new and difficult items', such as new grammatical points or difficult questions (medium oriented).
- Learner competence is a factor in teacher use of L1 (more L1 used in the beginner stage).
- 75 % of learners felt that use of L1 was helpful in facilitating learning.

(p.228)

When the teacher uses the target language as the principal means of instruction s/he will in part be imitating a native speaker who does not speak the L1 of the classroom. In a study which was carried out in the Tarclindy project, in French (L2) classrooms, it was found that in only a small percentage of cases (10 %) pupils perceive the teacher as a real French person. In the majority of cases (64 %), teachers were perceived as English people helping them understand some French (Macaro, 1997).

Some research was carried out to investigate the relationship between the teacher's use of the first or target language, and the pupils use of the first or target language. For instance, in a follow-up action research project, Zilm (1989) discovered that when she increased the use of German in class, her students' use of German (the target language), rose proportionally (Nunan, 1991a).
Finally, Chaudron (1988), in a general but brief review of research and literature on the use of L1 and L2 (in all types of second language classrooms), draws the following conclusions:

- teachers apply and expect quite different uses of L2 according to the type of learner/classroom they are teaching;

- use of teacher L2 in Canadian classrooms ranges from about 90% in the French immersion classes to about 70% in the core French (standard FL classroom) (Chaudron describes the latter as 'respectably high levels of TL use in a foreign language environment').

- The total proportion of L1 to L2 use alone is probably not the critical variable in determining the degree of L1 maintenance or L2 acquisition

(quoted in Chaudron 1988, p.124; Macaro 1997, p.75)

Cook (2001) concludes that 'SLA research provides no reason why any of these (classroom) activities is not a perfectly rational use of the first language in the classroom. If twenty-first-century teaching is to continue to accept the ban on the first language imposed by the late nineteenth century, it will have to look elsewhere for its rationale' (Cook 2001, p.155).

I agree with Cook that it is not necessary to ban teachers from using the first language in the classroom, however, the use of the first language should be reduced gradually. I strongly believe that classroom is an important setting which provides an opportunity for learners to practise the target language. In this setting, teachers should try to create an atmosphere in which students are encouraged to use the target language for communication.

3.3.4.3 STUDENT TALK (STUDENT LANGUAGE PRODUCTION)

Student talk is another important variable in classroom interaction and it attracts much interest from researchers in the second language field. The patterns of interaction are constructed jointly by teachers, as they control the content and structure of classroom communication, and by students, as they interpret and respond to what teachers say and do' (Johnson 1996, p.72). Students in a classroom context are often restricted to a responding role; therefore, their opportunities for participating productively in the L2 classroom are constrained. It has been hypothesised that opportunities for using L2
resources are important for acquisition, then it would seem that learning might be inhibited in the classroom. The assumption is that participation is important for learning (Ellis, 1994).

3.3.4.3.1 Quantity and Quality of Student Participation in the Classroom

According to CLT, student participation is necessary for language acquisition. However, there is no clear evidence on the extent to which learners' productive participation in the classroom affects their language development. The results are mixed. Whereas some studies (e.g. Seliger 1977; Strong 1983; 1984) showed positive correlation regarding the amount of learner classroom participation and L2 achievement, a number of studies (for instance, Day 1984; Ely 1986a; 1986b) did not find such relationships. Allwright (1980) carried out a study on turn-taking patterns and found that learners who showed the greatest advances were not the ones who participated the most in the lesson.

Swain and Carroll (1987) observed that students in immersion classes do indeed have fewer opportunities to speak French in class - around two-thirds of the opportunities they have in instruction in their native language. The analysis of interaction suggested that by providing more opportunities for student-initiated talk and by teachers asking more open-ended questions so the amount of sustained talk would increase (Swain and Carroll 1987, p.233).

Recent task-oriented research has been focused on speech production theories. Skehan (1998), drawing on and extending Swain's output hypothesis (1995), suggests that production has six roles 1. it serves to generate better input through the feedback; 2. It forces syntactic processing (i.e. it obliges learners to pay attention to grammar); 3. It allows learners to test out hypotheses about the target-language grammar; 4. It helps to develop automaticity; 5. It provides opportunities for learners to develop discourse skills, for example by producing 'long turns'; and 6. It is important for helping learners to develop a 'personal voice' by steering conversations along routes of interest to the speaker (Skehan 1998, p.16-18). Ellis (2003) argues that several of these roles do not contribute to acquisition directly but rather indirectly (i.e. 1,3, and 6 would seem to fall in this category).
N'Zian (1991) notes that, in second language classrooms, the length of students' output is often restricted to one sentence or less whereas, outside the classroom, language use include utterances as minimal as one or two words as well as fairly sustained ones. The assumption is that classrooms become more natural, therefore more communicative, when opportunities are created for students to produce more sustained output. The length of student talk is, thus, another criterion to assess the communicativeness of language classrooms.

Researchers employed a wide range of specific measures to quantify learner production. In an early study, for example, Tong-Fredericks (1984) measured learner production in terms of the frequency of turns, the amount of self-correcting and he also measured the number of words learners produced per-minute of speaking, Brown (1991) measured task performance in terms of repetitions, prompts, rephrasing, repairs, instructional input whereas Newton and Kennedy (1996) investigated task-based production in terms of specific linguistic features, prepositions, and conjunctions (Ellis, 2003). Skehan (1996), on the other hand, distinguishes three aspects of production: Fluency, Accuracy and Complexity. Skehan suggests that language users and tasks vary in the extent to which they emphasise fluency, accuracy, or complexity.

Many researchers (Hunt 1966, 1970; Schneider and Connor 1990; Young and Milanovic 1992; Young 1995) used T-units (i.e. one main clause with all subordinate clauses attached to or embedded in it) and also c-units (i.e. utterances, for example, words, phrases and sentences, grammatical and ungrammatical, which provide referential or pragmatic meaning) in order to quantify language production.

While the amount of participation may not be a key factor in L2 acquisition, a stronger case can be made for the importance of high quality participation (Ellis, 1994). As discussed earlier, Swain (1985) claims that acquisition is promoted when there are opportunities for pushed-output, not just any kind of output. One of the factors that seem to determine the quality of learner participation in the classroom setting is the degree of learner exercise over the discourse. Catchard (1986) found that situations where the learner had the control of the talk were characterised by a variety of communicative acts (e.g. story-telling, interview, free-play, etc.) and syntactic structures. On the one hand, the situations where the teacher had control seemed to
produce single-word utterances, short phrases, and formulaic chunks. Other researchers have also found significant differences in the quality of learner participation depending on the kind of activity they are involved in. For instance, House (1986) compared the performance of advanced learners of L2 English in a role-play situation and a teacher-led discussion. She reported that the role-play conversations sounded much more natural. Ellis (1988) suggests that some other factors may affect the nature of the interactions in classrooms, such as whether the learners' responses are volunteered or nominated, or the teacher's policy regarding the distribution of practice opportunities (Ellis, 1994).

Ellis (1994) summarises that the quantity and quality of interaction varies according to task. The results of research which has investigated the effect that different tasks have on classroom interaction have generally been very inconclusive, mainly because of the difficulty of identifying and controlling the task and learner variables that affect interaction. Finally, Foster (1998) reports that it is the dyad set-up that plays a crucial role in getting students to talk, regardless of task type.

As McKay (1994) emphasises, the quality of student talk is, however, important. The COLT Observation scheme picks up this feature of student turns through the categories 'form restriction' (i.e. restricted/unrestricted) and 'length of student talk' (i.e. ultra-minimal, minimal, sustained).

So far, this chapter has provided an overview of research studies into some major variables in classroom interaction. The argument and discussions developed in this chapter are hoped to give some insight into current research and also to provide a basis for analysis of the findings of the study.
CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter outlines the methodology used to collect and analyse the data and gives background information on the schools where the research was conducted. In order to discuss the techniques and procedures used in the process of data collection and data analysis this chapter is divided into the following sections:

1. Data collection methods in social sciences and the data collection methods used in this study are introduced.

2. The schools in Turkey and England in which the data was collected, and the process of data collection are briefly described.

3. The data analysis process is presented.

As illustrated above, first a general discussion about quantitative and qualitative issues in L2 classroom research and also the methodological issues involved in the use of systematic observation in modern language classroom research will be studied and evaluated. This leads to a description of the research design and an explanation of the rationale used when deciding on the research methods of this study. Second, the methods of investigation putting particular emphasis on the COLT scheme, which is one of the most sophisticated systematic observation system in language classroom research, will be introduced and issues related to research methodology (i.e. validity and reliability; strengths and limitations of the data collection methods) will also be discussed in this chapter. Finally, a detailed description of the data analysis process (i.e. the way the data is organised and analysed) will be provided.
4.2 RESEARCH DESIGN

4.2.1 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This piece of research explores the nature of oral interaction in language classes in order to reflect upon the effect of different communicative orientation in two different contexts. Since Turkish and British MFL syllabuses, which will be analysed later in this chapter, assign different emphases on grammar teaching and form-focused instruction, the hypothesis put forward for this study is that the communicative orientation of the classrooms observed in the two countries will be different, and this difference will impact in classroom interaction. Therefore, the communicative orientations of language classrooms in these two countries will provide data to compare the differences and the effects of these differences in classroom interaction.

This study, therefore, focuses on oral interaction in modern language classrooms and aims to investigate any qualitative and quantitative differences that exist between the ways that the teaching and learning of spoken language are handled pedagogically in Turkish and English secondary schools.

This piece of research also explores whether different inputs (activities, materials, etc.) cause different outcomes in verbal interaction and the extent to which these different activities affect the nature of interaction.

The research questions in this study are developed in the light of previous research and existing theories, which have been discussed so far, and they aim to explore the nature of classroom interaction in L2 classrooms in Turkish and English secondary schools. The research questions for this study are as follows:

1. What is the nature of the communicative orientation of the secondary L2 classes observed? Does communicative orientation make a difference in the classrooms observed in terms of classroom interaction and students' language production?

2. How do the types of activities affect the oral interaction in language classrooms? (e.g. what types of activities induce more modified interaction and negotiation of meaning, etc.)
3. Do less controlled activities induce more authentic, natural and flexible interaction between students?

4. How can the materials/activities be designed to enhance the learning opportunities and the nature and the quality of the interaction?

5. Is there any difference in the way the modern language teachers organise the lessons in the two countries? That is, 'is there any difference in the types of activities they use and in the way they use these activities in the classroom? Do these lead to any differences in students' language production?

6. Is there any relationship between instructional differences (i.e. meaning-focused and grammar-focused instructions; explicit and implicit grammar-teaching) and students' language production?

7. Are there any differences in the kind of instruction that learners in modern language classrooms in the two countries are receiving and do the differences in these kinds of instructions affect language production?

The term 'communicative orientation' is used in this study, in a similar way to how McKay (1994) used the term in her research, to refer to the relative emphasis on classroom interaction towards 'communicative' (experiential or meaning-focused) orientation and 'focus on language form' (analytical or focusing on the linguistic features such as, grammar, lexis, etc.) orientation within naturally occurring classrooms. The orientation (or instructional variation) in this study is measured by a quantitative analysis of the emphasis on meaning-focused and form-focused instruction within classroom interaction defined by the COLT observation scheme by Allen et al. (1984) and Spada and Frohlich (1995), will be discussed in detail in the following sections.

4.2.2 DATA COLLECTION

There are four sources of data drawn upon in this study which are used to support the conclusions reached:

- Classroom observations, analysis of interaction through structured classroom observation scheme
4.2.2.1 ISSUES IN RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The main issues of subjectivity and objectivity in data collection and data analysis often emerge when devising observation schedules for recording classroom data. However, they are not just the problems of observation schedules and it raises the issue of whether a 'qualitative' or a 'quantitative' approach should be applied to classroom research; or, whether it possible to combine quantitative and qualitative approaches in classroom research. Newman and Benz (1998) suggest that the conflict between quantitative and qualitative researchers is based upon the differences in assumptions about what reality is, whether or not it is measurable. Quantitative tradition is concerned with explaining and predicting how natural phenomena work, whereas qualitative tradition focuses on understanding and interpreting how these phenomena organised (Ochsner, 1979). Ochsner (1979) differentiates between quantitative and qualitative traditions by noting that quantitative research assumes that there is a single, discoverable reality that causality obeys the laws of the nature. In contrast, qualitative tradition predicts that multiple realities exist and that human events in particular can be interpreted only according to their outcomes (Markee, 1994). Salamon (1991) concludes that each of these research paradigms serves
different purposes, addresses different issues, asks different questions, and employs different methodologies: 'Each of them entails also some weaknesses in the same areas in which the other approach might be strongest' (Salamon 1991, p.16).

Brannen (1992) suggests that the most prominent difference is the way in which each tradition treats data. A quantitative research paradigm which is an inquiry into a social or human problem, based on a testing a theory composed of variables, measured with numbers, and analysed with statistical procedures, in order to determine whether the predictive generalisations hold true. Qualitative research paradigm, on the other hand, emphasises how people differ from inanimate natural phenomena and, indeed, from each other (Creswell, 1994).

4.2.2.2 CLASSROOM RESEARCH

This study involves classroom-based research in second language classrooms. Allwright and Bailey (1991) suggest that classroom-centred research is 'research-centred on the classroom, as distinct from, for example, research that concentrates on the inputs to the classroom (the syllabus, the teaching materials, etc.) or on the outputs from the classroom (learner test scores)' (p.2). Classroom research investigates the process of teaching and learning as they occur in language classrooms; it simply tries to explore what actually happens in the classroom. Therefore, it is quite distinctive from the research that concentrates on the inputs to the classroom or on the outputs from the classroom. Its findings are important to classroom teachers, researchers, and theorists. As Lightbown (1990) puts it,

Doing research on how instructional variation affects learning in classroom settings is one of the most frustrating endeavours known...

For researchers who are aware of the pitfalls at every step, it takes courage, commitment, and a great tolerance for ambiguity to pursue classroom-centred research. Those who do so with this knowledge are convinced that something as important as finding research evidence which can lead eventually to the improvement of second language instruction cannot be abandoned simply because it is so difficult.

(p.82)
As Gaies (1980) notes the classroom is a crucible - the place where teachers and learners come together and language learning happens.

In L2 classroom research the central data derive from things that go on in the classroom. Classroom researchers start with certain ideas, assumptions of significance and relevance, a set of preferred procedures, and expectations for certain results. Classroom-oriented research has helped researchers to understand the nature of interaction in the classroom (van Lier, 1988).

It is classroom-oriented research, defined by Nunan (1991b) as that

\[
\text{research which either derives its data from genuine language classrooms (that is, classrooms which are specifically constituted for the purposes of language learning or teaching) or which has been carried out in order to address issues of direct relevance to the language classroom.}
\]

(p.249)

Methodological approaches to L2 classroom research is very diverse ranging from relatively simple observations to tightly controlled experiments. Classroom research is a dynamic area of investigation, and this diversity of research methods reflect on both extremely varied research questions and purposes, and a range of theoretical perspectives on the conduct of research (van Lier, 1988).

There is a range of traditions in second language classroom research. Chaudron (1988) identifies four traditions: 1. \textit{psychometric} (standard educational psychometric procedures using the 'experimental method', with comparison treatment groups; applied in early evaluations of L2 instruction, e.g. Scherer and Wertheimer, 1964) 2. \textit{interaction analysis} (the development of systems for the observation and analysis of classroom interaction in terms of social meanings and an inferred classroom climate, e.g. Flanders 1960; Moskowitz 1971; Wragg 1970) 3. \textit{discourse analysis} (analysis of the discourse of classroom interaction in structural-functional linguistic terms through the study of classroom transcripts which typically assign utterances to predetermined categories, (e.g., Bellack \textit{et al.} 1966; Fanselow 1977a,b; Sinclair and Coulthard 1975) and 4. \textit{ethnographic studies} (attempts to interpret behaviours from
the perspective of the participants' different understandings rather than from the observer's or analyst's supposedly 'objective' analysis through naturalistic, 'uncontrolled' observation and description (e.g. Green and Wallat 1981; Wilkinson 1982) (Chaudron 1988, p.13-15; Nunan 1992, p.3). Disputing this analysis on the basis that there are actually two distinct research traditions in language classroom research methodology, Nunan (1992) brings Chaudron's four traditions down to the commonly perceived psychometric and ethnographic distinction. According to Nunan the psychometric/ethnographic distinction reflects on the distinction between quantitative (obtrusive, controlled, objective and product oriented, generalisable and provides 'hard' and replicable data) methods in mainstream education literature and qualitative (naturalistic 'uncontrolled', subjective, process-oriented, difficult to generalise but provides 'real, 'rich', and 'deep' data) (Nunan, 1992).

Observation is commonly used in education as a tool to support understanding educational situations, evaluate the effectiveness of educational practices, and plan attempts for improvements (Malderez, 2003).

As Parkinson (1992) puts it,

*It is increasingly realised that observing actual lessons is a necessary, or at least highly desirable part of all such activities, because indirect evidence - teaching materials, lesson plans, learner recordings and scripts, tests, questionnaires and interviews simply cannot give a complete picture.*

(p.20)

There are a number of categories into which the world of classroom observation is divided up in schemes put forward in the literature. All frameworks proposed by different researchers (e.g. Seliger and Shohamy 1989; Wallace 1991; Hopkins 1993) address a number of questions, such as the observer's degree of participation, the issue of 'objectivity', inductive (heuristic) and deductive (analytic) parameters, among others (McDonough and McDonough, 1997).

As Croll (1986) emphasises, the relationship between systematic and qualitative observation emerges naturally from the fact that they both use observation as a data
collection technique. These two observation methods used in L2 classroom will be analysed in the following section.

4.2.2.1 Naturalistic Observation (Ethnographic Approach to Observation)

At the simplest level, 'naturalistic' refers to a concern with the understanding of natural settings and the representation of the meanings of the actors within that setting. In the case of EFL, the everyday lesson with its usual participants in real time provide two essential elements to construct a database for a naturalistic observation (McDonough and McDonough, 1997).

In terms of the logic of the paradigm, the notion of context becomes crucial, since it sites the phenomenon of study in space and time, and can therefore explore interactions and relationship patterns in a group of people working together (This is the 'holistic world' as Van Lier, 1988 calls, where the setting speaks for itself). The supporters of this approach believes that a 'classroom culture' can be built up over a long period of time, since even a short interaction may contain some complex verbal and behavioural presuppositions (McDonough and McDonough, 1997).

The ethnographic approach is generally identified as a qualitative, process-oriented approach to the study of interaction (Chaudron, 1988). While systematic observation claims to be objective because of its well defined categories and puts emphasis on the generalizability of its results, the ethnographic approach, also referred to as 'unstructured observation', claims to be more insightful and insists on giving a better understanding of what is actually going on in the classroom since no a-priori categories are used (N'Zian, 1991). The ethnographic approach rejects the predetermined hypotheses to test, and implies that 'the structuring is done by the researcher and not by the data gathering device chosen prior to beginning the observation' (Long 1980b, p.21).

According to Markee (1994), 'the value of ethnomethodology lies in the fact that it provides the field with opportunities for critically reevaluating its dominant epistemology and also for reassessing the criteria by which it measures its level of success as a scientific endeavour' (p.112).
As Markee (1994) points out, the traditional qualitative critique of the quantitative approach focuses crucially on experimentalists' rejection of ordinary language and day-to-day experience as valid ways of knowing and organising the world. The proponents of quantitative tradition view these ways of accessing knowledge as too value-laden and subjective to be useful tools for science, therefore they can only provide 'shallow' explanations of social phenomena. Markee, however, disagrees with the quantitative tradition's characterisation of qualitative (descriptive) studies as limited and non-theory generating and she argues that 'interpretative explanations, inspired by hermeneutics, of ordinary data have considerable theoretical power, which may be generalised beyond the single events on which they are based' (p.112).

Naturalistic observation techniques used for the classroom observations have been developed since the mid-1960s (see Allwright 1988; Allwright and Bailey 1991; Chaudron 1988; van Lier 1988). Such approaches, which basically focus on teacher behaviour or classroom interaction processes, have not typically been used to examining SLA development directly. However, through analyses of additional measures of interaction and learning opportunities arising from classroom behaviours, researchers have pointed to contexts and processes that might influence language acquisition (Chaudron, 2003). For example, Markee (1994), applied the 'Conversation Analysis' (CA, which builds on ethnomethodological assumptions and adopts an empirical approach to the study of interaction in real-life, as Martin, 2004 defines) analysed transcripts of lessons to explain how the mechanisms of turn-taking and repair may be used as sources for successful second language learning. CA has been used in the analysis of classroom talk, specifically learner and teacher talk to investigate how negotiation of meaning might be optimised in the language classroom, in the context of growing interest in interaction and teacher research (van Lier, 1996; quoted in Martin 2004, p.146).

In similar studies, Lyster (1998a; 1998b), and Lyster and Ranta (1997) also used audio-recordings of lessons to evaluate student performance in relation to teacher feedback.

Lam and Wong (2000) report a study that investigated the influence of teaching students key interaction strategies during class discussion. The key interaction strategies which students need to learn are described by 24 practising teachers as
seeking and providing clarification when communication difficulties arise in class discussions. Lam and Wong (2000) recorded the class discussions and used the transcribed data in order to show how training in interaction strategies affect the development of oral competence in the ESL secondary classroom. Lynch (2001) also offers an interesting study, in which he gets students to make transcripts of an extract (90-120 seconds) from their task performance as a method for inducing noticing. After transcribing, students are required to make any editing changes they wish. The teacher then takes away the word-processed transcripts and formulates them. The next day students are asked to compare their own edited transcript with the teacher's reformulated version (Ellis, 2003). In a similar study Williams (1999) also recorded listening-speaking classes to determine the extent to which learners in communicative classrooms can attend to form spontaneously.

A few similar studies have also made use of the analysis of classroom transcripts or direct observation of learner production in order to characterise L2 progress. For example, Ellis (1992) used his hand-recorded notes on the production and interaction of two students. He used his audio-recordings only to confirm analyses (Chaudron, 2003).

As Hall (2002) points out, the idea of taking the classroom as a unit of analysis, and using ethnographic methods to collect and analyse data is relatively new in applied linguistics. Canagarajah (1993) and Harklau (1994) investigated students' attitudes towards learning English. They compared the communicative activities found in two instructional contexts - English as a second language (ESL) and mainstream classrooms - for adolescent learners of English as a second language in the United States (Hall, 2002).

4.2.2.2 Systematic (Structured) Classroom Observation

A) Structure of the Systematic (Structured) Classroom Observation Method

Systematic classroom observation had an important role to play in the collection of data in this study. Therefore, in this section, an overview of systematic observation will be provided.
Long (1980b) refers to systematic classroom observation as a kind of instrument 'which standardises both observers' data collection procedures and focus' (p.3). As Croll (1986) states, systematic observation in classrooms is a research method which collects data on patterns of behaviour and interaction in classrooms by using a system of highly-structured observation procedures. This approach in L2 teaching and learning has been developed rapidly in the past twenty years. 'Systematic observation is intended to be a non-reactive measure. The researcher wants a description of the on-going activities in the classroom as they would be if the observer was not present but the description necessarily involves the presence of an observer' (Croll 1986, p.90).

Systematic observation had been started to use in order to provide a description of the state of language teaching in a particular setting. As Allwright (1988) points out, in Britain, there is a particularly interesting study on the work of the team at the University of Stirling. Mitchell et al. (1981) developed a lesson analysis system which they applied to 147 French lessons involving seventeen different teachers. The result gave a very detailed ‘picture’ of the position of French language teaching in that area at that time. Mitchell et al. related that informative picture to the communicative ideas current in discussions of language pedagogy and found little evidence that these ideas had made much of an impact on what was happening in the language classroom.

The first step in structured observation is to define the variables that are to be observed. In other words, researchers should clarify the purpose of the observation. Researchers then need to define categories for recording what they are going to look for (Robson, 1993). In order to do that, ‘the observer has to learn how to recognise instances of particular categories of classroom behaviour and note them down as they occur, either live or from some kind of recording’ (McDonough and McDonough 1997, p.105).

Using a systematic observation schedule, whether in real time or on a recording or transcript, is a way of separating out significant events from the mass of data, and reaching an interpretation of the structure of what has been observed (McDonough and McDonough, 1997). Researchers make an observational schedule with the categories they consider appropriate, and then record what happens using those categories, in other words they reduce the data using some preconceived plan (i.e. the
checklist of categories). The research questions, related literature, and probably gathering supporting information from other resources such as interviews and questionnaires might help to construct various observational categories (Robson, 1993). As McDonough and McDonough (1997) point out, the validity of the resulting interpretation is based on the uniqueness of the particular observation. For example, Nunan (1989c) demonstrates in his lesson transcription excerpt how three different ways of representing and analysing the data give quite different insights into the progress of that lesson, which is in fact the opening sequence of greeting and warm up (McDonough and McDonough, 1997). The validity and the reliability issues of the systematic observation schemes will be discussed further in the following section.

Finally, Denscombe (1998) refers to the advantages of systematic observation (p.146):

- It directly records what people do, as distinct from that they say and they do.
- The use of the observation schedule produces objective observations. It requires little inference from the observer.
- It provides substantial amounts of data in a relatively short time-span.
- It produces quantitative data which is pre-coded and ready for analysis.
- In the observations the fact that two or more observers use the same schedule should achieve high levels of inter-observer reliability.
- It is relevantly easy to record. Observers just have to look at carefully selected aspects of what is going on and tick the categories.
- Finally, using the observation schedule can also reduce the actual observation time substantially but there is correspondingly increased time investment required in developing an observational schedule. However, as McDonough and McDonough (1997) points out, systematic coding schedules can be tailor-made for a particular problem.

As Denscombe (1998), states the whole purpose of observation schedule is to minimise, possibly eliminate, the variations that will arise from data based on individual perceptions of events and situations. Its aim to provide a framework for observation which all observers will use, and which will enable them to record data systematically and thoroughly.
B) Reliability and Validity of Systematic Classroom Observation Method

Whether it is an essentially qualitative or quantitative approach, the issues of reliability and validity emerge as the main concerns in a research project. Allwright and Bailey (1991), and Hoge (1985) discuss three types of validity:

1. **Construct validity** is comparison with alternative instruments for the same behaviours. In other words, it involves trying to determine whether it is 'verifiable' and can be 'captured' through various measurement procedures.

2. **Predictive criterion validity** involves comparison with observations of events or behaviours that are related to or predicted by those on the instrument.

3. **Internal (treatment) validity** is important in observational studies. The researcher tries to document that the treatment was in fact implemented and that it was identifiable different from whatever it was being compared with. It shows the sensitivity of the instrument to 'direct intervention efforts'.

   (quoted in Chaudron 1988, p.24; Allwright and Bailey 1991, p.48)

The other form of validity to set against the internal kind is 'external validity' (generalisability). It involves the extent to which the findings of a study can be generalised, or applied, to other contexts (Allwright and Bailey, 1991). Porte (2002) claims that if a study does not have internal validity, it cannot have external validity. As van Lier (1988) argues that generalisability cannot be a major goal in language classroom research because 'the first concern must be to analyse the data as they are rather than to compare them to other data to see how similar they are' (quoted in Allwright and Bailey 1991, p.51).

To assess the reliability of data obtained from structured observational schedules requires particular specialist approaches. Robson (1993) suggests that we can usefully discuss two types of observer reliability: 1- Intra-observer reliability (observer consistency) is the extent to which an observer obtains the same results when measuring the same behaviour on different occasions (e.g. when coding the same audio or video-tape at an interval of a week). 2- Inter-observer reliability (inter-observer agreement) is the extent to which two or more observers obtain the same results when measuring the same behaviour (e.g. when independently coding the same tape) (p.221).
Problems occur if the observers/instruments show variation at different times, or if different observer/instruments vary from each other. Therefore, it is highly desirable to have more than one observer in any study involving structured observation. Even if a study is predominantly single-observer it is often possible to ask for the help of a colleague to observe some sessions together and to reach an agreement on the occurrence of the behaviours, or on the categories (Robson, 1993).

Both intra-observer and inter-observer reliability are measured by the same means. There are several indices developed for this purpose: As Allwright and Bailey (1991) suggest, the degree of reliability between observers can be calculated, and then a training programme can be carried out to improve observers’ inter-observer agreement figures. Also calculation of the degree of correlation between the two sets of measurements can be made (Robson, 1993).

C) Limitations of Systematic Classroom Observation Method

Many criticisms have been made concerning both the validity and the value of the methodology of systematic classroom observation. It has also been criticised for merely focusing on quantitative data analysis, hence overlooking important information that can only be obtained by qualitative data analysis (Tsui, 1995). Although most qualitative researchers recognise the value of empirical enquiry within classrooms, they question the possibility of educationally relevant empirical enquiry as well as the validity of particular studies. The consideration of these views is therefore relevant to educational research in general as well as to classroom based studies (Croll, 1986).

The systematic classroom observation schemes are generally criticised for using predetermined categories which might prevent the teacher or researcher from gaining a full understanding of the complexities in classroom processes (Tsui, 1996). Delamont and Hamilton (1976) capture the problem quite clearly as below:

*Many of the systems assume the “chalk and talk” paradigm...They imply a classroom setting where the teacher stands out front and engages the students in some kind of pedagogical or linguistic ping-pong (teacher asks question / pupil replies / teacher asks questions) ...*

(p.10-11)
This raises the issue that systematic classroom observation methods can only give a partial (usually a biased) view of classrooms. That is to say, the variables of a systematic classroom observation schedule only capture a part of what is happening in classrooms. Croll (1986) agrees on this point, however, he emphasises that the ways observation systems are constructed are determined by the purposes for which the research is being carried out and they involve a process of abstracting those variables thought to be relevant for particular research purposes from the totality of the social world. Croll (1986) notes that there is a more general point to that issue and he argues that the partial nature of the descriptions offered by systematic observation is not just a limitation of this technique but it is inevitable in any description of the social world. All descriptions of social processes involve selection. The main issue here is to define what is relevant to the purposes of the study, in other words, it is necessary to be clear what is of concern in a particular piece of research (Croll, 1986).

Seliger and Long (1983) also point out that observation schedules hypothesise that the behaviours recorded by their categories are variables affecting the success of classroom language learning but very little has been done to test those hypotheses. That is, the variables in observation schedules are not based on theory; they are not derived from any theoretical assumptions. Croll (1986), however, claims that this criticism of observation instruments is in contrast to many researchers' views which declare that 'it is theoretically possible to free the mind of all pre-suppositions about the relationship between events in the classroom and the correlation between these events and possible outcomes' (Eggleston, Galton and Jones 1975, quoted in Croll 1986, p.161). Croll (1986) also adds that,

> All observers must make selections and the researcher who thinks that observations are unguided by theory is actually influenced by 'commonsense' everyday assumptions about educational processes which are every bit as theory-laden as the explicitly theoretical formulations of more sophisticated researchers.

(p.161-62)

N'Zian (1991) supports this view and she adds that,
As long as it is understood there is no comprehensive observation instrument for all the aspects of the classroom second language learning, that each observation instrument focuses on one specific aspect and that several observation instruments can be applied to the same data (audio or video recorded for example), the reductionist tendency of systematic classroom observation is no threat to the global understanding of classroom second language learning.

(p.297)

Delamont and Hamilton (1984) also believe that systematic observation schemes typically ignore the context in which the data are collected. Most observation systems collect data during very short periods of observation (i.e. measured in minutes); and the observer is not expected to record information about the physical setting. Delamont and Hamilton (1984) claim that ‘divorced from their social and temporal (or historical) context in this way, the data collected may gloss over aspects relevant to their interpretation’ (p.9). Seliger and Long (1983) support this view by suggesting that because ‘teaching’, ‘learning’, and also ‘talking’ conventions might be very different from culture to culture the data collected during the interaction analysis can only be meaningful when viewed in the cultural context in which it was established. As Denscombe (1998) notes, systematic observation schedules also tend to miss contextual information which might have an impact on the behaviours recorded therefore, systematic observation is not a holistic approach. As Mehan (1979) points out, in coding systems 'the relationship of behaviour to context is not captured' (p.10).

However, Croll (1986) points out that there are a number of ways to contextualize observations by noting the physical arrangements of the classroom and the materials in the beginning of a period of observation. There have been some studies which used this kind of observation system (i.e. 'A study of Schooling', Gieson and Sirotnik 1979). Moreover, field-notes and tape-recordings might also be helpful in providing a solution to these issues.

A good deal of criticism has been directed at the way systematic observation schedules produce data and how this data is statistically analysed. Delamont and Hamilton (1984) indicate that the coding schemes using predefined categories aim to produce numerical and nominal data which is similar in kind to those produced by
questionnaires. On the other hand, many researchers have reservations about quantification and they claim that quantitative data cannot meaningfully represent social reality. Croll (1986) argues that a coding decision which is made during the observation is a similar kind of decision to one that is made on an everyday basis and in qualitative research when someone is asked to give any sort of description.

Croll (1986) also claims that comments which qualitative research use such as 'usually', 'typically', 'unusual', 'most of the time' etc. are no different in principal from '20 percent' or '80 percent', which may be even less precise.

Another criticism put forward by Denscombe (1998) is that systematic observation schedules do not deal with the intentions that motivate the behaviour; in other words it can help a researcher to describe what happens, but not why it happens. Seedhouse (1995) also notes that systematic coding schedules cannot demonstrate the relationship between pedagogical purposes and linguistic patterns of interaction. Seedhouse suggests that, based on the reasons put forward by many researchers as outlined above, coding systems 'cannot constitute the basis of methodology for the description, analysis and evaluation of L2 classroom interaction' (p.11).

Despite the limitations discussed above, as Zotou (1993) points out, research which uses systematic observation schedules as research tools have made an enormous contribution to second language pedagogy (e.g. Moskowitz 1971; Mitchell et al. 1981, etc). As Seedhouse (1995) acknowledges, '...there are a great number of coding schemes which are effective for purposes for which they have been developed, e.g., facilitating observation, teacher training, isolating specific behaviour, capturing differences in the communicative orientation of L2 interaction' (p.11). Indeed, the COLT Observation Scheme, for example, has contributed to current understanding of CLT by giving an insight into instructional practices and procedures in language classrooms (e.g. Allen et al. 1987; Swain and Carroll 1987, etc.).

As Zotou (1993) emphasises, there is not a single research paradigm that can be taken as self-contained and exclusive. However, every research method can contribute in giving insights when appropriately selected. Markee (1994) also acknowledges that 'qualitative and quantitative research represent complementary paths to new
knowledge about the phenomenon of SLA and that the results of nomothetic (quantitative) research are many ways impressive' (p.112).

D) The Rationale of Using Systematic Classroom Observation Method in This Research Study

As stated earlier in this chapter, a systematic classroom observation schedule is used as the main data-gathering method in this study. When language classroom research developed in the 1970s, many researchers began to feel that the existing instruments were inadequate for evolving research purposes. Changes in linguistic and language pedagogy contributed to the development of new research instruments, such as structured observation schemes (Bailey, 2001). As Parkinson (1992) claims, it is increasingly realised that observing actual lessons is necessary because indirect evidence - teaching materials, tests, questionnaires, or interviews simply cannot give a true picture.

The systematic observation method is chosen for this study because it can be an appropriate technique for getting at 'real life' in the 'real world', as Robson (1993) puts it. In other words, 'the researcher is given the opportunity to gather "live" data from "live" situations' (Cohen et al. 2000, p.305). This enables the researcher to understand the context of programmes, to investigate things that participants may not freely talk about in interview situations and to move beyond perception-based data (e.g. opinions in interviews) (Cohen et al., 2000). In other words, direct observation has an important advantage since the researcher watches what people do and listens to what people say, as stated earlier in this chapter. In addition, as Black (1999) points out, observation-based techniques are more valid than paper-based instruments (questionnaire, interview, et.) because data are collected in the context of a real activity.

Croll (1986) points out that although there is general agreement about the value of direct observation of classrooms in educational research, there is very much less agreement about the appropriate methodology for such observation - systematic or naturalistic (ethnographic) observation - . In this research there were more available resources to conduct a systematic observation, since naturalistic observation, by its very nature, generally requires longer periods of observation and specialist training. In
other words, using an observation scheme seemed to be much more practical than conducting a naturalistic observation. Besides, ethnographic observation is heavily reliant on perception and views of an individual ethnographer therefore, it is difficult to generalise the findings. As Long (1980b) puts it, “Ethnography is only as good as the person doing it...” (p.28).

The use of an observation scheme enables the researcher to generate numerical data from the observations and also compare results across observation. In other words, ‘numerical data facilitate the making of comparisons between settings and situations, and frequencies, patterns and trends to be noted and calculated’ (Cohen et al. 2000, p.306). Since this study was a comparative study between language classes in secondary schools in Turkey and in England, it was more appropriate to collect numerical data and compare results.

Using an existing coded schedule would perhaps enhance reliability and validity of data since these schemes had been used before, therefore their reliability and validity were tested. As McKay (1994) puts it, ‘without an observation scheme, classroom observation is inevitably subject to the constraints of ethnographic/qualitative research in terms of objectivity, reliability, and validity’ (p.119).

Because of its predetermined categories, systematic classroom observation enables a researcher to focus on a specific aspect of the language classroom, which was necessary for this piece of research. The observation instrument chosen for this study was designed to evaluate the communicative orientation of second language teaching, which this study aims to focus on.

4.2.2.2.3 The COLT Observation Scheme

This section gives a brief background to the COLT Observation Scheme and describes the structure and the categories in this scheme. It also discusses methodological considerations regarding the use of observation schemes in studies (e.g. strengths and weaknesses of the observation schemes; reliability and validity issues) and in this study in particular.
The COLT observation scheme is relied upon as a tool of observation in this study, and as the major determiner of the analysis of communicative orientation in the classrooms observed.

A) Background to the COLT Observation Scheme

The Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching (COLT) Observation Scheme has been developed for the specific purpose of capturing differences in the communicative orientation of L2 classrooms. The COLT Observation Scheme was developed in the early 1980s within the context of a large-scale research project investigating the nature of language proficiency and its development in classrooms. This project, referred to as the Development of Bilingual Proficiency (DBP) was carried out at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education in Toronto, Canada and centred around an examination of four general issues: the nature of language proficiency, the influence of social context on bilingual development, the effects of instructional variables on L2 language learning (Allen et al., 1983). 'Since a major component of the DPB research was to investigate the effects of instructional variables on learning outcomes, a classroom observation scheme was needed to systematically describe instructional practices and procedures in different L2 classrooms' (Spada and Frohlich 1995, p.2).

There are three major themes in the L2 teaching and learning literature which influenced the design of the COLT scheme:

- the widespread introduction and acceptance of communicative approaches to L2 teaching
- the need for more and better research on the relationship between teaching and learning
- the need to develop 'psycholinguistically valid' categories for classroom observation schemes.

(Spada and Frohlich 1995, p.2)

In 1984 Allen, Frohlich and Spada published a paper describing the rationale, the overall organisational framework and the specification of its categories. In sum, the COLT scheme offers one way of looking at instructional practices and procedures in L2 classrooms. As Ellis (1994) points out, unlike other interaction analysis systems,
the COLT has been used quite extensively in classroom research. It has been successfully used to distinguish the types of interaction that occur in different classrooms. By doing so, they provide a basis for investigating interactional features which are important for language acquisition (see Allen et al., 1984; Spada and Frohlich, 1995 for a detailed description of the COLT scheme and its use in L2 classroom research).

B) Reliability and Validity of the COLT Observation Scheme

One of the problems concerning the observation schemes, as discussed earlier in this chapter, is that they include categories that were without psycholinguistic validity. As Long (1980b) pointed out, many of the categories in the observation schemes did not measure those features of instruction which 'current theory would suggest [are] relevant for the study of second language classrooms' (p.20). According to Spada and Frohlich (1995), part of the reason for this shortcoming could have been the fact that several of the observation instruments (e.g. Flanders, 1970; Moskowitz, 1971) had been designed primarily for teacher training purposes. As a result, these observation schemes’ implementation had pedagogic rather than psycholinguistic value. ‘One of the primary motivations for developing COLT was a desire to respond to this concern' (Spada and Frohlich 1995, p.6). The COLT developers wanted to identify those features of instruction which communicative theorists and L2 researchers consistently referred to as contributors to successful learning. And most importantly, they wanted to define the categories in this observation scheme in such a way that these hypotheses could be tested in process-product research (Spada and Frohlich, 1995).

The COLT scheme, significantly, starts from a theoretical perspective that makes possible predictions about the characteristics which will distinguish classrooms from each other in ways that will make a difference in learner outcomes. From the outset, however, it was intended that the COLT would eventually be used in studies which combined the study of learner outcomes with systematic observation of classroom interaction. In this way the development of COLT differed from that of some classroom observation schemes developed on the assumption that we already knew what was good for learners, and that the observation schemes would make it possible to see which teachers
and classrooms were providing these advantageous features to a greater or a lesser degree. Such schemes tended to be used for teacher training rather than in process/product research.

(Lightbown 1990, p.83)

The developers of the COLT Scheme undertook a validation study as part of its development. Frohlich et al. (1985) tested the COLT in different L2 programs in 1985 in order to determine whether the categories were capable of capturing the features intended and the overall scheme permitted distinctions between more or less communicatively oriented instruction. Frohlich et al. (1985) reported the results of a pilot application of the instrument in 13 traditional FSL and ESL classes at grade 7 level. Evidently, they proposed that the instrument had validity in capturing differences among the programs and classes, as measured by the relative frequency of communicative behaviours and activities observed. The criterion in this case is simply independent classification of the programs on communicative teaching methods (see Frohlich et al., 1985 for more detailed description of this research).

The predictions regarding the communicative orientation of the four program types were confirmed in the data. The core French program was at least 'communicative' in terms of the COLT categories, the immersion the most 'communicative'. It was proposed therefore, that the validity of the COLT Observation Scheme was established since the scheme demonstrated the ability to distinguish between the different types of programs. That is, the instrument was able to find that the frequency of communicative categories varied according to the independent ranking, it was believed to be validated (Spada and Frohlich, 1995).

Other researchers (e.g. Allen 1983; Allen and Carroll 1988; Allen et al. 1989; Dicks 1992; Zotou 1993; McKay 1994; Fazio and Lyster 1998) who used the COLT scheme in their studies confirmed Frohlich et al.'s (1985) findings and they reported that the COLT scheme was capable of revealing significant differences in the communicative orientation of language classes. As Allen et al. (1989) point out, 'the ability of COLT observation scheme to capture differences in instructional orientation in a wide range of programs was seen as an indication of its validity '(p.4).
The validity of the COLT scheme, however, is questioned by Chaudron (1988), who suggests that there is uncertainty in the independent classification of the programs into communicative orientation, and the arbitrariness of the selection of categories for the discrimination test used. He raises questions of relative weightings in the profiling of 'experiential' and 'analytical' classes. Chaudron (1988) claims that the assignment of equal weightings to each of the categories selected (amount of group work, focus on meaning, topic control, use of extended text, and use of semi-nonpedagogical materials) is not clear.

Chaudron (1988) also points out that the problem, therefore, remains as to how researchers can validate their complex systems of categories:

*The solution resides, in part at least, in a careful development of research on specific sorts of classroom behaviours that would validate their meaningfulness for L2 learning, and in the construction of an empirically and conceptually grounded theory of interaction and language learning in L2 classrooms.*

(p.28)

Reliability is another essential element in research involving classroom-based observations. Reliability of the COLT Observation Scheme 'varies according to the nature of the application of the scheme, though the subjectivity of some categories will militate against full reliability of all items' (McKay 1994, p.113).

The developers of the COLT tried to devise a set of procedures which enable trained researchers to obtain reliable data (Nunan, 1992). As many researchers (e.g. Chaudron, 1988; van Lier, 1988; Nunan, 1992) recommended, the reliability can be enhanced by the use of more than one observer or rater (inter-observer reliability), as discussed earlier in this chapter. As Robson (1993) points out, it is highly desirable to have more than one observer in any study involving structured observation. However, it can be argued that two observers might affect the class atmosphere much more than one observer. Sanaoui (1995) calculated inter-rater agreement in his study and he reported that inter-rater agreement for the coding of 10 per cent of the data was 86 per cent for 664 coding decisions. However, van Lier (1988) argues that the inter-rater reliability method might not be very objective either. If two observers are trained to
make the same coding decisions in the same environment, a significant level of intercoder agreement can be the result of this shared training (van Lier, 1988). Nunan (1992) contributes to the discussion by claiming that while the developers of the COLT tried to formulate a set of procedures which enable trained researchers to obtain reliable data the categories and communicative features were subjective to the extent that they have been selected with reference to a particular theory of language and current research. 'This serves to underline the point that there is no such thing as 'objective' observation, that what we see will be determined, at least in part, by what we expect to see' (Nunan 1992, p.98). He concludes that,

While the use of observation schemes can provide a sharper focus for our data collection than unstructured observation, it can also serve to blind us to aspects of interaction and discourse which are not captured by the scheme, and which may be important to our understanding of the classroom or classrooms we are investigating.

(p.98)

C) Limitations of the COLT Observation Scheme

The COLT observation scheme and its applications are subject to a number of limitations and they are summarised in the SLA literature as follows:

Most of the categories in the COLT scheme are reported to be highly-inferential and therefore, it requires strong reliability measures in order to overcome the problem of different interpretations and results across raters (Chaudron 1988; Spada and Lightbown 1989).

A few researchers (e.g. Chaudron 1988; Zotou 1993; Suwa 1994) also reported that some categories are less clear than others. Chaudron (1988) comments that 'a weakness lies in the fact that dimensions do not appear to be mutually exclusive, and therefore the only possible comparison is on each category at a time, across the different program types studied' (quoted in McKay 1994, p.114).

As Stern (1990) points out, since the COLT scheme is designed to identify the characteristics of communicative teaching, the characteristics of noncommunicative analytic teaching are more or less taken for granted and not specifically defined
within the scheme. Moreover, Allen et al. (1987) describe under analytical features typical audiolingual teaching as it had developed in the 60's, without distinguishing what is inherent in the concept of analytic and without differentiating it from the accidental practices associated with the analytic strategy because of its historical development (Stern, 1990).

Chaudron (1988) argues that it is difficult to make comparisons of classes with regard to form-focused and experiential-focused orientation because of the difficulty 'in determining which programs are initially likely to be focusing on form and what behaviours constitute a validation of such a focus' (p.186). He suggests that 'more concerted efforts are needed to construct theoretically appropriate measures of classroom behaviour exhibiting formal or functional operations' (p.186)

Some researchers (e.g. Valcarcel et al. 1991; Sanaoui 1995), who used the COLT scheme in their studies reported that there is a need to further define the concept of pedagogical 'activity' in order to improve the COLT instrument and its uses in future studies (Spada and Frohlich, 1995). Valcarcel et al. (1991) also point out that the COLT system developers preferred leaving the category 'open-ended', and thereby they left it open to arbitrary descriptions. They concluded that,

*The lack of classification of activity types is regrettable loss of information about classroom practices, since there can thus be no assessment of the overall amount of more or less communicative behaviours evident in portions of classroom lessons.*

(quoted in Spada and Frohlich 1995, p.150)

Therefore, Valcarcel et al. (1991) developed a system of activity types which is a revision of an earlier activity system used by Chaudron and Valcarcel (1988) (Spada and Frohlich, 1995). An adaptation of Valcarcel et al.'s system of analysis, which will be discussed further later in this chapter, is used to categorise the activity types in this study. Activity type is an important feature in the COLT scheme as the unit of analysis in Part A is the activity; in other words, the categories in Part A are coded across activity units. Therefore, the categorisation of activity types is important for the COLT scheme. The definition and the categorisation of activity types are also particularly important for this study since one of the main objectives of this study is to
investigate the effects of activity types on learners' language production in a classroom setting.

As Spada and Frohlich (1995) indicate, the COLT scheme offers a general picture of the communicative orientation of teaching in L2 classrooms at the level of activities. That is to say, it gives a general description of what is happening in the classroom. On the other hand, Allen and Carroll (1988) reached the conclusion in a piece of research they conducted that although the COLT scheme provided a great deal of useful information about core French classroom practices, it could not reveal the differences between pedagogically effective communicative activities, and pedagogically ineffective routines. Allen et al. (1987) indicate that because the COLT observation scheme was developed to provide a broad picture of the types of activity which characterise L2 classrooms, it does not enable researchers, for example, to pay sufficiently close attention to the exchange structure of discourse, particularly to the way in which conversations are jointly negotiated by means of various topic incorporation devices. Similarly, Zotou (1993) reported that COLT A found, for example, that group work was rare, but could not tell 'why' it was rare without the support from other kinds of data. The instrument is also blind to issues of quality at a more micro level: it could tell us that group work was done, but not whether it was done well' (Zotou 1993, quoted in Frohlich 1995, p.138). However, she added that using COLT B could have made a contribution to answer this kind of question.

Stern (1990) also concludes that for future research there is a need for a revision of the COLT scheme that would document not only experiential but also analytic features of teaching and would at the same time investigate the effect of different mixtures of experiential and analytic approaches in the classroom.

Having said that, Spada and Frohlich (1995) point out that L2 theory, research, and practice has changed rapidly since the COLT was originally proposed and there is a need to discuss some of these changes. When the COLT was first developed, in the early 1980s, the dominant view in L2 literature was simply that the focus on meaning-based instruction, group work and creative language-use opportunities were 'good' and teacher-centred classrooms with a focus on form, correction and restricted language-use were 'bad'. Today, the research findings on this issue are very controversial. Some research results have shown that while an exclusive focus on
meaning does lead to higher levels of fluency and communicative abilities in the L2, it does not lead to high levels of linguistic accuracy or more retained knowledge. Indeed, one process-product study conducted by Spada (1984) provided strong evidence that the combination of a product and a process component is essential in second language classrooms. And also some other researchers (i.e. Harley and Swain 1984; Spada and Lightbown 1993) suggested that it could be more beneficial to language learning if a focus on form is provided within an overall communicative context rather than instruction with an exclusive focus on meaning (Spada and Frohlich, 1995).

Lightbown (1990), on the other hand, claims that the difficulties of conducting effective comparisons between 'communicative' and 'non-communicative' classrooms are also evident in a carefully planned study by Allen et al. (1987). This study was based on Stern's (1981) distinction between 'experiential' and 'analytic' teaching strategies and Allen et al. used the COLT in order to describe the teaching strategies used in eight grade 11 French classes in Toronto. It was hypothesised that the analytic classes would perform better on a written and grammatical accuracy level, on the other hand, the experiential classes would do better in terms of sociolinguistic and discourse competence. According to Lightbown (1990), however, the results in this study showed that the differences between the two types of classrooms were minimal. There were only a few statistically significant differences between the two most experiential and two most analytical classes.

The COLT scheme developers, however, responded to these arguments and suggested that the results in their research clearly show that all the classes in their sample were marked by combinations of analytic and experiential features. They found many similarities between the classes, as well as differences, and they also claim that 'it became clear that we were looking at relative degrees of experiential or analytic emphasis' (Harley et al.1990, p.111-112). The COLT scheme developers point out that these findings were not particularly surprising since they were observing classrooms in the real world, not the hypothetical, idealised classes that feature so prominently in the CLT literature (i.e. a structurally-oriented, teacher-directed class could not be communicative, and a functionally-oriented, student-centred class could not be simultaneously analytic) (Harley et al., 1990). The COLT scheme developers
also argue that in order to distinguish between experiential and analytic classrooms, the COLT categories were grouped in such a way that each experiential feature was matched by a corresponding analytic feature, i.e. group activity is matched with whole-class activity, or student/shared control is matched with teacher control, etc. COLT findings were supported by teacher questionnaires providing information about classroom activities throughout the year, and by descriptive profiles compiled for each of the classrooms on the basis of field notes made during the observation period (Harley et al., 1990). Dicks (1992), in his piece of research, also reported that there were differences in the learners' L2 proficiency in relation to instructional variation. Therefore, the developers of the COLT scheme disagreed with Lightbown's statement that the differences between the two types of classroom in the research they conducted were minimal. They claim that the observation data, the teacher questionnaires, and the classroom profiles showed that there were major differences between the two types of classroom in Allen et al.'s study (1987) which could have an effect on the learning outcome. The developers of the COLT scheme conclude that,

There is no doubt that communicative language teaching theory has raised important questions about the relationship between classroom variables and language learning. Any such theory must be subject to empirical investigation if it is to provide us with a better chance of identifying treatment factors that are the most relevant to learning particular aspects of language and use.

(quoted in Harley et al. 1990, p.115)

The developers of the COLT scheme, however, accept that there is a need to refine CLT theory so that the essential COLT features can be identified and weighted accordingly and there is a need to pay more attention to the quality, as distinct from the quantity of classroom interaction (Harley et al., 1990).

One of the major ethnographic criticisms of COLT is that it cannot capture the culture of the classroom. In other words, COLT ignores the cultural aspects of classroom interaction. According to the proponents of the qualitative tradition, the notion of context is crucial, since it sites the phenomenon of study in space and time. Benson and Hughes (1991) indicate that 'the point of working with "actual occurrences",
single instances, single events, is to see them as the products of "machinery" that constituted members' cultural competence enabling them to do what they do, produce the activities and scenes of everyday life...the explication, say, of some segment of talk in terms of the "mechanism" by which that talk was produced there and then, is an explication of some part of culture (p.130). Furthermore, the various methodologies in qualitative tradition for example, Conversation Analysis claims that a 'classroom culture' can be built up over a long period of time, since even a short interaction may contain some complex verbal and behavioural presuppositions (McDonough and McDonough, 1997). As van Lier (1988) puts it, coding systems, such as COLT fail 'to address the complexity of classroom interaction' (p.45).

It is also important to note that COLT was developed for the Canadian bilingual/immersion context and it may be necessary to consider its appropriateness for each particular setting, and review the categories or modify them according to the particular context. Handscombe (1990), for example, suggests the development and validation of the COLT observation scheme across a variety of language learning settings.

As Nunan (1992) suggests, observation schedules might miss some aspects of interaction and discourse which may be important to our understanding of the classroom being investigated. A few modifications can be applied to the scheme to compensate for some weaknesses identified to make the scheme more efficient and manageable. New categories can be developed to include important features of classroom interaction and also to reflect on recent discussions and developments in second language learning. For example, the COLT scheme developers used only one category for teacher correction, which might be considered as a weakness of the observation scheme since there are other researchers (e.g. Chaudron 1988; Seedhouse 1997) who define a variety of corrective reactions, such as interrupt, negation, prompt, clue, camouflaged repair, etc.). Some researchers might be interested in the nature of teachers' corrections (i.e. implicit/explicit) and their effects on language acquisition or language production. It might also be helpful to differentiate repair trajectories (i.e. self-initiated self-repair and self-initiated other-repair; other-initiated self-repair and other-initiated other-repair), as suggested by Seedhouse (1999b), and add the relevant categories into the scheme, depending on the goals of a particular
research. Non-verbal teacher feedback might also be added as another subcategory into the scheme.

Another weakness of the COLT scheme identified in this study is that it does not allow the researcher to differentiate between pairwork and groupwork. Since the features of interaction can be very different in these two different settings it might be helpful to add 'pair-work' as a separate category under 'Participant Organisation'.

The lack of definition and classification of activity types in the COLT is an important loss of information about classroom practices, as acknowledged by many other researchers (e.g. Valcarcel et al., 1991). In order to compensate for the weakness of the scheme in this piece of research, activity types are described and categorised, as detailed later in this chapter.

Some supplementary data might also be appropriate to cover missing information or complement the data obtained by the COLT scheme. The COLT data accompanied by a qualitative analysis of transcripts or a more detailed discourse analysis is believed to help researchers and readers to visualise what happens in lessons. This type of additional data might also enable the researcher to capture differences in the quality of interactions, for example, the way in which meaning is negotiated in the classroom. The research data in this study has been obtained through careful and detailed recordings of classroom interaction over a month. Some representative transcript excerpts are also put in the appendix to help readers visualise the lessons and their orientations described in this piece of research. However, lesson transcriptions are not analysed in a way that could have provided qualitative data supplementing COLT-based findings in this study. Lacking this type of data is considered as one of the weaknesses of this study. The detailed classroom observation field-notes taken in this study have helped the current researcher to establish for example, the physical descriptions of settings in which the study took place. The data obtained in this way also supplemented the researcher's own observations of the proceedings which helped to explain some of the findings of the study.

The COLT Observation Scheme, despite the limitations and weaknesses outlined above, was found to be a valuable tool for classroom observation and also for investigating the communicative orientations of language classrooms. There are a
large number of researchers (e.g. Allen 1983; Allen and Carroll 1988; Allen et al. 1989; Dicks 1992; Zotou 1993; McKay 1994; Fazio and Lyster 1998) who confirmed that the COLT scheme was capable of revealing significant differences in the communicative orientation of language classes, as mentioned earlier in this chapter. Mitchell (1985) and Zotou (1993) also concluded that 'the research community has much to gain from collaboration in the use and development of such instruments over time, in different settings' (quoted in Spada and Frohlich 1995, p.138). Moreover, Zotou claims that COLT can contribute considerably to our understanding of CLT.

The COLT scheme has also proved to be a useful training tool for teacher or observer, who sometimes does not 'see' what is happening in the classroom. For example, McKay (1994) reported in her study that one of the classes she observed, appeared at first to be a reasonably interactive class in that teacher and students were 'interacting' in the target language for most of the lessons. However, with the COLT analysis it became clearer that there was little negotiation of meaning taking place, that students were restricted in their utterances, and that the teacher always focused on the grammatical structure of the utterance rather than its meaning (McKay, 1994).

As Hendscombe (1990) states,

> Providing an accurate description of what actually takes place in a classroom is, in my view, a most worthwhile endeavour. Much of the conflicting data concerning the relative effectiveness of various approaches to second language education in North America have resulted from a lack of specificity as to what exactly is going on in the various programs (Enright, 1984). In this regard, the development of the COLT observation scheme (Allen, Frohlich, and Spada 1987) is a welcome one. The categories used in the scheme provide an excellent starting point for helping teachers monitor their, and their students' behaviour in the classroom.

(p.181)

After surveying present observation instruments, Chaudron (1988) also reported that 'no one scheme includes all the potentially relevant dimensions of information about
classroom interaction, nor could any authors maintain they had included the complete and mutually exclusive set of categories within any dimension' (p.21). Chaudron maintains that this does not invalidate the usefulness of a scheme since dimensions should be chosen according to their practical or theoretical value for the intended research.

The researcher in this study acknowledges the limitations of the COLT scheme as well as the strengths of it. Some of the limitations of the scheme were believed to be compensated to a certain extent in this study, as will be detailed later in this chapter.

D) The Rationale of Using the COLT Observation Scheme in This Research Study

Changes in linguistic and language pedagogy contributed to the development of new research instruments, such as structured observation schemes, as discussed earlier in this chapter. COLT is an observational instrument which was developed as a result of these changes in language pedagogy. 'COLT' s categories reflect the developments in communicative language teaching, such as the use of information gap activities' (Bailey 2001, p.116).

The choice of the COLT scheme as a data collection method for this study is based on several reasons and they can be summarised as follows:

This study aims to capture and evaluate the communicative features of modern language classrooms in order to compare them. The proponents of the COLT scheme appeared to pursue the same goals as Allen et al. (1984) who state: 'The instructional variables selected for examination in the COLT scheme have been motivated by a desire to describe as precisely as possible some of the features of communication which occur in second language classrooms' (p.233).

Using a systematic observation schedule, therefore, seemed to be more practical and more appropriate to achieve the main goal of this research. As Tsui (1995) notes, observation systems are developed for different purposes, and different systems would be necessary for different classroom settings. For example, FIAC and FLint are devised for teacher-fronted classrooms and would be inappropriate for use in describing the communicative orientation of language classes. Moreover, Allen et al. (1984) indicate that although recent approaches to L2 instruction, e.g., CLT,
emphasise the need for more meaningful and natural use of language inside the classroom, there has been little research aimed at illustrating the precise differences between the communicative language approach and a more traditional approach in respect to methodology and outcomes. Thus, instead of using such ill-defined concepts as 'functional practice', 'meaningful discourse', or 'authentic language use' they aimed to design an instrument which compiles a list of indicators of communicative behaviour, each of which could be separately observed and quantified.

Lightbown (1990) notes that characterising classroom interaction is not a straightforward exercise, and it would be particularly useful to provide a range of variables one might choose to describe. As Spada and Frohlich (1995) suggest, the COLT observation scheme can be used to capture significant features of verbal interaction in L2 classrooms, and also to provide a means of comparing some aspects of classroom discourse with natural language as it is used outside the classroom.

As Stern (1990) points out the uncertainty about how to pinpoint communicative teaching has been a concern until today. But he notes that,

\begin{quote}
Of the many efforts that have been made to state precisely what features make up communicative teaching, COLT is the most comprehensive, the most detailed, and the clearest. The publication of the earlier COLT studies (e.g. Allen et al., 1984) has already been very helpful to students of communicative language teaching. The COLT studies in the DBP project make a valuable contribution to sorting out the distinction between a more analytic and a more communicative approach in language classes.
\end{quote}

(Stern 1990, p.95-96)

Throughout the developments in L2 theory, research and practice, researchers and teacher-educators have continued to use the COLT scheme in their work (e.g. Allen and Caroll 1988; Allen, Harley and Swain 1989; Spada 1990; N'Zian 1991; Zotou 1993; McKay 1994; Sanaoui 1992; Lyster and Ranta 1997; Fazio and Lyster 1998, etc.) and most of them have concluded that the COLT scheme did in fact enable the observers to systematically describe instructional practices in different L2 classrooms.
E) Categories in the COLT Observation Scheme

The COLT observation scheme is rooted within a theory of Communicative Language Teaching and the categories in the scheme are defined to describe as precisely as possible some of the features of communication which occur in second language classrooms. (Allen et al., 1984). Within the theoretical construct of Communicative Language Teaching, the developers of the COLT observation scheme drew on a range of different findings in first and second language acquisition to design the scheme's categories (McKay, 1994).

The COLT observation scheme, as mentioned earlier, is divided into two parts (see Appendices I and II). Part A describes classroom events at the level of activity and episode (see Appendix I). Part B analyses the communicative features of verbal exchanges between teachers and students and/or students themselves as they occur within each episode or activity (see Appendix II).

4.2.3 DATA COLLECTION AND DATA ANALYSIS PROCESSES

4.2.3.1 DATA COLLECTION

4.2.3.1.1 Schools

Two types of schools were observed in Turkey: selective and non-selective schools. As Dogancay-Aktuna (1998) notes, English is thought of as a foreign language in Turkey. The formal classroom is the most common domain for the acquisition of English where it is widely studied from the age of 11 onwards, though with quite different results. The Turkish Educational System is organised in a strictly hierarchical fashion. The Ministry of Education is the official authority at the top setting educational policy, and the local administration and the schools are at the bottom, which is a representation of a highly centralised system. The school curriculum is prescribed by the Ministry of Education through an official document, which specifies the content and the textbooks to be followed each academic year. Only the private and selective schools have the freedom to choose their textbooks, which still have to be approved by the Ministry of Education.
In the state-owned mainstream schools, the study of a foreign language is compulsory. Although students can choose one language out of several offered in their schools (e.g. English, French or German), English is now either a compulsory foreign language in many Turkish secondary schools, or simply the most preferred foreign language. There are great discrepancies in the quality and extent of instruction available in these schools. The instruction of English varies across types of schools because of differences in the amount of time dedicated to it in the curriculum. In non-selective secondary schools, students generally study English 3-6 hours a week, while others receive intensive instruction 9-12 hours a week, especially in private schools. In Anatolian Lycees (highly competitive state schools), the students have to attend a preparatory class, where a foreign language (English, French or German) is taught intensively (Dogancay-Aktuna, 1998).

Although many students tend to prefer English, it seems that their competence does not develop beyond the basics in most cases. 'Many of the graduates of public schools can only be categorised as false beginners, even after English language instruction for 3-6 hours a week throughout high school' (Dogancay-Aktuna 1998, p.32).

The selective and non-selective schools observed in this study were state schools, as mentioned earlier. However, the way teachers gave instructions and the materials they used in these two types of schools were expected to show great diversity, due to the reasons outlined above. In selective schools students in their first year (prep. class) had 30 hours of English classes per week whereas, the students in non-selective schools had only 4 hours of English classes in a week. It was predicted in this study that both the way teachers use the target language in the classroom and the activities used in those two types of schools would be quite different since the students have different experiences of learning English and also have quite different levels of English. The study of English was compulsory in both types of schools.

The educational system in England and Wales, on the other hand, is represented by four 'partners': the Government, the Local Educational Authorities (LEA), the Teaching Profession and the Churches. In general, the Secretary of State's approval is necessary for most decisions taken by the Local Education Authorities (N'Zian, 1991). Until the recent introduction of the National Curriculum (1988), modern languages were not compulsory in the school curriculum. Since then, it has been statutory to
teach a foreign language to all secondary-age students in England and Wales. The document, 'Modern Foreign Languages for ages 11 to 16' states that all pupils should have the opportunity to experience a modern foreign language (Department of Education and Science/Welsh Office, 1991). Modern languages now occupy one of the central places in the British school curriculum (N'Zian, 1991). For Modern Linguists, there appears to be an increased recognition of foreign language needs (at least for Europe), and a belief in the necessity of languages for all (Brumfit 1995, p.2). Among the foreign languages taught in British schools, French has always been the first choice for the vast majority of the pupils (Brumfit, 1995).

It might be suggested that modern languages have been given a more prominent role in Turkey than in Britain since teaching a foreign language has been compulsory in the Turkish school curriculum for many years.

The school observed in England for this study was a community college and French or German were taught as a modern foreign language. The time allocated for modern language classes (French or German) was only 2 hours per week.

Instruction time in modern language classes in each school can be summarised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Turkey (selective)</th>
<th>Turkey (non-select.)</th>
<th>England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13-14 year age-group</td>
<td>4 hours per week</td>
<td>2 hours per week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Year 9)</td>
<td>(Lessons 40 mins.)</td>
<td>(Lessons 60 mins.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-15 year age-group</td>
<td>30 hours per week</td>
<td>4 hours per week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Year 10)</td>
<td>(Lessons 40 mins.)</td>
<td>(Lessons 40 mins.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(prep.class)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Hours of Instruction in Modern Language Classes per week

An official letter was written to the Turkish Ministry of Education outlining the research project in order to get permission to conduct the research in Turkish
secondary schools. Gaining access to the schools in Turkey was difficult in the sense that the researcher had to do all the arrangements when she was in England. The researcher contacted the Headteachers of the schools in Turkey through other teachers working at the school. The researcher was invited to the schools by the Vice-Principals after they received a letter from her outlining the research project. Permission for conducting the research in the community school in Leicester was given by the Head of the Modern Languages Department. Since the researcher conducted another observation in this school before as a part of her course, she was familiar with the school and school staff. The head of department and the teachers were given a brief description of the research project. The only problem was having to wait more than one month to start conducting the observations.

The schools in both countries were selected according to a number of criteria, such as students having similar learning experience in the target language, being the same age-group, and having similar socio-economic status. All the schools in both countries were inner-city schools. However, gaining access also played an important role in the selection of these schools since the researcher was, to a large extent, dependent on the permission that she could get. Therefore, this study does not claim to represent all language classes in Turkey and England but it is believed that good representations of 13 to 14 (Year 9) and 14 to 15 year age group (Year 10) students and teachers were provided in this research study.

4.2.3.1.2 Modern Foreign Languages in Turkish and English National Curriculum

In this section, the syllabuses used respectively in England and in Turkey will be described in order to give more insight into learning and teaching cultures in both countries.

A) Modern Foreign Language (MFL) Syllabuses in English National Curriculum

Although there is a new version of the National Curriculum (2000), the old version of the National Curriculum (1991) will be defined here since the old version of the document was in use during the observation period of this study.
The following are the stated aims of modern foreign language (MFL) programmes of both key stages 3 and 4 (13-14 year age-group/Year 9 and 14-15 year age group/Year 10) in the English National Curriculum:

- to develop the ability to use the language effectively for purposes of practical communication.
- to form a sound base of the skills, language and attitudes required for further study, work and leisure.
- to offer insights into the culture and civilisation of the countries where the language is spoken
- to develop an awareness of the nature of language and language learning
- to provide enjoyment and intellectual stimulation
- to encourage positive attitudes to foreign language learning and to speakers of foreign languages and a sympathetic approach to other cultures and civilisations
- to promote learning skills of a more general application (analysis, memorising, drawing inferences).


As with the English curriculum, modern foreign language teaching has four broad attainment targets: listening, speaking, reading and writing. MFL syllabuses in the English National Curriculum defines the speaking attainment target for Key stage 3 and 4 (Year 9 and Year 10) as below:

- describe everyday activities and narrate events;
- express personal feelings and opinions;
- learn phrases by heart;
- increase their awareness of different languages and forms and registers;
- use knowledge about language (linguistic patterns, structures, grammatical features and relationships, and compound words and phrases) to infer meaning and develop their own use of language;
- come into contact with native speakers in this country and (where possible) abroad;
- work with authentic materials from the countries or communities of the target language;
- learn the use of social conventions (e.g. forms and greetings) and become increasingly aware of cultural attitudes and expressed in language;

- investigate, discuss and report on aspects of the language and culture of these countries or communities.


Moreover, the National Curriculum extends opportunities and experiences for pupils by promoting

- maximum use of the target language;
- the integration of language skills;
- imaginative and creative tasks and activities;
- the use of authentic materials to develop cultural as well as linguistic awareness.


As illustrated above, MFL syllabuses in the English National Curriculum puts emphasis on the functional aspect of language, developing communicative skills of the students in order to enable them to use the language for real purposes. As N'Zian (1991) points out, teachers are advised to take into account the Semantic and Functional Organisation of the syllabus in their teaching. According to the MFL syllabuses in England, learning of language should engage the students into intellectual and cultural aspects of learning.

The first objective of the MFL syllabus is to develop the learners' ability to communicate orally (N'Zian, 1991). It is also emphasised that, throughout the programmes of study for both key stages 3 and 4, students should take part in activities which enable them to use language for real purposes as well as to practice skills; help them acquire, learn and use the target language to communicate with each other, their teacher and other speakers of the language (p.21). Teachers are also advised to use the target language as the principal means of communication in the classroom: 'Departments should agree on policy for consolidating or extending the use of the target language by teachers and pupils', to ensure that the target language is used consistently by all members of the department with shared expectations of
pupils' use of it' (Department of Education and Science/Welsh Office November 1991, p. C1).

In the MFL syllabuses in England five different content lists appear: a list of topics and settings, a list of functions, a list of general concepts, a list of structures and vocabulary lists by topics.

B) Modern Foreign Language (MFL) Syllabuses in Turkish National Curriculum

In Turkey, the National Curriculum, which is issued by the Ministry of Education (Milli Egitim Bakanligi), defines the objectives of MFL programme for the 13-14 year age-group and for the 14-15 year age group and prep. class (14-15 year age group) in selective schools as below:

- This programme is based on the learner-centred approach. Therefore, student participation is essential.

- The 'usefulness' of language should be considered as an essential feature in language teaching. Therefore, students should be introduced to the most common language units in such an order which would enable them to use language for everyday communication (short-term) and also for their intellectual development (long-term needs).

- The use of language is as important as the usage of language. Therefore, the content of the lesson should be introduced in a meaningful context.

- The integration of the four language skills is essential. However, developing listening and speaking skills should be given priority in language teaching.

- The needs of students, the most common language units, learnability and the functional aspects of language should be taken into consideration in planning the MFL syllabuses.


The MFL syllabuses in the Turkish National Curriculum recommend teachers to take account of the context in which they teach. The MFL syllabuses in Turkish National Curriculum also emphasise that introducing language items through the PPP approach is important for effective language teaching. Moreover, using interesting activities and practice techniques is also considered as necessary to motivate the students. It is also emphasised that concerning the large-class size in the Turkish school system, teachers should apply more group work in their teaching.
According to the MFL syllabuses for state (nonselective) schools, students' speaking skills should enable them

- to use the structure to express him/herself
- to use the structure in order to be able to make simple and complex sentences verbally
- to use the structures and the words appropriately in order to communicate
- to make simple and complex sentences in order to deal with everyday problems
- to ask questions and answers in everyday language.


The MFL syllabuses for the 14-15 year age group also advise teachers to use the target language as the principal means of communication in the classroom.

According to the MFL syllabuses prepared for prep. class, pupils should be able to make the transition to creative control of the target language system and show the ability to apply language previously learned to new situations. The MFL syllabuses prepared for prep. class recommend teachers use both mechanical and meaningful drills, and communicative activities in the classroom in order to develop their speaking skills. It is also emphasised that the students should be encouraged to use the target language in the classroom and the mother tongue should not be used in the classroom unless it is necessary.

In the Turkish MFL syllabuses 4 different content lists appear: a list of topics, a list of functions, a list of structures and a list of vocabulary.

As outlined above, both English and Turkish MFL syllabuses put emphasis on functional aspect of language and developing communication skills of students. According to Turkish and English MFL syllabuses, students should be exposed to the target language as much as possible and they should be able use the language for real purposes (e.g. to express their opinions, to narrate daily activities, etc.).

The MFL syllabuses in the Turkish National Curriculum appear to put relatively more emphasis on developing students' awareness of language. Throughout the syllabuses language teachers in Turkey are encouraged to teach grammar explicitly to develop
student understanding of language structures of the target language. The program provides a list of language structures by topics and it emphasises that teaching structures of the target language can help students to produce correct and appropriate sentences. Teachers are also recommended to introduce language items through the PPP approach.

The teachers in English context, on the other hand, are encouraged to introduce the linguistic items in ready-made chunks, without analysing or labelling them. That is, implicit grammar teaching is recommended in order to be able to focus on communicative functions of the target language. 'Awareness of language should grow naturally out of the teaching and learning of the target language rather than be the subject of formal exposition out of context ((Department of Education and Science/Welsh Office November 1991, p. C1).

The MFL syllabuses in the English National Curriculum also seem to give a particular importance to raising cultural awareness of students while they are learning the target language. It aims to raise student awareness towards the other cultures.

Overall, both MFL syllabuses in Turkey and England emphasise communicative objectives for the teaching of languages in schools, they assign different emphases on grammar teaching and form-focused instruction, as described above. Therefore, the hypothesis put forward for this study is that the communicative orientation of the classrooms observed in the two countries will be different and this difference will impact on classroom interaction.

4.2.3.1.3 Subjects

The subjects in this study were modern language teachers and non-native speaking students in secondary schools in Turkey and in England.

A) Teachers

The participating teachers were selected from those who volunteered to take part in this research. One of the difficulties of classroom-based research is that there is always a possibility that teachers might not accept researchers into the classroom, and
they might also put some restrictions on visits for a classroom observer who must attend at certain times in order to collect a sufficient amount of data for the research.

The details of modern language teachers observed in both countries are provided in Table 2, 3 and 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class taught</th>
<th>Numbers of teachers</th>
<th>Gender of teachers</th>
<th>Teaching experience</th>
<th>Native speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Female = 2, Male = 0</td>
<td>5 yrs. = 1, 20 yrs. = 1</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Female = 2, Male = 1</td>
<td>8 yrs. = 1, 13 yrs. = 1, 20 yrs. = 1</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Teachers in Non-selective Schools in Turkey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class taught</th>
<th>Numbers of teachers</th>
<th>Gender of teachers</th>
<th>Teaching experience</th>
<th>Native speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Female = 2, Male = 2</td>
<td>8 yrs. = 1, 9 yrs. = 1, 10 yrs. = 1, 20 yrs. = 1</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 Teachers in Selective Schools in Turkey
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class taught</th>
<th>Numbers of teachers</th>
<th>Gender of teachers</th>
<th>Teaching experience</th>
<th>Native speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Female = 3</td>
<td>5 yrs. = 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male = 2</td>
<td>6 yrs. = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 yrs. = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16 yrs. = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22 yrs. = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Female = 3</td>
<td>5 yrs. = 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male = 3</td>
<td>6 yrs. = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 yrs. = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 yrs. = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16 yrs. = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22 yrs. = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 Teachers in Non-selective Schools in England

The researcher introduced herself both as a student and a language teacher. It was an attempt to make the teachers realise that the researcher is familiar with the classroom environment and the conditions that teachers are working in. The researcher tried to define the objectives of the research project and she also defined the parameters in Part A and in Part B of the observation scheme briefly to the teachers. Some teachers in Turkish secondary schools were very concerned about recording classes and some teachers in non-selective schools in Turkey and in Leicester also expressed their concern about their students' level and their poor use of the target language in the classroom. The researcher explained to the teachers that the aim of the tape recording was not to capture the errors that they might make during the observations and the recordings were necessary for the second part of the observation scheme. The researcher also emphasised that her aim in this study was not to criticise or to evaluate their teaching skills or the students' levels.

B) Students

The students in this study were volunteered by their teachers for participation. The number of students in each type of school in both countries is set out in Table 5.
The students in the selective schools in Turkey are selected according to either their diploma grades or their exam results. Some selective schools (e.g. Anatolian Lise) require students to sit an exam and students are accepted to these schools according to their exam results. Since the Ministry of Education, in 1997, replaced the former system (of five years at primary schools, followed by three years at middle school/junior high school/lower secondary school education) with the new system (secondary education follows eight years of primary education and covers general, vocational and technical high schools providing 3 or 4 years of education), the entrance exam for Year 6 students in Anatolian high schools was abolished. However, a new exam was introduced for students who had just finished their primary education. Some schools (e.g. Super Lise), on the other hand, decided to select their students according to their primary school diploma grades. Both these selective schools are high schools with intensive foreign language teaching and the students who are selected for these schools have to attend a preparatory class, where a foreign language (English, French or German) is taught intensively. The students in the prep. class observed were those who completed their 8 years of primary education (new system) and they were mostly state-school oriented (they graduated from state primary schools). In other words, they had not experienced intensive language teaching before they started their preparatory class and most of them had similar language teaching experiences.

4.2.3.1.4 Pilot Study

Before the main data collection process, a pilot study was conducted in a community college in Leicester in order to try out the observation scheme, the audio-recording equipment and also to iron out any problems, if there were any. The lessons were also

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Turkey (selective)</th>
<th>Turkey (nonselect.)</th>
<th>England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 9</td>
<td>average 40-45</td>
<td>average 20-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 10</td>
<td>average 40-45</td>
<td>Average 45-50</td>
<td>average 20-25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 Number of Students in Each Classroom
audio-recorded in the pilot study. The classroom observations conducted for the pilot
study indicated that the recording equipment was satisfactory and the teacher and
students were not overtly distracted by the recording equipment and they also adjusted
quickly to the researcher's presence in the classroom. A total of 10 classes were
observed using the COLT A. The problems experienced in marking some categories
were discussed and negotiated with a colleague who was using the same scheme.

The coding process in Part B was also found to be both difficult to manage effectively
and time-consuming. The researcher felt that it was necessary to go back and check
the coding constantly in order to ensure reliability. The manual provided for the
COLT observation scheme by the developers was quite helpful although some parts of
the coding procedure were not sufficiently clear and the guidance was not detailed
enough.

The data collected during the pilot study was not used in the main research project.

A few modifications were brought to the scheme mainly in order to compensate for
some weaknesses identified during the pilot study. Additions of some categories also
are believed to help the researcher to make the scheme more efficient.

Firstly, the COLT system developers left the category 'Activities' open-ended, 'and
thereby open to arbitrary descriptions' (Spada and Frohlich 1995. p.150). Since the
unit of analysis in Part A was the activity type, it was considered to be important to
develop a category system of activity types. Therefore, an adaptation of Valcarcel et
al.'s system of analysis is used to categorise the activity types in this study. As
Valcarcel et al. (1991) states, 'Our development of a system of activity types is, to our
minds, one of the crucial contributions of our work to the development of such
observation instruments, both for research and both for teacher training purposes'

Concerning the category of 'Language', the subcategory 'Form' was further specified
to indicate which formal language feature was the focus of instruction: 'Grammar',
'Vocabulary', 'Pronunciation', and 'Spelling' categories were added to the Scheme.

A subcategory 'Audio-visual' was placed under 'Material Type' to include audio-visual
materials used in language classrooms.
In Part B, a subcategory 'Mixed (L1-L2)' was added to the 'Target Language Use' category in order to indicate the teacher and students' use of L1 and L2 simultaneously.

In the pilot study, the time-sampling procedure, recommended by the COLT developers, would not be used as it was found to be very difficult and unreliable. It was decided that all activities, episodes and turns would be coded from transcripts.

The researcher also felt it necessary to note the physical arrangements of the classrooms used during the observation period. Detailed field-notes were also believed to be quite useful in collecting reliable data and also in supplementing the data obtained by the COLT scheme.

4.2.3.1.5 Classroom Observations (The Application of the COLT Observation Scheme into the Present Study)

The classroom observations were conducted in six schools (three selective and three non-selective) in Ankara. In the non-selective schools 8 different classes were observed at two levels (13-14 and 14-15 year age group), whereas in the selective schools 3 different classes were observed at only one level (14-15 year age group - prep. class). Some lessons observed were double lessons. About 36 lessons were observed in these six schools in Ankara over a month.

In England, the observations were conducted in only one school (a community college in Leicester) and about 31 lessons were observed with classes at two levels (13-14 and 14-15 year age group). A total of 13 different classes were observed in this school in Leicester over a month.

In Turkey, English classes were observed whereas in the UK, the observation was conducted in French and German classes. The researcher was under time-pressure since the school visits, especially in England, were restricted to a certain degree by time and the researcher needed to obtain reliable data in a limited period. Observations were undertaken in April 2000 (in Turkey) and in June 2000 (in England). The observations were arranged primarily by the language teachers.

The observations conducted in each school can be summarised as below:
A systematic observation scheme (the COLT scheme) was used in this research study, as discussed earlier in this chapter. The coding procedures described in Allen et al. (1984) and Spada and Frohlich (1995) were followed as the basis for the coding of lessons observed. All the lessons were also audio recorded as a part of the COLT observation scheme.

During the observation period the observer was sitting somewhere in the classroom and collected the data in as unobtrusive a manner as possible. The researcher was just an observer taking no part in any activity in the classroom. In the data collection process, it was observed that teachers and students adjusted very quickly to the observer present and the recording equipment. The coding for all categories on Part A of the scheme is done in 'real time'; in other words, this part of scheme is filled in while the observer is present in the classroom as the lesson unfolds.

Part A describes classroom events at the level of activity, as mentioned above. Each sub-activity, which constitutes an activity, is called an 'episode'. As Spada and Frohlich (1995) describe, 'activities' and 'episodes' constitute the instructional segments of a classroom. Some activities might consist of two or more episodes: For example, two episodes of one activity would be: 1. Teacher introduces dialogue; 2. Teacher reads dialogue aloud. These would be described as two separate episodes within one activity. As Spada and Frohlich (1995) points out, although it is difficult to precisely define Activity, it is relatively easy to identify. They are marked by changes in the categories of the main features of COLT. That is, the beginning or end of an activity is typically marked by a change in the overall theme or content. For example, the first activity is one which the teacher asks questions about the news. Second
activity begins when there is a shift away from the news to the correction of grammatical errors that students produced in a previous lesson (Spada and Frohlich, p.30).

The activities and their constituent episodes are timed and the starting point for each activity is entered in the left-hand margin of the coding form. During the observation period the observer put check marks in all the relevant boxes under each of the major headings (see Appendix I). While coding for Part A some additional notes were also taken in order to obtain a complete picture of the overall period of observation. The researcher was provided with the materials that each of the teachers used in their classes, which enabled her to follow the lessons.

The basic unit of analysis in Part A is a change in activity type. The category 'Activity' left open-ended and thereby open to arbitrary discussions, as mentioned above. Since this study investigates the effect of activity types on classroom interaction, it was necessary to use a category system of activity types in order to examine verbal interaction patterns within these activities. Therefore, the system developed by Valcarcel et al. (1991) was used in this study in order to categorise the activity types (see Appendix III). They defined 38 activity types and put them under 4 phases (for a more detailed description of the system see Valcarcel et al., 1991). In this study, these activities defined by Valcarcel et al. were grouped under three major headings according to the degree of teacher versus student control over the performance of the activity (Controlled, Semi-controlled and Free Activities) as Crookes and Chaudron (1991) had done in their research (see Appendix III). As discussed in the previous chapter, recent language teaching and research literature emphasise the value of realistic-communication activities, including more open-ended activities, such as discussions, games, etc. Thus, a fairly broad classification of activity types was detailed, on a continuum from 'controlled' to 'free' (i.e., with respect to the degree of teacher versus student control), or 'mechanical' to 'meaningful', to 'communicative'. As Crookes and Chaudron (1991) indicates, the frequent dictum is that, for a specific learning point, learners need to develop from more controlled and mechanical to less controlled (free) and communicative behaviours. Therefore, a categorisation of activity types along such a continuum sets the alternatives from which the teacher can select a given sequence within a lesson.
Activities in this study are categorised according to the degree of control that the teacher imposed on each of them. Controlled activities are those in which the teachers exert a great deal of control over the topic and the structure to be used. For example, explanation of lesson content and grammar or other rules and points is considered to be a controlled activity in this study. In semi-controlled activities, the teacher shares some control with students over the performance of the activity. For instance, the teacher asks referential questions which s/he does not know the answer beforehand. The teacher has a minimum control over topic or structure that students use. Activities like a debate on real-life topics, or topics which are selected by students or personally meaningful to them, etc. are categorised under the free activity type.

The category system used in this study also reflects on the recent debate on differences between controlled and less controlled activities, in terms of their effect on classroom interaction, which have been discussed in detail in the previous chapter. The COLT observation scheme is designed to reflect findings in SLA and communicative literature supporting the use of real communication in the language classroom, as McKay (1994) notes. According to the proponents of CLT, less controlled activities are believed to lead to more communicative, realistic use of language. In other words, learners often use the target language in a less restricted way in order to communicate with each other during this type of activity. Specifying and categorising the set of activities is believed to enable the researcher to make comparisons of the communicative degree of activities and their effects on student language production.

During the observation process audio recordings were made for later part B coding transcription coding. Unlike the Part A coding which is done in 'real time', coding for Part B is done after the observation, using audio recordings since this level of analysis is more detailed than Part A.

During the recordings, the researcher was in the classroom and the participants were aware of the recording. The researcher used two tape-recorders to provide back-up in case of a failure. One of the audio-recorders was placed in the middle of the classroom. The second audio-recorder was often carried by the teacher; a collar microphone is also placed on the teacher. A time-sampling procedure (e.g. coding one out of every three minutes of interaction), described by Spada and Frohlich (1995)
was not used in this study since it was found to be difficult and unreliable. The occurrence of Part B features for the entire observation period is coded, in other words, all the utterances were coded.

The basic unit of analysis for coding and later for analysis for Part B is the teacher and student turn (i.e. any speech which is produced by a speaker until another person starts speaking). Within each student or teacher turn a check mark was put in the appropriate column whenever any relevant categories occurred. New check marks are entered only when there is a change in one of the categories; in other words, a new check mark was not placed when several uninterrupted instances of the same category occurred (see Appendix II).

In cases of pair-work and group-work, there was little guidance on how to collect data in the COLT scheme. Therefore, the researcher had to make her own decision. Two tape recorders were used to record the interaction between the students when pair/group work was in operation.

The German and French classes were transcribed and coded from the transcripts. However, the English classes were coded from the audio recordings because the researcher was limited by time. It was not found to be necessary to transcribe the English classes' recordings since the researcher is familiar with the language and with Turkish language classrooms.

Extensive notes were taken to compensate for the aspects which the COLT scheme could not capture and which, it was felt, would be helpful for the understanding of the recordings and the interpretation of the codings. Physical descriptions of classrooms are also noted in the beginning of every observation. The researcher also took some photographs of the classrooms observed which would help her to describe the physical arrangements in the classrooms observed.

The lessons in Turkey lasted 40 minutes, whereas each of lessons was 60 minutes in the schools in Leicester.

All the results of Part A and Part B coding will be presented in the next chapter.
4.2.3.1.6 Teacher Interviews

A semi-structured interview schedule was used in this study to interview the modern language teachers in order to provide their perspectives on what was happening in the classroom. The interviews took place just after the lessons and the interviews were related to what had occurred in the lesson. However, the interview data was not used in this study since the researcher was limited by time and length.

4.2.3.1.7 Field-notes

Field-notes and transcriptions are not analysed in this study in order to provide a qualitative data which could supplement the data obtained by using the COLT scheme. However, field notes are used to give the physical descriptions of the classrooms observed. Transcriptions of the lessons are also believed to help readers to visualise the lessons and their communicative orientations (see Appendix XII.).

4.2.3.2 DATA ANALYSIS

Once the data are coded, the issue of how to organise, analyse and synthesise them is very important. There are many ways in which the data can be treated and analysed, as Spada and Frohlich (1995) points out. This section will describe the methods used to analyse the data coded with Part A and Part B.

4.2.3.2.1 Analysis and Synthesis

The analysing procedures described in Spada and Frohlich (1995) were used in order to analyse the coded data in this study. All the analysis was carried out by the researcher, therefore it was believed that a strong consistency was provided through the analysis of interaction.

A) PART A: Calculation of Scores

For COLT A, the percentage of time spent on each of the categories under the major features (e.g. 'Participant Organisation', 'Content', etc.) was calculated. By doing these calculations, it is hoped that within the category 'Participant Organisation', for example, what percentage of class time the teacher worked with the whole class or did
choral work, what percentage of time was spent on group-work will be illustrated. In order to provide these percentages, it is necessary to calculate the percentage of time spent on each particular category. Each category for each episode and activity was assigned a time value in minutes and the length of time of each episode and activity was calculated. If two or more categories were ticked under the same major heading, the coder has to indicate which category constituted the primary focus (most time spent on it). In such cases, the coder ignores the secondary foci (that is, check marks which do not indicate either a primary/exclusive focus or combinations with equal focus) and s/he only calculates the primary foci. That is, the primary category receives credit for the entire length of time the episode lasts. The COLT developers did not include the secondary foci since they have been more interested in the categories which are most prominent in different classroom settings. Using only the primary foci is also more practical way to deal with data since it makes it easier for analysis. Depending on the objectives of the research study, it might be important to take note of these secondary emphases.

The COLT scheme, on the other hand, allows researcher to do double coding in Part A which indicates equal focus on two features. If two or more categories under the same major heading were marked, and they were considered to be of equal focus (combinations), the time was divided equally among them. In general, for example, a primary focus is coded for the 'Language' categories when it is evident from the teacher's verbal (or non-verbal) behaviour that s/he is focusing on language. If the emphasis of an activity is exclusively on message, and not on any of the categories under 'Language', only check marks under 'Other Topics' are entered (see Spada and Frohlich, 1995).

Moreover, within an activity, the primary focus may shift from message ('Other Topics') to language form ('Form'), or both language form and message may receive equal emphasis. Combinations (equal focus on both 'Language Form' and 'Other Topics') were calculated in the same way described above. Therefore, the scheme was capable of demonstrating for example, a dual focus on language form and message, which has recently been emphasised in the second language literature, as discussed earlier. These combinations were calculated separately from an exclusive or primary focus and they will also be reported separately in the next chapter.
Following these calculations, the sum of the percentages of the major headings added up to 100%.

The analysis of the data in Part A consists in (sic) finding out how much of the teaching time has been spent on every category. It is the same as the analysis carried out by the proponents of the COLT scheme. The more time spent on the communicative features of a given lesson, that is the criteria thought to lead to communicative language teaching, the more communicative the lesson will be concluded to be, at the level of the activity at least.

(N'Zian 1991, p.347)

Finally, Spada and Frohlich (1995) summarise that the observational data collected with Part A and quantified in the manner described above permits statistical analyses to provide information regarding instructional differences between classes, methods and programs.

All lessons observed for Part A were analysed. Valcarcel et al. 's (1991) typology of classroom activities is used in this study in order to analyse instructional variables. In this way, the researcher expected to establish which activities result in different patterns of 'Participant Organisation', which activities are characterised by a differential focus of 'Language' features, such as Form or Sociolinguistics, etc., as suggested in Spada and Frohlich, 1995.

B) PART B: Calculation of Scores

The Part B analysis focuses on the verbal output and the interactions of teachers and students and thus, it is more detailed than the Part A analysis.

Each check mark in a particular column of Part B was counted and divided by the total numbers of check marks under that particular feature. This procedure was followed for all categories of part B for both teacher and student verbal interaction (see Appendix IX).

Within the limits of a Doctoral thesis, the researcher had to make a decision on the amount of data to be analysed. Since the coding and analysing procedures for Part B
were quite time-consuming, 5 lessons observed at two levels (Year 9 and 10) in the non-selective schools in both countries were coded and analysed. 5 lessons observed at only one level (Year 10/prep. class) in the selective schools were coded and analysed. The researcher believed that the comparison between the pupils who are having intensive language education in prep. classes (exposed to extensive target language input/comprehensible input as in immersion/submersion classes observed by Harley 1989; Swain and Caroll 1987 and Fazio and Lyster 1997) and the ones who are having standard language education would be quite interesting and useful for this study. As already mentioned above, those students in both types of schools had similar language learning background before they started their secondary school education.

It was hoped that the audio-recordings of the lessons would provide a detailed description of the verbal interactions between teacher-student and student-student in the language classrooms observed.

C) The General Procedure for Comparisons between Classes

The ranking of classes in the Year 9 and Year 10 in order to be able to make comparisons between them follows the procedure introduced by Allen et al. (1987). They grouped the features of interaction according to whether they were experiential or analytical (see also Stern 1981; 1990; Allen and Carroll, 1987 and Allen et al., 1989) and their grouping system is adapted for this study as illustrated below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analytical Features</th>
<th>Experiential Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whole class activity</td>
<td>Group/pair work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on form</td>
<td>Classroom management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrow range of reference</td>
<td>Focus on function/discourse/sociolinguistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher control</td>
<td>Limited/broad range of reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal text</td>
<td>Student or shared control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogic (L2) materials</td>
<td>Extended text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adapted/real/student made materials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 7 Experiential/Analytical Features in COLT A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analytical Features</th>
<th>Experiential Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of L1</td>
<td>Use of L2 (the target language)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving predictable information</td>
<td>Giving unpredictable information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo(Display) request</td>
<td>Information (genuine) request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultramin/Minimal speech</td>
<td>Sustained speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction to form</td>
<td>Reaction to message</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted/Limited form</td>
<td>Discourse initiation by student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correction, repetition, paraphrase</td>
<td>Unrestricted form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comment, expansion, clarification, elaboration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 8 Experiential/Analytical Features in COLT B**


According to the COLT categories, 'more communicatively oriented classes' are those in which students are given opportunities to use language in creative and unrestricted ways and participate in the negotiation of topics and activities. Classes in which teachers spend more time focusing on meaning and group work interaction can also be considered to be 'more communicatively oriented classes'. 'Less communicatively oriented classes', on the other hand, are those in which instruction is focused primarily on language form and error correction and also, students tend to be
asked questions to which they already know the answer and teachers place restrictions on the variety of language forms that learners could produce (Spada and Frohlich, 1995). Allen et al. (1984) claim that these definitions of classes emerged from previous observations, an examination of textbooks and other teaching materials, and also on discussions with teachers, consultants and school board officers.

The COLT scheme developers also argue that in order to distinguish between experiential and analytic classrooms, the COLT categories were grouped in such a way that each experiential feature was matched by a corresponding analytic feature. As a result of their review of the literature, the COLT scheme developers attempted to compile a list of indicators of communicative behaviour, each of which could be separately observed and quantified (Allen et al., 1990). It is important to emphasise that the pedagogic orientations of classrooms is not determined by any one feature, but by a cluster of interrelated features' (Allen et al. 1990, p.58). They claim that it would not make any sense to take the single feature, for example 'group activity versus whole-class activity' and to use it as the basis for distinguishing between experiential and analytical classrooms. Therefore, the COLT scheme developers attempted to find classes where relatively more time is spent on a combination of activities marked by group-work, reaction to message rather than code, use of extended text, and so on and they characterised this type of classes as 'having an overall experiential profile'. Similarly, they described classes that spend relatively more time on whole class activities, explicit focus on language, use of minimal text, so on, as 'having an overall analytic profile' (Allen et al., 1990).

In order to give some idea of what the labels experiential and analytical mean in terms of classroom behaviour, Allen et al. (1990) provide some examples: In the most experiential classes which they reported in their study, there were proportionately more topic control by students, more extended written text produced by the students, more sustained speech by students, more reaction to message rather than code and more use of student-made materials than in the other classes. Allen et al. (1990) labelled these classes as Type E classes, in contrast to the Type A classes in their study, where more analytic features were in evidence, such as a higher proportion of topic control by teachers, minimal written text by students, student utterances of minimal length, and restricted use of linguistic items by students.
Liao (2004), in his recent study, observed language classrooms in secondary schools in China using a classroom sheet. He also concluded that classes which spent relatively more time on teaching functional language, pair/group-work, and communicative activities had 'communicative features'.

The data collected from Year 9 and Year 10 MFL classes in this thesis was ranked on an experiential-analytical scale on the basis of the experiential features listed above, as the COLT scheme developers did in their studies. In order to provide comparable ratings for the classes in both countries, the total percentage of time spent on each of the experiential features in COLT Part A and Part B, as outlined above, were calculated and added the figures together (see Allen et al. 1990; Stem 1990). The information provided by this method is expected to enable the researcher to rank the classes according to their communicative orientation (i.e. from less communicative to most communicative).

As Hammersely (1986) emphasises, any type of classification involves risks and reducing the data using some binary feature grouping might be considered as a somewhat problematic practice by some other researchers. However, as McKay (1994) concludes, ranking is an extremely useful summary tool to indicate levels of communicative orientation and establish comparison across classes. Indeed, in this study, ranking the classrooms helped the researcher to demonstrate the different orientations of each of them, which will be illustrated in the following chapter.

The comparisons will be made between the MFL classes observed in the secondary schools in Turkey and in England. All the comparisons will be made on the basis of the criteria of Part A and B of the observation instrument. The findings and results will be presented in the following chapter.

4.2.3.2.2 Checking the Reliability of Analysis

In order to enhance the reliability of the observation instrument in this study, the manual prepared by Spada and Frohlich et al. (1995) was read carefully, so the researcher knew the scheme in detail and it was also discussed with a colleague who would use the same scheme. Before the pilot study process, some observation videos were watched with the colleague in order to gain familiarity with the scheme and the
coding processes of Part A before starting the data collection process. It was agreed to
go through the watching and coding process separately without consulting each other,
and then discuss the coding and watch again if there was a disagreement or
clarification was needed. Inter-coder reliability (the percentage of similarity in coding
between two coders) appeared to be high. It was concluded that there was a high level
of agreement between the two coders. As soon as the pilot study and the main data
collection were completed, the problems experienced in marking the categories in the
scheme during the observation period were also discussed and negotiated, and
eventually a common decision on coding categories was reached.

Part B was also tested jointly and separately with the same colleague in a similar way.

Some researchers also applied different types of inter-coder reliability measures. For
example Valcarcel et al. (1991) used Cohen's 'kappu' (a conservative measure of
agreement) in their study to determine the reliability of coding between the three
raters. There is a very limited guidance on using inter-coder reliability measures in the
COLT scheme.

Reliability of this study is believed to have been strengthened by being consistent in
analysis and in the interpretation of the COLT scheme across all coding since the
same rater coded all observation schemes and audio-recordings. In addition, detailed
classroom observation notes helped the researcher in coding high inference categories
in real time. As discussed earlier in this chapter, unlike the Part A coding which was
done in real time, coding for B was done after the observation, using audio-recordings
of the lessons. Therefore, good quality audio-recordings enabled the researcher to do
the codings correctly and re-check them where necessary. Audio-recordings were also
useful for verifying the coding for Part A. Furthermore, counting of final coding and
also calculating class averages were done with great care, and all counting was
checked more than once. All these reliability measures are believed to be important
and enhance the reliability of the study.

Finally, it was concluded that the COLT Observation Scheme was a reliable
instrument.
CHAPTER V

FINDINGS AND RESULTS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter the results of the COLT based analysis of classroom observations will be presented as combined data for both Year 9 and Year 10 classes in two different contexts (Turkey and England). Since this study aims to investigate the effects of activity types on the outcomes of classroom interaction, the results of COLT coding will also be presented according to the category of activity types. The Year 9/10 classes observed in England will be ranked on an experiential and analytical scale, as Allen *et al.* (1987) and McKay (1994) did and as described in Chapter 4.

In this section the combined data for the Year 9 and 10 classes will be presented in order to provide an overview of the features of classroom interaction in Year 9/10 classes in England.

The following glossary will be used in this chapter (see Appendix I and II for more detail):

*Tr.*: Teacher

*St.*: Student

**Participant Organisation**

*TS_C*: Teacher to Student/Classroom Organisation

*S_S_C*: Student to Student/Classroom Organisation

*Ind.*: Individual
**Language**

Gr. : Grammar  
Voc. : Vocabulary  
Pr. : Pronunciation  
Funct. : Function  
Discour. : Discourse  
Socioling. : Sociolinguistics

**Other Topics**

N: Narrow  
Stereo. : Stereotype  
Biogr. : Biography  
L: Limited  
Person : Personal (related to students' immediate personal affairs, such as)  
Soc_Rut. : Social/Routine  
B: Broad  
Abstr. : Abstract  
Person. : Personal (refers to reflective personal information, such as "What do you like living in a city?")  
Imagin. : Imagination

**Student Modality**

Listen : Listening  
Speak : Speaking  
Read : Reading  
Write : Writing
Materials

Text_min. : Text minimal

Text_ext. : Text extended

Text_min_ext.: Text minimal - extended

Type of Materials

Pedag. : Pedagogic

Sempedag.: Semi-pedagogic

Nonpedag.: Non-pedagogic

Stmade. : Student-made

Use of Materials

Ctr.: Control

Target Language Use

L1: First Language

L2: Second Language

Both L1_L2: Teachers or students are using L1 and L2 simultaneously

Information Gap

Pred. Info. : Predictable Information

Unpred. Info.: Unpredictable Information

Display Req. : Display Request

Genuine Req.: Genuine Request

Sustained Speech

Ultramin.: Ultra-minimal

Sp. : Speech
Incorporation of Tr/St Utterances

Incorp. : Incorporation
Correct. : Correction
Repeat. : Repetition
Paraph. : Paraphrase
Commt. : Comment
Expans. : Expansion
Clarif. r. : Clarification request
Elabor. r.: Elaboration request
5.2 SUMMARY OF RESULTS OF CODING: COLT PART A - B
YEAR 9/10 CLASSES IN ENGLAND

The results of the observations conducted in Year 9 and Year 10 classes were combined and this section will summarise the features of classroom interaction based on the findings of these observations. The mean percentage of observed time in each category in Part A and the mean percentage for each superordinate category in Part B, deriving from frequencies for the classes observed, will be calculated and the sum of experiential features of Year 9/10 classes observed in England will be presented below. The tables set out the percentages of total observations and will be presented in the order that each category appears in the COLT observation scheme.

The scores and results based on the findings of COLT A and B are also calculated according to the activity types described in this study (see Chapter 4) and they will be illustrated in graph form below. Free activity types, however, will not be included in this data analysis since no percentage of time was recorded for free activity types during the observation period in Year 10 classes.

First, COLT Part A results for the Year 9/10 classes will be illustrated. Then, COLT Part B findings will be set out in graph form.

The sum of experiential features of Year 9/10 classes will also be set out after the results are presented, which is expected to enable the researcher to rank the classes according to their communicative orientation (i.e. from less communicative to most communicative).

The data collected from MFL classes in this piece of research was organised and analysed in this way in order to provide comparable ratings for the classes in both countries.

PART A - YEAR 9/10 CLASSES IN ENGLAND

A total of 1623 minutes was observed in both Year 9 and Year 10 classes in England; the majority of the total observation time spent on controlled and semi-controlled activities (79% and 21% respectively).
Overall, classroom interaction in England was mainly teacher-centred (60%). The findings of some research studies which suggest that group-work is facilitative of SLA and provides opportunities that promote L2 acquisition (e.g. Long and Porter 1985; Martyn 1996; Foster 1998; Storch 1999) appears not to have been widely taken up in the language classrooms observed in England, although several instances of pair/group-work (12%) occasionally emerged. There was more emphasis on group work and student-to-student/class interaction during the semi-controlled activities observed (see Table 9).

Table 9 Participant Organisation as a percentage of observed time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Controlled Activities</th>
<th>Semi-controlled Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T_S_C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S_S_C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part of the teacher talking time in the classroom has been labelled 'Managerial Talk', which consists of organising activities, giving instructions, etc. Managerial exchanges are of particular interest in L2 learning since it refers to authentic, spontaneous communication in the classroom. Teachers explained classroom procedures about 80% of the time spent on 'Managerial Talk', which suggests that MFL teachers in England spend a considerable amount of time on organising general procedures for class interaction. Only 30% of teachers' managerial talk was in the target language.

In the COLT observation scheme, the two major categories under the category of Content are 'Language' and 'Other Topics'. The explicit focus on 'Language' is divided into several subsections: form, function, discourse, and sociolinguistics (see Appendix I). These four categories have been derived from theories of communicative competence (e.g. Canale and Swain, 1980) and on the model of L2 proficiency proposed by the COLT developers (see Allen et al., 1983). The assumption underlying the 'Language' categories is that instruction which gives differential attention to these areas of competence may affect language learning in a variety of ways.

As explained in the previous chapter, a primary focus is coded for the 'Language' categories when it is evident from the teacher's verbal (or non-verbal) behaviour that s/he
is focusing on language. With regard to explicit focus on 'Language', form refers to grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, and spelling, as the COLT defines it. The findings of this study indicate that the majority of time focusing on language in MFL classes in England was spent on form. Teachers mainly focused on vocabulary (teaching single, lexical items) (12%) and grammar (10%) (see Table 10 and also Appendix XII-A).

MFL teachers in England spent relatively limited time on function (7%) and discourse (2%). No time was spent at the activity or episode level on sociolinguistics (see Table 10). As discussed in the previous chapter, if two or more categories under the same major heading are marked and they were considered to be of equal focus (combinations), the time was divided equally among them. Table 10 shows a combination of function and discourse which indicates that teachers focused on these two features equally at around 5% of the total teaching time. During the semi-controlled activities observed, students have markedly more opportunities to focus on the features of function and discourse (see Table 10). The COLT developers suggest that talking about discourse coherence and situational appropriateness in the target language would constitute a communicatively rich activity. Therefore, explicit focus on function, discourse and sociolinguistics are listed as an experiential feature on the experiential and analytical scale, which served as the basis for ranking the language classes observed in this study (see Tables 24, 25, and 26), following the same procedure as in Allen et al. (1987) and McKay (1994).

Other combinations in this category such as, vocabulary-function, etc. were also calculated and analysed separately. Since the amount of time spent on these combinations was too limited to make assumptions about and these combinations were not crucial for the argument developed here, they were not illustrated in the table below.

Table 10  **Content: Language as a percentage of observed time**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Controlled Activities</th>
<th>Semi-controlled Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar-Vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function-Discourse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As mentioned in the previous chapter, if the emphasis of an activity is exclusively on message, and not on any of the categories under 'Language', only check marks under 'Other Topics' are entered. 'Other Topics' is the other major area of Content, which is represented by three subdivisions, 'Narrow', 'Limited', and 'Broad' topics. The COLT developers used this tripartite system to characterise topic types that may arise in classroom conversation. For example, topics of narrow range refer to the immediate classroom environment, or stereotyped exchanges such as "How are you?", "What is your name?", etc. Topics like movies, hobbies are categorised as limited in this study. Topics of broad range involve reference to current world events, abstract ideas, etc. (see Appendix I).

The main topics arising in classroom conversation in MFL classes in England were personal and social topics ('Limited') in many cases, such as movies, hobbies, holidays, etc. (see Table 84 in Appendix IV).

The question of whether the primary focus of instruction should be on meaning or on code is one of the crucial issues in second language pedagogy and research, as discussed earlier in the previous chapters. The COLT scheme developers assume that, within an activity, the primary focus may shift from message ('Other Topics') to language form ('Form'), or both language form and message may receive equal emphasis (combination), as described above. Table 11, therefore, indicates that the classes observed in England focused on language form (i.e. on grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, and spelling, as the COLT scheme defines it) rather than message being conveyed (32% as opposed to 14%), and they focused on both language form-message at 25% of the total teaching time.

**Table 11 Focus on Language Form/Message as a percentage of observed time**
The final category relating to Content is 'Topic Control' (i.e. it determines who selects the topic being talked about in the classroom). In the literature on CLT teaching, the teacher is seen as a guide or counsellor rather than an authority figure or director of the students' work. However, during observed interaction, teachers generally exerted a great deal of control over content (81%). The topic was tightly controlled by teachers especially during the controlled activities (96%). Teachers' direct control over content markedly decreased (28%) during the semi-controlled activities. There were no activities recorded, which were determined by only students during the observation period (see Table 85 in Appendix IV).

All classes covered a range of student modalities; their time was mainly distributed between listening (35%) and the combination of listening and reading (i.e. students are focusing on listening and reading equally during the activity) (16%) (see Table 12).

### Table 12 Student Modality as a percentage of observed time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Listening</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Listen-Speak</th>
<th>Listen-Read</th>
<th>Read-Write</th>
<th>Speak-Write</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled Activities</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-controlled Activities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The last parameter in the COLT scheme is 'Materials' and they are categorised under two major areas, concerning their type and use. Classes used materials for 78% of the total teaching time; they were mainly extended written text (37%), such as stories, dialogues, connected paragraphs, etc. and visual materials (25%), such as pictures, flashcards, OHP, etc. (see Table 13). They were, on the other hand, mainly pedagogical materials and were highly controlled by teachers. Teachers used more pedagogical materials during the semi-controlled activities (98%) than the other activity types, although teachers might be expected to use more authentic materials in their teaching during less controlled activities. Authentic materials are essential in order to prepare students for the kinds of
discourse they will encounter outside the classroom, as CLT suggests (see Tables 86 and 87 in Appendix IV).

Table 13 Type of Materials as a percentage of time spent on this category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Controlled Activities</th>
<th>Semi-controlled Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text, min</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text, out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text, min, out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio, Visual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART B - YEAR 9/10 CLASSES IN ENGLAND

As explained in the previous chapter, the basic unit for coding in Part B is the teacher and student turn. A 'turn' is defined in the COLT scheme as any speech which is produced by a speaker until another person begins speaking. Within each turn, a check mark is placed in the appropriate columns whenever any relevant categories occurred. Overall, there were more teacher turns than student turns recorded during the observed interaction. That is, teachers generally participated in classroom interaction more than students did and they controlled classroom discourse in a high percentage of cases (74% as opposed to 26%) (see Table 14).

Table 14 Total Teacher and Student Turns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Controlled Activities</th>
<th>Semi-controlled Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr_Total Turns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St_Total Turns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first parameter in Part B is 'Target Language', which is designed to measure the extent to which the target language is used in the classroom. Teachers mainly used English (55%) rather than the target language (44%) in their interaction with students (see Table 15).
Table 15 Teacher: Target Language Use as a percentage of total teacher turns

The second parameter in Part B refers to the extent to which the information requested and/or exchanged is not known in advance. It follows that one of the aims of CLT is to engage learners in activities where the message is reasonably unpredictable. 'Information Gap' features (i.e. predictable/unpredictable information and pseudo/genuine request) markedly increased with regard to teacher statements with unpredictable information in the target language and slightly decreased with regard to genuine requests during controlled activities, as presented in Table 16. Overall, teachers focused on giving information more than asking questions in their classroom interaction (58% as opposed to 42%).

Table 16 Teacher: Unpredictable Information and Genuine Request as a percentage of turns spent on each category within its superordinate category (L2 only)

The third parameter in Part B is 'Sustained Speech', which is intended to measure the extent to which speakers (teachers and students) engage in extended discourse, or restrict their sentences to a minimal length of utterance. The majority of teacher utterances was minimal (70%) and remained stable through the activity types observed.

The fourth feature coded in Part B is closely related to the 'Content' parameter of Part A, which is designed to show whether the purpose of exchange is to focus on language form
or on the message being conveyed. Teachers generally reacted to code rather than message during the classroom interaction observed. However, teachers' reaction to message increased during semi-controlled activities, as it might be expected to see more meaning focused interaction while students are engaged into less controlled activities. (see Table 17).

**Table 17 Teacher: Reaction to Form and Message as a percentage of turns spent on each category within its superordinate category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Controlled Activities</th>
<th>Semi-controlled Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tr_Form</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tr_Message</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'Incorporation of Student Utterances' feature refers to the various ways in which teachers react to student utterances. Teachers commented on and repeated students' utterances to a high degree in this category (34% and 18% respectively) (see Table 18).

**Table 18 Teacher: Incorporation of Student Utterances as a percentage of turns spent on each category within its superordinate category**

Students, on the other hand, used the target language (54%) more than they used English (46%), in contrast with their teachers (see Table 19).

**Table 19 Student: Target Language Use as a percentage of total student turns**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Controlled Activities</th>
<th>Semi-controlled Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The parameter of 'Student Discourse Initiation' follows another principle of CLT is that students should be encouraged to initiate discourse themselves, instead of always having the role of responding to question imposed on them. This feature, therefore, measures the frequency of self-initiated turns by students. Student discourse initiation during the observed interaction remained very limited (around 1% of total student turns in the target language).

Overall, there were more student utterances with giving information (90%) than those with making requests (10%). 'Information Gap' features markedly increased with regard to student statements with unpredictable information in the target language and with regard to genuine questions during semi-controlled activities, as less controlled activities are expected to lead to more communicative, realistic use of language. (see Table 20).

**Table 20 Student: Unpredictable Information and Genuine Request as a percentage of turns spent on each category within its superordinate category (L2 only)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Controlled Activities</th>
<th>Semi-controlled Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St_Unpred Info</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St_Genuine Req</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The length of student utterances was mainly ultra-minimal (65%) (see Table 21).

**Table 21 Student: Sustained Speech**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Controlled Activities</th>
<th>Semi-controlled Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St_Ultramin sp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St_Minimal sp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St_Sustained sp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'Form Restriction' refers to the degrees of linguistic restriction imposed upon student utterances. Students produced restricted utterances (79%) during all the activities observed (see Table 22).
The last two features in Part B refer to the various ways in which students react to each other's utterances. Students reacted to code and message almost equally (52% and 48% respectively). Students mostly repeated and paraphrased preceding utterances during the classroom interaction observed (44% and 28% respectively) (see Table 23). Overall, there were only a few clarification requests, which might indicate that students had a limited opportunity to get involved in two-way communication and negotiation of meaning.

MFL teachers in England spent most of their teaching time on giving and requesting information (56% of total teacher turns). However, teachers also reacted to students' preceding utterances in a relatively high percentage (44% of total teacher turns) (see Table 88 in Appendix IV). English students, on the other hand, spent most of their teaching time on giving and requesting information (see Table 89 in Appendix IV). This finding provides support to the suggestion that students did not have much opportunity to get involved in two-way communication during the observation period.
5.2.1 RANKING OF YEAR 9/10 CLASSES ON EXPERIENTIAL - ANALYTIC SCALE / ENGLAND

The COLT Observation Scheme is relied upon as the major determiner of the analysis of the communicative orientations in the classrooms observed. The scheme is rooted within a theory of CLT and the categories in the scheme are defined to describe as precisely as possible some of the features of communication which occur in second language classrooms. In the literature of CLT, for example, group-work or giving/receiving of unpredictable information is considered to be an important factor in the development of communicative competence (Allen et al., 1983). N'Zian (1991) points out in her study that the criteria specific to the actual teaching situation defined by the COLT are,

- types of activities and tasks done in the classroom,
- the types of topics dealt with,
- how often the learners initiate discourse,
- the length of the language addressed to and used by learners,
- and how natural this language is left to be used and how cooperative the interactions between the teachers and the learner are.

It is to be remembered that these criteria have been chosen on the basis they will enable us to highlight the communicativeness of the foreign language classroom.

(p.298-299)

Therefore, in this section, the Year 9/10 classes (the combined data for both Year 9 and Year 10 classes) observed in England will be ranked on an experiential and analytical scale, following the same procedure as in Allen et al. (1987) and described in Chapter 4.

The total percentage of time spent on each of the experiential features in COLT Part A and Part B (as illustrated above), will be calculated and added together in order to reach the total communicative scores of language classes representing the communicative orientation of each school observed in this study (see Allen et al. 1990; Stern 1990). The information provided by this method is expected to enable the researcher to rank the classes according to their communicative orientation (i.e. from less communicative to most communicative). As Allen et al. (1983) and McKay (1994) put it, a combination of
scores for the various categories will enable the researcher to place the classes observed at some point on a communicative continuum or scale. The data collected from Year 9/10 classes in this piece of research was organised and analysed in this way in order to provide comparable ratings for the classes in both countries. All the comparisons will be made on the basis of the criteria of Part A and Part B of the observation instrument.

The total percentage of time spent on each of the experiential features in COLT Part A and Part B during each activity type (i.e. controlled and semi-controlled) will also be added to show the effect of activity types on classroom interaction in terms of communicative orientation.

Table 24 YEAR 9/10 CLASSES ON EXPERIENTIAL/ANALYTICAL SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiential Features</th>
<th>Mean Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part A</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Activity</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function/discourse/sociolinguistics</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad/Limited range of reference</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student or shared control</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended text</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-pedagogic/L1 adapted/student-made materials</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part B</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of L2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr.</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

153
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiential Features</th>
<th>Mean Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Giving unpredictable information</strong></td>
<td>Tr. 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Making genuine request</strong></td>
<td>Tr. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustained speech</strong></td>
<td>Tr. 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reaction to message</strong></td>
<td>Tr. 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment, expansion, clarification and elaboration</strong></td>
<td>Tr. 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discourse Initiation</strong></td>
<td>St. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unrestricted form</strong></td>
<td>St. 23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**YEAR 9/10 CLASSES**
**TOTAL COMMUNICATIVE SCORE** 608

---

Table 25 **YEAR 9/10 CLASSES ON EXPERIENTIAL/ANALYTICAL SCALE**
(CONTROLLED ACTIVITIES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiential Features</th>
<th>Mean Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part A</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Activity</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential Features</td>
<td>Mean Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function/discourse/sociolinguistics</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad/Limited range of reference</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student or shared control</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended text</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-pedagogic/L1 adapted/student-made materials</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of L2</th>
<th>Tr.</th>
<th>St.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Giving unpredictable information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tr.</th>
<th>St.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Making genuine request**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tr.</th>
<th>St.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sustained speech**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tr.</th>
<th>St.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reaction to message**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tr.</th>
<th>St.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment, expansion, clarification and elaboration r.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tr.</th>
<th>St.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discourse Initiation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>St.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unrestricted form**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>St.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**YEAR 9/10 CLASSES**

**TOTAL COMMUNICATIVE SCORE**

**561**

**IN CONTROLLED ACTIVITIES**
### Table 26 YEAR 9/10 CLASSES ON EXPERIENTIAL/ANALYTICAL SCALE (SEMI-CONTROLLED ACTIVITIES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiential Features</th>
<th>Mean Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part A</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Activity</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function/discourse/sociolinguistics</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad/Limited range of reference</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student or shared control</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended text</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-pedagogic/L1 adapted/student-made materials</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part B</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of L2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr.</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving unpredictable information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr.</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making genuine request</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr.</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustained speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr.</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction to message</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr.</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential Features</td>
<td>Mean Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment, expansion, clarification and elaboration r.</td>
<td>Tr. 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse Initiation</td>
<td>St. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted form</td>
<td>St. 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YEAR 9/10 CLASSES
TOTAL COMMUNICATIVE SCORE 770
IN SEMI-CONTROLLED ACTIVITIES

5.2.2 OVERVIEW OF FINDINGS IN YEAR 9/10 CLASSES IN ENGLAND

As illustrated above, Year 9/10 classes observed in England were mainly teacher-fronted; pair/group-work was used occasionally. Content was mostly 'Limited', such as personal and social topics, with classes spending the majority of their time focusing on forms. Teachers' 'focus on code' was directed towards mainly vocabulary and grammatical structures. There was relatively limited focus on function and discourse in any of the classes observed. Teachers were the major controllers of content. All classes covered a range of student modalities however, students were mainly engaged with listening and the combination of listening-reading activities. Although material types were varied across classes, they were mainly pedagogically-developed extended written texts, such as stories, dialogues, etc. and visual materials, such as flashcards, OHP, etc.

The MFL teachers observed in England structured classroom discourse mainly by giving or asking information from their students. Although genuine questions were not frequent in the observed classroom interaction, teachers' use of unpredictable information was quite high. Teachers generally controlled the classroom discourse and about 44% of
teacher talk was in the target language. MFL teachers in England spent a considerable amount of time explaining structure and the purpose of activities and organising general procedures for class interaction, a high proportion of this managerial type of talk was in English. Moreover, the majority of teacher utterances were minimal.

There were 54% of student turns in French however, student discourse initiation was negligible (around 1%). Students mainly produced ultra-minimal and restricted utterances. Students' responses to teacher questions were often predictable.

The amount of teacher incorporation of student utterances was not high. Making comments on preceding utterances and repetition was found to be the most common means of interaction with students in the MFL classes observed. About 63% of these reactions were to language form. Students, on the other hand, had a limited opportunity to get involved in two-way communication and negotiation of meaning (making clarification and/or elaboration requests according to the COLT definition) with their peers.

The majority of teaching time was spent on controlled activities (79%). The effects of different activity types on the variables in the classroom interaction process are analysed and illustrated above. The findings of this study suggest that the semi-controlled activities were 'more communicative' than the controlled activities (see the communicative scores outlined in Tables 25 and 26) observed in Year 9/10 MFL classes in England, which will be further analysed in the following chapter.
5.3 SUMMARY OF RESULTS OF CODING: COLT PART A - B
YEAR 9/10 CLASSES IN TURKEY (NON-SELECTIVE)

The results of the observations conducted in Year 9 and Year 10 classes in non-selective schools in Turkey were combined and this section will summarise the features of classroom interaction based on the findings of these observations. The mean percentage of observed time in each category in Part A and the mean percentage for each superordinate category in Part B, deriving from frequencies for the classes observed, will be calculated and the sum of experiential features of Year 9/10 classes in Turkey will be presented below. The tables set out the percentages of total observations and will be presented in the order that each category appears in the COLT observation scheme.

The scores and results based on the findings of COLT A and B are also calculated according to the activity types described in this study (see Chapter 4) and they will be illustrated in graph form below. Free activity types, however, will not be included in this data analysis since no percentage of time was recorded for free activity types during the observation period in Year 9 and in Year 10 classes in non-selective schools in Turkey. Therefore, the results will be presented according to the controlled and semi-controlled activities observed in this study.

First, COLT Part A results for the Year 9/10 classes will be illustrated. Then, COLT Part B findings will be set out in graph form.

The sum of experiential features of Year 9/10 classes will also be set out after the results are presented, which is expected to enable the researcher to rank the classes according to their communicative orientation (i.e. from less communicative to most communicative). The data collected from MFL classes in this piece of research was organised and analysed in this way in order to provide comparable ratings for the classes in both countries.

PART A - YEAR 9/10 CLASSES IN NON-SELECTIVE SCHOOLS IN TURKEY

A total of 23 observations were carried out and 703 minutes were recorded in both Year 9 and Year 10 classes in Turkey; the majority of the total observation time spent on controlled activities (95%) and only 5% of it spent on semi-controlled activities. No
percentage of time was recorded for free activity types in Year 9 and 10 classes in Turkey.

Overall, classes in Turkey were mainly teacher-centred (86%). There was more emphasis on student-to-student/class interaction during the semi-controlled activities observed.

Table 27 Participant Organisation as a percentage of observed time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Controlled Activities</th>
<th>Semi-controlled Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-controlled</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS_C</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S_S_C</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part of the teacher talking time in the classroom has been labelled 'Managerial Talk', which refers to spontaneous communication in the classroom (e.g. giving instructions, etc.). Teachers explained classroom procedures about 52% of the time spent on 'Managerial Talk'. Only 18% of teachers' Managerial talk was in the target language.

In the COLT observation scheme, the two major categories under the category of Content are 'Language' and 'Other Topics'. The explicit focus on 'Language' is divided into several subsections: form, function, discourse, and sociolinguistics (see Appendix I). These four categories have been derived from theories of communicative competence (e.g. Canale and Swain, 1980) and on the model of L2 proficiency proposed by the COLT developers (see Allen et al., 1983). The assumption underlying the 'Language' categories is that instruction which gives differential attention to these areas of competence may affect language learning in a variety of ways.

As explained in the previous chapter, a primary focus is coded for the 'Language' categories when it is evident from the teacher's verbal (or non-verbal) behaviour that s/he is focusing on language. With regard to explicit focus on 'Language', form refers to grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, and spelling, as illustrated in Table 28. The findings of this study indicate that form-focused language use was extensive throughout the interaction in Year 9/10 classes observed in Turkey. Almost all categories in Content were coded as 'Language', since no percentage of time was spent on 'Other Topics' (see
Table 28). The findings also revealed that teachers in non-selective schools in Turkey directed most of their students' attention on grammatical structures (75%) (see Table 28 and also Appendix XII-B), as would be expected in traditional language classes.

As discussed in the previous chapter, if two or more categories under the same major heading are marked and they were considered to be of equal focus (combinations), the time was divided equally among them. Table 28 indicates that language teachers focused on functional use of language and grammar teaching equally at around 79% of the total teaching time during the semi-controlled activities. As mentioned earlier, combinations in this study were calculated and reported separately from an exclusive or primary focus. Since there was no explicit focus on function, discourse, and sociolinguistics during the observed interaction, no percentage of time recorded under these categories (see Table 28). Other combinations in this category such as, vocabulary-function, etc. were too limited to make assumptions about and these combinations were not crucial for the argument developed here, they were not illustrated in the table below.

![Table 28 Content: Language as a percentage of observed time](image)

The question of whether the primary focus of instruction should be on meaning or on code is one of the crucial issues in second language pedagogy and research, as discussed earlier in the previous chapters. The category of form indicates explicit focus on language form ('Form') rather than message ('Other Topics'). As mentioned above, there was no percentage of time recorded for 'Other Topics' in Year 9 and Year 10 language classes observed in Turkey. Table 29, therefore, indicates that the classes observed in Turkey focused on forms (i.e. on grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, and spelling, according to the COLT definition) in a very high percentage (78%), and they focused on both language form-message at 9% of the total teaching time. During the semi-controlled
activities teachers focused on grammar and function equally at 79% of the total teaching time, as illustrated above. However, this percentage was not summarised under the categories of form or function since combinations in this study were calculated and reported separately from an exclusive or primary focus.

**Table 29 Focus on Language Form/Message as a percentage of observed time**

![Table 29](image)

The final category relating to Content is 'Topic Control' (i.e. it determines who selects the topic is being talked about in the classroom). Teachers generally continued to exert a great deal of control over content (92%). However, teachers shared the control over content with students to a great extent (82%) during semi-controlled activities, which suggests that CLT ideas had a considerable impact in this respect (see Table 90 in Appendix V).

Both classes covered a range of student modalities; students were mostly involved in both listening-reading (41%) and listening (21%) (see Table 91 in Appendix V).

Classes used materials for 86% of the total teaching time; they were mainly minimal written text, such as isolated sentences, word lists, etc., which suggests that classes observed in Turkey were quite traditional in this respect. During the semi-controlled activities, classes had much more opportunities to use visual materials (see Table 30). There was no teaching time spent on using audio materials in any activity type observed.

All of the materials used in language classes were pedagogical and they were mainly highly controlled by teachers (see Table 92 in Appendix V).

**Table 30 Type of Materials as a percentage of time spent on this category**

![Table 30](image)
PART B - YEAR 9/10 CLASSES IN NON-SELECTIVE SCHOOLS IN TURKEY

Teachers generally participated in classroom interaction more than students did and they controlled the classroom discourse to a high degree (66%) in all activity types observed.

The English teachers in Turkey used both L1 and the target language equally in their speech turns observed (49%), as presented in Table 31. Teachers' use of the target language reached its highest during semi-controlled activities (66%), as one might expect to use more realistic use of language during less controlled activities (see Table 31).

Table 31 Teacher: Target Language Use as a percentage of total teacher turns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Controlled Activities</th>
<th>Semi-controlled Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tr_L1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr_L2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr_Both L1_L2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although teacher statements with unpredictable information and genuine requests in the target language were not frequent in the observed classroom interaction, these features in 'Information Gap' category markedly increased during semi-controlled activities, as presented in Table 32. Overall, teachers focused on giving information more than asking questions in their classroom interaction (68% as opposed to 32%).

Table 32 Teacher: Unpredictable Information and Genuine Request as a percentage of turns spent on each category within its superordinate category (L2 only)
The third parameter in Part B is 'Sustained Speech', which is intended to measure the extent to which speakers (teachers and students) engage in extended discourse, or restrict their sentences to a minimal length of utterance. The majority of teacher utterances observed in Turkish schools was minimal (83%) (see Table 93 in Appendix V).

Teachers generally reacted to language form rather than message during the classroom interaction observed. However, teacher reaction to messages significantly increased during semi-controlled activities, might suggest that there was more focus on message being conveyed during this type of activities (see Table 33).

**Table 33 Teacher: Reaction to Form and Message as a percentage of turns spent on each category within its superordinate category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Controlled Activities</th>
<th>Semi-controlled Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tr_Form</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr_Message</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage of teacher turns devoted to 'Repetition' and 'Correction' was high when responding to student utterances (25% and 24% respectively) (see Table 34).

**Table 34 Teacher: Incorporation of Student Utterances as a percentage of turns spent on each category within its superordinate category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Controlled Activities</th>
<th>Semi-controlled Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>correction</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repeat</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parah</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comment</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expansion</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>short. f.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elabor. f.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students used the target language in a high percentage (83%) (see Table 35). The parameter of 'Student Discourse Initiation' follows another principle of CLT is that students should be encouraged to initiate discourse themselves, instead of always having
the role of responding to question imposed on them. This feature, therefore, measures the frequency of self-initiated turns by students. Student discourse initiation in the non-selective classrooms remained quite limited (around 5% of total student turns in the target language) (see Table 94 in Appendix V).

Table 35 Student: Target Language Use as a percentage of total student turns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>St_L2 Use</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Controlled Activities</th>
<th>Semi-controlled Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students continued to give information (84%) rather than ask questions (16%). Student statements with unpredictable information and genuine requests were quite limited, as presented in Table 36. This percentage significantly increased during semi-controlled activities, as less controlled activities are expected to lead to more communicative, realistic use of language. As Table 37 shows, the length of student utterances were mainly minimal (62%).

Table 36 Student: Unpredictable Information and Genuine Request as a percentage of turns spent on each category within its superordinate category (L2 only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>St_Unpred Info</th>
<th>St_Genuine Req</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Controlled Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 37 Student: Sustained Speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>St_Ultramin sp</th>
<th>St_Minimal sp</th>
<th>St_Sustained sp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Controlled Activities</td>
<td>Semi-controlled Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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'Form Restriction' refers to the degrees of linguistic restriction imposed upon student utterances. Table 38 also shows that students produced mainly restricted utterances (91%).

Table 38 Student: Form Restriction as a percentage of spent on each category within its superordinate category (L2 only)

Reaction to the code by students were quite high (around 88% of total student turns in this category) in all activity types observed.

Students mostly repeated and paraphrased preceding utterances during the classroom interaction observed (48% and 36% respectively) (see Table 39). There were only a few clarification and elaboration request, which suggest that students did not have much opportunity to get involved in two-way communication during the observation period.

Table 39 Student: Incorporation of St/Tr Utterances as a percentage of turns spent on each category within its superordinate category

Overall, both teacher and student turns were mainly in Information Gap (giving and requesting information) categories in Turkish secondary schools observed (see Tables 95 and 96 in Appendix V).
5.3.1 RANKING OF YEAR 9/10 CLASSES IN NON-SELECTIVE SCHOOLS ON EXPERIENTIAL - ANALYTIC SCALE / TURKEY

The COLT Observation Scheme is relied upon as the major determiner of the analysis of the communicative orientations in the classrooms observed. The scheme is rooted within a theory of CLT and the categories in the scheme are defined to describe as precisely as possible some of the features of communication which occur in second language classrooms. In the literature of CLT, for example, group-work or giving/receiving of unpredictable information is considered to be an important factor in the development of communicative competence (Allen et al., 1983). Therefore, in this section, the Year 9/10 classes (the combined data for both Year 9 and Year 10 classes) observed in non-selective schools in Turkey will be ranked on an experiential and analytical scale, following the same procedure as in Allen et al. (1987) and described in Chapter 4.

The total percentage of time spent on each of the experiential features in COLT Part A and Part B (as illustrated above), will be calculated and added together in order to reach the total communicative scores of language classes representing the communicative orientation of each school observed in this study. The information provided by this method is expected to enable the researcher to rank the classes according to their communicative orientation (i.e. from less communicative to most communicative). The data collected from Year 9/10 classes in this piece of research were organised and analysed in this way in order to provide comparable ratings for the classes in both countries. All the comparisons will be made on the basis of the criteria of Part A and B of the observation instrument.

The total percentage of time spent on each of the experiential features in COLT Part A and Part B during each activity type (i.e. less controlled and semi-controlled) will also be added to show the effect of activity types on classroom interaction in terms of communicative orientation.
Table 40 YEAR 9/10 CLASSES ON EXPERIENTIAL/ANALYTICAL SCALE (TOTAL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiential Features</th>
<th>Mean Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part A</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Activity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function/discourse/sociolinguistics</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad/Limited range of reference</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student or shared control</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended text</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-pedagogic/L1 adapted/student-made materials</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part B</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of L2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr.</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving unpredictable information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making genuine request</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustained speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction to message</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 41 YEAR 9/10 CLASSES ON EXPERIENTIAL/ANALYTICAL SCALE (CONTROLLED ACTIVITIES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiential Features</th>
<th>Mean Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part A</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Activity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function/discourse/sociolinguistics</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad/Limited range of reference</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student or shared control</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended text</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-pedagogic/L1 adapted/student-made materials</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YEAR 9 CLASSES

TOTAL COMMUNICATIVE SCORE 279
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiential Features</th>
<th>Mean Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part B</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of L2</td>
<td>Tr. 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving unpredictable information</td>
<td>Tr. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making genuine request</td>
<td>Tr. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustained speech</td>
<td>Tr. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction to message</td>
<td>Tr. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment, expansion, clarification and elaboration r.</td>
<td>Tr. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse Initiation</td>
<td>St. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted form</td>
<td>St. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**YEAR 9 CLASSES**

**TOTAL COMMUNICATIVE SCORE** 256

**IN CONTROLLED ACTIVITIES**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiential Features</th>
<th>Mean Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part A</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Activity</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function/discourse/sociolinguistics</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad/Limited range of reference</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student or shared control</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended text</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-pedagogic/L1 adapted/student-made materials</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part B</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of L2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr.</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving unpredictable information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making genuine request</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustained speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction to message</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr.</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As illustrated above, classroom interaction in the non-selective schools observed in Turkey was mainly teacher-centred; the use of pair/group-work appeared to be quite limited. 78% percent of class time was spent on focus on forms, with virtually no time spent on message (Other Topics). Teachers tightly controlled the use of English, which it reflected in their giving detailed explanations of grammatical constructions and practising the grammatical structures extensively. No percentage of time was recorded for discourse and sociolinguistics in any of the classes observed. All classes covered a range of student modalities, however more time was spent on listening and reading than other modalities. Although material types were varied across classes, they were mainly pedagogically-developed minimal written texts, such as isolated sentences, word lists, etc., which suggests that classes observed in Turkey were quite traditional in this respect.

The MFL teachers observed in Turkey structured classroom discourse mainly by giving or asking for information from their students. Most teachers' 'Information-Gap' turns contained predictable information and display questions. The MFL teachers in Turkey used the mother tongue and the target language equally during the observed interaction.
Teachers mainly used Turkish for classroom management. Moreover, the majority of teacher utterances were minimal.

In most of the classes observed, students spoke English in minimal and ultra-minimal turns. Students asked only a few questions and rarely initiated discourse. Students' responses to teacher questions were often predictable.

The amount of teacher incorporation of student utterances was quite limited. The teachers' reaction to code was high, and the repetition and correction of students' utterances was also extensive. Students, on the other hand, had a very limited opportunity to get involved in two-way communication and negotiation of meaning with their peers.

The majority of teaching time was spent on controlled activities (95%). The effects of different activity types on the variables in classroom interaction process are analysed and illustrated above. The findings of this study suggest that the semi-controlled activities were 'more communicative' than the controlled activities (see the communicative scores outlined in Tables 41 and 42) observed in Year 9/10 MFL classes in Turkey, which will be further analysed in the next chapter.
5.4 SUMMARY OF RESULTS OF CODING: COLT PART A - B
YEAR 10 CLASSES IN TURKEY (SELECTIVE SCHOOLS)

The results of the observations conducted in Year 10 (prep.) classes in selective schools in Turkey will be summarised in this section. The mean percentage of observed time in each category in Part A and the mean percentage of teacher turns in each category in Part B will be calculated and presented below, as explained earlier.

The scores and results calculated according to the activity types described in this study (see Chapter 4) will also be illustrated in graph form below. Only one class observed in selective schools used a free type of activity. The activity observed in this lesson was not a very successful one and the interaction was impossible to transcribe. Thus, free activity in the observed interaction is coded for only Part A. After the class, the teacher also told the researcher that she does not usually use this kind of activity in her teaching, but she wanted to do it in the particular class for the sake of recordings. Therefore, the researcher decided not to analyse this lesson and not to include the free activity type observed in the data analysis. That is, the results will be presented according to the controlled and semi-controlled activities observed in this study.

In this chapter, first, the COLT Part A results for the Year 9/10 classes will be illustrated. Then, the COLT Part B findings will be set out in graph form.

The sum of experiential features of Year 10 (prep.) classes will also be set out after the results are presented, which is expected to enable the researcher to rank the classes according to their communicative orientation (i.e. from less communicative to most communicative). The data collected from MFL classes in this piece of research were organised and analysed in this way in order to provide comparable ratings for the classes in both countries.

PART A - YEAR 10 (Prep.) CLASSES IN SELECTIVE SCHOOLS IN TURKEY

A total of 13 observations were conducted in Year 10 (prep.) classes in selective schools in Turkey and a total of 453 minutes of observation time was recorded. Teachers mostly used semi-controlled activities and they spent 68% of the total teaching time on this type
of activities. In other words, the majority of the activities used in Year 10 classes in the selective schools were not teacher-centred activities as observed in language classes in the state schools. Teachers spent only 32% of their time on controlled activities (see Table 97, Appendix VI).

The results show that there was almost an equal focus on teacher-to-student/class interaction and student-to-student/class organisation in Year 10 classes observed in the selective schools in Turkey, as illustrated in Table 43. Only about 1% of the total teaching time was spent on group work.

Table 43 Participant Organisation as a percentage of observed time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled Activities</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-controlled Activities</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers explained classroom procedures about 90% of the time spent on 'Managerial Talk', which suggests that Year 10 teachers in the selective schools in Turkey spend a considerable amount of time on explaining the structure and purpose of activities and organising general procedures for class interaction. 85% of teachers' managerial talk was in the target language. Managerial exchanges are of particular interest in L2 learning since it refers to authentic, spontaneous communication in the classroom.

In the COLT observation scheme, the two major categories under the category of Content are 'Language' and 'Other Topics'. The explicit focus on 'Language' is divided into several subsections: form, function, discourse, and sociolinguistics (see Appendix I). As explained in the previous chapter, a primary focus is coded for the 'Language' categories when it is evident from the teacher's verbal (or non-verbal) behaviour that s/he is focusing on language.

If the emphasis of an activity is exclusively on message, and not on any of the categories under 'Language', only check marks under 'Other Topics', which is the other major area of Content, are entered.
Overall, the result that is most significant in this category is that most of the MFL teachers in Year 10 classrooms in the selective schools focused on message being conveyed (28%) rather than the presentation of language code (21%), as CLT suggests (see Table 44 and also see Appendix XII-C).

As stated earlier, the COLT scheme developers assume that, within an activity, the primary focus may shift from message ('Other Topics') to language form ('Form'), or both language form and message may receive equal emphasis (combination). Table 44 indicates that the classes observed in selective schools spent the majority of teaching time focusing on language form (i.e. on grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, and spelling, as the COLT scheme defines it) and on message ('Other Topics') equally.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 44 Focus on Language Form/Message as a percentage of observed time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="chart1.png" alt="" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regard to explicit focus on 'Language', form refers to grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, and spelling, as the COLT scheme defines. The majority of time devoted to language form in the selective classes was spent on grammar (16%). No percentage of time was coded for function and sociolinguistics in this category (see Table 45).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 45 Content: Language as a percentage of observed time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="chart2.png" alt="" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'Other Topics', on the other hand, is represented by three subdivisions: 'Narrow', 'Limited', and 'Broad' topics, which characterise topic types arising in classroom conversation. For example, topics of narrow range refer to the immediate classroom
environment, or stereotyped exchanges such as "How are you?", "What is your name?". Topics like movies, hobbies are categorised as limited in this study. Topics of broad range involve reference to current world events, abstract ideas, etc. (see Table 46).

Content was mainly 'Broad' and 'Limited' in the language classes observed in selective schools. The main topics arising in classroom conversation were current world events, reflective personal information such as "What do you like about living in big cities?", and social/routine topics like movies, hobbies, etc. The amount of time spent on 'Narrow' topics was negligible (see Table 46).

Table 46 Content: Other Topics as a percentage of observed time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content: Other Topics as a percentage of observed time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled Activities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-controlled Activities:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students in the selective schools actively participate in the selection of topics in the classroom as CLT suggests. There was also little opportunity for content control by students (see Table 98 in Appendix VI).

The findings in 'Student Modality' category showed that most of the teachers tended to choose more activities involving listening and reading during observations (see Table 99 in Appendix VI).

Finally, Year 10 classes observed in the selective schools in Turkey used mostly extended texts (42%), such as stories, dialogues, etc., which are typically used in communicative classrooms (see Table 47). The materials used in the Year 10 classes in the selective schools were mainly designed for second language teaching (74%), which is considered to be a feature of traditional language teaching. However, they were mostly semi-controlled as CLT suggests (see Table 100 in Appendix VI).
PART B - YEAR 10 (Prep.) CLASSES IN SELECTIVE SCHOOLS IN TURKEY

The first parameter in Part B is 'Target Language', which is designed to measure the extent to which the target language is used in the classroom. The English teachers in the selective schools in Turkey used the target language to a very high degree in their speech turns observed. They produced 93% of their utterances in the target language, as presented in Table 48 (see also Appendix XII-C).

Table 48 Teacher: Target Language Use as a percentage of total teacher turns

Overall, teachers gave out unpredictable information in 85% of their turns and also asked display questions in 53% of their turns in this category. Teachers, however, asked markedly more genuine questions during the semi-controlled activities observed, as less controlled activities are believed to lead to more communicative, realistic use of language according to the proponents of CLT (see Table 49).

Table 49 Teacher: Information Gap as a percentage of turns spent on each category within its superordinate category (L2 only)
Overall, teachers tend to spend more time on giving information than requesting information (60% of total teacher turns involve giving information).

The English teachers in Turkey used markedly more minimal speech (89%) than sustained speech (11%) in their classroom interaction in the selective schools.

Teachers' reaction to message in the selective schools was markedly different than teachers' reaction to form in all the activity types observed; in 66% of cases, their reactions to student utterances were related to the message sent (see Table 50).

Table 50 Teacher: Reaction to Form and Message

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Controlled Activities</th>
<th>Semi-controlled Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tr_Form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr_Message</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

The data in this parameter shows that the highest percentage of teacher turns was devoted to comment on student utterances (26%) (see Table 51).

Table 51 Teacher: Incorporation of Student Utterances as a percentage of turns spent on each category within its superordinate category

This feature in Part B measures the frequency of self-initiated turns by students. Students initiated discourse on average in only 5% of the total student turns in selective classes (see Table 52).

Table 52 Student: Discourse Initiation
Teachers, on the other hand, generally participated in classroom interaction more than students did and they controlled classroom discourse to a high percentage in all activity types observed (59% as opposed to 41%).

That is to say, the classroom discourse in the selective schools remained mainly teacher-controlled since the teachers initiated and controlled most of the discourse in classroom interaction.

Overall, the selective school students' use of the target language was markedly different than the ones observed in the non-selective schools in this study; about 90% of their utterances were in the target language (see Table 53 and also Appendix XII-C).

Table 53 Student: Target Language Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>St_L1</th>
<th>St_L2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-controlled Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students in the selective schools in Turkey tended to produce utterances containing unpredictable information more than utterances containing predictable information (see Table 54). This tendency increased during semi-controlled activities, as students would be expected to give messages which are not easily anticipated during less controlled activities.

Table 54 Student: Information Gap as a percentage of turns spent on each category within its superordinate category (L2 only)
When the data is analysed as a percentage of total student turns in the 'Information Gap' category, the difference between giving information and asking questions appeared to be quite high. Students had a markedly larger number of opportunities to give information (90%) than to ask questions (10%) (see Table 101 in Appendix VI).

Students produced mostly minimal (55%) utterances. Student sustained utterances, on the other hand, made up only 13% of their utterances (see Table 55). Students produced more sustained utterances and unrestricted utterances during semi-controlled activities (see Table 56), as learners are often expected to use the target language in a less restricted way in order to communicate with each other during this type of activities.

**Table 55 Student: Sustained Speech**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Controlled Activities</th>
<th>Semi-controlled Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St_Ultramin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St_Minimal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St_Sustained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 56 Student: Form Restriction as a percentage of spent on each category within its superordinate category (L2 only)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Controlled Activities</th>
<th>Semi-controlled Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St_Choral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St_Restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St_Unrestricted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, students reacted to message at a low rate (28%). Therefore, the main emphasis remained on language form in all activity types observed (see Table 102 in Appendix VI).
Most student incorporation of utterances was in the form of repetition (92%) of previous utterances in the selective schools. There was a very small percentage of clarification requests (5%) on the preceding utterances which might indicate that students did not much opportunity to get involved in two-way communication and negotiation of meaning (see Table 57).

**Table 57** Student: Incorporation of St/Tr Utterances as a percentage of turns spent on each category within its superordinate category

Overall, student turns in the selective schools were mainly in 'Information Gap' categories whereas, teacher turns were almost equally divided between 'Incorporation of Teacher/Student Utterances' and 'Information Gap' categories (see Tables 103 and 104 in Appendix VI).

### 5.4.1 RANKING OF YEAR 10 (prep.) CLASSES IN SELECTIVE SCHOOLS ON EXPERIENTIAL - ANALYTIC SCALE / TURKEY

The COLT Observation Scheme is relied upon as the major determiner of the analysis of the communicative orientations in the classrooms observed. The scheme is rooted within theory of CLT and the categories in the scheme are defined to describe as precisely as possible some of the features of communication, which occur in second language classrooms. In the literature of CLT, for example, group-work or giving/receiving of unpredictable information are considered to be an important factor in the development of
communicative competence (Allen et al., 1983). Therefore, in this section, the Year 10 (prep.) classes observed in the selective schools in Turkey will be ranked on an experiential and analytical scale, following the same procedure as Allen et al. (1987) and described in Chapter 4.

The total percentage of time spent on each of the experiential features in COLT Part A and Part B (as illustrated above), will be calculated and added together in order to reach total communicative scores of language classes representing communicative orientation of each school observed in this study. The information provided by this method is expected to enable the researcher to rank the classes according to their communicative orientation (i.e. from less communicative to most communicative). The data collected from Year 10 (prep.) classes in this piece of research were organised and analysed in this way in order to provide comparable ratings for the classes in both countries. All the comparisons will be made on the basis of the criteria of Part A and B of the observation instrument.

The total percentage of time spent on each of the experiential features in COLT Part A and Part B during each activity type (i.e. less controlled and semi-controlled) will also be added to show the effect of activity types on classroom interaction in terms of communicative orientation.

Table 58  YEAR 10 (prep.) CLASSES ON EXPERIENTIAL/ANALYTICAL SCALE (TOTAL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiential Features</th>
<th>Mean Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part A</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Activity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential Features</td>
<td>Mean Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function/discourse/sociolinguistics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad/Limited range of reference</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student or shared control</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended text</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-pedagogic/L1 adapted/student-made materials</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of L2</th>
<th>Tr.</th>
<th>St.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Giving unpredictable information</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making genuine request</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustained speech</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction to message</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment, expansion, clarification and elaboration r.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse Initiation</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted form</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**YEAR 10 (prep.) CLASSES**

**TOTAL COMMUNICATIVE SCORE** 888
Table 59 YEAR 10 (prep.) CLASSES ON EXPERIENTIAL/ANALYTICAL SCALE (CONTROLLED ACTIVITIES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiential Features</th>
<th>Mean Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part A</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Activity</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function/discourse/sociolinguistics</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad/Limited range of reference</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student or shared control</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended text</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-pedagogic/L1 adapted/student-made materials</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part B</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of L2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr.</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving unpredictable information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr.</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making genuine request</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustained speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction to message</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr.</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment, expansion, clarification and elaboration r.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr.</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

185
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiential Features</th>
<th>Mean Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discourse Initiation</td>
<td>St. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted form</td>
<td>St. 18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YEAR 10 (prep.) CLASSES
TOTAL COMMUNICATIVE SCORE 702
IN CONTROLLED ACTIVITIES

Table 60 YEAR 10 (prep.) CLASSES ON EXPERIENTIAL/ANALYTICAL SCALE (SEMI-CONTROLLED ACTIVITIES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiential Features</th>
<th>Mean Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part A</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Activity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function/discourse/sociolinguistics</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad/Limited range of reference</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student or shared control</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended text</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-pedagogic/L1 adapted/student-made materials</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential Features</td>
<td>Mean Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part B</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of L2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr.</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving unpredictable information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr.</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making genuine request</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr.</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustained speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction to message</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr.</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment, expansion, clarification and elaboration r.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr.</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse Initiation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YEAR 10 (prep.) CLASSES
TOTAL COMMUNICATIVE SCORE 982
IN SEMI-CONTROLLED ACTIVITIES
5.4.2 OVERVIEW OF FINDINGS IN YEAR 10 (Prep.) CLASSES IN SELECTIVE SCHOOLS IN TURKEY

In sum, the main pattern of organisation for classroom interaction in the selective classes observed in Turkey was student-to-student/class organisation. However, like other classes, a very limited amount of pair/group-work was observed in the selective classes. The selective classes were the only classes observed in this study which spent the most time on message being conveyed rather than on language structures. Content was mainly Broad and Limited, such as current world events and personal, everyday-related topics. The amount of time spent on Narrow topics was negligible (see Table 46).

Students in the selective classes had many more opportunities to participate actively in the selection of topics in the classroom as CLT suggests. All the classes covered a range of student modalities, however like the other classes observed in this study, more time was spent on listening and reading than other modalities. Although material types were varied across classes, they were mainly pedagogically-developed extended written texts, such as stories, dialogues, etc., which are typically used in communicative classrooms.

Teacher turns in the selective schools were almost equally divided between 'Information Gap' (giving and requesting information) and 'Incorporation of Teacher/Student Utterances' (51% and 49% respectively). Most of the teachers' information-giving turns contained unpredictable information. Although most of the teacher questions were display questions, teachers also used a high percentage of genuine questions during their interaction with students. Therefore, it might be suggested that there was a certain amount of exchange of real information in these classes. The MFL teachers in Turkey used the target language as a means of communication. However, the majority of teacher utterances were minimal.

Students in the selective classes also used English for around 90% of their utterances, but initiated discourse very little. Students' utterances also remained minimal and restricted. However, the findings also revealed that students in the selective classes had much more opportunity to produce sustained and unrestricted speech than any other classes observed
in this study. Although students asked only a few questions during the observed interaction, they were mainly genuine questions. Students' responses to teacher questions were also often unpredictable.

The extent of teacher reaction to message was high and teachers incorporated student utterances by commenting, repeating and paraphrasing. Students, on the other hand, had a limited opportunity to get involved in two-way communication and negotiation of meaning with their peers, like the other classes observed in this study.

The majority of teaching time was spent on semi-controlled activities (68%). The effects of different activity types on the variables in the classroom interaction process are analysed and illustrated above. The findings of this study suggest that the semi-controlled activities were 'more communicative' than the controlled activities (see the communicative scores outlined in Tables 59 and 60) observed in Year 9/10 MFL classes in Turkey, which will be further analysed in the following chapter.
CHAPTER VI.

DISCUSSION AND RESULTS

6.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter aims to analyse the findings reported in the preceding chapter in the light of the theories and issues discussed so far in this study. That is, the nature of the classroom interaction in language classrooms will be discussed in relation to SLA literature. The research questions, which this study aims to address, have been outlined in Chapter 4. In sum, the results of this piece of research are explored in relation to the following major research questions:

1. What is the nature of classroom interaction in L2 classrooms in English and Turkish secondary schools?

2. What is the nature of communicative orientation of the L2 classes observed?

3. Is there any relationship between instructional differences (i.e. meaning-focused and grammar-focused instructions; communicative oriented language teaching, etc.) and language production?

4. How do the types of activities affect the oral interaction in language classrooms?

Since this study includes a relatively small sample of language teaching it only aims to give some insight into classroom interaction and how this interaction shapes L2 learning and teaching in the two countries in which this research study was conducted. Therefore, the suggestions and the indications of the findings of this study will be tentative rather than conclusive. From a theoretical perspective it is hoped that the findings of this study will provide some implications for the questions raised and provide food for discussion on a number of pedagogic and theoretical issues. It is also expected that this study would provide possible future directions for further research.

The following glossary will be used in this chapter:

England: classes observed in England (in the Leicester school).
Turkey: classes observed in the non-selective schools in Turkey.
Selective: classes observed in the selective schools in Turkey.
6.1.1 OVERVIEW OF MAJOR FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

As Holliday (1999) points out, there are secondary school classrooms all over the world with very similar seating arrangements and teacher-student behaviour, despite national cultural differences. Indeed, this study provides some evidence that language teaching and classroom interaction have some similar features as well as different features in the two different countries observed. Further, the findings of this piece of research also suggest that even within the same country there are some differences across the schools observed.

In this research study, communicative scores calculated for each school are presented in the previous chapter (see Tables 24, 40 and 58). According to these results, the communicative orientation in secondary classrooms observed was found to be different, as illustrated below:

**Table 61 Experiential Ranking of Language Classes Observed**

Although the language classes observed in England were initially predicted to be the most communicative among the classes observed in this study, the results detailed in the previous chapters showed that the selective classes observed in Turkey were more communicative than the ones observed in England. That is, in terms of communicative orientation, the most communicative was the Turkish selective classes, followed by the Leicester classes, and then the Turkish non-selective classes. Therefore, this chapter will analyse the differences and the reasons for these differences based on the rankings given above. All the comparisons will be made on the basis of the criteria of Part A and B of the observation instrument.

Finally, in order to determine how important the differences found in the comparisons are, two statistical tests have been used to compare the classes and schools observed:
A One-way Anova test to compare the means of the categories (variables) in Part A and a Chi-square test to compare the frequencies of categories occurring in Part B. Although these two tests have been applied to all categories, in this chapter, only the results which were statistically significant (at the 1% level) in the two tests will be provided.

6.1.1.1 ACTIVITIES

It is generally accepted that some activities are intrinsically more communicative or they lead to more communicative interactions and are more likely than others to bring about language acquisition. The type of activity, therefore, is a good criterion to use to assess and to compare the communicative orientations of L2 classrooms (N'Zian, 1991). In this study the activity types are grouped under 3 major headings according to the degree of teacher versus student control over the performance of activity, (Controlled, Semi-controlled and Free Activities), just as Crookes and Chaudron (1991) did in their research. Activities observed during the observation period are coded according to this category system, as discussed in Chapter 4 (see also Appendix III). The data collected in this study is also analysed further according to some activities (e.g. drills, language modelling, etc.) observed in this study in order to provide a closer perspective on the effect of particular types of activities on classroom interaction (see Appendix X).

The data in this study suggests that teachers mostly used teacher-controlled activities in the non-selective schools observed in both countries. No percentage of time was recorded for free activity types in the non-selective schools observed in this study. In the selective schools, on the other hand, classes spent the majority of the total observation time on semi-controlled activities (see Table 62).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 62 Activity Types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>England</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
<th>Selective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Controlled</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-controlled</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.1.1.2 PARTICIPANT ORGANISATION

Research shows that teacher talk most of the time in a classroom and controls the classroom interaction. As Nunan (1987) points out student oral participation and student talking time are crucial criteria for CLT. This piece of study also indicates that language classes in non-selective schools in both countries were mainly teacher-centred and teachers controlled the classroom discourse to a high degree (see Table 63). In the selective schools, on the other hand, there was more student-to-student/class organisation than teacher-to-whole class organisation (see Table 63). Therefore, students had more opportunities to participate in classroom interaction compared to the students in the non-selective schools observed in both countries, as discussed earlier. Intensive language teaching in selective schools might have effect on student participation. Ellis (1994) points out, one of the factors that seems to determine the quality of learner participation in the classroom setting is the degree of learner exercise over the discourse. As it will be discussed further later in this chapter, students in selective schools students exerted influence over the content to a much higher degree than the students in non-selective schools in both countries. According to CLT, student participation is necessary for language acquisition. However, there is no clear evidence on the extent to which learners' productive participation in the classroom affects their language development.

Table 63 Participant Organisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>England</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
<th>Selective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TS_C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS_C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.1.1.2.1 Pair/Group-Work

Since the COLT Scheme does not differentiate between pair-work and group-work, the results are combined and will be analysed here under the sub-category of pair/group-work. There was little emphasis on pair/group-work in language classrooms in both countries. MFL classes spent markedly more time on pair/group-
work than their Turkish counterparts (12% compared to only about 2%). The percentage of time spent on pair/group-work in selective classes was negligible (less than 1%) (see Table 64).

Table 64 Use of Pair/Group-work Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>England</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
<th>Selective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>n1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E n g l a n d</td>
<td>T u r k e y</td>
<td>S e l e c t i v e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings of SLA research that group work is facilitative of language acquisition (e.g. Seliger, 1983; Long and Porter, 1985; Long, 1989) and helps the teacher to create a positive and relaxed atmosphere (Foster, 1998) appear not to have been applied into the classroom contexts observed in either country. The findings of this study provide a support to the claim developed by researchers, such as Prabhu 1987; Fazio and Lyster 1997, that the greatest percentage of time in L2 classrooms was spent in teacher-led whole class activities.

This might be explained by class sizes in both countries. As Jacobs (1998) points out, physical arrangement of students might have an impact on organising pair/group-work activities in classrooms. There were an average of 15-20 students per class, sitting at big tables with individual chairs in language classrooms in England whereas in Turkey, there were 45-50 students in each class, sitting in five or six rows with desks, facing the front of the room where the teacher stands or sits on a raised dais. Moreover, language teachers in Turkey mentioned during the teacher-interviews that they rarely use pair/group-work in their teaching mainly because it is difficult to control students and the targets of those activities are unachievable most of the time because of the classroom size. However, this study failed to provide enough teachers' views on this issue in order to support this assumption developed by the researcher. As Nelson (1995) points out, there are some cultural differences in using (or not using) small groups. This popular teaching technique is likely to contribute to dissatisfaction in students from certain cultures. However, it is important to emphasise that those preferences are dynamic too.
Since the amount of pair/group-work activities observed in Turkish language classrooms in the non-selective and selective schools was too limited to generalise and make assumptions about, the interaction features occurring during these activities will not be analysed in this chapter.

Although some researchers (e.g. Nunan, 1991) described teacher-led lessons as 'lock-step' and criticised them for minimising students' use of the target language, Wong-Fillmore (1985) concluded in her research that a teacher-centred classroom organisation provides better input to the class than pair/group-work. She claims that the teacher is generally the only person in class who knows English well enough to provide any kind of help to the learners. In a group-work context, students can interact with their classmates while they are working, but if no one knows English very well, such interactions do little to further their development of that language. Moreover, if the students share a common L1, their interactions are most naturally conducted in the language they know rather than in English, which is new to all of them. Indeed, this piece of research showed that students used slightly more L1 (51%) than L2 (49%) while they were engaged in pair/group-work activities in the Leicester school (see Table 65). During teacher-led whole class activities in the same lessons in which pair/group-work activities were observed in England, student utterances were mostly in L1 (53%) (see Table 65).

Table 65 Student: Target Language Use during Pair/Group-work and Teacher-led Whole-class Activities in England

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group-work</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-led</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As an alternative to lock-step grammar teaching, Fotos and Ellis (1991) suggest that the usual teacher-fronted lock-step approach to grammar teaching might be replaced by group-work which interactively integrates grammar instruction with opportunities for meaningful interaction. Bygate (1988) also suggests that pair/group-work promotes acquisition by providing opportunities for learners to build up utterances through the satellite units which are believed to give flexibility in communication,
allowing the learner to formula their messages. Some researchers also found significant differences in the quality of learner participation depending on the kind of activity they are involved in, as mentioned in Chapter 3. For instance, House (1986) compared the performance of advanced learners of L2 English in a role-play situation and a teacher-led discussion. She reported that learners in the teacher-led discussion failed to use 'discourse lubricants', such as topic introducers (e.g. 'You know...'). On the other hand, the role-play conversations sounded much more natural. She concludes that in cases where participation is strictly controlled there may be few opportunities for learners to practice communicative strategies. Gaies (1983) argues that negotiation is evident in teacher-dominated lessons as he found in the kind of feedback that learners provide in activities that required the teacher to describe graphic designs and found evidence of considerable variation among the learners.

As Johnson (1995) points out, one of the more common types of student-student interaction found in second language classrooms is small groups of students' reviewing and/or practising teacher-taught materials. Language teachers in England used conversation-teaching materials mainly to emphasise transactional skills, such as how to ask for directions, how to order a meal, etc., and teachers generally moved around to help pairs. While students were engaged in pair/group-work activities most of the students simply copied or changed the dialogue or activity in textbook or in a worksheet and repeated them in front of the whole class. However, these descriptions of pair/group-work activities in English classrooms might be subjective.

The data in this study also supports the fact that there was little evidence of negotiation of meaning between students (making clarification and/or elaboration requests according to the COLT definition) in either situation (teacher-centred and pair/group-work), as Pica and Doughty (1985) found in their study.

Group work with more than two participants was avoided by most of the teachers during the observations. Some teachers in the Leicester school used large-group activities. As noted previously, the basic unit for coding in Part B is the teacher and student turn. Although teachers did not participate any pair/group-work observed they often moved around helping and monitoring students. In a few cases, teachers also called attention to the whole class in order to provide some further guidance while pair/group-work was in operation, which might indicate that pair/group-work in these
classrooms were controlled by teachers to a certain extent. Therefore, teacher inputs were also coded during pair/group-work activities. In MFL classrooms in England 72% of the total turns were student turns and only 28% of the total turns were recorded as teacher turns during pair/group-work activities (see Table 66). During teacher-led whole class activities in the same lessons in which pair/group-work activities were observed in England, teacher turns were 73% of the total turns and student turns were recorded as only 27% of the total turns (see Table 66). In other words, students got the opportunity to talk in the classroom more than their teachers during the pair/group-work observed although students used slightly more L1 (51%) than L2 (49%) during this type of activity, as illustrated earlier in Table 65.

Table 66 Total Teacher/Student Turns during Pair/Group-work and Teacher-led Whole-class Activities in England

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group-work tasks</th>
<th>Teacher-led whole class tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total teacher turns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total student turns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher-led whole class activities are also criticised for having a lack of interactive features since teachers appear to be interested in only getting the right answer rather than a meaningful discussion. The data in this study suggests that teachers reacted to form (52%) and message (48%) almost equally during the teacher-led activities observed in the language classrooms in England (see Table 67). During the pair/group-activities, on the other hand, teacher reaction to message (85%) was markedly different (see Table 67). Students, on the other hand, reacted to form in a higher percentage in their turns during the teacher-led activities and they reacted to form and message almost equally during the pair/group-work activities observed.

Table 67 Teacher: Reaction to Form and Message during Pair/Group-work and Teacher-led Whole-class Activities in England

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group-work tasks</th>
<th>Teacher-led whole class tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Message</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Ellis (1994) points out, while the amount of participation may not be a key factor in L2 acquisition, a stronger case can be made for the importance of high-quality participation. One of the factors that seems to determine the quality of learner participation in the classroom setting is the degree of learner exercise over the discourse. As Catchart (1986) found, situations where the learner had control of the talk were characterised by a variety of communicative acts (e.g. story-telling, interview, free play, etc.) and syntactic structures. On the other hand, in the situations where the teacher had control the students seemed to produce single-word utterances, short phrases, and formulaic chunks. However, this study showed that students did not make any sustained speech in either teacher-centred or pair/group-work activities in England. Unrestricted student utterances in teacher-centred activities observed in the Leicester school were also quite limited. However, unrestricted students utterances were more marked than restricted ones during the group-work activities in the observed interaction (68% of total student turns in the target language as opposed to 27% of total student turns during teacher-centred activities) (see Table 68).

**Table 68 Student: Unrestricted Utterances during Pair/Group-work and Teacher-led Whole-class Activities in England**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group-work Tasks</th>
<th>Teacher-led Whole-class Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, as Tong-Fredericks (1984) suggests pair/group work, if structured and managed properly, can play an important role in students’ language development. They can be used, for example, for motivating students, practising language models and for opportunities for conscious awareness of language. As Long and Porter (1985) suggest, pair/group-work provides the kind of input and opportunities for output that promote rapid L2 acquisition. However, Long (1989) draws attention to the fact that successful group-work depends on the kinds of activities in which speakers are engaged and further research on effective group work activities is needed. Martyn (1996) also concluded in his piece of research that certain activities had an effect on
the amount of negotiation of meaning in small group-work. As Mercer (1996) points out that children need to learn how to do pair/group-work. The value of collaborative work can be enhanced through the preparation of students for activity performance. Mercer (1996) claims that children rarely get guidance on how to talk and work effectively together on classroom-related activities.

6.1.1.3 CONTENT: MANAGEMENT

Part of the teacher talking time in the classroom has been labelled 'Managerial Talk', which consists of organising activities, giving instructions, etc. The observation data in this research indicates that there were some differences in giving instructions in the two settings. The way the teachers give instructions was quite different in the two countries. MFL teachers in England spent a considerable amount of time (80% of the total time spent on 'Managerial Talk') on organising general procedures for class interaction (see Table 69). It might be due to the fact that teachers in England usually prepared their own materials. Therefore, it was necessary to explain the purpose of activities and to give instructions about overall classroom procedure and appropriate behaviour once at the beginning of each lesson. Their Turkish counterparts, on the other hand, spent 52% of the total teaching time on organising general procedures for class interaction and teachers often read out the necessary information already written in the textbook. 18% of teachers' managerial talk was in the target language. It reached its highest percentage during the observations in the selective schools in Turkey. Year 10 language teachers in the selective schools explained classroom procedures about 90% of the time spent on 'Managerial Talk', 85% of teachers' managerial talk was in the target language (see Table 69). Teachers in selective schools tried to create an atmosphere in the classroom in which students felt comfortable to use the target language for purposes of practical communication. It was observed that teachers tended to use the target language as the principal means of communication in the classroom (see Appendix XII-C).

Table 69  Teacher's Managerial Talk and Use of Target Language in Managerial Talk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Managerial Talk</th>
<th>Use of Target Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective school</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.1.1.4 CONTENT: FOCUS ON LANGUAGE FORM AND MEANING

Researchers have been trying to find out whether focusing only on language form is more or less effective than a more integrated approach. The advocates of consciousness-raising (Rutherford, 1988; Rutherford and Sharwood-Smith, 1988) or input enhancement (Sharwood-Smith, 1991) suggested that learners must attend to linguistic features in the input as well as messages, therefore they proposed that a more integrated approach would be most effective. There are some COLT-based studies (e.g. Spada, 1990) which provide some evidence to support this assumption (McKay, 1994). Williams (1995), Robinson (1996), and Doughty and Williams (1998) recognised the value of 'integrating grammar instruction with communicative language learning that would enable learners to recognise the properties of target structures in context, and develop accuracy in their use'. It is necessary to investigate this issue further.

As with communicative features of interaction, the focus on forms and/or meaning in each class differed across schools and across countries. Classes in the non-selective schools observed in both countries focused on language form (grammar, vocabulary, etc., as the COLT scheme defines it) more than on the message being conveyed. These findings support the fact that ESL teachers still emphasise forms over meaning, accuracy over communication. As pointed out before, the COLT scheme allows researcher to do double coding which indicates equal emphasis on two features. Therefore, the scheme was capable of indicating the equal focus (combinations) on form and message being conveyed in this category. Classes in the selective schools observed in Turkey focused on message and on message-form combination rather than focusing exclusively on language form (see Table 70). Teachers in the selective classes observed used a variety of topics, such as current world events, everyday-related topics, in order to motivate students to use the target language to communicate.

Table 70 Focus on Language Form/Message and both on Form-Message

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>England</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
<th>Selective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Message</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form-Message</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A striking difference was seen in teachers' focus on different aspects of form, and in different combinations. MFL teachers in England focused mainly on vocabulary, whereas in both Turkish non-selective and selective schools, language teachers' focus on grammatical forms and patterns was markedly different. These differences will have differing impacts on learners' opportunities for noticing, which may influence the nature of SLA. Focusing on grammar is more likely to provide learners with opportunities to notice how language is constructed. Indeed, it was observed that the language teachers in the non-selective schools in Turkey introduced a particular grammatical construction through pattern drills. The focus was on the syntax of the language example, rather than its semantic content. MFL teachers approached the language first through detailed analysis of its grammar rules. That is, language teachers in Turkey tended to give more explicit grammar teaching than their English counterparts, as the MFL syllabuses in Turkey suggested (see Table 71 and also Appendix XII-B).

As Nunan (1988) found in his study that the transfer of skills from the classroom context to other contexts did not occur as readily as was hoped. Indeed, it would be highly optimistic to suggest that the classroom interaction in language classrooms observed in Turkey were natural.

MFL teachers in England, on the other hand, tended to give implicit grammar teaching and they were reluctant to use the grammatical labels while introducing the structure. They introduced the linguistic forms in ready-made chunks, (whole utterances, such as ‘I don’t know’ or utterance frames with one or more empty slots, such as ‘Can I have a …’) without analysing them. The teachers focused on communicative functions of the language units and set the activities in order to introduce this aspect of language rather than the particular grammatical aspect. As
Ellis (1994) points out, native speakers know a large number of formulas, which they have learnt as unanalysed units. They also know rules that enable them to understand and produce novel sentences without conscious effort. It is not clear, however, whether giving explicit or implicit grammar teaching assists students' language production.

Many argue that there is no evidence that the type of grammar-focused teaching activities used in many language classrooms reflect the cognitive learning processes employed in naturalistic situations outside the classroom. They would argue that engaging learners in meaning-focused activities provides a better context for the activation of learning processes rather than form-focused activities, and hence ultimately provides better opportunities for language learning to take place. Language learning is believed to depend on immersing students not merely in 'comprehensible input' but in activities that require them to negotiate meaning and engage in naturalistic and meaningful communication.

Nunan (1988), on the other hand, claims that no matter how carefully such simulations are developed, it is unlikely that communicative classroom conditions can be developed which replicate all aspects of communication outside the classroom. In order to maximise the potential of the classroom, it is necessary to develop student autonomy and meta-awareness. In the context of the National Curriculum in Great Britain, as discussed earlier in the Introduction Chapter of this study, many educators (e.g. Grenfell 1999; Biriotti 1999) have been discussing the need for teaching metalinguistic terminology (terms of grammar, morphology, etc.). Van Lier (1996) contributes to the discussion saying that it is difficult to see in the absence of clear goals the use of such terminology: why would it be useful, for what purpose, in order to achieve what goals? It is possible that in some cases, formal knowledge is easier to handle and it is more easily assessed. However, as Nunan (1988) suggests, one of the major reasons widening the scope of language beyond grammatical structures to functions, notions and so on, was the fact that learners will be able to transfer knowledge and skills developed in the rather artificial environment of the classroom to new contexts and situations in the real world outside.

The observation data in this study suggests that most of the classroom interaction was tightly controlled by the teachers. Since the teachers, particularly in England, tended
to give the structure in chunks in order to enable students to make linguistically appropriate sentences, using the appropriate structures it might have minimised students' reliance on their interlanguage. Although the students in Turkish classrooms were exposed to grammatical structures more than their English counterparts, it is not clear to what extent this grammatical knowledge enabled them to express themselves or to communicate with the others since most of their utterances were minimal, restricted and also grammar-focused. As McKay (1994) suggests, it is worth pursuing more research in classes where communicative interaction occurs alongside focus on form.

The COLT observation scheme is constructed to reflect findings in SLA and communicative literature supporting the use of oral communication in the second or foreign language classroom (McKay, 1994). Thus, in an analysis of interaction in the classroom, the COLT scheme mainly investigates the specific features of communication. As McKay (1994) points out, COLT categories were grouped in such a way that each experiential feature was matched by a corresponding analytic feature in order to capture the differences in instructional orientation (for example, 'Restricted' versus 'Unrestricted' turns; 'Display' versus 'Informational' questions, which are coded after the observation, using audio-recordings). In this way, a description of communicative interaction in a classroom can be attempted (McKay, 1994). Allen et al. (1983), referring to the COLT scheme, also adds that

...we compiled a list of indicators of communication, each of which can be separately observed and quantified. The communicative orientation of classrooms is therefore not characterised by a single feature, but by a cluster of interrelated dimensions.

(p.247)

6.1.1.5 STUDENT MODALITY

One of the arguments made in CLT literature is that students should be encouraged to integrate their skills practice to reflect a more authentic use of language. Nunan (1987) points out that student oral participation and student talking time are crucial criteria for CLT (Hollliday, 1994). Porter (1986) suggests that learners must get
practice speaking in communicative exchanges in the classroom in order to promote communicative competence. Holliday (1994) also notes that,

*Although the focus on practising language use involves reading, writing and listening in what often amounts to very integrated learning tasks, much emphasis is, according to the common myth, placed on oral work. Student oral participation is at a premium; and student talking time is an important measurement of a 'good lesson'.*  
(p.170)

This feature in the COLT scheme was developed to determine whether differential focus on the various skills areas and their combinations affect the development of particular aspects of the learners' L2 competence. Although the MFL syllabuses in the two countries recommend teachers to focus on developing students communicative abilities and speaking skills, it does not appear to have been applied into the classroom contexts observed in either country. All classes (in both non-selective and selective schools) observed in both countries spent the most total teaching time on listening and reading activities; they spent a very limited amount of time on speaking.

![Table 72 Student Modality](image)

The statistical test shows that the different focus on listening-speaking combination (while students were engaged with listening and speaking activities) according to the activity types is statistically significant at the 1% level (p< 0.01) in the non-selective schools observed in both countries (see Table 105 in Appendix VII).

### 6.1.1.6 USE OF MATERIALS

Another important parameter in the COLT scheme is 'Materials' which introduces categories to describe the materials used in connection with classroom activities. Advocates of the communicative approach claimed that authentic materials are
essential in order to prepare students for the kind of discourse they will encounter outside the classroom. Many believe that the materials should reflect the outside world in order to assist learners to do in class what they will need to be able to do outside (Allen et al., 1984). This authenticity should relate to the text sources as well as to student activities. The materials should also foster independent learning by raising the consciousness of the learners and making them more aware of the learning process' (Nunan 1988, p.99). Materials come in many shapes and formats. The most obvious distinction is between local materials produced by a teacher for her class, and those which are commercially produced (teacher’s books, students’ books, audiotapes, filmstrips, etc.). One of the problems with comprehensive, structured course materials is that they can sometimes dictate what goes on in the classroom, leaving teachers with little opportunity to exercise their own creativity (although there is evidence that many teachers tend to modify materials to suit themselves) (Nunan, 1988).

All classes observed in both countries used materials to the majority of the total teaching time. Teachers in England tend to prepare their own materials, whereas teachers in Turkey tend to follow a textbook. Language classes in England used mostly extended written texts and visual materials. They were mainly pedagogical materials and were highly controlled by teachers. Classes in the selective schools also used mostly extended texts, such as stories, dialogues, etc., which are used in communicative classrooms However, they also used minimal texts in a high percentage (see Table 73). Although the materials used in selective schools were mainly designed for second language teaching, they were mostly semi-controlled. Classes in the non-selective schools in Turkey, on the other hand, spent the majority of the total teaching time on minimal written texts which suggests that the classes observed in Turkey were traditional in this respect.

Table 73 Type of Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Materials</th>
<th>England</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
<th>Selective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Text Minimal</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Extended</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.1.1.7 USE OF TARGET LANGUAGE

There has been a debate over the use of L1 and L2 in language classrooms, as discussed previously in Chapter III. Almost every popular teaching method in the twentieth century tried to encourage target language use in the classroom. Krashen's comprehensible input hypothesis implies that there is no place for L1 use in language classrooms. However, Cook (2001) argues that there is no evidence that code-switching is inappropriate in a language classroom and he claims that SLA research provides no reason why it is not rational to use L1 in the classroom. Teachers in the non-selective schools in both countries used L1 to a great extent in their speech turns observed, as illustrated earlier in Table 15 and 31. The language teachers in the selective schools, on the other hand, used the target language to a markedly high percentage in their speech turns observed, as CLT suggests. Several researchers also investigated teachers' views on using the target language in the classroom. For example, Franklin (1990) found that 90 per cent of teachers think teaching in the target language is important. Macaro (1997), on the other hand, reported that only about 34% of the language teachers agreed on the importance of using the target language in the classroom. The teacher interviews in this study suggests that language teachers in both selective and non-selective schools in Turkey believe that using the target language is important in the classroom. However, the language teachers in the non-selective schools also point out that student level plays an important role in the teachers' language choice in L2 classrooms and it is often necessary to use L1 along L2 in order to prevent a communicative breakdown. Language teachers in the Leicester school also mentioned that it is not necessary to avoid using L1 in the classroom and they should use L1 to some degree to explain the activities and new items.

Some researchers (such as Zilm 1989, etc.) also discovered that when the teachers increased the use of the target language in class, the students' use of the target language rose proportionally. Teachers in the non-selective schools in England and Turkey used L1 to a great extent (55% of teachers' utterances in England and 49% of teachers' utterances in Turkey were in the mother tongue). Students, on the other hand, used the target language in the classroom more than their teachers (55% of student utterances in England and 83% of student utterances in Turkey were in the
target language) (see Table 74). Both teachers and students in the selective schools used the target language to a high degree (around 90% of their utterances) (see Table 74). Therefore, the findings of this study provided some evidence regarding how the teachers' use of the target language affected the students' use of the target language. Since students in selective classes are exposed to extensive target language by their teachers, it might increase their use of the target language.

Table 74 Teacher/Students' Use of Target Language in Total Turns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>England</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
<th>Selective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are also some studies (e.g. Kharma and Hajjah, 1989) suggesting that teachers use more L1 in earlier stages of learning, as discussed earlier. However, this piece of research showed that teachers and students in both England and Turkey (non-selective schools) used more L2 in Year 9 classes than they did in Year 10 classes during their classroom interaction (see Table 75 and Table 76). In particular, teachers' use of L2 in Year 9 and in Year 10 classes in Turkey was markedly different (see Table 75).

Table 75 Teachers' Use of the Target Language in Year 9 and in Year 10 Classes

Table 76 Students' Use of the Target Language in Year 9 and in Year 10 Classes
6.1.1.8 TEACHER: INFORMATION GAP

Another aspect of teacher talk which has attracted attention in SLA research is that of teacher questions. Cullen (1998) indicates that there is evidence from classroom research that aspects of teacher talk, such as the kind of questions teachers ask, significantly affect the quantity and quality of interaction in the lesson. Many researchers also reported that teachers typically ask many questions. However, this study showed that teachers in both countries focused on giving information more than asking questions and they tend to give unpredictable information. Some studies (Long and Sato 1983; White 1992, etc.) also reported that language teachers asked more display questions than referential questions. They point out that this result contrasts with native speaker behaviour outside the classroom where referential questions are predominant. Indeed, this study provides some support for these findings; teachers asked markedly more display questions in the secondary (non-selective) schools observed in both countries (see Table 77). However, the findings of this study also shows that MFL teachers in the selective classes observed used more genuine questions in their teaching, as CLT suggests. This might indicate that there was more real use of the target language in the selective schools observed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 77 Tr_Information Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

![Bar chart showing the distribution of information types across countries and selectivity levels.]

There are a few studies investigated the relationship between teacher's choice of question and learners' proficiency level. Some researchers (e.g. White, 1992) reported that teachers used more referential questions with a high-level class, as discussed earlier. The data in this piece of research also suggests that teachers asked markedly more genuine questions in Year 10 classes than they did in Year 9 classes in the non-selective schools observed in both countries (see Table 78).
6.1.1.9 TEACHERS’ INCORPORATION OF STUDENT UTTERANCES

MFL teachers in England used a very limited amount of correction whereas teachers in non-selective classes in Turkey gave immediate reactions to code and corrected and paraphrased the students' previous utterances in order to draw learners' attention to the language form, for noticing (Schmidt, 1990) to occur and for negative evidence (Schachter, 1984) which forces learners to pay attention to mismatches between input and output (Long 1996; Pica et al. 1996). Error correction, along with formal instruction, is considered as one of the language teacher's most important functions and it is also said to be one of the things which distinguishes classroom interaction from interaction outside the classroom (Nunan, 1989a). According to interactionist theories, feedback through interaction can facilitate SLA, the input being provided by all interlocutors, not excluding the learner himself/herself (Ellis, 1985a). The output hypothesis also attributes considerable importance to feedback, both direct and indirect (Ellis, 1994). However, Krashen (1982) hypothesises that acquisition is not affected by negative data, in other words, incorrect acquisition cannot be changed unless more comprehensible input is provided. As discussed in Chapter 2, Long (1996), in his new version of the interaction hypothesis, focuses on negative feedback and suggests that negative feedback obtained during negotiation or elsewhere may facilitate L2 development. MFL teachers in England mostly commented on students' preceding utterances. In the selective schools observed in Turkey teachers used a more integrated approach and they commented and repeated the preceding students' utterances and also paraphrased on students' utterances almost equally. Although all teachers in both countries commented on students' utterances the
way they used this particular feature was quite different. English teachers often praised
the students for their preceding utterances in order to encourage them to participate in the
classroom interaction, whereas Turkish language teachers rarely used remarks such as
'good', or 'well done'.

Some studies (Long and Porter 1985; Courtney 1996; Macia and Caimons 1999)
supported modifying interaction through the negotiation of meaning, providing
comprehensible input to the learners' subconscious language processing mechanisms.
Around 45% of MFL teachers' turns in the non-selective schools in both countries were
recorded in the 'Incorporation of Teacher/Student Utterances' category. Teachers spent
the majority of their time on the 'Information Gap' category (asking questions and giving
information) (see Table 79). The total number of teacher turns in the selective schools, on
the other hand, was almost equally divided between 'Incorporation Teacher/Student
Utterances' and 'Information Gap' categories (see Table 79). Negotiation of meaning
(recorded under the categories of clarification and elaboration requests) was very limited
in any classroom observed in this study.

Table 79 Teacher: Information Gap and Incorporation of Student Utterances
as a percentage of total teacher turns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>England</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
<th>Selective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tr_Information Gap</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr_Incorp of St Utterances</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are also some studies suggesting that teachers' use of interactional modifications
(e.g. Hamayan and Tucker 1980; Ellis 1985) increase in early stages of learning.
However, this study also failed to find any marked difference between teacher's use of
interactional modifications in Year 9 and Year 10 classes in the two countries observed
(see Table 80).
**6.1.1.10 STUDENT: INFORMATION GAP**

Students in the Leicester school and in the selective school in Turkey asked open-ended (referential) questions to a high degree (see Table 81).

Students in the non-selective schools in both countries gave remarkably more predictable information than unpredictable information. Students in the selective schools, on the other hand, tended to give out more messages which are not easily anticipated, as CLT suggests (see Table 81). Teachers' choice of topics in the selective schools might have a positive impact on student production of utterances containing unpredictable information. Teachers in the selective classes tended to use a variety of topics, which were personally meaningful to students in order to motivate them to use the target language to communicate.

**6.1.1.11 STUDENT TALK: SUSTAINED SPEECH, FORM RESTRICTION AND DISCOURSE INITIATION**

Student talk is another important variable in classroom interaction. As Ellis (1994) indicates, students in a classroom context are often restricted to a responding role,
therefore, their opportunities for participating productively in the L2 classroom are constrained. Harley et al. (1990) also reported that because student talk in teacher-fronted activities are restricted, and learners also have a limited number of opportunities they have to produce language which goes beyond simply getting their messages across. The data in this study also shows that students observed in this study generally produced restricted utterances (see Table 82). However, it is necessary to emphasise that student unrestricted use of language in selective classes was considerable (see Table 82).

Swain and Carroll (1987) suggested that asking more open-ended questions would increase the amount of sustained talk. Students generally produced a very limited amount of sustained talk (1%) in both countries, regardless of type of questions teachers asked, as presented below. Therefore, this study failed to provide some direct correlation between teachers' referential questions and the amount of students' sustained talk.

Swain and Carroll (1987) also predicted that providing more opportunities for student-initiated talk would increase the amount of sustained talk. Student initiation remained quite limited in the language classrooms observed in both countries Although student initiation reached the highest percentage during the observations conducted in the selective and non-selective schools observed in Turkey the amount of sustained student talk remained very limited in the non-selective schools in Turkey (see Table 82). Students in the selective schools produced more sustained utterances than the ones in the non-selective schools. Therefore, this study provided mixed evidence with regard to the percentage of students' initiation and the amount of students' sustained talk.
6.1.2 SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

This study provides evidence that less controlled activities lead to more communicative interactions. In other words, classes were more communicatively oriented during the semi-controlled activities than the controlled activities observed in this study (see total communicative scores presented in Tables 25, 26; 41, 42 and also 59, 60). Moreover, the classes observed in the selective schools and also in the Leicester school used less controlled activities to a higher degree (see Table 62). They also focused on messages being conveyed more than those in the non-selective schools observed in Turkey (see Table 70). Therefore classes observed in the selective schools and also in the Leicester school were remarkably more communicatively oriented than the ones observed in the non-selective schools in Turkey (see total communicative scores presented in Tables 24, 40 and 58).

As Tong-Fredericks (1984) suggests that different activities contribute to acquisition in different ways. Different types of activities and different classroom settings may be complementary in pedagogic value. Long and Crookes (1992) believe that tasks should have a clear pedagogic relationship to real-world language needs. They suggest that needs analyses should be conducted which identify target uses of language, allowing tasks which have a meaningful relationship to such language use to be designed for the classroom. Long and Robinson (1998) propose that if tasks are designed for real-world needs they will generate interactions which engage acquisitional processes and lead to interlanguage development. The tasks will catalyse meaningful language use since opportunities to negotiate meaning and recast productions in a supportive environment can assist structural development in the target language (Skehan 1998, p.124).

Schmidt (1990), on the other hand, presumes in his 'consciousness hypothesis' that unconsciousness language learning is impossible, and attention to input is a necessary condition for any learning; intake is what learners consciously notice. Paying attention to language form is hypothesised to be facilitative in all cases. When the learners notices a 'gap' in their representation of the relationship between a linguistic form and its function, restructuring occurs. Schmidt (1990) argues that carefully designed tasks can be used to
bring about such noticing. He also points out that specifically focused tasks are exactly what is needed to promote language acquisition in the classroom.

The theoretical perspective which supports the use of communication activities and tasks is that which holds that language is best learned and taught through interaction (Pica et al., 1993). Such activities are organised in order to enable students to talk in the target language. The data in this piece of research shows that students had more opportunity to participate in classroom interaction (see Table 83) and to use the target language in the classes in non-selective schools in Turkey (focused only on forms) than those in the Leicester school, contrary to the expectations of this study (see Table 74).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 83 Total Teacher and Student Turns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total teacher turns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This study also provides evidence that students in the selective schools were the ones who used the target language most in their classroom interaction. This might be explained by the fact that students in selective schools receive much longer hours of instruction per week than the ones in non-selective schools. They were also exposed to extensive target language input since teachers used the target language to a very great extent (see Table 74).

Student utterances in the selective schools were more sustained and unrestricted compared to the ones in the non-selective schools observed in both countries (see Table 82). Although students in the Leicester school produced more unrestricted utterances, there was no significant difference between the Leicester school and the non-selective schools observed in Turkey with regard to students' sustained speech (see Table 82).
Mackey (1996) carried out research in which learners of English were engaged in communicative activities with questions as the targeted structure and they were given opportunities for interaction between themselves. Mackey concluded that there was a positive relation between interaction and development. Gass and Varonis (1994) failed to find any direct relationship between negotiation of meaning and comprehension. There was very limited negotiation of meaning between teachers-students and students-students in any classes observed in this study, regardless of their communicative orientation. As Kumaravidevelu (1993b) argues that,

*In theory, a communicative classroom seeks to promote interpretation, expression, and negotiation of meaning...Learners should be encouraged to ask for information, seek clarification, express an opinion, agree and/or disagree with peers and teachers. More importantly, they should be guided to go beyond memorised patterns and monitored repetitions in order to initiate and participate in meaningful interaction. In reality, however, such a communicative classroom seems to be a rarity. Research studies (Guthrie, 1984; Nunan, 1987; Walz, 1989) show that even teachers who are committed to communicative language teaching can fail to create opportunities for genuine interactions in their classrooms.*

(p.12)

Teachers' focus on teaching grammar in Turkey was markedly different than their English counterparts (see Table 71). During the teacher interviews the teachers, who were teaching in the Leicester classes, confirmed that they believed it was not necessary to teach grammar because it was too difficult for most students, and they suggested that students could produce the target language through practise without having knowledge of grammar. Classes in the Leicester school also focused on more function/discourse/sociolinguistics aspects of the language (see Table 71). The statistical test shows that the different focus on the function-discourse combination between the
activity types is statistically significant at the 1 % level (p< 0.01) in the Leicester school (see Table 106 in Appendix VII).

Classes in selective schools also focused on form and message simultaneously to a greater extent (see Table 70). During the teacher interviews the teachers in the selective schools reported that both meaning and language form are important for language acquisition. Students should learn the target language through explicit grammar in order to make correct utterances and they also should be able to practise them in the classroom in order to develop their fluency. However, this study failed to provide enough teachers' views on this issue.

Teachers in Leicester and selective schools in Turkey, who focused more on the message being conveyed than those in non-selective schools in Turkey, used also more student-to-student interaction or group-work in their teaching (see Table 63). This study also showed that there was more emphasis on pair/group-work or student-to-student/class interaction during the semi-controlled activities than the controlled-activities observed in the language classes in England (see Table 9). The statistical test indicates that different focus on student-to-student/class organisation and pair/group work between the activity types is found to be statistically significant at the 1 % level (p< 0.01) in the Leicester school and also in the selective schools observed in Turkey (see Tables 107 in Appendix VII).

Teachers, who were teaching in Leicester and selective schools in Turkey, also shared the topic control (i.e. it determines who selects the topic is being talked about in the classroom) with students to a higher degree than the ones in non-selective schools in Turkey (see Tables 85, 90 and 98 in Appendix IV, V, and VI). Teachers' direct control over content markedly decreased during the semi-controlled activities in any classes observed in this study. That is, students actively participate in the selection of topics in the classroom as CLT suggests. The difference in this category (Topic Control) according to the activity types is also found to be statistically significant at the 1 % level (p< 0.01) in the Leicester school and also in the selective schools observed in Turkey (see Tables 108 in Appendix VII).
CHAPTER VII.

CONCLUSION

7.1 INTRODUCTION

The primary aim of this study was to investigate the features of instructions and learning outcomes in modern language classes in Turkey and England. This research study focused on student-student and teacher-student interaction, which are considered very important aspects of classroom life. That is, it explores the current language teaching and learning cultures in both contexts in order to compare the communicative orientations of language classrooms by analysing oral interactions between teachers and students.

The COLT observation scheme was used as the major data collection method of this study. The strengths and weaknesses of the observation schemes have been outlined in Chapter 4. The COLT scheme was found, after extensive use in this research study, to have its own strengths and weaknesses.

This chapter will consider the theoretical implications of this research study for language teaching pedagogy and SLA, and also the practical implications for language teaching approaches in secondary language classrooms in England and Turkey. In other words it will explain the quantitative and qualitative differences observed between the ways that teaching and learning of spoken language are handled pedagogically in English and Turkish secondary schools.

This chapter will also provide some retrospective evaluation of this research study and give some evaluative comments on the COLT Observation Scheme.
7.2 THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE FINDINGS OF THE RESEARCH STUDY

- Language teaching and classroom interaction in secondary schools observed in England and Turkey appear to have some differences, but they also have some similarities, despite classroom culture differences in the two countries.

- In terms of communicative orientation, the rankings in this study (according to the COLT observations and the experiential-analytical scale) were found to be Turkish selective, Leicester and Turkish non-selective classes. That is, the classes in the selective schools were found to be the most communicatively-oriented among the classes observed in this study. The classes observed in England were more communicatively-oriented than the ones observed in the non-selective schools in Turkey. The communicative orientation ranking is an indication of different combinations of communicative features on the COLT Scheme.

- As with communicative features of interaction, the focus on language form and/or message (according to the COLT scheme) in each class differed across schools and countries. Classes in the non-selective schools observed in both countries focused on language features more than on the message being conveyed. Teachers in the selective classes, on the other hand, tried to draw students attention to the language form and the message simultaneously.

- Classes in selective schools and in the Leicester school were more meaning-focused than Turkish non-selective ones. Teachers in Turkey focused on explicit form, which is almost exclusively on grammatical structure. There was very little time spent explicitly focusing on the discourse and sociolinguistics features of the linguistic system in all the classes observed, which indicates that teachers in this study did not put much effort into directing students' attention towards these language features. As emphasised by Canale and Swain (1980), discourse competence is an important component of communicative competence, and is therefore needed in extended communicative interaction. There was more explicit focus on function in the Leicester school observed.
Although their communicative orientations were different, classes in both England and Turkey mostly used teacher-controlled activities. Classes in the selective schools, on the other hand, focused more on semi-controlled activities.

The findings of this research study provide evidence that some activities intrinsically lead to more communicative interactions in language classrooms. In other words, classes were more communicatively oriented (according to the COLT observations and the experiential-analytical scale) during the semi-controlled activities than the controlled activities observed in this study. However, this piece of research did not provide a clear relationship between activity types and student language production in non-selective schools. That is, the length of student utterances and unrestricted use of language in these classes remained limited regardless of activity types.

Similarly, this study failed to provide clear evidence about the effect of communicative orientation of language classes on student language production. There was no direct correlation between the communicative orientation of language classes and student language production in the non-selective classes observed. The results appeared to be mixed on this issue. Although students in the Leicester classes produced more unrestricted utterances, they did not appear to use the target language to a greater extent or produce more sustained utterances than their Turkish counterparts observed in non-selective classes. Students in selective schools were found to be the ones who produced the most unrestricted, sustained utterances among the students observed in this study. They also used the target language to a greater extent.

This study provided evidence that classroom organisation shows a tendency to teacher-centred classes. The main classroom organisation was teacher-student/class in the non-selective schools in both countries. The findings of this study provide support to the claim that the greatest percentage of time in L2 classrooms was spent on teacher-led whole class activities. In the selective schools, however, there was more emphasis on student-to-student/class interaction.

There was little emphasis on pair/group-work activities in all the schools observed in both countries. Teachers used mostly guided and structured pair/group activities.
in which students were expected to produce spoken and written language. The findings of SLA research that group-work facilitates language acquisition and helps the teacher to create a positive and relaxed atmosphere appears not to have been applied in the classroom contexts observed in both countries.

- This study failed to provide evidence with regard to the claim that small group interaction maximises the amount of time available for each student to use the target language. Although students in Leicester school had markedly more opportunities to participate in classroom interaction during the pair/group-work activities, there was no marked difference between pair/group-work and teacher-led whole class settings, in terms of student use of target language. This piece of research also failed to find any discourse lubricants or satellite units in either setting (whole class and group-work) which are believed to provide flexibility in communication. However, the findings of this piece of research also showed that students in the Leicester school had markedly more opportunities to participate in classroom interaction during the pair/group-work activities than teacher-led whole class activities.

- Many studies reported that students tend to use L1 during pair/group activities. The findings of this study were controversial. It failed to provide strong evidence for the hypothesis developed by Wong-Fillmore (1985) that if students share a common L1 their interactions in pair/group-work would be conducted in L1 rather than L2. It is believed that that if the activity is structured and managed properly it could promote students to use L2 in their interaction. One of the teachers in England managed to structure group-work activities in a way that students were able to use L2 most of the time. As Scarino et al. (1988) puts it, group work itself needs tight control and student adherence to rules of conduct if it is to be effective.

- This study showed that there was little evidence of negotiation of meaning in any classes observed in this study. The findings of this study also suggest that there was no significant difference between small-group and teacher-led activities with regard to negotiation of meaning between teachers-students and students-students.

- Some studies (e.g. Catchard 1986; House 1986) reported that students seemed to produce single-word utterances and short phrases where the teacher had control
whereas students produce longer and unrestricted sentences where they had the control of the talk. However, this study showed that students failed to make any sustained speech in either teacher-centred or group-work activities. The findings on unrestricted use of the language in this study, on the other hand, showed that students produced markedly more unrestricted utterances during the group-work activities than during teacher-led whole class activities observed in the Leicester school.

- Recordings and transcriptions of pair/group-work activities showed that students had the opportunities to construct the language together in such kinds of activities. During the observation period, it was noted that students read the dialogues together several times during construction and before reading them to the class. Swain (1985) has pointed to the usefulness of this type of interaction for comprehensible output (MacKay, 1994). During whole-class activities students had fewer of these opportunities; in particular they had fewer opportunities for output, having their ultra-minimal turns accepted and built on by the teacher as MacKay (1994) also found in her study.

- Teachers, especially in Turkey, pushed students to produce complete and accurate utterances by giving immediate reactions to code. All the teachers in Turkey corrected, repeated and paraphrased students' previous utterances to a greater extent in order to draw learners' attention to the language form for noticing to occur and for negative evidence which forces learners to pay attention to notice the gap between input and output. Thus, students had the opportunity to practise their linguistic resources to achieve full grammatical competence. MFL teachers observed in both countries generally controlled the output in terms of amount, length and nature (grammatical structures and vocabulary needed).

- Since most of the classroom interaction was tightly controlled by the teachers students' reliance on their interlanguage was minimal in the non-selective schools observed in both countries.

- Language teachers in non-selective schools used L1 to a great extent in their speech turns observed. Students, on the other hand, used the target language more than their teachers did. Both teachers and students in the selective schools used the target language to a markedly high degree in their speech turns. Therefore, this
study provides some evidence regarding how the teachers' use of the target language affected the students' use of the target language. As some researchers (such as Zilm 1989, etc.) suggest that when the teachers increase the use of the target language in class, the students' use of the target language rise proportionally.

- This research showed that teachers talk most of the time and control the classroom interaction as many researchers suggested. There are also many research studies which report that teachers often spend most of the total teaching time asking questions. This study, however, showed that teachers in both countries focused on giving information more than asking questions and teachers in non-selective schools asked markedly more display questions. This study failed to show that teachers' referential questions had any effect on the amount of sustained student speech production. Although the MFL teachers in selective schools asked referential questions to a greater extent compared to the non-selective schools observed in this study, sustained student utterances remained limited.

- The data in this study also showed that students in non-selective schools responded to teachers' questions in most of their speech turns and produced restricted utterances. Thus the findings of this study give support to the claim that students in a classroom context are often restricted to a responding role, therefore, their opportunities for participating productively in the L2 classroom are constrained.

- Learners have unequal status in the social context of the classroom, and this inhibits successful second language comprehension, production and ultimately acquisition (Pica, 1987). Teachers in the selective schools tended to create an atmosphere in the classroom in which students felt more comfortable, participated more, and took responsibility for the management of the lesson. Humour also occasionally emerged in these classes (see Appendix XII-C). It might be proposed that classes in the selective schools achieved a high score on the communicative/experiential scale partly because of this certain level of informality in the classroom interaction. These descriptions of classroom atmosphere in language classrooms are based on the researcher's own interpretations. Therefore, they might involve some degree of subjectivity.
Teachers in selective schools tried to use more real-world related, broad topics to enable the students to express themselves by using the target language. In other words, teachers in the selective schools encouraged students more to practise the target language in order to express themselves. They used a variety of topics, which made their lessons motivating and interesting for their students. On the contrary, content was mainly limited in the non-selective schools observed.

Teachers in the selective schools used less controlled activities in their teaching and the selective classes observed in this study were more communicatively oriented than the non-selective classes observed in this study, as mentioned earlier. The students were constantly exposed to the target language from their teachers. As Sharwood-Smith (1986) suggests, supplying a rich communicative environment should be sufficient for acquisition to take place, if the teacher has sufficient time to allow naturalistic processes to work. Indeed, student utterances in the selective schools produced the most sustained and unrestricted utterances among the students observed in this study, as discussed earlier. However, negotiation of meaning between students and student discourse initiation in the selective classes appeared to be quite limited.

Overall, classes in the selective schools were more learner-centred compared to the other schools observed in this study: That is, students had more opportunities to participate in classroom interaction and used the target language to a marked extent. Moreover, students in selective classes had more opportunities to take part in the selection of topics and activities they worked on during the observed interaction. There was also much more emphasis on student-to-student/classroom organisation in these classes. However, the amount of pair/group-work in the selective classes remained quite limited.

This study failed to provide a direct correlation between the percentage of student initiation and the length of student utterances. Although the length of student utterances varied across schools, student initiation remained quite limited in the language classrooms observed in both countries.

The MFL teachers observed in this study usually forced the students to work hard and monitored them closely. Turn-taking seemed to be carefully controlled and generally allocated by the teachers in all the classes observed in this piece of...
research. The lessons were quite typical in terms of interaction patterns; most of the teacher-student interaction followed I-R-F (Initiation-Response-Feedback) sequence (see Appendix XII-A, B, and C).

- Another important parameter in the COLT scheme was Materials, which were found to be mostly pedagogic, and highly controlled by teachers in the non-selective schools observed. The teachers in the selective schools observed shared the control of materials with students to a high degree as CLT suggests. The language teachers in Turkey usually followed textbooks. In contrast, the modern language teachers observed in England generally prepared their own materials. Their conversation-teaching materials mainly emphasised transactional skills such as, how to ask for directions, how to order a meal, etc., which are considered to be important components of communicative competence.

- All classes observed in both countries spent most of the total teaching time on listening and reading activities. They spent a very limited amount of time on speaking, which is considered to be a crucial criterion for CLT.

- Procedure was predominant in language classes in the Leicester school. The language teachers in England spent a considerable amount of time explaining the structure and purpose of activities and organising general procedures for classroom interaction. Their Turkish counterparts in non-selective schools, on the other hand, spent relatively little time on organising activities since all the necessary information was written in the text-book. The teachers in non-selective schools in both countries mostly used the mother tongue while they were explaining classroom procedures.

- Each student in language classrooms in Turkey was expected to participate in the same activity, and at the same level of language use in all classes, regardless of their ability. Teachers in England, however, seemed to be more aware of individual learner differences and their careful selection of activities appeared to cater for individual abilities in classroom activities. It was observed that teachers in the Leicester school often prepared different activities for students with different abilities.
7.3 EVALUATION OF THE COLT SCHEME IN THIS STUDY

The systematic observations in this study are limited to the extent that they are constrained by the nature of the observation instrument used, that is, the COLT observation scheme.

There were some practical problems in using the COLT scheme in this research. As Spada and Frohlich (1995) illustrate, some of the categories in the scheme are relatively easy to code because the behaviours they capture are explicit and overt (e.g. student repeat utterances, or, group work on same/different activity). Other categories, however, are more difficult to code because they capture more implicit, covert behaviour (e.g. procedure/discipline, narrow/broad, or student requests clarification). There were many categories to fill in a very short period and the COLT scheme forces the observers to code each major category; the COLT scheme demands that the observer chooses one category under each major category. It was also very difficult to take field notes, which might have provided very important supplementary information, as there was not enough time to do it. Identifying individual activities from their constituent episodes was also found to be problematic as this category is open-ended and vaguely defined. Moreover, especially Part B of the scheme requires the observer to understand the language (German, French) in order to tick the appropriate boxes.

In cases of pair-work and group-work, there was little guidance on how to collect data in the COLT scheme. Therefore, the researcher had to make her own decision. It is necessary to provide some guidance in the COLT scheme manual on how to collect data while pair-work or group-work is in operation.

The scheme did not provide enough guidance on how to use inter-coder reliability measures in order to determine reliability of coding.

One of the strengths of this piece of research is that real classrooms were investigated over a period of one month and a total of 67 lessons were recorded during the observation period. Because it was structured as an observation study rather than experimental one it gave the researcher opportunity to observe classrooms in the real world and to see what is happening in a real classroom in two different language
learning contexts. As the COLT scheme developers point out they were observing classrooms in the real world, not the hypothetical, idealised classes that feature so prominently in CLT literature. Furthermore, as McKay (1994) also reports in her study, the COLT scheme also proved to be a useful training tool for teacher or observer, who sometimes does not 'see' what is happening in the classroom. As Nunan (1987) indicates classroom based studies are needed to show what actually happens in the classrooms. Classroom-based studies as such might help researchers to provide direct and useful information for language pedagogy. McKay (1994) also notes that,

*The findings of these studies will assist in the development of a rational foundation of understandings about language teaching which will help the field to avoid 'pendulum swings' in relation to world-wide 'trends' in language teaching; they may also assist theorists not to ignore, and advocates of particular approaches not to forget, constraints in the reality of classroom teaching.*

(p.317)

It is hoped that this study provides a better understanding of instructional practices and procedures in L2 classrooms. That is, the results of this study might help to determine to what extent differences between more or less communicatively-oriented instruction contributed to differences in the development of particular aspects of communicative competence, as Spada and Frohlich (1995) put it. Finally, using the COLT scheme in this study is also expected to give a detailed picture of the nature of verbal interaction which takes place between teacher-student and student-student in language classrooms. The classroom observations were conducted in six schools (three selective and three non-selective) in Turkey, whereas only one school was observed in England. It was a weakness of this study.

It was concluded that the COLT observation scheme was able to differentiate between the classes observed in this study, both in terms of individual categories of interaction which capture the features intended to show the nature of communicative interaction in language classrooms and in terms of the final ranking procedure which gives sufficiently differentiated scores regarding communicative orientation of classrooms. However, as Stern (1990) concludes in his research, for future research there is a need
for a revision of the COLT scheme that would document not only experiential but also analytical features of teaching and would at the same time investigate the effect of different mixtures of experiential and analytic approaches in the classroom.

Mitchell (1985) and Zotou (1993) also conclude that 'the research community has much to gain from collaboration in the use and development of such instruments over time, in different settings' (quoted in Spada and Frohlich 1995, p.138).

Although the COLT observation scheme was able to differentiate well in terms of the nature of communicative interaction it did not provide any detailed information on how students negotiate for meaning or if they produce meaningful and grammatically correct sentences which would help the researcher to compare learners' achievement in each class. As Allen and Caroll (1988) indicate, because the COLT observation scheme was developed to provide a broad picture of the types of activity which characterise L2 classrooms, it does not enable researchers, for example, to pay sufficiently close attention to the exchange structure of discourse.

Because of the various limitations to the study specified above, the results in this research should be treated tentatively. More research is needed to validate the findings presented in the previous chapter.

**7.4 SUGGESTIONS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE COLT SCHEME FOR FUTURE RESEARCH**

The COLT observation scheme and its applications are subject to a number of limitations and weaknesses as summarised in the previous chapters. Harley et al. (1990) also note that there is a need to refine CLT theory so that the essential COLT features can be identified and weighted accordingly and there is a need to pay more attention to the quality, as distinct from the quantity of classroom interaction. In this section, there are a number of suggestions to be made about the improvement of the COLT scheme for future research. A few modifications might be brought into the scheme mainly in order to compensate for some weaknesses. Additions of some categories are also believed to help to make the scheme more efficient.
As Nunan (1992) puts it, observation schedules might miss some aspects of interaction and discourse which may be important to our understanding of the classroom being investigated. A few modifications can be applied to the scheme to compensate for some weaknesses identified to make the scheme more efficient and manageable. For instance, new categories can be developed to include important features of classroom interaction and also to reflect on recent discussions and developments in second language learning. For example, the COLT scheme developers used only one category for teacher correction, which might be considered as a weakness of the observation scheme since there are other researchers (e.g. Chaudron, 1988) who define a variety of corrective reactions, such as interrupt, negation, prompt, clue, etc. A researcher might be interested in the nature of teachers' corrections (i.e. implicit/explicit) and their effects on language acquisition or language production. Based on a relatively recent discussion put forward by Seedhouse (1997), for example, 'camouflaged repair', can be used to determine whether teachers try to establish such 'a dual focus' in their feedback. It might also be helpful to differentiate repair trajectories (i.e. self-initiated self-repair and self-initiated other-repair; other-initiated self-repair and other-initiated other-repair) as suggested by Seedhouse (1999b) and add the relevant categories to the scheme, depending on the goals of a particular research. Coding non-verbal teacher feedback might also be useful for the scheme.

Some supplementary data might also be appropriate to cover missing information or complement the data obtained by the COLT scheme. Qualitative analysis of lesson transcriptions can provide supplementary data to COLT-based findings, which are believed to help researchers and readers to visualise what happens in the lessons. This type of additional data might also enable the researcher to capture differences in the quality of interactions, for example, the way in which meaning is negotiated in the classroom. Teacher interviews would also be valuable in establishing confidence in the results of such a study.

The detailed classroom observation field-notes are also believed to help a researcher to establish physical descriptions of setting, in which a study takes place.

Another weakness of the COLT scheme identified in this study is that it does not allow the researcher to differentiate between pair-work and group-work. Since the
features of interaction can be very different in these two different settings it might be helpful to add 'pair-work' as a separate category under 'Participant Organisation'.

The lack of definition and classification of activity types in the COLT is an important loss of information about classroom practices, as acknowledged by many other researchers (e.g. Valcarcel et al., 1991). In order to compensate for this weakness, it is necessary to develop a typology of activity types.

Finally, it is also important to note that COLT was developed for the Canadian bilingual/immersion context and it may be necessary to consider its appropriateness for each particular setting, and review the categories or modify them according to the particular context.
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APPENDIX I.

THE COLT OBSERVATION SCHEME - PART A
Main Parameters and Categories of the COLT Observation Scheme

The COLT Observation Scheme Part A: Classroom Events

As in the case of the categories of Part A, the communicative features have been developed by a number of discussions in the current literature of first and second language acquisition, communicative language teaching, and communicative competence.

The following 5 parameters are differentiated in Part A:

1. **Col.1  Time:** The starting time of each activity and its episodes are entered.

2. **I. Activities (and episodes):** This parameter of the observation scheme is open-ended, in other words, there are no predefined categories to be checked off by the observer. Activities and episodes are separate units, which constitute the instructional segments of a classroom. Separate activities would include some episodes: For example, the episodes of a reading activity could be teacher introduces dialogue, teacher reads dialogue aloud, individual students read parts of dialogue aloud, teacher asks comprehensive questions about dialogue, etc.

3. **II. Participant Organisation**

   1. **Whole Class**
      
      a. Teacher to student or class (T-S/C).
      
      b. Student to student, or student to class and vice versa (S-S/C).
      
      c. Choral work by students (Choral).

   2. **Group work**
      
      a. Groups all work on the same task.
      
      b. Groups work on different tasks.
3. Individual work
   a. Individual seat-work on the same task (students work on their own, all on
      the same task or on different tasks).
   b. Individual seat-work on different task (some students are involved in
      group work, others work on their own).

III. Content

1. Management
   a. Procedure: checked when the teacher gives directives.
   b. Discipline: refers to the teacher's critical comments on student behaviour.

2. Language
   a. Form: Explicit focus on grammar, vocabulary, or pronunciation.
   b. Function: Explicit focus on illocutionary acts such as requesting,
      apologising, and explaining.
   c. Discourse: Explicit focus on the way sentences combine into cohesive and
      coherent sequences.
   d. Sociolinguistics: Explicit focus on the features of utterances that
      make them appropriate to particular social contexts.

3. Other Topics
   a. Narrow range of reference
      Classroom: refers to the immediate classroom environment.
      Stereotype: refers to formulaic exchanges, such as "Good morning" or
      "How are you?".
      Personal/Biography: refers to students' personal and family affairs.
      Other: marked for other subject matters for Narrow topics.

   b. Limited range of reference
      Personal: relate to students' immediate personal affairs.
      Routine/Social: refers to social topics like movies, hobbies, holidays.
Family: relate to students' immediate family affairs.
School Topics: refers to school topics including extra curricular activities.
Other: marked for other subject matters for Limited topics.

c. Broad range of reference

Abstract: refers to abstract ideas.
Personal/Reference: refers to reflective personal information such as, "What do you like about living in a city?".
Imagination: refers to imaginative ideas.
World Topic: refers to current world events and controversial public issues.
Other: marked for other subject matters for Broad topics.

4. Topic Control

a. Teacher selects the topic to be talked about
b. Teacher and Students decide on the topic together.
c. Students select the topic to be talked about.

IV. Student Modality: This section identifies the various skills that may be involved in a classroom activity.

1. Listening-Speaking-Reading-Writing: The focus is on the students, and the purpose is to discover whether they are listening, speaking, reading, or writing, or whether these skills are occurring in combination.

2. Other: covers activities such as drawing, modelling, acting, or arranging classroom displays.

V. Materials: This parameter introduces categories to describe the materials used in connection with classroom activities.

1. Type of Materials
   a. Text (written)
   b. Audio
c. Visual

2. *Length of Text*
   a. Minimal
   b. Extended

3. *Source/Purpose of Materials*
   a. Pedagogic (specifically designed for pedagogic purposes (L2 teaching)).
   b. Semi-pedagogic (utilising L1 materials or real-life objects and texts, but in a modified form).
   c. Non-pedagogic (materials originally intended for L1 or non-pedagogic purposes, e.g. postcards).
   d. Students made (materials produced by the students themselves).

4. *Use of Materials*
   a. High Control: refers to the teacher's strict control of materials use (e.g. materials provided by the writer of the course book) and the discourse (e.g. questions and answers adhere quite closely to the text).

   b. Semi Control: refers to the students' limited freedom in the use of materials and the discourse (it extends occasionally beyond the restrictions imposed by the textbook).

   c. Mini Control: refers to the students' great freedom in materials use. The textbook simply provides the starting-point, and the ensuing conversation ranges widely over a number of topics which emerge spontaneously from the contributions of the students.

   (quoted in Allen *et al.* 1984, p. 234-239; Allen *et al.* 1990, p. 78-80)

   (see also Spada and Frohlich, 1995 for a more detailed outline of the scheme)
SPECIAL NOTE

This item is tightly bound and while every effort has been made to reproduce the centres force would result in damage.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Minimal</th>
<th>Extended</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Listening</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Discourse</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socioling</th>
<th>Narrow</th>
<th>Broad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Narrow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher/Text</th>
<th>Teacher/Text/Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher/Text</td>
<td>Teacher/Text/Student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Made</th>
<th>Student Listening</th>
<th>Student Speaking</th>
<th>Student Reading</th>
<th>Student Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Made</td>
<td>Student Listening</td>
<td>Student Speaking</td>
<td>Student Reading</td>
<td>Student Writing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimal</th>
<th>Extended</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Extended</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Extended</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activities &amp; Episodes</th>
<th>Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Lesson (min.)</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Lesson (min.)</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Lesson (min.)</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX II.

THE COLT OBSERVATION SCHEME - PART B
The COLT Observation Scheme Part B: Communicative Features

The second part of observation scheme (Part B) analyses the communicative features of verbal exchanges between teachers and student and/or students and students as they occur within each episode or activity. The rationale for Part B derives from the fact that the development of communicative competence is a major concern in the current language teaching literature, and constitutes one of the basic issues in the Development of Bilingual Proficiency (Allen et al., 1983).

This section of the scheme is divided into the following 7 major parameters:

Col. 1 No Talk

Col. 2 Off-task: This category is reserved for verbal interaction, which is unrelated to the action, episode or overall lesson (e.g. teacher announces a parent meeting or students may ask some questions about weekend trip, etc.).

I. Use of Target Language

1. Use of First Language (L1)
2. Use of Second (Target) Language (L2)

II. Information Gap

1. Giving Information
   a. Predictable (the message is easily anticipated, although there may be different ways of saying it).
   b. Unpredictable (the message is not easily anticipated in that there is a wide range of information which can be provided).

2. Requesting Information
   a. Pseudo (display) request (the speaker already possesses the information requested).
b. Genuine request (the information requested is not known in advance).

III. Sustained Speech

1. *Ultra-minimal* (utterances that consist of one word - coded for student speech only).
2. *Minimal* (utterances that consist of one clause or sentence; for the teacher, one-word utterances are coded as minimal).
2. *Sustained* (utterances that are longer than one sentence, or which consist of at least two main clauses).

IV. Reaction to Form or Message

1. *Form* (a correction or other explicit statement that draws attention to the linguistic incorrectness of an utterance).
2. *Message* (a correction or other explicit statement that draws attention to the factual incorrectness of an utterance).

V. Incorporation of Preceding Utterances

1. *Correction*: Correction of previous utterance/s.
2. *Repetition*: Full or partial repetition of previous utterance/s.
3. *Paraphrase*: Completion and/or reformulation of previous utterance/s.
4. *Comment*: Positive or negative comment (not correction on previous utterance).

VI. Discourse Initiation: It refers to spontaneously initiated talk by students.
VII. **Form Restriction**: It refers to relative restriction of linguistic form.

1. **Choral**: The whole class repeats after a model. The linguistic forms produced by the students are totally restricted.

2. **Restricted**: The production or manipulation of one specific form is expected, as in a transformation or substitution drill.

3. **Unrestricted**: There is no expectation of any particular linguistic form, as in free conversation, oral reports, or personal diary writing.


   (see also Spada and Frohlich, 1995 for a more detailed outline of the scheme)
SPECIAL NOTE

This item is tightly bound and while every effort has been made to reproduce the centres force would result in damage.
## TEACHER VERBAL INTERACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target language</th>
<th>Information gap</th>
<th>Sustained speech</th>
<th>Reaction to form/message</th>
<th>Incorporation of student utterances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Giving Info.</td>
<td>Request Info.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pred.</td>
<td>Upred.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Sustained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Message</td>
<td></td>
<td>Correction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paraphrase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Expansion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clar. request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## STUDENT VERBAL INTERACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target language</th>
<th>Information gap</th>
<th>Sustained speech</th>
<th>Form restriction</th>
<th>Reaction to form/message</th>
<th>Incorporation of student/teacher utterances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Giving Info.</td>
<td>Request Info.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pred.</td>
<td>Upred.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Sustained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Message</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Correction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paraphrase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expansion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clar. request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes
- A, E, M: Additional notes or codes for analysis.
- L1, L2: Coding for specific interactions or categories.
APPENDIX III.

ACTIVITY TYPES
The activities in this study defined below are categorised according to the degree of control that teacher imposed on each of them (i.e. Controlled, Semi-controlled and Free activities). In other words, the activities in this list grouped according the three degrees of teacher versus student control over the performance of the activity. Controlled activities are the ones teachers exert a great deal of control over the topic and the structure to be used. In semi-controlled activities, teacher shares some control with students over the performance of the activity. Teacher has a minimum control over topic or structure that students use.

1. **Warm up**: mime, dance, song, joke, play. This activity has the purpose of getting the students stimulated, relaxed, motivated, attentive, or otherwise engaged and ready for the classroom lesson, not necessarily related to the target language.

2. **Setting (Lead in)**: focusing in on lesson topic; either verbal or non-verbal evocation of the context that is relevant to the lesson point; teacher directs attention to the upcoming topic by way of questioning, miming, picture presentation, or possibly tape recording of noise and people.

3. **Organisational**: managerial structuring of lesson or class activities. Includes reprimanding of students and other disciplinary action, organisation of class furniture and seating, etc., general procedures for class interaction and performance, structure and purpose of lesson, etc.

4. **Content explanation**: explanation of lesson content and grammar or other rules and points. Phonology, grammar, lexis, sociolinguistics, or whatever is being 'taught'

5. **Role-play demonstration**: use of selected students or teacher to illustrate the procedure(s) to be applied in the lesson segment to follow; it includes brief illustrations of language or other content to be incorporated.

6. **Dialogue/Narrative presentation**: reading or listening passage, presentation in the form of dialogue, narration, song or other, for passive reception (i.e. students get familiarised with the text being asked to perform any task related to the content; it usually implies listening to a tape or teacher reading aloud and students following with or without
the text. No implication of student production or other identification of specific target forms or functions (students may be asked to 'understand').

7. **Dialogue/Narrative recitation**: students reciting a passage or dialogue which they have previously learned or prepared, either in unison or individually.

8. **Reading aloud**: student/s reading aloud from a given text; it is distinguished from dialogue presentation in that the focus is on pronunciation and rhythm.

9. **Checking**: teacher either circulating or guiding the correction of students' previous activity or homework, providing feedback as an activity rather than within another activity.

10. **Question-answer (Display)**: controlled activity involving prompting of students' responses by means of display questions (i.e. teacher or questioner already knows the answer, or has a very limited set of experiences for the appropriate response, or has a very limited set of expectations for the appropriate response); it is distinguished from referential questions by means of the likelihood of the questioner knowing, and the speaker being aware of the questioner knowing the response, and the speaker's being aware of that fact.

11. **Drill (mechanical)**: typical language activity involving fixed patterns of teacher and student responding and prompting, usually with repetition, substitution, and other mechanical alterations; typically with little meaning attached.

12. **Translation**: student or teacher provision of L1 and L2 translations of a given text.

13. **Dictation**: students writing down orally presented text.

14. **Copying**: students writing down text presented visually.

15. **Identification**: students picking out significant items of information from an oral or visual mode and producing an oral or written response (i.e. they identify specific target forms, particular speech functions or any other relevant information related to the text by
means of filling in columns, diagrams, taking notes, answering questions (display) etc., about factual information.

16. **Review**: teacher-led review of previous week/month/ or other period as a formal summary and type of test of students' recall and performance.

17. **Testing**: formal testing procedures to evaluate student progress.

18. **Drill (Meaningful)**: language activity involving exchange of a limited number of fixed patterns of interaction; distinguished from *Mechanical drills* in that students have to make a choice with respect to the meaning conveyed.

19. **Language Modelling**: presentation of new language, by the teacher, through isolated sentences with the help of visuals, drawings on blackboard, realia, miming, etc., or making use of recorded material; it involves participation in the form of repetition, display questions and answer, translation, etc.; it is usually aimed at checking correct pronunciation, meaning comprehension and syntax construction.

20. **Repeating**: students repeat after teacher.

21. **Homework**: teacher gives a homework.

22. **Brainstorming**: a special form of preparation for the lesson, like *Setting*, which involves free, undirected contributions by the students and teacher on a given topic, to generate multiple associations without linking them; no explicit analysis or interpretation given by the teacher.

23. **Story telling**: oral presentation of a story or an event on the part of the teacher as lengthy practice, although not necessarily lesson-based; it implies the use of extended discourse; it usually aims at maintaining attention or motivation, and it often implies an aim of entertainment.

24. **Question answer (Referential)**: activity involving prompting of responses by means of referential questions (i.e. the questioner does not know beforehand the response
information); distinguished from Information exchange in that the information obtained is not meant to achieve a task or solve a problem.

25. **Cued narrative/dialogue**: students building up a dialogue or a piece of narrative following cues from miming, cues cards, pictures, flow charts, key functional requests or other stimuli related to narrative or dialogue (e.g. filling empty bubbles, cued dialogues, completing a dialogue or a text, discourse chains, etc.).

26. **Information transfer**: students extracting information from a text (oral or written) which they apply to another mode (e.g. visual — written; oral — written, etc.); it implies some transformation of the information by means of filling out diagrams, graphs, answering questions, etc. while listening or reading. Distinguished from Identification in that students are expected to reinterpret the content of information.

27. **Information exchange**: activity involving one-way or two-way communication as in information gap exercises, when one or both parties must obtain some information from the other to achieve some goal; distinguished from meaningful drill in that the pattern of exchange is not limited to a fixed set or order of structures; also distinguishes from Information transfer in that the information is not reinterpreted; and distinguished from Referential questions in that obtaining information is critical for the resolution of task.

28. **Wrap up**: brief teacher or student produced summary of point or items that have been practised or learned.

29. **Narration/Exposition**: students' lengthy exposition of something which they have seen (film, video, program, event, etc.), read (news, books, etc.) or experienced (events, story, etc.) and narrated in their own words presentation and without previous presentation; distinguished from Cued-narrative because of lack of immediate stimulus.

30. **Preparation**: students planning the subsequent activity (in pairs, individually or in-groups) by means of rehearsing, making notes, or simply thinking.
31. **Role-play**: students acting out some specified roles and functions in a relatively free way; distinguished from *Cued dialogues* by the fact that cueing is provided only minimally at the beginning, and not during the activity.

32. **Games**: an organised language activity that has a particular task or objective and a set of rules which involves an element of competition between players (i.e. board games, hangman, bingo, etc.); it usually implies an aim of entertainment and relaxation.

33. **Report**: prepared oral exposition of students' previous works (books read, stories, project work, etc.) and elaborated on according to students' own interpretation; it can also be students' reports on information obtained from previous activity as long as that can be considered as preparation (i.e. students report back with the help of data obtained during the activity).

34. **Problem solving**: students are asked to work in an activity in which a problem and some limitations on means are established to resolve it; it requires co-operative action on the part of participants, in small or large groups, in order to reach a solution; only one outcome - sometimes among other possible solutions - is allowed per group.

35. **Drama**: planned dramatic rendition of play, skit, story, etc.

36. **Simulation**: activity involving complex interaction between groups and individuals based on simulation of real-life actions and experiences.

37. **Discussion**: debate or other form of group discussion of specified topic, with or without sides/positions prearranged.

38. **Composition**: written development of ideas, story, dialogues, or other exposition; it is akin to *Report* but in the written mode.

39. **A propos**: conversation or other socially oriented interaction/speech by teacher, students or even visitors on general real-life topics; typically authentic and genuine.

40. **Miming**: teacher or student(s) use mimics, body language to explain something.
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41. *Pair/Group-work*: students are working in pair/group work setting.

APPENDIX IV.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS OF CODING: COLT PART A - B

YEAR 9/10 CLASSES IN ENGLAND

Table 84 Content: Other Topics as a percentage of observed time

Table 85 Content: Topic Control as a percentage of observed time

Table 86 Source of Materials as a percentage of time spent on this category

Table 87 Use of Materials as a percentage of time spent on this category

Table 88 Teacher: Information Gap and Incorporation of Student Utterances as a percentage of total teacher turns

Table 89 Student: Information Gap and Incorporation of Student/Teacher Utterances as a percentage of total student turns
Table 84 Content: Other Topics as a percentage of observed time

Table 85 Content: Topic Control as a percentage of observed time

Table 86 Source of Materials as a percentage of time spent on this category

Table 87 Use of Materials as a percentage of time spent on this category
Table 88 Teacher: Information Gap and Incorporation of Student Utterances as a percentage of total teacher turns

Table 89 Student: Information Gap and Incorporation of Student/Teacher Utterances as a percentage of total student turns
APPENDIX V.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS OF CODING: COLT PART A - B

YEAR 9/10 CLASSES IN TURKEY

Table 90 Content: Topic Control as a percentage of observed time

Table 91 Student Modality as a percentage of observed time

Table 92 Use of Materials as a percentage of time spent on this category

Table 93 Teacher: Sustained Speech

Table 94 Student: Discourse Initiation

Table 95 Teacher: Information Gap and Incorporation of Student Utterances as a percentage of total teacher turns

Table 96 Student: Information Gap and Incorporation of Teacher/Student Utterances as a percentage of total student turns
Table 90  Content: Topic Control as a percentage of observed time

Table 91  Student Modality as a percentage of observed time

Table 92  Use of Materials as a percentage of time spent on this category
Table 93 Teacher: Sustained Speech

- Tr_Minimal sp.
- Tr_Sustained sp.

Table 94 Student Discourse Initiation

- Discourse Initiation

Table 95 Teacher: Information Gap and Incorporation of Student Utterances as a percentage of total teacher turns

- Tr_Information Gap
- Tr_Incorp of St Utterances

Table 96 Student: Information Gap and Incorporation of Student/Teacher Utterances as a percentage of total student turns

- St_Information Gap
- St_Incorp Tr/St Utterances
APPENDIX VI.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS OF CODING: COLT PART A - B

SELECTIVE SCHOOLS IN TURKEY

Table 97 Activity Types as a percentage of observed time

Table 98 Content: Topic Control as a percentage of observed time

Table 99 Student Modality as a percentage of observed time

Table 100 Use of Materials as a percentage of time spent on this category

Table 101 Giving and Requesting Information as a percentage of turns spent on the category of Information Gap

Table 102 Student: Reaction to Form and Message

Table 103 Teacher: Information Gap and Incorporation of Student Utterances as a percentage of total teacher turns

Table 104 Student: Information Gap and Incorporation of Student/Teacher Utterances as a percentage of total student turns
Table 97 Activity Types as a percentage of observed time

Table 98 Content: Topic Control as a percentage of observed time

Table 99 Student Modality as a percentage of observed time

Table 100 Use of Materials as a percentage of time spent on this category
Table 101 *Giving and Requesting Information as a percentage of turns spent on the category of Information Gap*

![Bar chart showing distribution of St_Giving Info and St_Requesting Info across Total, Controlled Activities, and Semi-controlled Activities.]

Table 102 *Student: Reaction to Form and Message*

![Bar chart showing distribution of St_Form and St_Message across Total, Controlled Activities, and Semi-controlled Activities.]

Table 103 *Teacher: Information Gap and Incorporation of Student Utterances as a percentage of total teacher turns*

![Bar chart showing distribution of Tr_Information Gap and Tr_Incorp St Utterances across Total, Controlled Activities, and Semi-controlled Activities.]

Table 104 *Student: Information Gap and Incorporation of Student/Teacher Utterances as a percentage of total student turns*

![Bar chart showing distribution of St_Information Gap and St_Incorp Tr/St Utterances across Total, Controlled Activities, and Semi-controlled Activities.]
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APPENDIX VII.

RESULTS OF STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE TESTS

To determine how important the differences are found in the comparison of activity types, in other words, to investigate the extent to which these different tasks affect the nature and the quality of oral interaction in language classrooms, two statistical tests were used: One-way Anova (Part A) and Chi-square (Part B) tests. The following results are found to be statistically significant:

Table 105 Student Modality - Activity Types
Table 106 Language - Activity Types
Table 107 Participant Organisation - Activity Types
Table 108 Topic Control - Activity Types
Table 105 STUDENT MODALITY - ACTIVITY TYPES

YEAR 9/10 NONSELECTIVE - ENGLAND

ONE-WAY ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>listening - speaking</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>641.316</td>
<td>173.576</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YEAR 9/10 NONSELECTIVE - TURKEY

ONE-WAY ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Between Groups</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>20.936</th>
<th>29.035</th>
<th>.000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>listening - speaking</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 106 LANGUAGE - ACTIVITY TYPES

YEAR 9/10 NONSELECTIVE - ENGLAND

ONE-WAY ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>function - discourse</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>59.219</td>
<td>5.756</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>10.288</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>275</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 107 PARTICIPANT ORGANISATION - ACTIVITY TYPES

YEAR 9/10 NONSELECTIVE - ENGLAND

ONE-WAY ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>23.951</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.984</td>
<td>9.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>222.349</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>246.301</td>
<td>275</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GROUP DIFFERENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1924.973</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>641.658</td>
<td>1037.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>168.256</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>.619</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2093.228</td>
<td>275</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YEAR 10 SELECTIVE - TURKEY

ONE-WAY ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>501.382</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>250.691</td>
<td>12.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1899.893</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>19.999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2401.276</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 108 TOPIC CONTROL - ACTIVITY TYPES

#### YEAR 9/10 NONSELECTIVE - ENGLAND

**ONE-WAY ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tx_Tr_St</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2349.426</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>783.142</td>
<td>106.622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>426.010</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>7.345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2775.435</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### YEAR 10 SELECTIVE - TURKEY

**ONE-WAY ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Text_Tr</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>34.825</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17.413</td>
<td>3.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>449.297</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4.729</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>484.122</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tx_Tr_St</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>348.378</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>174.189</td>
<td>9.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1676.326</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>17.646</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2024.704</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>491.347</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>245.673</td>
<td>26.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>874.500</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>9.205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1365.847</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX VIII.

A SAMPLE OF RESULTS OF CODING - PART A

(Part A - England, Year 9-10 Combined)
Actual time on each category (minute), Year 9-10 combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Organisation</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TS_C</td>
<td>S_S_C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Time</td>
<td>1623</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean percentage of observed time (%), Year 9-10 combined

| 60.44 | 2.64 | 11.8 | 18.5 |
| 10.35 | 12.13 | 7.45 | 1.84 | 0 |

(981/1623)
### Content Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function Discourse</th>
<th>Other Combination</th>
<th>Text/Teacher</th>
<th>Text/Teacher/Student</th>
<th>Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>1315</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean percentage of observed time (%)*

|          | 5.11 | 81.02 | 18.97 | 0      |
APPENDIX IX.

A SAMPLE OF RESULTS OF CODING - PART B

(Part B - England, Year 9-10 Combined)
TEACHER VERBAL INTERACTION

Actual teacher turns in each future, Year 9-10 combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Language</th>
<th>Information Gap</th>
<th>Sustained Speech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total teacher turns</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1027</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean percentage of teacher turns in each superordinate category (%), Year 9-10 combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Language</th>
<th>Information Gap</th>
<th>Sustained Speech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Both L1-L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.81</td>
<td>43.71</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(563/1027) (63/160) (56/75) (274/391)
APPENDIX X.

THE EFFECT OF PARTICULAR ACTIVITY TYPES ON CLASSROOM INTERACTION

Table 109 Participant Organisation
Table 110 Focus on Language Form/Message
Table 111 Material Types
Table 112 Teacher: Use of Target Language
Table 113 Teacher: Sustained Speech
Table 114 Teacher: Reaction to Form/Message
Table 115 Student: Use of Target Language
Table 116 Student: Sustained Speech
Table 117 Student: Form Restriction
Four activity types observed in this piece of research, namely, Drills (mechanical), Information Transfer, Dialogue/Narrative Presentation, and Language Modelling (see Appendix III for detailed descriptions of these activity types), are analysed in this section by using the COLT scheme in order to provide the effect of these particular activities on classroom interaction.

**Table 109 Participant Organisation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TS_C</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S_S_C</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 110 Focus on Language Form/Message**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form MESSAGE</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Message</th>
<th>Form-MESSAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TS_C</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S_S_C</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 111 Material Types**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textmin</th>
<th>Textext</th>
<th>Audio</th>
<th>Visual</th>
<th>Text_m_e</th>
<th>AudioVis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 112 Teacher: Use of Target Language

Table 113 Teacher: Sustained Speech

Table 114 Teacher: Reaction to Form/Message
APPENDIX XI.

TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS
In this study, the transcriptions were done according to the table below:

a) **Full-stop** : It indicates certainty or completion. The absence of any turn-final punctuation indicates speaker incompletion, either through interruption or trailing off.

b) **Comma, :** These signal speaker parcelling of non-final talk. Thus, commas are used to make long utterances readable, and usually correspond to silent beats in the rhythm (but not breaks or pauses, which are marked with…).

c) **Question mark ?** : These are used to indicate questions or to mark uncertainty.

d) **Exclamation mark !** : This mark is used for the expression of ‘surprise’.

e) **Quotation mark “ ”** : Speaker directly quote another’s speech.

f) **‘ ’** : New vocabulary.

g) **Empty parenthesis ( )** : Untranscribable segment of talk.

h) **(Italics within parenthesis)** : Uncertain transcription; transcriber’s guess.

i) **(Words within parenthesis)** : In this study it is used for the translations from German, French and Turkish.
j) [Word in square bracket] : Information about relevant non-verbal behaviour. Such information is only included where it is judged important in making sense of the interaction.

k) Three dots ... : Short hesitations between utterances are defined as brief pauses within turns.

l) Square brackets [ ] : Significant pauses or lulls in the conversation between turns.

m) Double equals == : Overlap phenomena

n) Dash – then talk : A false start occur when a speaker “rethinks” aloud and rephrases what they were saying before completing the first version.

o) Fillers : The most commonly used fillers are represented as follows:
   i) umm: doubt
   ii) ah: staller
   iii) mmm: agreement, confirmation
   iv) oh: other reaction
   v) huh: asking for confirmation
   vi) ssstt: discipline
p) Participants

: i) T : Teacher

ii) S1 : Identified student, using numbers

iii) Ss : Unidentified a group of students

speaking in chorus.

(Adapted from Eggins and Slade 1997; Musumeci 1996).
APPENDIX XII.

SAMPLE LESSON TRANSCRIPTIONS
A) NON-SELECTIVE CLASS IN ENGLAND:


2 Ss: village.
3 T: village. Oui, levez la main. (Yes, put your hands up). "De vacance"?
4 Ss: Holiday.
5 T: Holiday, that’s right. So, "un village de vacance = a holiday village". "Un gite"? I am not sure you know that word. "Un gite", qu’est ce que c’est "un gite"? Non, personne me sait? (What does "un gite" mean? Anybody knows this word? "Un gite". C’est une maison dans un pays étranger, en France par exemple, une maison qui est louer, louer? qu’est ce que c’est "louer"?...We have seen that before. Louer = to hire, to rent, huh? Alors c’est une maison, un gite c’est une maison qui est louer a des étrangers par exemple. A house that is rented to foreigners. A house abroad like in France which is rented, OK, to foreigners to come on holiday. OK. Un gite, un hotel, pas de problemes. "Une auberge de jeunesse", qu’est ce que c’est "Une auberge de jeunesse"? "Une auberge de jeunesse", any idea?

6 S1: a youth hostel.
7 T: Excellent, yes, a youth hostel, huh? "Une chambre d’hote", qu’est ce que c’est "une chambre d’hote"?
8 Ss: Room.
9 T: Room, well done. In a room, room, what sort of room?
10 S2: Hot.
11 T: Hot, hot is an English word, the word we have here is "hote", h-o-t-e. It is a "guest", a room for guests, ...also could be a room in somebody’s house. OK, the thing we have to do here is to listen to me, I haven’t got a tape for that so you are gonna listen to me and you are gonna match...where these people are going, qu’est ce
qu'ils preferent? That's the title, qu'est ce qu'ils preferent et pourquoi? Pourquoi is the bubble, phrases in the bubbles, OK? But, first of all let's do here one at a time, we are gonna match the number with a letter. Do you understand what to do? I am gonna read something out you are going to work out what they prefer, what sort of holiday they prefer You pen, your crayons, les papiers? On y va! Oui?

13 Ecrivez la lettre a cote du chiffre. OK? The letter next to the number. On y va. Je prefer descender a l'hotel parceque' il y a une piscine et un resto et meine quelqum qui range le chambre. Je repete. [Teacher repeats the same sentence]. (Let's start. I prefer a hotel because there is a swimming pool and a restaurant and you can choose your own room).

Numere deux = Je prefere une auberge de jeunesse. On est libre - pas de parents. You work on the sheet, huh? You can work on the sheet. (I prefer a youth hostel. It's cheap and there are no parents around). [Teacher repeats the same sentence one more time]

Numero trois = Pour mor c'est la camping, on est a la montagne au bord de la mer, et on fait ce qu'on veut. Je repete, numeror trois. [Teacher reads out the sentence one more time]. (I would go for camping on a mountain or at the seaside, where I can do whatever I want).

Numero quatre = Vous louons un gite, c'est tres bien. On a une mison et on peut faire ce qu'on veut: resten au lit, manger quand on eut, et c'est confortable et pas cher. Je repete. [Teacher repeats it]. (Renting a house would suit me perfect; in a house where I can do whatever I want: I can lie in a bed and eat whenever I want. It's comfortable and not very expensive).

Numere cinq = Je prefere un village de vacance, avec des copains, il y a toujours plain de choses a faire et on se fait de mouveoux amis. Je repete. [Teacher repeats the sentence]. (I prefer going to a holiday village with my friends. There are always plenty of things to do and you can also make new friends).

Numero six = Do you know what you are doing, huh? Numero six, six is here. Anybody nor sure what we are doing by the way, huh? Alright. Nous allons das endroit que mous connaissions tres bien, a la campagne, en chambre d'hote. C'est pas cher, on y mange le petit-dej, mais pour les autres repas, on prend un sandwich ou on va au resto ou n'importe ou! Il y a un centre d'equitation tout pres et j' y passe toutes mes journes. Je repete. [Teacher reads it out one more time]. (We would choose having a holiday in a place that we know very well. A guesthouse in the countryside would be perfect. It is not expensive, and we can have breakfast there. For lunch and dinner, we can get a sandwich or go to a restaurant wherever we want. There is an equestrian centre nearby where we can spend all day doing horse-riding).

Numero sept = Nous reservons la meme appartement pres de la mer chaque annee. Ca me convenient tres bien. C'est confortable et on est complitement libre. Il y un lave - vaiselle, alors pas de problems. Le seul inconvenient, c'est qu'il faut le vider. [Teacher reads out exercise number 7 one more time]. (We rent the same flat, which is near to the sea, every year. It suits us very well. It's comfortable and completely free. There is a dishwasher, which is very convenient. The only problem is emptying it).
OK. Et finalement le numero huit (8) = le dernier, le numero huit = Je prefer la camping parceque nous alons une tente a nous, et on connait deja tout le monde, parcequ'on y va tous les ans. Alors bien sur, j'aime ca! Je repete. [Teacher repeats exercise number 8 one more time]. (I prefer camping because we all have our tents and we know everybody since we go there every year. Of course, that's what I like).

14 Right le deuxieme exercise, c'est = pourquoi? Second exercise, why? Why do they want to go to these different places? Why? Pourquoi? You are going to have to put now... and

15 S4: ()

16 T: Sorry?

17 S4: More than one?

18 T: Mmm...more than one, possibly, yes it could be more than one. You are going to put mmm the the bubbles right, you are gonna put another letter next to the ...first letter you have put in. Do you understand what I mean? We are going to hear, listen to these again and we are going to hear why, pourquoi. Yes you can put next to it another letter. The choice in the bubble, you have got all 12 bubbles, OK? Let's go through them quickly.

19 A = On connait deja tout le monde, qu'est - ce que c'est 'on connait deja tout le monde'? First bubble, on premier bulle, qu'est - ce que c'est 'on connait deja tout le monde'?

20 S5: All around the world.

21 T: No, "le monde" is "the world" that's right but it is not it's not that world as around the world. What did you say?

22 S6: (Countryside).

23 T: Think of reason why they would want to go to these different places, which are camping, apartment

24 Ss: "Around the world".

25 T: No, it's not around the world. 'on connait tout le monde', "toud le monde", "everybody", "everbody". "Tout le monde" is all the world, but obviously it's not quite all the world, it means "everyone". So A is 'on connait deja tout le monde'. B = 'On est a la campagne', qu'est - ce que c'est 'on est a la campagne'? You know one word there "campagne".

26 S7: (Countryside).

27 T: Yes, "countryside", that's right. Try to think of key words, huh? Don't worry too much if you don't understand all the words. Nobody expects you to understand all the words but key words, pick up key words, OK? C = 'C'est comfortable'.

28 Ss: Comfortable.

29 T: Yes, 'comfortable', 'it's comfortable'. D = 'On est libre', 'libre'.
Ss: 'Free'.

T: 'Free', well done. E = 'On fait ce qu'on veut', 'on fait', you know what is 'on fait'.

S8: 'Do'.

T: to do, something to do, right. 'On fait ce qu'on veut', 'veut'. You know 'veut', what's 'veut'?... 'On fait ce qu'on veut'. 'We do, one do what we want', 'veut', 'want'. F = 'On est pres de la mer'.

Ss: 'near the sea'.

T: yes, 'close enough', 'we near the sea'. OK? 'la mer' is 'the sea', 'pres de' is it up there, I think yes 'pres de' 'near, huh, we got it up there. G = 'Il y a beaucoup de choses a faire'.

S9: 'Lots of'.

T: 'Lots of things to do'. H = 'Il y a une piscine et un resto'... Now 'resto' is a short for something.

Ss: 'Restaurant'.

T: Yes, 'restaurant', that's right. So there is a swimming pool and a restaurant. I = 'Ce n'est pas cher'.

Ss: 'Not expensive'.

T: Well done. 'Ce n'est pas cher', 'it is not expensive'. J = 'Il y a un centre d'équitation'.

S10: 'Swimming pool'.

S11: 'Horse-riding'.

T: Well done. 'd'équitation is the sport, 'horse-riding'. K = On se fait de nouveaux ammús. 'On se fait de nouveaux ammús'?

S12: 'Friends'.

T: Something do to with friends, yes, excellent. 'Fait', you know what 'fait' is.

Ss: 'to do'.

T: = = 'to do', 'make'. So, put it altogether?

S13: 'Do things with friends'.

T: Close. 'We make friends', 'make friends', 'on se fait de nouveaux ammús', 'mouveaux' means 'new', huh, 'mouveaux ammús'. Et finalement, L = 'Il y un lave-vaisselle'.

Ss: (Washing-up).

T: That's right, something to do with washing-up but...what do you think

S14: = = 'Dishwasher'.

T: 'Dishwasher'. There is, 'il y', 'there is a dishwasher'. So it really sounds like a good idea to go on that particular holiday because there is a dishwasher, isn't it? Excellent idea to go there. OK.
B) NON-SELECTIVE CLASS IN TURKEY:

1. T: Gecen ders 'Indirect' cumleyi 'Direct' cumleye cevireydik. Evet onla ilgili örnekleri cogaltalim bu ders. Evet, kim yapacak? Evet, 'John said he would fly to England in March' (Last lesson we learnt how to turn Indirect speech into Direct. Let's do more exercises on this. The first exercise in the text-book: 'John said he would fly to England in March'. Who would like to do it?

2. S1: Ogretmenim ben yapabilir miyim? (Can I do it Miss?)
3. T: Tahtaya gel (Ok, come on here and write it on the board).
4. [The student starts writing the exercise on the board]
5. T: Once yazdigin Indirect cumleyi oku sonra Direct cumleyi oku (OK, now first read the Indirect sentence and then read the Direct one).
6. S1: John said he would fly England...England in March.
7. T: March [The teacher corrects the students' pronunciation]
9. T: Dogru oldu mu? (Is it correct?)
10. Ss: Oldu ogretmenim (Yes, Miss).
11. S2: Hocam, Mart'in onune 'in' mi geliyor? (Miss, do we use the preposition 'in' with March?)
12. T: March icin 'in'. Aylarin onunde hangi preposition 'u kullaniyoruz? (We use the preposition 'in' with March. Which preposition should we use before the months?)
13. Ss: 'in'.
14. T: 'in', 'in March', 'in June'. Evet, Husniye. 'Frank said he could read and understand French'. Bu cumleyi Indirect cumleye cevirebilir misin? (Yes, Husniye. "Frank said he could read and understand French". Can you reconstruct this sentence in Direct speech?)
15. S3: "I could read and understand French".
16. T: Niye 'could' oldu orasi? Indirect cumle degil mi bu? Nasil direct cumle yapacagiz bunu? 'Could' yerine ne olur direct cumlede? (Why did you use 'could' there? This is indirect speech, isn't it? What should we replace 'could' with in direct speech?)
17. Ss: 'Can'.
19. T: Niye 'T' yerine 'he' kullanindin orada? (Why have you changed 'he' into 'T' there?)
20. S3: [ ]
21. T: Frank cunku kendinden bahsediyor orada degil mi, direct cumlede? (Because Frank is talking about himself there, in direct speech, isn't he?)
22. S3: Yes. (Evet).
23. T: Oku cevabini bakalim. (Read your answer aloud).
24. S3: I can read and
25. 24 T: and
26. S3: understand
27. 26 T: understand. [The teacher corrects the students' pronunciation]
30. [The student starts writing the exercise on the board]
31. T: "Linda said that the latest Franky Hank record was better than the first one". Cevabini ver. Yapamadin degil mi? Arkadasinin defterini aldin degil mi oradan bulacaksin. Sen niye yapmadin Gizem? (Write the answer on the board. I think you couldn't do it, that's why you got your friend's note-book and you are writing the answer from her book. You were supposed to do this exercise at home Gizem).
32. S4: Ben yaptim ogretmenim. (I did it Miss).
33. T: Tamam. Bir yandan da odevleri acin bakayim kontrol edecergim...Emre nerede?...Ne dedin anlamiyorum. (OK. Open your exercise books I'll check your homework. Where is Emre?... I can't hear you).
34. S5: Ogretmenim ceketimi cikarabilir miyim? Cok sicak oldu burasi. (Miss, may I take off my jacket? It's very hot here).
35. T: Evet. (Yes). Daha hala yapamadin mi Gizem? (You haven't written the answer on the board yet Gizem?)
36. S4: Bu alistirmayi evde de yapamamistim ogretmenim. (I couldn't do this exercise at home Miss).
37. T: Hayir neyi yaziyorsun sen? Soruyu yazmana gerek yok, indirect cumle zaten var orada. Yaz bakalim. 'Sen' olur mu direct cumlede? Hayir yaz bakalim ne diyor. Linda tirnak ac 'the latest', yazsana kizim, 'latest, latest'. 'Franky Hank record is better than the first one.' Tamam. Sebnem gel hemen 5'i yap, acele et. Seyi yapmana gerek yok, soruyu. Yani kitabinizda olani yazmana gerek yok, cevabini yaz. Kitap turn sen bak. (No, what are you writing there? You don't need to write the question on the board. You cannot use 'you' in direct speech. Write, Linda, come on write, 'latest'. "Franky Hank record is better than the first one". OK. Sebnem, do the exercise number 5 quickly. You don't need to write the question on the board).
38. [S6 starts writing the exercise on the board]
39. [T: "I am going to study physics at university". Oku simdi bir kere. (Read it out).
41. S6: "I am going to study"
42. T: study [The teacher corrects the pronunciation] mmm mmm. Evren ... Cevabi yaz, direct cumleyi yaz. (Write the answer, direct speech on the board)
43. 

44. T: "I will give me" mi olacak orası?... Ne olacak orası?...
"I will give you". Nasıl oluyor? "I will give you this science fiction". That yerine ne kullanacagız? Direct cumlede 'this' olan indirect'de 'that'. "The science fiction book", 'the book' niye var orada? "This science fiction book". "I will give you this science fiction book the next day". 'The next day' mi 'the next week' mi yazıyorsun? "Next week" yazıyorsun, niye değiştirdin onu? "Next week", evet. Evet, gel kizim. (You need to use 'you' instead of 'me' in indirect speech. What should we use there instead of 'that'? 'This', niye? Why did you write 'the book' there?... Isn't it 'next week' in the exercise? Why did you change it? 'Next week', yes...Soner, come here please and write it on the board).

45. [S7 starts writing the exercise on the board]

46. 

47. T: Ne yazıyorsun? "Sandra saw", orada T mı kullanacaksın? Dikkat et. "Sandra said she had seen me at the cinema the previous week". Neden T oluyor orası?... 'Have saw' olur mu? Ne demek? Past tense kullanacaksın, oyle bir tens mi var? "She saw", 'see-saw-seen', past formu "she saw", mmm mmm, "she saw you at the cinema"... orada 'she' yerine ne de kullanabiliriz? 'He' de olabiliriz, anlamına gore 'he' de olabiliriz. "He saw you at the cinema yesterday" de diyebilirdik orada. Niye 'yesterday'? Tamam olur, 'last week' de olabilir...Oktay, sen yaz bakalım. (What are you writing? "Sandra saw" Can you use T there? Be careful. "Sandra said she had seen me at the cinema the previous week". Why do you use T there? Can you say 'have saw', it does not make any sense. You need to use the past form of the verb, 'see-saw-seen' What is the past form of the verb 'see'? "She saw you at the cinema", we can use either 'she' or 'he' there. Both of them would be correct. Why did you use 'yesterday' there?

48. [S8 starts writing the exercise on the board]

49. 41 S9: Hocam ceketimi cikarabilir miyim? (Miss, may I take off my jacket?)

50. T: Cikarabilirsin. (Yes, you may).

51. S10: Hocam 3. halini kullanmis, 2. halini kullanmak zorundayiz (Miss, he used the past form of the verb we need to use the past participle here).

52. T: Niye? Bir dakika. "He had failed" past perfect kullanmis, sen ne kullanacaksın? Present perfect kullanacaksın sen? Hani 'have' nerede, 'has' nerede?...Bir dakika orada ozne de yanlis oldu. "Tom told me he had", orada T olacak degil mi? 'I have'...Dogru yaz, 'examinations', yanlis yazdin. (Why? Hold on. "He had failed" is in the past perfect, what should you use there? Where is 'have' or 'has' in your sentence?...Hold on. The subject is not correct either. "Tom told me he had", you should use T there instead of 'he'...Correct. Write, 'examinations', you spelt it incorrectly).

53. S8: Tom: "I have failed all my examinations".

54. T: "I have failed all my examinations"...Tamam, evet... (OK.)...Evet bu konuda da, bu unite de direct cumleyi, soru cumlesini nasıl indirect soru cumlesi haline
getiriyoruz? Sorularda daha farklı ifade edilir, şimdi göreceksiniz nasıl soru yapıyorum? (OK, now we are going to look at interrogative forms).

55. S11: Yazılıyım dahil mi hocam? (Are you going to include this chapter in the exam Miss?)

56. T: Ne anlatırsam dahil...Su tahtayı biriniz silin 'Questions in Indirect Speech', olaylı Konuşmada Sorular'. Bakalım soruları nasıl yapıyorum? Bunların da gene kuralları var ona göre...Cabuk biraz. (Yes...Can someone clean the board? 'Questions in Indirect Speech'. There are also some rules to it that I need to explain).

57. [The teacher starts writing on the board]

58. T: Konuşmadan dinle beni. (Listen to me without making any noise).

59. []

60. T: Evet direct question "Where is she going?" Nasıl bakalım indirect yapacagız bunu?...Bu ne 'where'? (OK, here is the direct question "Where is she going?" Now we'll report it as indirect speech). Where?

61. Ss: Nerede. (It means 'where' in Turkish).

62. T: Wh-question dedigimiz soru sozcüğü tamam mı? Yaz bak hepsini yaz. Türkçe yazacağız bunu, soru sozcüğü. 'Is' ne? (auxiliary) verb yani yardımcı fiil. "She" ne burada, subject; 'going' ne verb değil mi?...Evet bakin simdi Indirect questiona. "He asked where she was going". Ne oldu? İkisinin inceleyin siz gorun bakalım ne oldu. Bak dikkat et, direct question'da nasıldı. "Where is she going?" Indirect questiona bak "where she was going". Ne yer değişirdi burada? (It is one of the Wh-questions, OK? Write all of these in your note-books. What 'is' is here, auxiliary verb, isn't it? 'She' is the subject and 'going' is the verb of the sentence, isn't it?...OK, look at the indirect question on the board. 'He asked where she was going.' Now let's look at both the direct question and indirect speech, so we can compare them. Have you noticed anything? In direct speech, it was "Where is she going?" In indirect speech it is "Where she was going". What is the difference between these two sentences?)

63. Ss: Yardımcı fiil. (the auxiliary verb)

64. T: Yer değiştiren ne? (What has changed here?)

65. S12: 'Is' 'was' oldu past haline geldi. (We have used the past form of the verb 'be'.)

66. T: Ozne ile ne yer değiştirdi? (What has the subject swapped place with in the sentence?)

67. Ss: Yardımcı fiil. (the auxiliary verb).

68. T: Yardımcı fiil yer değiştirdi degil mi?...Bunlara bakin. Soru cümlelerindeki degisimler wh-question dedigimiz bu soru sozcüğü olursa farklıdır; bu soru sozcüğü kullanmadan yani yes/no question dedigimiz tarzda soru cümleleri için farklıdır, farklı farklı kullanılır. Onlara da önce vereceğim, bunlar da wh-question dedigimiz soru sozcüğü var ona göre...Evet simdi örnekler yapalım daha iyi anlasıniz. (The auxiliary verb has changed its position in the sentence, hasn't it? You need to apply
different rules if it is a yes/no question. I'll give you some examples of it later...OK, let's do some exercises on this structure first).

69. [The teacher starts writing on the board]

70. T: "He said what time is it?...Evet gene wh-question dedigimiz ne var? Soru kelimeleri var. Nasil yapabiliriz bunu bir dusunun bakalim. Yukaridaki ornege bakarak siz kafanizi calistirin. Bak ayni zamanda hem yer degistiriyoruz hem de direct cumleyi indirect cumleye cevirirken yaptigimiz neyi yapiyoruz? Degismeleri yapiyoruz; yani 1. derece pastini kullanarak yine degisimleri yapiyoruz ayni birakmiyoruz degil mi? Evet ne diyecegiz simdi? ("He said what time is it?"...Yes, it is another wh-question. You need to change the position of the subject in the sentence and you also need to use the past form of the verb. OK, how can we construct this sentence?)

71. S13: "He asked what it was time".

72. T: Bir daha soyle. (say again)

73. S13: "What it was".

74. T: "He asked".

75. S13: "He asked what it was time".

76. T: "What it was time" olur mu? (Can we construct the sentence like this, 'what it was time?)

77. S13: "What time it was".

78. T: "What time" zaten wh-question soru kelimesi. Nasil ayirdin onu? "What time is it" diye soruyor. Saat kac diye soruyorz. 'Time' i baska yerde kullanabilir miyiz? Nasil kullanacagiz? 'He asked', 'said' yerine ne kullaniyoruz, soru kelimesi indirect'de 'asked' kullaniyoruz. Ne diyoruz? 'What time... [the teacher is expecting the students to fill the gap] (You cannot separate 'what' from 'time' here. It is "what time is it?" We also need to replace 'said' with 'asked' in the Indirect form. So how do we say it now? What time... )

79. Ss: 'It was'.

80. T: Boyle mi diyorum? (Can we construct the sentence like this?)

81. Ss: Soru isareti kullanacagiz. (We need to put a question mark there).

82. T:Soru isareti koymuyorum...Indirect questionlarda soru isareti kullanmiyoruz tamam mi? Burada oldugu gibi, "he asked what time it was". Ne yapiyoruz, soru isareti kullanmiyoruz. Evet, ask what time it was. Yardimci fili file ozne ne yapiyor? Yer degistiriyor. Evet, ikinci bir ornek yapalim. "He said Mary when is the next train?" Kim yapar bunu? Ne diyeccegiz burada? He asked...[expecting the students to fill the gap] (You cannot separate 'what' from 'time' here. It is "what time is it?" We also need to replace 'said' with 'asked' in the Indirect form. So how do we say it now? What time... )
wants to do this? Rabia, would you like to do this exercise? You can make a mistake, it is OK. He asked … [expecting the students to fill the gap]

83. S14: "He asked Mary"

84. T: "He asked Mary".

85. S14: "When the next train was".

86. T: "When the next train was", evet... Burada yer değişimini gösterelim, soyle 1, 2 diyse numaraları ne oluyor? 2 basa 1 sonra geliyor... Ne yapıyorsun? Özneleri ehm yanılış soyledim. ("When the next train was", OK... Let's see what has changed here? If we give numbers to the subject and the auxiliary verb here. Let's say number 1 is the auxiliary verb and 2 is the subject. Subject, ohh sorry, I made a mistake here).

87. S15: Yanılış. (Wrong)

88. T: Neden? Tamam, neresi yanlış? Değişimi gösteriyorum Neresi yanılış dedin Ilhan? Bir bak bakalım... Evet bir tane örnek daha yapalım. Kim yapar? (Why? Where is the mistake here? Why did you say that it's wrong Ilhan? Have a look at it again... OK. Let's do one more example. Who would like to do it?)

89. S16: Me.

90. T: OK then.

91. [S16 starts writing on the board]

92. T: He said, tırnak içinde comma, once virgül koyuyorsun 'he said' den sonra. Evet, "Where is Ayse", "Where is Ayse?"... Soru işaretleri... evet, "He asked where Ayse was". Evet, doğru. Bunlarda da dediğim gibi aynı kurallar geçerli, past tense perfect tense yapıyorsun ama soru cümlelerinde bu kadar bilin yeter. Bir tane daha başka örnek gösterirsem size corba edersiniz. Simdi bunlar wh- question ile kullanılan yani soru sozcuğlarıyle kullanılan nelerdir? Direct soru cümleleri indirect soru cümlelerine çevirmek. Simdi bir de wh- questionlari olmadan yanılış sozcuğları olmadan bakalım nasıl yapıyorum. Simdi bunlar direct yazın benim soylediklerimi. (He said, you need to put a comma after that. OK, "where is Ayse?"... Question mark... yes. "He asked where Ayse was". Yes, that's right. As I said before, the same rules also apply here. You need to use the past participle form here. OK, that's enough. I don't want to confuse you by doing more exercises on this. Now, as I said before they are wh-questions. But we know that we can also make questions without using 'what', 'where', 'why', etc., don't we? Now I want you to open your books and start writing as I say).

93. [The teacher starts dictating].

94. Eger dolaysiz soru cumleinde soru sozcüğü yoksa, bir de size İngilizce yazıldığımı düşünün! Eger dolaysız soru cümleinde soru sozcüğü yoksa yani 'where', 'what', 'why', bunlar neydi? Wh-question dediğimiz soru sozcuğları yoksa, bak tahyata 'if' ya da 'whether' kullanılamalıdır. Genellikle biz 'if' ile kullanırız, 'whether' da kullanılır ama en yaygın olan en çok kullanılan 'if' dir. 'If' ya da 'Whether' kullanırmız...(If there is no wh-question, such as 'where', 'what', 'why', etc. in the direct question... Imagine
me saying these in English! Look at the board, we use 'if' or 'whether'. In such sentences, using 'if' is more common).

95. [The teacher starts writing on the board].

96. Bakin simdi soru cumlesine bakin. 'He said: Is anyone there?' Var mi burada wh-question dedigimiz 'what', 'where', 'why', 'how', var mi boyle soru sozcukleri? (Look at the board. 'He said: Is anyone there?' There is no wh- questions here, like 'what', 'why', and 'where', is there?)

97. Ss: Hayir. (No).

98. T: Yok, onun icin ne kullanmak lazim? 'If' ya da 'whether' kullaniriz dedik, acaba bunlari nasil kullaniyoruz? Indirect question yaziyoruz tekrar...He asked if/whether anyone was there'...Bakin su daha anlasilabilir bir ornek. 'Ali: Are you happy?', Ne demek 'are you happy?', ne demek 'happy'?(No, so what do we need to use here? 'If' or 'whether'...'He asked if/whether anyone was there'...This is a better example. 'Ali: are you happy?' What does 'happy' mean in Turkish).

99. Ss: Mutlu. (It means 'happy' in Turkish).
C) SELECTIVE CLASS IN TURKEY:

1. T: OK! First of all last lesson we watched a film. I hope that you all remember the name of the film. And now I am going to ask some questions about the film. What did we watch? Who is going to tell this? (He is selecting someone to answer. Some students are calling out the name of the film).

2. S1: (Flubber)

3. T: Sorry, what?

4. S1: Flubber.

5. T: Yes..., where does it come from?... Do you know? - What does it mean?


7. T: OK. Fly and rubber. OK. Do you remember the colour of the thing - the stuff?


9. T: Yes, it is green. And OK, what can it do? What can it do? Please make a list. Yes, Gulay.

10. S2: It can jump very well.

11. T: Yes, it can jump very well, ha? Very high, ha?

12. S2: And it is very soft.

13. T: It is very soft, yes...OK, what else? Yes.

14. S3: It can fly.

15. T: It can fly.


17. T: Yes.

18. S3: And it has a mind.

19. T: It has a mind. Yes, it can think, ha? Like a man. Yes.

20. S4: Maybe it is a living creature.

21. T: It's a living creature, yes. What about the shape of it?

22. S4: "Shape"? [The student looks confused indicating that he does not know the meaning of 'shape']

23. T: 'shape' – its shape, ha? Yes... What 'shape', 'shape'? [The teacher is checking the students know what 'shape' means]

24. Ss: 'Shape' 'bicim' mi demek? (Does 'shape' mean 'bicim'? in Turkish)

25. T: For example, this is a what? [The teacher is drawing on the board]
26. Ss: Square.

27. T: Square. Ball is what? Round, ha? Yes. It can change?... [the teacher is expecting the students to complete the sentence]

28. Ss: Shape.

29. T: Every ( ) what shape. OK. Yes, make a summary. Who is the main character of the film? Who? Please tell me. Yes, other friends. It is very easy.

30. T: Every ( ) what shape. OK. Yes, make a summary. Who is the main character of the film? Who? Please tell me. Yes, other friends. It is very easy.

31. S5: Gerçek adlarını mı soyleyeceğiz? (Do you want us to give the actors and actresses’ real names?)

32. T: No, no. The name in the film. Yes.

33. S5: Professor Philip.

34. T: Philip, ha?

35. S4: Robbie Williams.

36. T: Yes. OK, what does he do and what does he work?

37. S5: He is a science professor and he works in a university.

38. T: Yes, he works in a university, mmm mmm - OK and, is he very active?

39. Ss: Yes.

40. T: Mmm mmm. How do you understand?

41. [silence]

42. T: Because...[The teacher is waiting for the students to give the answer]

43. S3: He works hard.

44. T: Yes, he works hard - he is a hard-working professor and what does he try to do - something what? He tries to what? Invent, ha? Yes, he invent what? - a new product maybe a chemical substances

45. S6: Called Flubber.

46. T: Called Flubber... Does he achieve at the end? Successful - is he successful?

47. Ss: Yes.

48. T: OK. And, then he loves someone, he falls in love

49. Ss: Sarah.

50. T: Sarah. OK, what happens? - something happens there in the beginning of the film and she gets a bit unhappy why? Could you catch it? She gets a bit unhappy, why?
51. S7: Because he for...ah for
52. T: forgets
53. S7: forgets her.
54. T: her but the wedding day, the wedding time. [The teacher complete the sentence with the other students who are calling out] And, yes?
55. S4: And he waited her in the church three times I think so. And they cancelled.
56. T: Yes, it is cancelled. Cancelled? [The teacher is checking if the student know the meaning of ‘cancel’]
57. S4: Yes, iptal edildi. [It means ‘it is cancelled’ in Turkish]
58. T: Yes, she gets a bit unhappy. At the end she invents ah he invents the (flubber) and then he used it for what? – He uses it for what? Where does he use it? Yes?
59. S8: Professor use it for the basketballer.
60. T: Yes, yes, yes for the basketballer, mmm mmm.
61. S3: Jumped.
62. T: Yes, for jumping. OK. Can you describe the team, the basketball team - the school team? OK. Do they play very well?
63. Ss: [speak out] No.
64. T: No. How do they play? Can they jump?
65. Ss: [calling out] No.
66. T: Yes. Can they basket?
67. Ss: [calling out] No.
68. T: They play very bad. What about the other team? They are shorter than the other team. The other team is very strong, and they are very tall and yes and they can play very well [the teacher finishes the last sentence with the students]. The score is high. But in the second half I think, I am not sure, something happens. And the professor says that what? The show time. Can you remember? He looks at his watch and he says that what? That is the show time and then? What happens then?
69. S4: They can jump very high ... and ... they play ... they can play very well basketball.
70. T: They can catch the ball very easily hi? And they are able to jump. And at the break-time one of the players sees some what?... Call it... under their snickers, he sees what? Rubbers, maybe (flubber) I think we can say. And he takes out and they cannot jump hi is it true? But how does the professor find the solution to it? What kind of solution does he find? What does he do?
71. Ss: Solution? Cozum? [in Turkish it means solution]

72. T: Ssstt [the teacher indicates that they should not speak in Turkish]. Solution? Cozum, yes.

73. 

74. T: And then what does he do? He rubs his hands, do you remember?

75. Ss: [calling out] Yes.

76. T: yes then he what? Shakes their hands. And then one of them, he puts his hands at his back ha?

77. [Laughter]

78. T: But during the match he falls ha? He hits his rivals, he falls on the ground floor and then he jumps on his back and make score. OK, yes...Did you like this film? Is it a what – is it a detectives film?

79. [Laughter]

80. Ss: No.

81. T: What? It’s a funny, mmm mmm, yes, it’s a comics. Have you ever watched it?

82. Ss: No.

83. T: No. This is your first time I think, and you liked it. OK. I just wonder about could you understand the film? Could you catch some words, ha? Do you think it is useful for you, ha? Can you hear the their sayings, and the writings? You see you can able to watch it. Yes, what happens after the watch? And I think some bad people there and another professor maybe. And he is a bad man because he wants to buy the what?

84. Ss: Flubber.

85. T: Flubber. But the Professor wants to what? - save the school. Because the school has got a lot of debts, they are in debt. So, they want to save the school and he invent this Flubber. And he wants to sell. OK, how does he get money? What does he do to get money, to get a lot of money? Enough money to save the school what does he do? Yes.

86. S4: I think he wanted to sell his flying car.

87. T: Yes, he wants to sell his flying car, ha? What colour is it – the car?

88. Ss: Red.

89. T: Red, ha? - you can think. OK, yes. And then he goes, he flies sorry not goes not drives he flies to what – which company?

90. Ss: Ford.
91. T: OK, Ford company. OK, where does he \textit{(wait)} - in front of the door?

92. Ss: No.

93. T: No, where?

94. Ss: \textit{(Window)}.

95. T: Yes, next to the window. OK. When the manager or maybe the director of the company opens the curtains, maybe the window and he sees the what? The flying car. Yes, it is an interesting machine. And they sell, and then they save the school. OK. So, we couldn’t finish the film. Maybe the next week we can finish it. OK, today we are going to talk about a new topic. I am going to give it to you right now and but beside I want to learn that don’t you have an exam for today? Because the other classes have an exam, what about you?

96. Ss: No.

97. T: Why – why don’t you have an exam?

98. Ss: Because our lecturer was ill and she came to the school late.

99. T: Ah, because you haven’t finished the subjects and you need..., ha, yes. OK.