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Abstract
This research study was undertaken to address questions and concerns about the language teaching textbook as regards to its role in input, feedback, and production of learner output. Specifically, it investigates whether literature-based reading texts generate different interactions than traditional language teaching texts and whether the differences can be related to the development of academic L2 literacy.

Six grade five classes (163 students) were selected, three that use a traditional English language teaching textbook and three that use a course intended as reading instruction textbook for native English-speaking children. A standardized non-verbal reasoning test was administered at the beginning of the study to determine similarity of intellectual ability of the groups. Two fifty-minute class periods were videotaped in each class, once during the fall term and once during the spring term, and a total of 30 minutes of each class observation were transcribed. Samples of the textbooks were selected for analysis, and all students were administered a reading comprehension test toward the end of the academic year.

Data analysis comprised both quantitative and qualitative approaches. A total of 1158 teacher utterances and 544 student utterances were coded and frequency data collected. The frequency data were analyzed using Chi-square tests, and data from standardized tests were subjected to analysis of variance (ANOVA). The transcribed utterances were further analyzed using a qualitative approach in order to identify categories of interaction exchanges.

Findings indicate that interactions differ in classrooms using the two types of textbooks. Significant differences were found in teacher questions, student communication, and teacher feedback. Qualitative differences in classroom discourse were identified that can be related to the textbook type. The two groups differed significantly in general and specific subject-matter reading comprehension. Based on the findings, a model showing the complexity of classroom language learning is suggested for further investigation.
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CHAPTER I - INTRODUCTION

Which is the best way out of this wood: it's getting so dark. Would you
tell me, please?

Lewis Carroll,  Through the Looking Glass

CONTEXT OF THE STUDY

The New Framework for Education in Lebanon, established by the Ministry of Education in 1995, mandates the teaching of two foreign languages, French and English, with German being also an option. The first foreign language is introduced in Kindergarten or Grade 1 of the primary school (age 5/6) and the second foreign language at the latest in grade 7 (age 12). The first foreign language will eventually serve as the medium of instruction in the general curriculum in subjects such as mathematics, sciences and technology. Traditionally, French has been the first foreign language in the majority of the schools, both public and private, but an increasing number of schools are opting for English-medium instruction, many beginning in the Kindergarten. Schools cannot delay using the foreign language for instruction beyond grade 7, but may use Arabic as the medium of instruction in the primary school. The official government examinations can be taken either in French or in English. While approximately 37% of the schools provide their students with English-medium instruction for twelve years, and all offer formal English language instruction for at least seven years, the English language proficiency levels of the matriculating students do not reflect this. At the same time, the drop-out rate is approximately 70%, and can, at least partially, be related to the foreign language requirement. The high drop-out rate has serious socio-economic implications not only for the individuals concerned but also for the nation as a whole.
This study was primarily motivated by a current controversy in Lebanon over textbooks; more specifically, a contest between the traditional English language teaching coursebooks and English first language reading books, which are both used in Lebanese primary school English language classes. The two types of imported course texts, which dominate the English language textbook market, compete for supremacy at the time of this writing. On the one hand, there are traditional English language teaching (ELT) textbooks, intended either for teaching English to children outside the English-speaking countries or for teaching English to immigrant children in the target language culture. Way Ahead (Ellis and Bowen 1998) and World Class (Harris and Mower 1994) are two examples of the first type while Parade (Herrera and Zanatta 1996) and Amazing English (Walker 1996) are two examples of the second type. In this study these books are referred to as 'ELT courses', regardless of the intended context by the authors.

On the other hand, there are American textbooks, intended for native English-speaking children's reading instruction. These are basically reading books, or anthologies, of authentic children's literature ('real books'), both fiction and non-fiction. Examples include Celebrate Reading (Scott Foresman 1995) and Harcourt Brace Reading Program: Laureate Edition (Cullinan et al 1989). In this research study, these textbooks are referred to as 'Native English Speaker (NES) Courses'. (Samples of both types of text are found in Appendix A.)

In the light of current, less than satisfactory student achievement and the high drop-out numbers, and in the absence of any comparative studies of the two types of coursebooks, there is a serious need in Lebanon to determine the suitability of
language teaching materials for their intended purpose. Since the primary aim of language teaching is the access to the general curriculum in the L2, the language teaching textbook needs to facilitate development of skills associated with academic learning. In this study, these skills are referred to as 'academic L2 literacy'.

The centrality of the textbook in the language classroom is widely recognized (Peacock 1995 cited in Martin 1999; Hutchison and Torres 1994) and attested to by the proliferation on the market of a considerable number of textbooks. Much of the general curriculum content is also accessed through texts and reading. Although a considerable body of literature exists on different language teaching methods, very little research exists on the possible influence of the language teaching textbook on classroom second language development in general and on the development of academic skills in the second language in particular. In contexts where learners need to access some or all the general curriculum through the medium of a foreign language, one of the primary aims of the language class is development of academic L2 literacy. Therefore, materials, including the textbook, must be selected so that they not only facilitate second language learning but also prepare students for the academic discourse typical of the general curriculum subjects.

It has been widely recognized in second language acquisition research that second language learning is facilitated by meaningful interaction, and interaction is argued by many to be particularly crucial for second language learners who need to learn language conventions that enable them to participate in academic discourse in the new language. Yet research into what teachers and learners actually do when interacting around a language teaching textbook is not much studied. However, if we are to select the best possible textbook, then we must find out how the textbook fits into the classroom dynamic, which is characterized by teacher-initiated discourse,
student responses and subsequent teacher feedback and evaluation of student responses.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This exploratory study investigated classroom interactions in six primary school English language classes in Lebanon that use the above-mentioned two types of textbooks to teach English. More specifically, the study aimed to identify, analyze, and compare the types of interactions observed in the hope of enhancing understanding of how the textbook may influence classroom interactions and the development of academic L2 literacy. The main premise was that it is possible to identify in classroom interactions features associated with L2 learning and the development of L2 academic literacy and that these interactions may be traceable to the type of textbook used. The study examined the extent to which the classes using different language teaching textbooks reflect what is known about successful second language learning in general and what is known about development of second language skills associated with subject matter learning in particular.

CENTRAL QUESTION

The central question in this research study is:

What actually happens in the classrooms where teachers and students interact around the two types of textbooks? More specifically:

a) Do the observed interactions reflect what is known about language learning in general, and about learning language for academic purposes in particular?

b) Do the classes using the two different types of textbook differ in the observed interactions, and do students in these classes differ in their L2 reading performance and, if so, how?
SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This research study focused on the role that English language textbooks play in classroom interactions and how the interactions may be associated with the development of second language academic literacy. Much of the SLA research has been conducted in North American and UK contexts, where the learning environment significantly differs from that in Lebanon. The data collected in this research study shed light on the interactions in second language classrooms where both teachers and learners are non-native speakers of the target language. This study, which approached the issue from an exploratory perspective, will add to the limited research literature on the role of the textbook in classroom interactions, attempting to bridge the fields of instructed second language acquisition, educational psychology and materials development.

The findings will provide insight into the significance of instructional texts in classroom interactions and development of second language academic literacy and thus provide information potentially useful in the selection of instructional materials. The study also contributes to the field of classroom-based research.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

The following definitions are provided to facilitate the understanding of the upcoming chapters:

Academic L2 literacy is used in this research study to refer to language proficiency that enables the learner to access the general curriculum in a foreign language and is here defined as:

a) the ability to read L2 texts with comprehension;

b) the ability to read and follow written instructions for tasks;
c) the ability to listen to teacher explanations and instructions with comprehension;

d) the ability to use L2 to ask and answer questions orally about the lesson content
and other relevant topics;

e) a familiarity with academic registers (Gibbons and Lascar 1998) of various subject
matter as demonstrated in the ability to respond to grade-level written questions in
mathematics, sciences and social studies; and

f) the ability to express one's knowledge and understanding of the subject matters
clearly and coherently in writing. (Written performance, although a critical aspect of
academic L2 literacy, particularly at secondary and tertiary levels (Bacha 1997;
Mann et al. 1998), was not included in this research study in order to keep the
research data within a manageable scope.)

_EFL_ and _ESL_ refer to English as a Foreign Language and English as a Second-
Language respectively. The terms 'foreign' and 'second' language are often used
interchangeably, but in the context of this research study the two must be
distinguished from each other. I have chosen to use the distinction provided by
Tomlinson (1998:x-xii) and use the terms ESL to refer to contexts where learners need
the new language, which is not their mother tongue, in order to communicate in the
classroom and in the society, and EFL to refer to contexts where English is studied as
a subject but is not a community language.

Examples of ESL contexts are the United States and Britain, where immigrant
children are provided with English instruction in order for them to be mainstreamed
into the general curriculum classes. The target language is not only the instructional
language of the general curriculum but is the official community language. This,
however, does not necessarily mean total immersion of the ESL children in the target
language outside the school as many might come from communities where the heritage language is the dominant language. This was illustrated, for example, in Wong-Fillmore's (1985) study of Kindergarten pupils in California and Ellis' (1988) study of two Punjabi-speaking children in London. Examples of EFL contexts are students learning English in France, Germany or China.

ELT is used in this research study to refer to English language teaching in general, regardless of the context.

The term EMI (English Medium Instruction) refers to teaching of subject matter through the medium of English, and has been used, for example, by Nuttall and Langhan (1997) in the South African context.

English language learner (ELL) and L2 learner are used here interchangeably to refer to a non-native English speaker learning English in school, regardless of the context.

Foreign language for academic purposes in primary school – FLAPPS is a term coined for this research study. It is used to refer to contexts where primary level students must learn a foreign language that is not one of the community languages in order to access all or some of the general curriculum taught through the medium of the foreign language, regardless of whether the onset of the L2-medium instruction takes place in the primary or the middle school. Examples of this type of context can be found, for example in South Africa's black community schools, in Brunei, Sri Lanka, and Lebanon. As the context differs in significant ways from both EFL and ESL contexts, a new term was deemed necessary. The acronym FLAPPS will be used in
this study to refer to the primary school English language class that aims to teach English for academic purposes in contexts where English is not the community language.

Specifically how the FLAPPS program differs from other typical language teaching programs will be elaborated on in Chapter II.

*Literature, children's literature, and real books*, whether fiction or non-fiction, are used in this research study to refer to texts in various genres written for native English speaking children and not intended for second or foreign language instruction. These terms are used to refer to both individual books and reading selections in anthologies.

The terms, *textbook, course book, and instructional text* are used in this study interchangeably to refer to the basic textbook used in the language classroom. The following two basic types of textbooks are distinguished in this study:

1) *ELT (English Language Teaching) course* is used in this study to refer to language teaching textbooks intended for students learning English outside the English-speaking countries;

2) *NES (Native English Speaker) course* is used in this study to refer to reading textbooks intended for students learning to read in English, their L1.
STRUCTURE OF THIS STUDY

In Chapter II, the Lebanese context is explored in detail and the problem is described and its implications explained. Chapter III reviews the literature on instructed second language learning, with a focus on children learning a second language in instructed settings, and situates it within the theoretical framework of second language acquisition. In Chapter IV, the literature on children learning a second language for academic purposes is reviewed. Chapter V explores the role of the language teaching textbook, discusses the implications of the reviewed literature for the FLAPPS context, and concludes by linking the research questions to the literature review. Chapter VI describes the research methodology and outlines the data analysis procedures, considering also the strengths and limitations of the study. Chapter VII consists of the data analysis. Chapter VIII discusses the findings and interpretation of the results. Chapter IX summarizes the study and its results and presents the conclusions, linking them to the theoretical framework of the study. The chapter also discusses the limitations and implications of the study, and concludes by presenting suggestions for further research.

I have decided to open each chapter with a quote from Lewis Carroll's Through the Looking Glass. The reason for the decision is that the quotes from Alice and her many acquaintances summarize my journey through the research process, reflecting the feelings and frustrations I experienced and the insights I developed in the process. At the same time, the quotes in some ways mirror what is known—or rather not known—about second language learning.
CHAPTER II– THE FLAPPS CONTEXT IN LEBANON:
CONCEPTUALIZING THE PROBLEM

Speak in French when you ca’n’t think of the English for a thing – turn out your toes
as you walk – and remember who you are!

Lewis Carroll, Through the Looking Glass

INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes the context of the study in detail. It begins by providing
a rationale for why English is used as the vehicle of instruction in Lebanon as opposed
to the mother tongue. It then presents an overview of the recent curriculum reform and
the role of English in the new curriculum framework in Lebanon, followed by the
English language objectives. The chapter then describes the conflict of textbooks
currently taking place in Lebanon and explains why the English language teaching
texts may, in fact, pose a problem in the Lebanese primary school context. The
chapter speculates on the serious consequences of the current situation for the future
of the learners and concludes by defining the problem and presenting the research
questions.

REASONS FOR FOREIGN INSTRUCTIONAL LANGUAGE

In Lebanon, the practice of using a foreign language for instruction is not new. It
can be explained by Lebanon's multinational character, traceable to hundreds of
years ago and which continues today when expatriate Lebanese, who are returning
from all corners of the globe to post-war Lebanon, bring with them the cultural
influences of their host countries. For an in-depth understanding of the language
policies and practices, see, for example, Salibi 1988, Shaaban and Ghaith (1996),
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The popularity of foreign languages in Lebanon is probably both a result of the Lebanese educational system, as well as a factor influencing it. There are a number of complex reasons, both ideological and practical, that underlie the use of foreign language in the general curriculum and that make it unviable, for the time being, to use Arabic, the mother tongue of the majority of the population, for instruction.

**Foreign legacy**

First, there is the legacy of the French mandate and European and American missionaries. Since the French mandate (1918-1943), French has enjoyed a special status as the second official language, equal to Arabic. During the mandate, all schools had to teach French language, and the language of instruction in the content area subjects was also French. After Independence, decree No. 6968 mandated that Arabic be used as the medium of instruction and gave English an equal status with French, permitting schools to choose which foreign language to teach. In 1968, decree No. 9099 provided schools with an option of using French or English in mathematics and science instruction.

Several French, English and American missionary projects in Lebanon have further influenced the educational system in a significant way, the universities established by French and American missionaries in particular having played a significant role in socializing the Lebanese into Western cultural values, thought and language. In 1848, the French Jesuit order founded a seminary, which in 1874 became The University of Saint Joseph. In 1866, the American Presbyterian mission established the Syrian Protestant College, which later became The American University of Beirut. In 1924, the predecessor of The Lebanese American University,
the American Junior College for Women, was founded by the Syria Mission of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian church. The foreign languages used by these institutions as a medium of instruction have contributed to the linguistic plurality and fostered positive attitudes toward foreign languages. Knowledge of foreign languages has also been motivated by economic gains as it has enabled Lebanese people to secure employment in foreign consular missions, cultural institutions and businesses. Individuals educated in the foreigner-operated schools have also been able to secure higher and better paying positions in government institutions (Hitti 1957).

The affinity with foreign languages is demonstrated by a number of Beirut residents, interviewed recently by Tonhauser (1999) and who reported being more comfortable with and better able to relate to English or French than Arabic, particularly in writing, while many reported using mainly English during their work day. Many of those interviewed also considered written Arabic mainly as a language of poetry and literature. Although Tonhauser's sample was limited (when questioned about the numbers, he stated having interviewed “several” individuals), his findings reflect the realities observable in everyday life in stores, banks, offices and educational institutions, where the use of French is frequent. An occasional television viewer will also quickly notice the frequency of French-language talk-shows and entertainment programs. The attitude toward Arabic is also reflected in a recent research study on students' language proficiency by the Lebanese Association for Educational Studies, which found poor grasp of Arabic, the students' mother tongue, while variations in French and English proficiency reflected differences in social class (Ibrahim 2000).
Language and cultural identity

Secondly, there is the question of cultural identity. The significant role Western thought has played in the Lebanese educational life has undoubtedly also contributed to a large segment of the Lebanese Christian population in particular perceiving themselves not as Arabs, but rather descendants of the Phoenicians. The dichotomy in the Lebanese national identity –Phoenician and Arab– is further reinforced by the religious factor; Christianity is associated by many with 'Western' values while Islam is perceived as 'Arab' and Oriental (or Eastern). This perception persists despite the fact that not all Arabs are Muslims, and not all Muslims are Arabs and, of course, not all Westerners are Christian and despite the fact that the Phoenicians are believed to have come originally from the Sinai Peninsula or the Arab Steppe, and were, in fact, Canaanites, a Semitic group (Moscati 1968). It appears as if in the absence of the Phoenician language, a foreign language, be it French or English, is perceived by many Christian Lebanese in particular to be a more desirable option than the formal written Arabic, which they associate with the Quran and thus Islam. This is also reflected in the fact that the Maronites, the single largest Christian group in Lebanon, still use in their liturgy Syriac, an ancient language based on eastern Aramaic dialect.

Failure of the Arabization movement

Yet another reason that helps explain the need for foreign language in instruction is the failure of the Arabization movement. There has been a drive to 'Arabize' the curriculum, prompted by groups that identify strongly with Lebanon's Arab heritage and are concerned with what they perceive as deteriorating standards of written Arabic, the national language and the mother tongue of the majority of the
The 'Arabization' of the curriculum has become, however, a highly emotionally and politically charged issue with the opponents seeing it as synonymous with 'Islamization' of the country and erosion of their Christian identity. It is also seen by many as a move that would result in serious retardation of the whole educational system as it would hinder access to up-to-date knowledge, particularly in science, technology and medicine. The new National Curriculum has effectively put an end to the Arabization effort, at least for the duration of the current government's term. The official national textbooks of Mathematics, Science, and Technology for the Middle and Secondary school classes are available only in French and English.

Access to imported knowledge

The fourth reason is a result of the Lebanese orientation towards foreign languages and the consequent undermining of classical Arabic as a language of learning. It has resulted in a number of further, more practical, obstacles for using Arabic as the medium of instruction in Lebanon. First, there are no relevant teacher training programs, and thus few qualified teachers of Arabic (Shaaban and Ghaith 1996). Second, the lack of qualified teachers has indirectly contributed to the scarcity of qualified professional translators in the field of sciences in particular. This is acutely felt by teachers of translation at the universities as reported by Ghosn of Université St. Esprit (personal communication 1998) and Sarkis of the Lebanese University (personal communication 1999). Both instructors reported university students majoring in translation as having weak written Arabic skills, the weakness in the written mother tongue coupled with a limited proficiency in the second language in terms of vocabulary, reading comprehension and academic writing. The lack of qualified

---

1 The TAIF agreement-based new Constitution of 1990 names Arabic as the official language, but no significant change in the status of Arabic as the medium of instruction has taken place (Shaaban and...
translators, in turn, means limited reference materials in Arabic and slow dissemination of new knowledge unless it can be accessed in the original, usually French or English. With the spread of the information superhighway and the Internet, knowledge of English has gained an added significance and has further reinforced the need for English language skills as information is coming in at a speed that makes translation of the material impossible with the current capacity and knowledge of available translators. Since its re-opening in 1994, The British Council in Beirut has witnessed an immense growth in the demand for English language courses of all levels, including a growing demand for teacher training (Malamah-Thomas 2000).

Access to higher education

Finally, mastery of a foreign language is not only necessary to access the general curriculum in grade school, but also in order to secure options for higher education. A cycle can be observed where students have to learn general curriculum subjects in the L2 in order to access higher education, leading to deterioration of their academic proficiency in formal Arabic. This, in turn, diminishes the number of academics qualified to teach Arabic and to use it for instruction, particularly in the rapidly developing fields of science and technology. The limited Arabic proficiency also considerably reduces students' chances for admission into the single public university, which, while nearly free of charge, sets rigorous entrance examinations, admitting only a small fraction of all applicants. A high level of Arabic language proficiency is required to pass the entrance examinations and to follow the academic program. Consequently, enrolment in foreign language universities has steadily risen. The two well-established American universities in Lebanon have a total enrolment of approximately 15,000 while

Ghaith 1996).
three new English-medium universities have been established within the past 15 years, and two more are currently in the process of getting licensed. In the five English-medium private universities in Lebanon, a high level of English language competence is required as all lectures are conducted in English and instructional texts are American university-level texts.

To sum up, the use of foreign instructional language at the moment appears to be the only viable option in Lebanon, and this is reflected in the official English language program.

THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROGRAM

Academic L2 literacy as one of the primary aims

The Plan for Educational Reform (Ministry of Education 1994) and The New Framework for Education in Lebanon (ibid. 1995:146) established guidelines for the new English as a First Foreign Language curriculum, which has three major purposes: ‘social interaction, academic achievement, and cultural enrichment’. Special emphasis is placed throughout the English curriculum on developing skills that will enable ‘students to communicate effectively in subject matter areas in general, and mathematics and sciences in particular’ (ibid: 148) and on equipping students with ‘the requisite linguistics skills to pursue university education’.

The term ‘academic competence’ is used throughout the curriculum to refer to language proficiency that enables the learner to access the general curriculum in a foreign language. In this research study, this language proficiency is referred to as ‘academic L2 literacy’, which in the context of this research study is defined as:

a) the ability to read L2 texts with comprehension;

b) the ability to read and follow written instructions for tasks;
c) the ability to use L2 to ask and answer questions orally about the lesson content and other relevant topics;
d) a familiarity with academic registers (Gibbons and Lascar 1998) of various subject matter as demonstrated in the ability to respond to grade-level written questions in mathematics, sciences and social studies; and
e) the ability to express one's knowledge and understanding of the subject matter clearly and coherently in writing.

L2 objectives related to academic literacy

In the New English Curriculum (Ministry of Education 1997: 10-34), the English-as-a-First-Foreign-Language program objectives include a number of skills particularly relevant for development of academic L2 literacy. During Cycle I of Basic Education, Grades 1-3, students are expected, for example, to:

- develop textbook skills;
- explore and conceptualize topics/issues under consideration;
- ask questions and elicit clarifications from teachers and peers;
- ask and answer questions related to different types of information;
- give and receive feedback;
- express personal feelings about different characters, stories, and plots;
- paraphrase and recap ideas for peers;
- give reasons for making choices;
- make inferences from what is read; interpret what is read.

During Cycle II of Basic Education, Grades 4-6, students are expected to be able to:

- formulate and answer various types of questions;
- summarize main points from texts and speech;
- differentiate between cause and effect, fiction and nonfiction, similarities and differences, etc.;
- infer ideas, outcomes, attitudes, intentions, feelings, etc.
- relate information to personal experiences and/or other content area material;
- discuss topics of interest or subjects under study;
- propose justifications, interpretations and explanations;
• discuss relationships and connections;
• develop logical thinking strategies;
• transfer knowledge and skills from one situation to another.

In order for the above objectives, which represent higher order academic skills, to be realized, the instructional approach and the language teaching materials, including the textbook, need to provide opportunities for development of these skills.

**Time allocated for English in the curriculum**

Since passing the official examinations in a foreign language and foreign language subject matter at the end of the Secondary Cycle (grade 12) is a prerequisite for access to tertiary education, the regular English language classes must prepare students for the demands of English-medium instruction from a very early age. Starting from 1997, English is taught in the English-as-a-First-Foreign-Language programs as shown in Table 2.1. below.

**Table 2.1 Hours of English Instruction in Lebanon**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Hours of EFL/week (30 weeks) by major*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Cycle I</td>
<td>1 – 3</td>
<td>6 – 8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Cycle II</td>
<td>4 – 9</td>
<td>9 – 14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Cycle</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>Science 3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Humanities 6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Humanities 6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Sciences 4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General Sciences 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Life Sciences 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* includes 1 hour of translation

2 In Lebanon, upon reaching the second year of the Secondary Cycle, students select to major either in Humanities or Sciences. In grade twelve they are further tracked to Humanities, Social Sciences, and General or Life Sciences.
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THE LEBANESE PRIMARY SCHOOL ENGLISH CLASS AS A PROBLEM
Differences with other types of programs

The Lebanese English as a first foreign language program differs from other types of English language programs, EFL, ESL, and Immersion programs in significant ways. Because these differences made it difficult to label the program with any of the existing labels, a new term was coined that would better describe the Lebanese English as the First Foreign Language program. The term Foreign Language for Academic Purposes in the Primary School, and its acronym, FLAPPS, will be used in this research study. It refers to any program that needs to prepare primary school students for academic learning in a language that is neither the students' mother tongue nor a prevailing community language, regardless of the time of onset of the L2 medium instruction.

The basic differences between FLAPPS and other English language programs are delineated below:

1. FLAPPS differs from traditional EFL programs for young learners in that the FLAPPS goal is not only the learning of L2 for communicative or enrichment purposes but sufficient mastery of the L2 to allow access to the general curriculum taught via the L2. Another difference is that in many FLAPPS programs, such as the Lebanese one, the learners' L1 is not used for instruction beyond the lower primary grades, with some exceptions, but is studied only as a subject.

2. Although FLAPPS and ESL share the same goal of preparing students for the general curriculum taught via the L2, FLAPPS differs from ESL programs in three significant ways. First, unlike in the ESL classrooms in the USA, UK, or Australia, for example, there are very few, if any, native speakers of the target language in the
FLAPPS classroom. Second, the L2 is not a widely spoken community language. Thus the majority of the children (especially in rural communities, areas outside large cities, and in lower socio-economic classes) have limited, if any, contact with native English speakers. For many learners, English TV films are the only exposure to the target language outside the classroom, and much of this programming is geared for adult audiences rather than for children. In Lebanon, for example, the local non-satellite programming for children consists mainly of cartoons and occasional Disney-type films, the former either dubbed or subtitled, the latter subtitled. Finally, teachers in FLAPPS programs are much less likely to be native speakers of the L2 than in the ESL contexts.

3. FLAPPS differs also from Early Immersion programs in three significant ways. First, in the FLAPPS program, English medium instruction is not voluntary but obligatory and functions as a gate-keeper to secondary and higher education, whereas early immersion programs are usually voluntary. They are either intended for majority language children to acquire an additional, often a community minority language, such as English in the French-speaking regions of Canada, or for enrichment, as is the case in Finland. Secondly, in total early immersion programs in Canada, USA and Japan, for example, instruction through the second language generally starts out at 100%, decreasing gradually to 50-80% at the end of the primary school, with the mother tongue instruction gradually increasing (Genesee 1985). In Finland, where a variety of immersion models have been explored, total immersion is recommended only in Kindergarten, and any subsequent L2-medium instruction ranges from 5 to 15 hours per week (Opetushallitus 1999), with mother tongue instruction being allocated a minimum of 50% of the time. In contrast, in the FLAPPS class L2-medium instruction
actually increases over the years while mother tongue mediated instruction decreases. In partial early immersion programs, where second language-medium instruction is allocated about 50% of the time throughout the students' school career, first language reading and writing skills precede those in the second language (ibid). In contrast, the Lebanese FLAPPS class introduces the reading and writing of the two languages simultaneously, meaning in this case that the young learners are introduced to two different alphabet systems and two reading directionalities at the same time. Finally, while in immersion programs, teachers are usually native speakers of the target language (or have near-native proficiency) and are professionally trained, the great majority of the teaching force in FLAPPS classes in Lebanon are more often non-native speakers of the target language.

In fact, the Lebanese program can be characterized as a version of submersion; in general curriculum classes, students with limited language skills are expected to learn academic content through the foreign language instruction and from subject matter texts written for native speakers, not for speakers of other languages.

Other problematic variables
The FLAPPS class is expected to prepare students for this submersion. Yet, it has a number of variables working against it:

1. Language distance: English is not related to Arabic, the children's native language. Thus, children cannot draw on L1 knowledge in attempts to communicate in L2 (as might be the case, for example, between Swedish and Danish).

2. English language environment outside school: A great many children, as pointed out above, have no contact with native speakers of English.
3. Mother tongue program: A distinct difference exists between the spoken Eastern Arabic common in Lebanon and formal written Arabic used for reading and writing. Children may thus face linguistic difficulties already in their first language, not perhaps unlike some of the difficulties of the West Indian Creole-speaking children in dealing with standard English dialect reported by Bullock (1975). Moreover, according to Abu-Nasr (1995), a specialist in early childhood education and the President of the Lebanese chapter of the International Board of Books for the Young, the Lebanese bookmarket is very poor in children's literature in formal Arabic that would foster literacy in and affinity with the written Arabic. The same concerns were reiterated by an experienced Kindergarten teacher, Ms. Itani (personal communication 2000), who reported not having been able to find suitably motivating Arabic materials in the market for her class of 4-year-olds. Both Abu-Nasr and Itani strongly believe that the traditional recitation-oriented Arabic instruction does not foster reading strategies that would be transferable to L2 reading. Students are required to begin English-medium instruction before they have developed any significant degree of academic language competence in their first language, a situation that is argued to hinder later academic achievement (Thomas and Collier 1997).

4. Teacher preparation: There is no formal preparation for primary school teachers in teaching language for academic learning, and many schools still appoint teachers who have no formal pre-service training. In a recent academic conference, Shaaban (2000), the Head of the English teacher training unit at the American University of Beirut, and one of the chief designers of the new curriculum, explained
how the long war years (1975-1991) have resulted in lowered teacher qualifications, with teachers doing "what they wanted to do, knew how to do, or liked to do". Skills-focused methods are still the norm, with teacher training programs separating instruction into sub-skills even in the new program. For example, the Teacher Training Handbook series accompanying the New English Curriculum, produced by an agency of the Ministry, still presents all skills separately despite the fact that the New Curriculum calls for integration of skills. The 'modus operandi' in the classroom is the teacher talking most of the time (Shaaban, op cit.).

5. Instructional texts: Both of the textbook types currently marketed in Lebanon pose potential problems in the FLAPPS class in particular. The structured ELT courses emphasize interpersonal communication skills and do not necessarily focus on developing the skills identified with academic L2 literacy and which are needed to master general curriculum subjects taught in L2. The imported NES courses have as their primary objective to teach reading skills and language arts to children who already know the language and who, upon entering school at age 6-7, can be expected to have a vocabulary of up to 13,000 words (Pinker 1999:3). These books do not address the goal of second language learning. Moreover, these books assume familiarity with cultural concepts that are often quite foreign to Lebanese children. This can make language learning very demanding for a child who must make sense of both the cultural context and the new language.
Student achievement

Despite 12 years of formal English language instruction, ranging from 5 to 8 hours per week, student achievement is often considered dissatisfactory, as evident when examining enrolment figures and interviewing professionals in the field.

Evidence shows that the English proficiency of secondary school graduates does not reach the standards expected by the Ministry of Education as judged by the results of the official Baccalaureat (at the end of year 12) examinations and the English placement tests of English-medium universities. For example, the statistics released by the National Center for Educational Research, only 37.3% of the students who sat for the English Baccalaureat examination in 1999 passed (Ministry of Education 1999).

According to statistics provided by the Admissions Office of one of the larger English-medium universities in Lebanon, of the 1052 students who sat for the English entrance examinations in 1996-97, only 15% scored above 575 in TOEFL equivalency, the minimum score required for access to regular university English classes. Less than 5% scored above 625, while 24% scored between 525 and 574, qualifying them to register only for a non-credit preparatory English course. The majority, 61%, scored below 525, requiring them to enroll in the pre-university Intensive English courses (Lebanese American University 1997). Although the applicants included students from French-medium schools who would have studied English only for 4-7 years in the middle and secondary school, they also included a number of near-native speaker expatriates returning from English-speaking countries. (The latter are included in the 5% that scored above 625.) Over half of the applicants came from English-medium schools where English is used as the primary instructional language.

Although the above results are in line with Allen and Widdowson's (1979) argument that secondary school programs, especially in the developing countries, do
not adequately prepare the students for higher education, in Lebanon, the problem may be traceable to the academic L2 literacy foundations laid in primary school.

Particularly striking about recent educational statistics is the high drop-out rate. A relatively small number of students actually complete the secondary school and many drop out already at the primary school level. For example, a glance at figures obtained from the Ministry of Education for the 1996-1997 (Ministry of Education 1998) shows the following levels of enrollment (see Table 2.2 below):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade level</th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
<th>Average enrollment per grade level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary (1-5)</td>
<td>382,309</td>
<td>76,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle (6-9)</td>
<td>215,389</td>
<td>53,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary (10-12)</td>
<td>76,613</td>
<td>25,537</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1996-1997, 69,380 students were enrolled in grade seven, 48,639 students in grade nine and 26,365 in grade twelve. Of these seventh graders, only 68% (47,178) reached grade nine in 1998-1999, with 70% (34,078) of the ninth graders reaching grade twelve in 1999-2000. In 1999-2000, only 67.5% (23,051) of the twelfth graders passed the official Baccalaureat examination. This implies that only approximately 35% of a given cohort entering school can be expected to matriculate. Considering that several children drop out already in the primary school, the matriculation percentage is even lower.

Access to secondary and tertiary education—and to better socio-economic status—is thus limited to the relatively small percentage of pupils who master the foreign language and can successfully pass the general curriculum requirements in the foreign language.
One reason behind the drop-out rates is undoubtedly the high cost of education; the average annual tuition in private primary schools ranges from nearly one million to seven million Lebanese pounds (LL) per child (approximately US $ 700–5000). In addition to the tuition, there is the cost of books and other materials (US $ 50-200) and uniforms (US $ 25 – 100), required by many schools. The public schools, which are free of charge, lack facilities and cannot accommodate all applicants, particularly in densely populated areas. When the monthly minimum wage is only LL. 300,000 (US $ 200)$^3$, many families are forced to pull their children out of school and into early employment or, rather, to unemployment and ultimately to emigration.

Another reason for the drop out rate was identified by Taleb Rifai, the Deputy Regional Director of the International Labor Organization: 'The failure of the educational system pushes the child into working...They end up seeing no sense in education and parents may believe that an early job will teach them better' (Haddad 1997). Due to the failure of the educational system to accommodate to their needs in the changing society, together with the material and activities that are not perceived relevant, youth from the lower socio-economic groups may feel alienated from the system, and stop perceiving it of significance to them. (This is especially true because the vocational education has not been updated at the same rate with higher education.)

However, one of the major causes for the high drop-out rate is academic failure. A 1995 UNICEF report indicates that while only 23% of the employed children and youth cited economic factors as reasons for dropping out of school, 71% reported having dropped out of school because of academic failure. A significant contributor to academic failure may well be the foreign language. First, a passing grade in the mandatory first

$^3$ In October 1997, the Labor Union was requesting the raise of the minimum wage to LL. 800,000.
foreign language is required for grade promotion from grade 4 on (age 9)\textsuperscript{4}. But more importantly, some level of proficiency in the language of instruction is necessary for successful access to the general curriculum in the grades where the medium of instruction is a foreign language. In English-medium schools, failure in the English language class results in hindered access to the general curriculum, and failure either in one of the content area courses or the English language class will result in grade retention and eventual dismissal or dropping out.

It was shown earlier in this chapter that the Lebanese FLAPPS class has several variables working against it. Yet another variable may well be the language teaching textbook. The language class, particularly the teacher and the textbook, and the language the two jointly generate, are often the only sources of English language input for students. This is especially true in rural communities and in schools where English-medium instruction in the general curriculum is delayed to grades 6 or 7 (age 11-12). In schools that begin their general curriculum instruction in English at the lower primary levels, students also receive English language input from the subject matter teachers and from texts, mainly science and mathematics, starting in Kindergarten (ages 4.5-5).

Although official government-produced course texts are mandatory in the public schools, private schools, catering in the 1999-2000 school year to 70\% of the total student population, are free to select their own course texts. The selection of English language textbooks is heavily influenced by commercial distributors' recommendations and, in some cases, incentives, particularly where teachers and program coordinators lack professional English Language Teaching (ELT) qualifications. It is not uncommon to meet English program coordinators who

\textsuperscript{4} In the new framework, grade 1 to 4 pupils are not subjected to grade retention.
themselves do not speak English but are responsible for selecting the textbook and other course materials.

In Lebanon, success in the language class is linked to students’ general academic success and, consequently, their socio-economic future as the language skill determines whether a student can continue to secondary and higher education or not. The first foreign language class, in fact, serves as a gate-keeping function, contributing to further stratification of the already divided society. In other words, mastery of the first foreign language is what Phillipson (1991:42) has aptly termed as a matter of ‘educational life or death’ for students.

**THE ‘BATTLE OF THE BOOKS’**

This research study has its beginnings in the rather sudden changes in the marketing strategies of the biggest textbook distributor in Lebanon that were observed during the second half of the 1990’s. The changes in the publishers’ marketing strategies involved mainly primary school English language teaching textbooks of the two types described in Chapter 1 (p.2). For a number of years, there had been in Lebanon competition between the two largest book distributors. The distributor of North American publishers Scott Foresman, Addison-Wesley and Harcourt Brace Jovanovich promoted NES courses in the affluent EMI schools in the capital and North American ELT textbooks in other schools. The distributor of British Longman marketed the traditional British ELT texts both in EMI schools and in the French-medium schools teaching English as the second foreign language. Each distributor extolled the virtues of their own materials, which is not at all unexpected. Both distributors offered free teacher training workshops and seminars to schools adopting their books.
In the 1990's, sudden and significant changes began to occur in the marketing behaviors of the British Longman distributor, and this is where the 'battle of the books' became very evident. The teacher training provided by the Longman distributor had for years promoted the traditional, structured, skills-based approach (typical of Longman primary school courses) as superior to the more content-based and thematic approach used by many North American ELT textbooks, and the use of NES reading books as totally inappropriate for ELT purposes. The other distributor, naturally, had promoted a contradictory philosophy in their workshops.

The first interesting change was noted when Pearson, the umbrella company for Longman, acquired the North American Addison-Wesley, producer of several ELT courses popular in the North American ESL programs. The Longman promotion and training, until then exclusively supportive of the traditional British ELT courses and structured, skills-based methodology, suddenly shifted to promoting the US-oriented ESL courses and communicative methodology. Schools were urged to consider the American courses that included, not only the book and a workbook, but also series of costly 'Big Books', audio-cassettes, videotapes, posters and other support paraphernalia. Again, this is, of course, perfectly understandable from the business-point of view. The American NES courses were still argued by the now Longman-Addison-Wesley distributor to be totally inappropriate for L2 teaching.

But a more radical change occurred when, shortly after the merger of Addison-Wesley and Pearson, Pearson went on to acquire the American Scott Foresman, producer of several popular reading series in the United States. Overnight, a shift was noted in the marketing strategy of the local distributor in favor of American reading books for teaching English to Lebanese, Arabic-speaking children. These expensive,
American readers are now aggressively marketed around the country as superior to any ELT materials, whether British or American. The promotional workshops have shifted focus from language teaching to teaching reading as that is the objective of the reading programs. (The pre-merger distributor of the Scott Foresman textbooks suffered a near-fatal heart attack due to the sudden loss of multi-million dollar annual sales following the final merger.)

**Concerns regarding the textbooks**

The situation gives rise to two principal concerns. The first relates to the anticipated effectiveness of the materials. As student achievement is currently far from satisfactory, it will be important to determine how suitable the materials selected are for the intended purpose. Yet clearly, the sudden change in the distributor's policy was not motivated by new research findings but rather by business concerns. No prior research has been carried out that would have assessed the effectiveness of the NES reading courses for L2 instruction or that would have compared the two types of textbooks in actual use. Should the NES reading courses provide better results than the traditional ELT materials, it would be imperative to assure that all children have access to them and that all teachers receive adequate training in their use.

The second concern is financial. The American L1 readers cost several times more than the traditional ELT materials, even without any supplementary materials. A typical grade five American reader is sold in Lebanon for about US $40.- while the cost of an ELT textbook of the same level ranges from US $15.- to 25.-. At the same time, locally produced texts cost approximately US $7-12. There are basically two reasons for the relatively high cost of the NES courses. First, these books use a large selection
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5 In the USA, school districts purchase textbooks, which are provided free of charge for students to use
of authentic literature selections (300-500 pages of text as opposed to 100-150 pages in typical ELT texts), implying copyright fees to holders of original rights. The special school library binding, typical of American readers, further adds to the cost. These books also include many full-color illustrations and photographs, undoubtedly adding to the cost.

The cost of the books, of course, always matters, but in post-war Lebanon this is of particular concern. Lebanon is currently struggling to regain economic stability following a prolonged period of civil strife and is, at the time of this writing, experiencing a severe economic crisis with the minimum monthly wage set at LL 300,000 (US $ 200), and an estimated 60-65% of the population living at or below the poverty level. Therefore, it can be very difficult for families to bear the burden of the cost of schoolbooks, customarily purchased through the school. At the same time, economic hardship may tempt those in charge of selecting textbooks to put aside pedagogical concerns and choose the materials that bring the biggest commission. It is not uncommon in Lebanon for the distributor to pay commission, or offer other perks, to the school or the coordinator of the academic program. Since parents buy the books from the school bookshop, the more expensive the book, the more the school and/or the coordinator will benefit. In the absence of any relevant research evidence, it is reasonable to investigate whether the assigned materials are appropriate for the intended purposes.

during the school year. These books are often used for several years, thus justifying the cost.

6 It is well-known in Lebanon that coordinators who make textbook decisions for a number of schools have received mobile telephones and paid trips to the UK in addition to the commission paid to the coordinator and the discount offered to the school. For a 40-dollar book, the school may be given 15-25% discount. This, for a school system with 2000+ students, means an extra income of 12,000-20,000 dollars out of one course book only. Not an insignificant amount by any standards, let alone in the current Lebanese situation of economic hardship.
CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter has presented an overview of the Lebanese educational context, showing that there are a number of complex reasons that support foreign-language medium instruction, which is mandatory. It has described the alarmingly low student achievement and identified the issues that are of concern in the Lebanese FLAPPS program. The chapter has described the current situation regarding native English speaker reading books being promoted for second language instruction and outlined the pedagogical and economic concerns associated with the selection of books. English language instruction in Lebanon is critical in that students in English-medium schools must access general curriculum subjects in English if they are to pass from primary to secondary education, matriculate and move on to higher education. Therefore, whether one type of textbook might be superior in fostering successful English language learning becomes an important question.
'Contrariwise,' continued Tweedleddee, 'if it was so, it might be; and if it were so, it would be: but as it isn't, it ain't. That's logic.'

Lewis Carroll, Through the Looking Glass

INTRODUCTION

This chapter begins by examining the variables associated with classroom second language learning and relating them to the theories they are based on. Bearing in mind the focus of this research study—classroom interactions—the theories and approaches that have direct relevance for instructed second language learning are reviewed. The chapter concludes by describing the socio-cultural theory of learning and relating it to second language learning.

LEARNING A LANGUAGE

In the field of child language acquisition, a great many theories have been posited during the past century, reflecting the complexity of the process. While a dichotomy exists between innate (nativist) and cognitive approaches to accounting for first language acquisition, it has been widely accepted that first language acquisition happens in the context of meaningful social interaction (Wells 1986; Hatch 1992; Aitchison 1993; Vygotsky 1978; Skinner 1957). There has been much less agreement, however, about second language acquisition, the theories and approaches being influenced by first language acquisition, linguistics, or learning theories. As far as
classroom second language learning is concerned, as Ellis (1988:160) has pointed out, there exists no theory specifically for it, but 'theorising about how [second language development] takes place in a classroom has either derived from general learning theory or from theories of naturalistic [second language development]'.

Trying to make coherent sense of the many second language learning theories and approaches in order to determine how language learning happens is much like the experience of the proverbial blind men in John Godfrey Saxe's poem, *The Blind men and the elephant*. During the past fifty years, second language learning has been attributed by different theorists and researchers to comprehensible input (Krashen 1982), learner output (Swain 1985; Swain and Lapkin 1995), negotiated interactions (Hatch 1978; Long 1981, 1983b; Gass 1997), cognitive (McLaughlin 1987; Anderson 1976, 1983), and neurolingual (Lamendella 1977) and other brain-based (N. Ellis and Schmidt 1997; Sokolik 1990) processes, and reinforcement (Skinner 1957). However, during the past two decades, interactions have become to be viewed as the main vehicle through which language learning happens (Gass 1997) and they are the focus of this research study.

**CONSTRUCTING LANGUAGE THROUGH CLASSROOM INTERACTIONS**

In classrooms, interactions typically happen within a three-phase sequence: teacher initiation, student response, and teacher feedback (Sinclair and Coulthard 1975). Teacher initiation is also referred to as elicitation because of its frequent function of eliciting student responses while teacher feedback is also referred to as evaluation (Mehan 1979; Cazden 1988), but in this research study, the term feedback will be used. In other words, learners receive some form of input that they respond to, and the teacher then provides some form of feedback or evaluates the response. In
this process some negotiation may take place. The following sections discuss input, output, negotiated interaction, and feedback.

Input

The starting point in the second language learning process is the input available to the learner. One can, of course, argue quite rightfully that learner characteristics, motivation\(^1\) and aptitude\(^2\) are the beginning point that will determine what the learner will be able to do with the input. These are, however, outside the scope of this study.

According to the creative construction theory of language acquisition (Dulay et al 1982), which derives from first language studies, learners must receive input that will enable them to develop and test hypotheses about the structures and revise as necessary (Newman 1980). This analysis happens on a subconscious level and is therefore not easily influenced by the teacher or the learner, but the input that learners receive must contain samples of the constructions present in the next developmental stage of the sequence (Krashen 1981, 1982). Because they assume automaticity of the acquisition process, the creative construction theorists argue that syntax should not be explicitly taught (Dulay and Burt 1973). They further suggest that such instruction, even if it might lead to learning, is not very important since such learning could not become automatized (Krashen and Scarcella 1978). In other words, there is no interface between naturalistic acquisition of second language and language learning, a construct that is defined as the non-interface hypothesis. Preference is placed on the acquired because, according to their view, only what is acquired can be

\(^{1}\text{For a comprehensive review of literature on motivation and second language learning, see Gardner and McIntyre (1993) and Dörnyei (1998).}\)
used in spontaneous interaction while what is learned is subject to varying degrees of 'monitoring', which potentially slows down the communication of meaning (Krashen 1982).

Krashen (1982:33) provides a criterion for successful input. It must be comprehensible, 'or even better, comprehended' (emphasis in the original). More specifically, the ideal input is slightly beyond the current level of the learner, but within an acquirable range at the time. Krashen refers to the input that is slightly beyond the learner's current level of functioning as 'i+1', meaning interlanguage + some more (not 'input' + 1 as it is sometimes interpreted). Krashen supports his theory by the notion that learners do not limit themselves to the linguistic input when trying to make meaning, but draw also on the context, their knowledge of the world, and other extra-linguistic information. In other words, 'we acquire by "going for the meaning" first, and, as a result, we acquire structure!' (ibid)

Krashen further suggests that successful input is relevant and interesting, with the focus on meaning and not on form, pattern drills, rote dialogues, and grammar exercises not leading to acquisition, as they fail the above criteria. Here Krashen includes both 'meaningful drills' and 'mechanical drills' (ibid: 67). Successful input is not grammatically sequenced (see Krashen 1981), as grammatically sequenced materials focus on the form as opposed to communication even when attempt is made to 'contextualize'. This is because contextualizing involves an artificially created, albeit realistic, context where the target structures can be introduced. Input can be made somehow comprehensible by familiar context/other linguistic and non-linguistic clues, and by slowing the rate or articulating more clearly, choice of vocabulary, simpler
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2 For a survey of literature on aptitude and second language learning, see Gardner and McIntyre (1992).
sentence structure and non-linguistic clues. There must also be a sufficient quantity of input, but it is unclear exactly how much is 'sufficient'.

Although the input hypothesis has been widely criticized (see, for example, Long 1983a; Larsen-Freeman and Long 1991; McLaughlin 1987; Sharwood-Smith 1991), clearly, input of some sort is necessary for any language learning to take place, justifying further examination of the quantity and quality of input learners receive in the classroom. However, if first language research is to be used as a basis for understanding second language acquisition (as Krashen and other proponents of the creative construction theory do), it becomes quickly evident that learning a language is much more than simply taking in input. Children acquiring their first language do not acquire language simply by taking in language; they are involved in meaningful social interactions where there is a need to understand and to be understood. The Bristol study (Wells 1986) of children's first language development, for example, found that the amount of conversation children engaged in was associated with the rate of their language development.

**Learner output**

Already in 1978, Hatch stressed the importance of conversations and the negotiated interactions that language learners may engage in. She proposed that a second language learner 'learns how to do conversation, how to interact verbally and out of this interaction syntactic structures are developed' (Hatch 1978:404). Since then, learner output and negotiated interactions have become a focus for many SLA researchers.

For example, Swain (1985) and Swain and Lapkin (1995) have come to the conclusion that, although perhaps sufficient in developing semantic competency,
comprehensible input is not sufficient for development of grammatical competency. The latter, according to Swain (op cit.) will also require learner output, suggesting more emphasis on learners' language production. The learner must try to make his or her output comprehensible to the listener. According to Swain and Lapkin's theory, the learner, while trying to produce the target language, may encounter a problem, leading them to realize the deficiency or lack of their target language knowledge. This, in turn, will lead them to attempt to produce more comprehensible input for the listener. In other words, they will work to restructure their output, which will assist acquisition.

Negotiation

In the process of the learner attempting to produce comprehensible output, the interactions are modified, with native-speakers employing a number of communication devices to prevent communication breakdown. Long (1981) has identified these to include confirmation checks, comprehension checks, clarification requests, repetition, expansions and questions, and argues that these modifications are not only necessary but that they are also a sufficient condition for L2 learning. Sato (1986) came to a similar conclusion in her study of young English language learners (ELLs) learning past time reference. In addition to the modification strategies identified by Long, Tsui (1995) found that language teachers also use repetition requests, self-repetition and decomposition of utterances in attempting to make meaning clear to learners.

Researchers have further distinguished between negotiation of meaning, negotiation of form (Swain 1995; Lyster and Ranta 1997), and negotiation of content (Rulon and McCreary 1986), in other words, the topic. Gass and Varonis (1985) have shown that negotiation of forms and meaning often occur simultaneously. Unlike the negotiation of meaning and negotiation of form, which interrupt the flow of the
interaction, negotiation of content is concerned with the topic of conversation and allows for continuing flow.

Native speakers' and teachers' use of clarification requests and subsequent extending and reformulating by the language learner may facilitate development of some aspects of language, and the attempts to obtain comprehensible input, referred to as negotiation of meaning, are now believed by many to be one of the keys to successful second language learning (see, for instance, Gass 1997 for a recent discussion). While comprehension of input may be facilitated by negotiation (Ellis et al 1994; Gass and Varonis 1994; Loschky 1994; Pica et al 1987; VandenBranden 1997) negotiation may also be significant in the internalization of L2 forms. Pica (1994:508) provides evidence of extensive form manipulation in the negotiation process and shows that, although negotiation does not necessarily lead to comprehension, it gets the learners to 'manipulate form'. Negotiation, therefore, may serve two functions: aiding in comprehension and providing a focus on form.

Studies on interactional modifications have largely been conducted with adult learners; in naturalistic contexts, however, NS and NNS children also have been found to engage in modifying their interactions (Hirvonen 1986; Peck 1980; Oliver 1995).

To sum up, as Ellis (1985:231) suggests, language learning happens as a product of 'the provision of comprehensible input as a result of successful communication taking place'. Hence the need to investigate what type of communication is taking place in the second language classroom that might serve as comprehensible input and provide opportunities for negotiation of meaning, and whether the tasks set in different types of textbooks might avail different opportunities for negotiation.
CLASSROOM INTERACTIONS

Teacher talk as input

In a language classroom, teacher talk can constitute up to 60-90% of all interactions (Chaudron 1988; Spada 1987; Lightbown and Spada 1994; Tsui 1985), thus potentially providing a significant amount of L2 input. Yet not all teacher talk is beneficial to learners. Wong-Fillmore’s (1985) extensive studies of Kindergarten and primary school ESL classrooms in California investigated teacher talk in terms of its value as input. Her findings suggest that successful teacher talk is grammatically correct in register, adjusted to learner output and feedback and is rich in repetitions of language patterns. In addition, the content of the talk is linked to learners’ prior knowledge and elaborated by demonstrations. Allen et al (1987, cited in Spada 1990), who investigated eight grade 11 French classes found that successful language classes were characterized by teacher doing relatively more talking to the class as a whole than to individual students. In other words, in these classes there was more public input available to the learners.

Much of teacher input consists of explaining and presenting new content. Effective explanations have been identified to be those that, among other features, are cognitively demanding and involve students in information processing and enable learners to relate the new information to their previous knowledge (Tsui 1995; Wong-Filmore 1985).

Teacher questions

One of the primary means of generating learner output in a classroom is teacher questioning, and, in a language classroom, the primary function of teacher questions is to get the learners to produce language (Van Lier 1988). Teacher
questions typically form the first stage in the three-stage IRF sequence, followed by student response and subsequent teacher feedback. An example from the pilot phase of this research study conforms to the often cited example of Mehan, 'What time is it, Denise?' (1979:285):

Teacher: What's the weather like, Rania?
Student: Sunny.
Teacher: Right.

Questions also enable the teacher to discover what the learner already knows, and serve as important determiner for instruction that follows (Ausubel 1978).

**Classifying teacher questions**

Teacher questions have been classified in a number of different ways, and they are argued to generate different learner output. For instance, Long and Sato (1983) use the term 'display questions' for the questions to which the teacher knows the answer, and 'referential questions' for those to which the teacher does not know the answer. The following examples from a lesson observed in this research study illustrate the two types of teacher questions:

1. The whale Moby Dick, what did he do?
2. What do you think about Captain Ahab wanting to kill the whale?

The first is an example of a display question as the teacher is checking students' comprehension of a story and has a specific answer in mind (Moby Dick shook the boat). The second question is a referential question to which the teacher does not have any obvious pre-determined answer in mind, as the teacher is asking for students' personal opinion.

Barnes' (1969) classification of teacher questions distinguishes between factual questions and reasoning questions, the former beginning with 'who', 'what', 'when' and 'where' and the latter beginning with 'how' and 'why'. In Barnes'
classification, factual and reasoning questions could both be either closed or open, the
former limiting the response and thus student output. The first question in the above
example represents a factual, closed question while the second represents an open
reasoning question, the answer not being implied in the passage under discussion.
The following examples further clarify Barnes' classification:

1. Do you like to read stories?
2. Why did Captain Ahab chase the whale?

The first one is an example of an open factual question while the second represents a
closed reasoning question to which the teacher knows the answer but which requires
the student to engage in reasoning.

Teacher questions have also been characterized in terms of the cognitive
demand they place on the learner as convergent (equivalent to display) or divergent
(equivalent to referential) (Smith 1969 in Oriich et al.), or as data recall, data
application or data processing (Shrable and Minnis 1974). The convergent and data
recall questions are cognitively less demanding, as they focus on the lower levels of
thinking. Research into classrooms shows that teachers ask many more simple
display and data recall questions and convergent questions than open-ended,
cognitively more demanding questions (Gallagher 1965; Sirotnik 1983).

Classifying teacher questions is not straightforward. In her observations of
Hong Kong language classrooms, Tsui (1995) noted several instances where
language teacher questions appeared on the surface to be of reasoning or referential
type, yet on closer inspection turned out to be either factual or display questions. The
following examples from the transcripts in this research study in Lebanon help
illustrate the difficulty:

Teacher: Why would Tom not want to paint the fence?
Student 1: He like to play.  
Teacher: He would like to play, yes, but what else?  
Student 2: The other boys will laugh.  
Teacher: Yes, the other boys would laugh at him.

This question seems on the surface to be a reasoning question. However, the teacher was trying to elicit one specific answer, which was indicated in the teacher's guide.

The following question about personal information seems also to be referential, but an examination of the resulting exchange reveals something else (raised, questioning tone is indicated by ^):

Teacher: Do you have any aunts?
Student: No.
Teacher: You have no aunts^ ... How come? What about your aunt Zeinab?

The question is, after all, a display question as the teacher clearly knows the student's family situation and is asking the question to check whether the student understands the word 'aunt'. The question, 'What do you think Captain Ahab should do?' is an example of an open factual question as Barnes defines them, as it begins with 'what'. However, one might well argue that the response requires some, perhaps even quite sophisticated, reasoning.

Although teacher questions have been classified in different ways, they share some common features and can be characterized along two continua as shown in Figure 3.1.

Figure 3.1 Continua of Teacher Questions

I Data recall II

Display (convergent) Referential (divergent)

III Data processing IV
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Display questions, which aim to get students to demonstrate knowledge already known to the teacher, can range from those requiring only data recall to those requiring data processing. Referential questions, which aim to get students to share knowledge that the teacher does not have, can also range from those requiring only data recall to those that require data processing. Questions falling in the two bottom quadrants are more demanding than those falling in the two top quadrants. The following examples help illustrate the differences:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What time is it, Zeina?</td>
<td>Display / Data Processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Who saved Little Red Riding Hood?</td>
<td>Display / Data Recall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How do you say that in the past tense?</td>
<td>Display / Data Processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Who came to your party?</td>
<td>Referential / Data Recall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that it is impossible to place the first three questions along the above continua without knowing the context where they are asked. Assuming a classroom context, it is likely that the teacher wants Zeina to show her ability to tell time in English; the teacher knows who saved Little Red Riding Hood; the teacher wants to find out whether the student knows the required past tense form. These assumptions would conform to the suggested types of question. However, if we assume that the questions are asked in the context of home, the categories need to be revised. Even the question about the past tense takes on a different function as genuine information-seeking if we assume a younger sibling–older sibling interaction, or a child–parent
interaction. These examples illustrate the difficulty of classifying questions out-of-context, and show that, in the classroom context, accurate classification necessitates examination of both the student response and the subsequent teacher feedback.

Teacher questions and student output

The classroom questions control, to varying degrees, the language that learners are expected to produce. Although often viewed negatively, in a language class, closed display-type questions can help develop formulaic speech and, thus, as Hatch (1978) has pointed out, give the learner a short-cut into communication. Even when the content of the question is cognitively not demanding, the L2 learner must process the question and the response through the target language. Display questions in the second language classroom, therefore, function as both input and elicitation of output.

It has further been suggested that referential questions produce longer and syntactically more complex responses than display questions (Brock 1986; Kubota 1989) while higher level cognitive questions might also increase the length and syntactic complexity of student output (Kubota op cit.). Cognitively more demanding questions are also likely to promote academic L2 literacy better than data recall questions. Convergent and data recall questions are cognitively less demanding than divergent and data processing questions and may thus restrict student response to a narrow, pre-determined range of responses, limiting student output and opportunity for negotiation of meaning. Given the centrality of teacher questions in the classroom and their potential influence on development of academic L2 literacy, teacher questions and how they may be influenced by the textbook used do merit investigation.
Teacher Feedback

Teacher feedback to students is argued to be 'the lynch pins of a lesson' (Brown and Wragg 1993:22) because they determine the course of the lesson. In a language class, correction of student errors is a fairly frequent form of feedback, but its influence is not clear although studies indicate that explicit corrective feedback has some benefits (Chaudron 1977; Lyster and Ranta 1997; Lyster 1998; Carroll and Swain 1993). Lack of attention to form has been suggested as one of the reasons for the frequency of accuracy errors observed in immersion students' output even after years of study (Chaudron 1986). Clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback and repetition have been shown to result in more frequent learner uptake than explicit correction or recasts which provide expansion or implicit correction (Lyster and Ranta 1997). Although considerable research has been conducted on error treatment, there is little empirical evidence to support any one type of error treatment as superior, as results have been inconclusive (Ellis 1994).

In fact, explicit error treatment, even when it might result in learning, may need to be viewed with caution as it may have a negative affective influence on the learner (Krashen 1982). In a primary school classroom in particular, overt error correction may be interpreted by young learners as teacher disapproval and may influence learners' motivation to continue producing output, thus limiting interactions. This is particularly relevant in the Lebanese cultural context, where errors are not viewed as an integral part of the learning process, and where perfection is expected from early on, a situation not very unlike Gregory's (1996) example of young Nancy’s learning French in France.

Teacher feedback may also function as reinforcement. In the field of SLA, reinforcement is generally associated with Skinner's (1957) behaviorist, operant
conditioning approach to language acquisition and the consequent Audio-Lingual Method to second language teaching. The theory was totally discredited by Chomsky (1959), and the audio-lingual method that it gave rise to was heavily criticized by Ausubel (in Ausubel and Robinson 1969). Ausubel differentiated between rote learning and meaningful learning, with rote-learned material more subject to forgetting. He objected to the audio-lingual method mainly on the grounds that it relied too heavily on rote-learning and did not consider the significant cognitive differences between an adult second language learner and a child first language learner.

The major criticism against Skinner's theory, however, centered around the question of reinforcement. It was argued that, contrary to Skinner's view, a child does not get reinforced for his or her correct utterances and the fact that it would be a mathematical impossibility for all utterances to be reinforced in order for them to be learned. Yet, there is a vast body of knowledge showing that a child acquiring his or her first language does, indeed, get reinforced, even quite frequently, by the caretaker responses. This reinforcement is not, however, associated with grammatically correct utterances, but with attempts to communicate ideas (Aitchison 1993; Hulit and Howard 1997; Fogel 1991). For example, if a young child says, *I wented to the zoo yesterday*, the caregiver is likely to say something like, *Oh, did you? What did you see?*, as opposed to, *You mean to say you went to the zoo*. Not only does the caregiver thus attend to the meaning the child is trying to convey but also extends and elaborates on it, thus reinforcing the child's attempts to communicate while, at the same time, modeling an appropriate conversational pattern. Therefore, the question of reinforcement, which is still very much alive in the field of general psychology as well as educational psychology, is also still relevant in the second language classroom, as has been noted by Van Lier (1988).
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Reinforcement, as it is defined in psychology, refers to any consequence that increases the likelihood of a given behavior to reoccur (Atkinson et al. 1996). The reinforcing consequence may take a variety of forms, ranging from a smile or a nod to a question that demonstrates interest in the speaker's ideas or comments. Reinforcement may also take the form of an accepted response accompanied by a verbal approval, such as Yes; That's right; Exactly; and so on. In the language classroom, a student who receives encouraging feedback for his or her attempts to communicate is more likely to attempt to communicate again than the one who does not receive such feedback.

In contrast, a learner whose communication attempts are frequently rejected or ignored is likely to decrease his or her responding behavior. Continuing lack of reinforcement may, in fact, ultimately result in extinction of the particular behavior (Atkinson et al. op cit.). Similarly, frequent rejecting feedback may also result in the weakening or extinction of student responding behaviors since rejection may function as punishment, especially in the case of school-age children.

Thus, the type and frequency of teacher accepting and rejecting feedback merit investigation in the second language classroom. Just as lack of positive reinforcement can lead to decrease in the participation and student output, frequent overt error corrections can also decrease participation as they may function as punishment, thus decreasing—and even eliminating—not the errors that the teacher wishes to eliminate, but also the participation behavior itself.

SOCIAL CONTEXT OF LEARNING

Examination of classroom interactions, as any human interactions, are social events and thus not 'unilateral' (Allwright 1984:159). The patterns of initiation,
responses and feedback are constructed jointly by all the participants, create opportunities for learning, and help establish the classroom culture. As all human interactions, classroom interactions are also influenced by the cultures within which they occur. Vygotsky’s (1978) socio-cultural perspective to learning, which has gained popularity during the past twenty years, views all learning as inherently social and asserts that one cannot understand individual learners without understanding their social world. The next section describes the Vygotskian view and relates it to the second language classroom.

**Vygotskian socio-cultural perspective to learning**

The foundational premise of Vygotsky's (1978) theory is that knowledge is mediated and constructed by and through language in social use. He suggested that children's higher-order functions develop from social interactions, which allow children to confront other people's points of view and discover how others respond in various situations. The processes of developing understanding through social interaction also allow the child to gain new information and provide a level of linguistic interaction that adds a verbal level to their understanding (Echevarria and Graves 1998).

Social learning theory recognizes the unique role that adults (or more capable peers) play in learning. It places emphasis on the importance of modeling and the use of language as a means to learning (Berk and Winsler 1995), rejecting the idea that children learn by passively absorbing information from teacher presentation. It postulates that children are actively engaged in processes that move them to construct new understandings and to make sense of their experiences within their own socio-cultural contexts.
Central to Vygotsky's socio-cultural perspective to learning is the 'zone of proximal development' (Vygotsky 1978:85), or ZPD. The ZPD is a theoretical zone, or area, that lies between the child's current unassisted level of functioning and the level of functioning that the child can reach with assistance. Learning happens within the ZPD as 'the child is interacting with people in his environment and in cooperation with his peers' (ibid:90). More capable others provide assistance, or other-regulation, which assures that the child is interacting within his or her ZPD for the particular task and gradually moving from object-regulation to other-regulation, and eventually to self-regulation.

The social interaction provides the child with information from which his or her own higher cognitive processes or 'individual plane of consciousness' is developed (ibid). Teaching, therefore, is mediation of knowledge through social context and expert 'scaffolding' (Berk & Winsler 1995). The term is traceable to Bruner (1983), and refers to adults or more competent peers assuming the role of mediators in the learner's gradual development of competence. Maybin et al (1992:188, quoted in Mercer 1994:104) define scaffolding as follows:

It is help which will enable a learner to accomplish a task which they would not have been quite able to manage on their own, and it is help which is intended to bring the learner closer to a state of competence which will enable them eventually to complete such a task on their own.

Successful scaffolding is intensely social and interactive in nature and is characterized by warmth and responsiveness on the part of the adult (Berk and Winsler 1995:29). Although clearly goal-oriented in that it aims at moving the learner along gradually towards the desired outcome, successful scaffolding views the learner as an active and collaborative participant in the process.
Characteristics of good teaching

Good teaching then, including language teaching, from the Vygotskian perspective, is teaching that assists learners' performance through the ZPD as they move from their current level of language to what is possible for them with appropriate assistance, or scaffolding. Scaffolding will be withdrawn when students become more competent (Van Lier 1988), capable of independent use of language. Supportive feedback and appropriate scaffolding are provided through the teacher incorporating the learner's idea into the response or feedback, which will enable the learner to construct, or 'appropriate', new understandings. The term "appropriation", which can be considered a socio-cultural analogy to Piaget's biological metaphor of assimilation, was introduced by Vygotsky's colleague, Leont'ev (Newman et al. 1989 cited in Mercer 1994:104). It refers to what meanings children might construct as a result of their encounters with new ideas and concepts. This implies that, as Macnamara (1994:2-3) has argued, 'at the heart of the educational process lies the teacher', because the teacher needs to determine the learner's zone of proximal development and then provide appropriate scaffolding.

Newman et al. (op cit) employ Leont'ev's term 'appropriation' to teachers' using student output to modify discourse. Appropriation includes strategies such as paraphrasing and recapping student utterances (Mercer 1994:105). It is this meaning of 'appropriation' that is used in this research study to refer to the teacher incorporating student output in the feedback, which may serve a scaffolding function. In order to define the function of individual utterances, and their potential scaffolding role, one needs to examine 'interrelatedness of cross-speaker linkages' (Jarvis and Robinson 1997:218). Jarvis and Robinson, who studied 17 EFL lessons in three
different countries (Malta, Malaysia, and Tanzania), discovered that teacher feedback can help move the discourse forward and build what Hoey (1992:79, cited in Jarvis and Robinson 1997) refers to as 'exchange complexes', which may provide scaffolding and thus support student learning.

In summary, learning opportunities are created and meanings constructed through collaboration between the learner and a more knowledgeable partner, whether an adult or a more capable peer. Successful collaboration provides models that are 'samples to learn from' as opposed to 'examples to learn' (Cazden 1988:108), the latter not enabling the learner to develop conceptual understanding, or in Bruner's words, 'go beyond information given'. In the case of children who must develop academic L2 literacy, it will be particularly important that they have opportunities for the kind of interactions that foster not only their second language development but also their conceptual development. Therefore, whether language classroom interactions provide scaffolding and 'samples to learn from', and whether this is influenced by the type of textbook in any way, should be investigated.

CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter has identified elements of interaction associated with instructed second language learning and situated them within the typical initiation-response-feedback pattern of classroom interactions. Language learners must first have comprehensible input, which they must process. Learners then need to produce language and engage in negotiating meaning, the language they produce being influenced by the type of questions teachers ask. Learners must also receive feedback that enables them to recognize problems in their interlanguage, but the feedback does not necessarily need to include overt error correction as that might have a negative
affective influence. The question of reinforcement that was associated originally with the behavioral approach to language learning, and that has long since been discredited, was re-introduced as a possible variable, particularly in the primary school context. The chapter described Vygotsky's socio-cultural approach to learning, which indicates that successful learning happens within a meaningful social context in a supportive environment in which the teacher provides frequent scaffolding feedback.

This chapter has explored the importance of negotiated interactions for second language learning. In the absence of contradictory evidence, it might be safe to speculate that young ELLs in FLAPPS classes will also benefit from an environment characterized by meaningful social interaction within supportive, child-centered conversations. Students in FLAPPS classes, however, need to learn more than just language; they need to develop academic L2 literacy that enables them to access the general curriculum. While classroom interaction opportunities were shown in this chapter to be associated with some aspects of second language learning, they are argued to be critical for second language learners who need to learn language conventions that enable them to participate in academic discourse in the new language. The complex process of learning a second language for academic purposes is explored in the next chapter.
CHAPTER IV – INTERACTING TO LEARN A NEW LANGUAGE FOR ACADEMIC PURPOSES

‘The question is,’ said Alice, ‘whether you can make words mean different things.’

Lewis Carroll, Through the Looking Glass

INTRODUCTION

This chapter begins by discussing the relatively widespread practice of using a foreign language as vehicle of instruction. The chapter then describes some of the complex skills that are needed in managing academic discourse. Skills involved in general academic literacy and discipline-specific language skills are explored. The chapter then reviews two theories that seek to account for academic language learning skills and the process of their development, followed by description of a promising approach that aims to foster development of these skills. The chapter concludes with a summary, which links the literature reviewed to the research study.

SPREAD OF ENGLISH-MEDIUM INSTRUCTION

That immigrant students arriving in the UK, USA or other English-speaking countries need to access the school curriculum in English, is quite understandable, but that children in their own country should access the general curriculum in a foreign language is perhaps less so. Yet, the Lebanese case is not unique.

Today, English is the language of instruction in many of the over 800 International Schools (Baker and Prys Jones 1998:533), the many European Schools
within the European Union, and schools in Africa and India. English functions also as
the vehicular language in some developing countries, including the former British and
some other European colonies. In many of these countries, the vernacular language
serves as the vehicular language only for the first few years of school, after which it is
replaced by a foreign language, most likely English. This is the case for example in
Ghana and Nigeria (Collison 1974), Botswana (Ramahobo and Ramsay Orr 1993),
and Brunei Darussalam (Ng and Preston 1993). In Zambia, initial literacy instruction
happens through English, which is not children's own language (Gregory 1996). In
South Africa today, English has become an important international language that
provides access to business and education (Stein 1993). In Lebanon, the context of
this research study, English and French are the languages of instruction both in
schools and most universities.

Although there is a justifiable need in some areas to use a foreign language for
instruction, the practice presents a potential problem for the learners. First, the
process is both complex and time-consuming. Secondly, the future socio-economic
status and consequent quality of life of learners depend on their ability to learn to
manage academic discourse in the foreign language.

MANAGING ACADEMIC DISCOURSE

Skills of general academic literacy

'Language forms the basis for thinking. It also serves to structure the ways that
ideas are developed, organized and presented' (Newman and Gayton 1964, cited in
Okhee and Fradd 1996:27). Language underpins the whole academic curriculum, and
successful academic performance implies not only competence in the subject matter
but also competence in the language required to access the content and respond to it (Mehan 1978). In this study, the term 'academic L2 literacy' is used to refer to such competence. To be 'literate' in something, according to *Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary* (1994:680) means, amongst other things, 'having knowledge or competence' in something, while 'competence' refers to 'knowledge that enables a person to speak and understand language' (ibid 234). Therefore, to be academically literate means to have knowledge of and be able to speak and understand the language associated with academic discourse. Jennings (1996 cited in Tuyay 1999:2) identifies literate practices as patterns of ways of constructing, interpreting, and interacting with texts. This view does not confine literacy to reading and writing, but considers also the complex communicative processes through which it is constructed (Santa Barbara Classroom Discussion Group 1992).

Some of the general language functions required for subject matter learning include the ability to ask questions, understand written text and written instructions for tasks (O'Malley 1992; Valdez Pierce and O'Malley 1992; and Chamot and O'Malley 1986), and familiarity with general academic register (Gibbons and Lascar 1998). In order to participate successfully in the classroom interactions in subject matter classes, students must have certain pragmatic and interactional skills, such as an understanding of the 'ground rules' of classroom discourse in both teacher-class and group work situations (Cameron et al 1996:226). They must also be able to extract information from texts and teacher explanations. In order to do this successfully, students must be able, for example, to recognize discourse markers and listen for key terms (Blue 1993:6).
Since students must also be able to communicate their learning in the evaluative teacher-student exchanges of the classroom (Saville-Troike 1991), they need linguistic skills in order to demonstrate their cognitive abilities to classify, compare, sequence, evaluate, hypothesize, infer, predict, and generalize (Gibbons 1995; Solomon and Rhodes 1995). They must understand and be able to express different points of view, and know when and how to request help (Blue 1993:6). In addition, there is the need for students to be able to understand the meaning of teacher instructions for tasks and the instructions found in tests, textbooks and other materials (Cameron et al. 1996).

Subject matter teachers consider effective responders as those who 'speak clearly, answer questions correctly, and volunteer frequently', and also ask clarifying questions (Schleppegrell and Simich-Dudgeon 1996:275). Teachers also expect good answers to be 'full, with more explanation, definition, and description' (ibid: 281). For instance, in a Botswana mathematics class conducted via the medium of English, teacher insistence on complete answers was clearly evident (Arthur 1994). Teachers in these studies were primary school (3rd and 6th grade) mathematics and science teachers, and one can safely speculate that secondary and tertiary level teachers expect no less comprehensive and detailed responses from the learners.

Solomon and Rhodes (1995:5), who investigated the quality and nature of academic language in two grade 5 classrooms in a bilingual school in Washington, DC, identify specific 'stylistic registers' that teachers expect students to be familiar with. The choice of a stylistic register depends on the type of task; for example, retelling of events is expected to follow chronological order and responses to written questions to be phrased in complete sentences.
Classroom interaction opportunities are argued by many to be particularly critical for second language learners who need to learn language conventions that enable them to participate in academic discourse in the new language (Faltis and Hudelson 1998; Hall 2000; Tharp and Gallimore 1991; Verplaetse 1998).

Given the importance of academic communication skill to FLAPPS students, it is appropriate to raise the question whether their language teaching textbooks generate the kind of communication associated with subject matter learning and academic discourse.

**Discipline-specific language skills**

In addition to the communication skills associated with general academic discourse, different academic subjects have their own discipline-based jargon, which may pose particular difficulties for young ELLs. In the Lebanese context, mathematics and sciences are of particular concern as they are the two subject areas that all students must study through the medium of a foreign language, starting from grade 7 (age 12) at the very latest. It is recognized that 'command of mathematical language plays an important role in the development of mathematical ability' (Anstrom 1997:21). Limited language proficiency can present a significant obstacle to mathematics learning because several aspects of mathematics learning require a considerable level of language proficiency to be understood and manipulated (National Council of Teachers of Mathematics 1991). For example, there is the issue of vocabulary. In addition to its own highly specialized vocabulary (e.g. quotient, divisor, denominator, minuend), mathematics uses everyday vocabulary with new meanings (e.g. even, table, column, product, volume) as Ramirez and Chiodo (1994) have shown. Syntactic
features, such as comparatives, logical connectors, use of passive voice and a variety of prepositions have also been identified as problematic for ELLs when learning mathematics (Spanos et al. 1988). Yet another problem may be in the language used to express hypotheticals, or probabilities and possibilities.

The following examples from the national curriculum objectives for mathematics in Lebanon (Ministry of Education 1995: 296-301) show some of the things that students in Cycle I & II of Basic Education, in grades 1-6, are expected to be able to do:

- justify answers;
- express understanding correctly, both verbally and/or in writing;
- ask and answer questions;
- extract general statements out of specific contexts;
- argue by analogy, giving examples and counter arguments;
- read, understand and interpret mathematical text by translating it into figures, representations or equations;
- translate a given mathematical relation into spoken language.

For all these objectives to be realized, considerable skill in the language of instruction, both spoken and written, is implied.

The language of science is another potential source of problems for young ELLs. Formulating hypotheses, proposing alternative solutions, describing, classifying, making inferences, interpreting data, predicting, and generalizing are some of the functions of scientific academic language (National Science Teachers Association 1991). Chamot and O’Malley (1986) and Bernhardt et al (1996) have pointed out the unique meanings certain non-technical terms have in the context of a science class, such as the common words ‘table’, ‘mass’, ‘energy’, and ‘force’, for example. Science class discourse is also characterized by use of the passive voice and long noun phrases, as Lemke (1990) has pointed out. This may pose obstacles for learning as students may develop erroneous conceptualizations because of language limitations (Collison 1974). Even when students are able to understand the concepts studied,
they may lack the ability to express their understanding concisely, whether orally or in writing (Michaels and O'Connor 1990, cited in Okhee and Fradd 1996:28).

The New Lebanese Curriculum (Ministry of Education 1995: 460-478) includes the following science objectives, which indicate the type of communicative functions that learners are required to manage in the L2:

Science, Cycle II of Basic Education, Grades 4-6
- give description of [nature's cycles] and state the importance of [them];
- identify and define;
- explain with examples;
- explain results of experiments; state expectations of what will happen.

Science, Cycle III of Basic Education, Grades 7-9
- describe, infer, explain, define, give examples, summarize, state;
- develop hypotheses;
- make scientific arguments;
- use correct scientific expressions; appropriate terminology and simple mathematical formalism [sic].

Not unlike like the mathematics objectives cited above, these objectives also indicate the need for a considerable level of language proficiency.

Yet another concern is the language associated with social studies. Explaining, describing, defining, justifying, sequencing, comparing, contrasting and evaluating are language functions typical of history classes, as are time-specific language, cause-effect relationship signals, sequence words, and specialized vocabulary (Coelho 1982; Short 1994). These are all potentially problematic for ELLs, as are the expressions of tentativeness, frequent in geography, for instance. Other problematic issues in Social Studies taught in a foreign language, and particularly when using a foreign textbook, include possibly unfamiliar political and cultural concepts (such as 'liberal' and 'abolition' for example, in the North American texts). In Lebanon, the language of Social Studies texts are of concern only in schools that use American Social Studies texts in the primary grades. It is not a concern in the majority of schools in the upper
grades, where local and regional history, as well as civics, are taught in Arabic using the nationally approved, local textbooks.

From the above, it is obvious that tackling academic subject matter in L2 is not at all a simple process and might present considerable challenges to learners. Young L2 learners need to develop good knowledge of how the target language works and learn to deal with unpredictable syntax and unfamiliar lexical items. They will also benefit from acquiring general vocabulary of the type that has been identified to pose problems in subject matter classes. The language teaching textbook and the interactions it generates must prepare FLAPPS learners for the challenges of the academic subject matter texts that they will encounter in the content area classes.

DEVELOPING ACADEMIC LANGUAGE SKILLS IN L2

If classroom second language learning is a complex phenomenon, acquiring academic skills in the second language is even more so, and the question of adequate preparation of ELLs and their consequent success in the general curriculum has been a serious concern in North American ESL context. Large numbers of language minority students are not achieving the academic standards of their age-peers despite a number of years of exposure to ESL and mainstream instruction within the target language culture (Collier 1995; Hamayan and Perlman 1990). In the United States, minority students' achievement has actually become a controversial political issue as the funding available for ESL programs has waxed and waned over time and across states. In the UK, both the Bullock Report (Bullock 1975) and the Swann Report (1985) have addressed the problem of adequate preparation of language minority children for general curriculum studies. Much less has been written about learners in
FLAPPS contexts, where English is the medium of instruction but not a widely spoken community language. Yet, concerns must be raised in the context where school is often the only source of the target language, and where the consequences of failure in L2 may lead to dropping out of school at an early age.

Two models are described below that aim at explaining how learners develop language skills necessary for academic subject matter learning.

**Cognitive-Academic Language Proficiency – CALP**

Cummins (1980) has differentiated between two types of language performance, or proficiency: Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills (BICS) and Cognitive-Academic Language Proficiency (CALP). The former, according to Cummins (1984a:133), is acquired in a relatively short time (2 years in a target language environment) while the latter takes several years (5-7 years) to master, even in total immersion programs. Cummins (1984b:4) further stresses that CALP is ‘socially grounded and could only develop within the matrix of human interaction,’ which allows students to examine and interpret information, formulate and express argument, and use higher order thinking skills. This notion is not unlike Vygotsky’s language-mediated social learning theory, which was discussed earlier in Chapter II. Although Cummins discusses BICS and CALP in the bilingual education context of North America, his theory is relevant in the FLAPPS contexts where students will study academic content in the L2 (as students in English-medium schools in Lebanon).

Cummins (1984:12) conceptualizes BICS-CALP along two continua as shown in Figure 4.1
On the one hand, the contextual support for communication can range from ‘context-embedded’ to ‘context-reduced’. The former is rich in paralinguistic and situational cues while the latter relies ‘heavily, or exclusively, on linguistic cues’ and a ‘shared reality’ cannot be assumed. Face-to-face conversations, picture-supported reading materials, or films are much more context-embedded than, for example, telephone conversations, non-illustrated reading materials, or radio programs. On the other hand, the cognitive demands that a given task places on the learner can range from undemanding to demanding. The level of demand depends upon the extent to which the task relies on ‘automatized’ linguistic tools or the extent it requires a level of active cognitive development and use of ‘non-automatized’ linguistic tools (ibid 13). For example, completing a grammar transformation exercise or reciting a list of irregular verbs from memory are cognitively less demanding than writing a persuasive essay or giving a speech. According to Cummins, academic language will be at its most difficult level for second language learners when it requires them to complete cognitively demanding tasks in context-reduced situations. Cummins argues that the
initial L2 input should be heavily context-embedded, making it more comprehensible, and goes further to suggest that this will facilitate development of L2 competence in eventual context-reduced communication.

Cummins' CALP model is not without problems; the construct itself is ambiguous and hard to assess and could also be perceived to be deficit-oriented in that learners either have it or not. Yet it gives some indication as to what could be expected of a language teaching textbook. Provided that the CALP model is valid, good language teaching courses would begin with context-embedded comprehensible input and become gradually more context-reduced and cognitively more demanding as learners gradually develop automaticity (McLaughlin 1987) or proceduralized language (Anderson 1983). This casts some doubt on the suitability of Native English Speakers' (NES) reading materials in L2 instruction. The NES texts may be too decontextualized when used outside the intended context because the assumed 'shared reality', created by cultural referents, is not, in fact, shared by the learners. The young learners may thus need to try to make sense of both the new language and the unfamiliar cultural context.

The Prism Model

The Prism Model (Thomas and Collier 1997) is another conceptual model that aims at explaining the development of second language skills for academic purposes. The Prism Model is more cautious than Cummins' CALP concept in that it recognizes the complex mixture of processes involved: language development in both L1 and L2, academic development, cognitive development, and social and cultural processes or interactions in the learner's life (see Figure 4.2). The Prism Model, unlike Cummins'
CALP construct, focuses on the processes. These processes, although existing separately, are interdependent; therefore, failure in one area may negatively influence the learner's overall development and growth (Collier 1995).

Figure 4.2  The Prism Model

The Prism Model is an outcome of a series of investigations over 14 years in five large school districts in the United States by Thomas and Collier (1997), who studied the achievement of over 700,000 students. The study concludes that the development of academic language proficiency in the second language may take up to ten years, as opposed to the 5-7 years suggested by Cummins (198b:133) and is closely related to the individual's level of L1 proficiency. Only students who had had an opportunity for cognitive and academic development both in their L1 and the L2 at least through the
primary school were found to be doing well in the upper grades (Thomas and Collier 1997:14).

However, there is disagreement in the field about the role of L1 instruction in academic L2 achievement. The recent, highly controversial debate in the United States about the value of bilingual education has resulted in California, for example, legislating in favor of early immersion of ELLs in mainstream classes, with Colorado considering similar legislation. A 1997 review of benefits of bilingual education by the National Academy of Sciences found no negative effects in children not developing L1 literacy before beginning to read and write in L2 (August and Hakuta 1997).

The Prism model reveals complex interdependent relationships between several interacting variables, and thus indicates an approach to research that would take into account this complexity. What this research study attempts to do is to examine the possible interdependence of teacher questions, feedback and scaffolding, student language production, and any possible influence of the language teaching textbook on these. First language competence, although a potentially influencing second language academic achievement, is outside the scope of this research study.

**Instructional Conversations**

Although the development of academic L2 literacy is clearly very complicated, specific approaches and methods have been developed to help the L2 learners in this difficult task. One promising method that is related to classroom interactions is Instructional Conversation.
Instructional Conversation (IC) is a teaching methodology that aims to promote the development of language, literacy and thinking and is rooted in the theories of Vygotsky discussed earlier. Goldenberg (1991) traces Instructional Conversation to classical Greece and the Socratic dialogue, in which the teacher carefully listens to the student in order to understand the attempted meaning and current understanding and then adjusts the discourse to facilitate and forward new understandings.

IC attempts to create a learning context resembling that of the home and/or community, where meaningful tasks are at the center of instruction and where language and the requisite cognitive skills are a natural outcome of the joint work on the task of the child and the adult. Although a variety of classroom strategies can provide assistance to learning, Tharp and Gallimore (1991:3) argue that critical for the thinking skills to develop is dialogue—'the questioning and sharing of ideas and knowledge that happen in conversation'.

The IC is responsive to student talk and ideas, inclusive of all the students in the group, balanced in terms of speaker turns, and not dominated by teacher talk (Dalton 1998). Successful ICs are characterized by thematically focused, planned discussion that links instruction to learners' prior knowledge, and direct teaching of skills or concepts takes place when necessary. There are extended student contributions generated through questioning, probing, and so on. Successful ICs concentrate on open-ended questions as opposed to single-answer, closed questions. The IC classroom is also characterized by a positive affective climate with sufficient challenge that enables learners to move along the zone of proximal development (Goldenberg and Gallimore 1991).
Research on the effects of Instructional Conversations show positive results on ELLs' comprehension (Saunders and Goldenberg 1992; Patthey-Chavez et al 1995), participation (Echeverria and McDonough 1995), writing (Saunders 1998) and, in the long term, overall academic achievement (Klein 1988).

Although ICs were developed for teaching subject matter to ELLs, they have implications also for contexts such as Lebanon where primary school students must develop academic second language literacy in order to access the general curriculum. Successful ICs are associated with teacher responsiveness to student ideas, as well as balanced, inclusive turns and open-ended questions in a positive climate. Given the demonstrated positive influence of these features, it is safe to speculate that IC type interactions will have a similarly positive influence on students in a FLAPPS class. In the FLAPPS class, teacher questions in particular can serve also as models for language structures and questioning techniques that learners will need when accessing information in subject matter classes (Gibbons 1995). Teacher explanations can function as scaffolding if they are used to directly teach concepts as in successful ICs. Tsui (1995) has identified as effective language teacher explanations those that are cognitively demanding and involve students in information processing. They help students relate new knowledge to old and are developed based on students' existing knowledge, working from the familiar to the new. These are all characteristics identified with successful ICs. The same features have been identified by Wong-Fillmore (1985) to be associated with successful L2 teacher behaviors in Kindergarten and lower primary ESL contexts.
CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter has presented a review of the relevant literature that provides grounds for understanding the demands of academic L2 literacy and the complex process characterizing its development. Students who need to access the general curriculum through a second language must acquire a number of specific skills, quite different from those associated with everyday interpersonal communication. In addition to developing awareness of general academic discourse, students need to develop awareness of language associated with specific subject matter areas. Although learning L2 for academic purposes is complex and time-consuming, specific strategies have been identified that facilitate language learning and academic achievement. Instructional methods which draw on Vygotsky's social learning theory have been found particularly successful; for example, the Instructional Conversations, characterized by frequent teacher scaffolding, have been found successful with ESL learners in North America.

Given that meaningful interactions are significant for development of both second language in general and academic L2 literacy in particular, and that teachers and students in the classrooms are often interacting around and about texts, it is pertinent to examine the role that language teaching textbooks might play in the process. The following chapter will explore the characteristics of the two types of textbooks and review literature about their potential suitability for language teaching.
CHAPTER V - TEXTBOOK IN THE LANGUAGE CLASSROOM

...'and what is the use of a book,' thought Alice, 'without pictures or conversation?'

Lewis Carroll, Through the Looking Glass

INTRODUCTION

This chapter attempts to link the language teaching textbook to the previous two chapters, which have explored second language learning and the development of academic second language literacy. The chapter begins by outlining characteristics of successful language teaching materials. It then presents some criticisms of traditional ELT textbooks, followed by arguments in favor of first language literature, or 'real books'. The chapter goes on to present some examples of research in ESL contexts, followed by a review of the rather limited EFL research on the role of the textbook on classroom language learning.

LANGUAGE TEACHING TEXTBOOKS

An investigation into English language teaching textbooks shows that a vast number of such books are produced and marketed around the world. Sheldon (1988) counts 1623 ESL textbooks being available from 28 major US publishers and Dougill (1987) mentions that 500 EFL-related publications (not necessarily all textbooks) were being published annually.

Much has been written on evaluating textbooks (for example, Sheldon 1987; McDonough and Shaw 1993; Tomlinson 1998), and suggestions pertaining to successful language teaching materials are available to teachers and materials
developers. Richard-Amato's (1988:209-210) concerns, for instance, can be summarized as follows: materials should reflect topics that are interesting and content that is relevant to learners' lives; the discourse should be meaningful and logical, with grammatical features existing naturally in the content. The focus must be on learning and communicating about something as opposed to language itself being the primary topic. Furthermore, materials should integrate skills and encourage creative use of language and negotiation of meaning. They need to also involve a variety of tasks, recycle concepts, and call for thinking and reflection. Academic challenge of the materials should gradually increase.

Cunningsworth (1995:15-17) suggests that language teaching coursebooks should: correspond to learners' needs and match the aims and objectives of the language-learning program; reflect the uses which learners will make of the language in terms of content, language skills and patterns; take into account individual learner needs and provide interesting and motivating topics; and support and facilitate the teaching and learning process.

Very little has been written on how teachers and learners actually use the textbook in the classroom, and how the textbook might influence the linguistic environment of the classroom. This is particularly surprising in the light of the recognized centrality of the textbook in primary school teaching, especially in developing countries, as shown, for example, by Peacock (1995, cited in Martin 1999). In Lebanon, the textbook has functioned much as a syllabus, with teachers "covering the book", page by page, as stated by Shaaban (2000). The gap in research on the role of texts in classroom events has prompted Tomlinson (1998) and Ellis (1998) to
call for systematic evaluation of materials in the actual teaching-learning situations and observation of learners using the materials. What needs to be looked at is how teachers and learners actually use the textbooks in real classroom situations. As Martin (1999:41) points out,

The interactional practices around texts are orchestrated by the teacher, but the unique social environment of the classroom is jointly constructed by the teacher, students and the texts...

Only when we know much more about how this environment is constructed and what role the textbook plays in it, can we begin to resolve the conflict about textbooks.

In the case of Lebanon, there is a need to examine how the two contending textbooks fare in terms of suitability for their intended purpose — development of academic L2 literacy. No studies were found that would have actually compared the two textbook types, but some concerns have been raised about both the traditional ELT materials and target language literature, while there is mounting evidence in favor of story-book based second language teaching. These are explored below.

CRITICISMS OF THE TRADITIONAL ELT TEXTBOOK

Traditional ELT textbooks have been based on the assumption that acquisition of syntactic features is a necessary precursor for conventional use of language (Larsen-Freeman and Long 1991). Although they have been used for decades and are produced for use around the world, they are not without critics. Traditional ELT textbooks have been criticized, for example, for having limited vocabularies, simple sentence structure, and lacking in literal form (Fielding et al 1984). The short sentences and controlled syntax that are associated with traditional materials, have
been argued to offer limited opportunity to deepen learners' awareness of the new language (Hill and Reid Thomas 1988).

David Crystal (1987:15) has delivered perhaps the harshest criticism against traditional materials. He has accused them of being 'stiff imitations of the spontaneity of real life', describing their characters as 'nice, decent and characterless', and the situations as 'generally unreal and dull'. Crystal also worries about the artificiality of the traditional texts, which present language that is very different from that which children have learned to expect. For instance, many ELT texts still retain the young learner in the simple present verb tense for up to three years (or more); yet it is unreal unless one will assume, as Crystal points out, the context of a sports commentary. A rather harsh judgement, indeed, but two examples from a typical ELT textbook for primary school learners help illustrate what Crystal perhaps means (the examples are provided by this author, not by Crystal):

Ben is late. He brushes his teeth and washes his face in a hurry. He dresses quickly...He dashes to the office, but the office is empty! Oh no! It's Saturday! Poor Ben. He wishes he was back in bed (Walker 1996:74).

It does sound somewhat like a sports commentary perhaps, and would undoubtedly sound more natural if presented in the narrative, using the simple past tense. The following text offers another example:

I always get up at seven o'clock. I have breakfast in the kitchen with my family....I always watch TV and play with my toys... At half past nine I say 'good night' to my mother and father' (Ellis & Bowen 1998:10).

This, too, is perhaps 'unreal', 'stiff', and 'dull'. Yet, in the context of teaching specific structures, such as the 3rd person singular -s, which is the objective in
the first example, or the habitual present tense of the second example, these approaches may seem justified from the structural perspective.

More importantly, the second example above is also reflective of what this researcher maintains to be a pervasive ethnocentric perception about what constitutes universal experience by authors of language textbooks produced in the western cultures for export. To use Phillipson’s term, it is reflective of ‘educational imperialism’ (1992:61-63). Although having breakfast in the kitchen, watching TV, and playing with toys are perhaps experiences shared by children in the western countries in particular, they do not necessarily mirror the daily experiences of children in other parts of the world. Even within western cultures, children in impoverished and underprivileged areas, or in some ethnic immigrant communities, may not readily relate to this scenario. It is reminiscent of the stereotypical world in the old ‘Dick and Jane’ readers where everybody was white, middle class and comfortable, and where all children had two parents, a nice house, and time to play with toys.

Difficulties may arise when young learners and their language learning texts inhabit separate worlds, as Gregory (1996) has shown. She gives an example of the young British-born Tony from a Cantonese family trying to reconstruct the meaning of a story, where the concepts related to breakfast are very different from those in Tony’s background experience at home.

However, the main problem is not the cultural content itself, which can arguably contribute to learning, as will be discussed later on. Rather, it is the approach to the content that poses a concern; learners are expected to situate themselves in a culturally foreign environment and practice personally meaningful and relevant language. This gives rise to artificial communication with little or no personal
relevance. Artificial language and un-motivating content may distance students from reading and language learning. Bruno Bettelheim has recognized the significance that reading material has for the developing child and for the way children learn to understand the world and themselves. If reading material is 'so shallow in substance that little of significance can be gained', reading 'becomes devalued when what one has learned to read adds nothing of importance to one's life' (1986:4). Although Bettelheim's remarks do not refer to L2 learners, one can easily draw an analogy between L1 reading material and materials used in an L2 class. One need only to substitute the word 'language' for 'reading' in Bettelheim's statement to understand its significance in ELT instruction. Exton and O'Rourke (1993) have expressed a similar concern. They worry that reading and language activities generated by the typical basal reader texts (referred to as reading scheme books in the UK) fail to offer readers any satisfaction and may actually foster a notion that 'reading and perhaps language in general involves the expenditure of effort upon texts that give back neither pleasure nor information in return' (27-28). This will reduce motivation and affect achievement.

Given these criticisms and the often critical significance of L2 learning for many learners, one needs to investigate whether or not the ELT textbooks generate the kinds of meaningful interactions that are associated with successful L2 learning.

**LITERATURE-BASED LANGUAGE TEACHING**

**Background**

In the 'battle of the books' in Lebanon, the traditional ELT textbook is challenged by the reading textbook intended for native English-speaking children, referred to as Native English Speaker (NES) courses in this study. In the United...
States, these primarily literature-based courses have replaced the traditional skills-based 'basal readers', or 'reading scheme books', in reading instruction in many areas. In 1989, seven states had statewide literature/literacy initiatives and 16 others had programs hinging upon the use of literature (Cullinan 1989:29). By 1993, many states and the United States Department of Education had officially endorsed the inclusion of literature in reading and language arts instruction (Sweet 1993). The literature-based courses have found their way also into many ESL programs. These courses consist of anthologies of authentic fiction and non-fiction written by award-winning children's authors, not for children to learn language from but to read for pleasure. These 'real books' based programs also include explicit teaching of reading comprehension skills, writing skills, and language usage.

The notion of using literature in language teaching is not new. Skillings (1995) traces the research in the study of literature in primary schools to the Dartmouth Conference of 1966, where a group of British and American educators exchanged ideas about English teaching practices and perspectives. Promoters of literature for language teaching draw much of their thinking from the work of Dewey (1933), Piaget (1970), and Vygotsky (1986), and the belief that children are active participants in their learning, constructing their own understanding as they interpret their environment and experiences. This belief underpinned the 'organic reading' approach construed by Sylvia Ashton-Warner (1974) and the 'shared book experience' developed by Don Holdaway (1982) in New Zealand pre-schools. Their work gave an impetus to the move toward an integrated approach to teaching the four language skills; listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The holistic trend was further significantly influenced by the work of Ken Goodman (1973) and Frank Smith (1985). Their arguments, which
were made against the discrete skills-based reading instruction, were that 'children learn to read by reading' (Smith 1983:5), and that 'people learn to talk by talking, comprehend oral language by listening, write by writing, and read by reading. And they learn to think by thinking' (Goodman et al 1987:7). Their arguments are supported by extensive L1 research, which shows that children do not learn and construct language very well by working on fragmented skills in isolation from social context. Halliday (1975), and Kamii (1991), have also stressed the social nature of language development in particular. They believe that children construct language by interacting with and manipulating language, and by engaging in meaningful use of language within a community of language learners.

Benefits of literature on language development

Children and story-books are a natural match, because in their narrative form, stories respond to the universal human need for narrative (Hardy 1978). Bruner (1986), Meek (1988), and Wells (1986) view narrative as a significant, if not a vital, part of children's cognitive development, including their understanding of human character. Stories socialize children into the values and mores of their society (Applebee 1978), foster character development (Bettelheim 1975), and nurture emotional intelligence (Ghosn 2000).

There are several benefits associated with literature and language development that are relevant in the FLAPPS class. First, literature presents a variety of discussion topics. The possibilities range from the literal ones to those that transcend the story and allow children to link the story to their own lives, at times making sophisticated generalizations, as McConaghy (1990) has pointed out. Talking
about literary texts can also ‘foster the development of competencies essential to an educated mind’ (Raphael et al. 1998:116). One such competency is perspective taking, whether historical, cultural, gendered or individual. Thus literature can both facilitate cognitive development and promote meaningful interaction that is necessary for children’s language development.

Literature contributes to vocabulary development and reading comprehension. The following examples from 1st language classes demonstrate the beneficial influence of literature in this respect. In the US, grade one children in two classes, where story-books were used, developed vocabularies 18 times larger than what could be expected in a skills-based reading program (Gunderson and Shapiro 1988:433). Cohen (1968) found that listening to stories daily and completing appropriate follow-up activities resulted in significant gains in vocabulary, word knowledge, and reading comprehension for 285 second grade students in New York City as compared to results of the control group. Carol Chomsky (1972) investigated the relationship of the rate of language development and exposure to written materials among thirty-six children (ages 6 to 10). She found a positive correlation between both the amount and complexity of books children were exposed to and their stage of language development. Also, national assessment data from the US shows that grade 4 students (ages 9-10) who were in programs with heavy emphasis on literature-based reading instruction scored higher in reading proficiency than those in programs with little or no literature (Analyzing the NAEP data 1993-94). Wolman-Bonilla (1989) shows how three 4th grade children improved their reading ability through personal responses to and questions about stories they read.
Although writing is beyond the scope of this research study, its importance in academic literacy is well recognized, thus meriting a look at the research that shows a positive relationship between story-books and writing skill development. DeFord (1981) and Eckhoff (1983) both found that children's writing reflected the linguistic structures, format, and style of their reading books. Mikkelsen (1984) systematically exposed children to fantasy and folklore and then elicited stories from them. She found that the writing children generated was mostly literature-based and paralleled methods employed by professional writers in adapting folk tales. Similarly, Dressel (1990) found that forty-eight fifth graders' quality of writing significantly improved when they read and discussed stories of high literary quality. The improvement was noted in all the children, regardless of their reading ability.

Literature comes in different genres, and Cullinan et al (1983) argue, citing a 1982 National Association of Educational Progress Report, that there is a relationship between the type of reading materials and development of reading comprehension skills. According to them, children become better readers when they read across different genres than when concentrating on one particular genre, such as non-fiction, for example. In Britain, Wray and Lewis' (1997) studies have been concerned with the over-emphasis on narrative at the expense of non-fiction reading and argue for using non-fiction books to develop literacy skills. Taken together, the studies of Cullinan et al, Wray and Lewis, and others suggest that a balanced approach to academic literacy development will draw on both fiction and non-fiction literature. It is just this type of balance that characterizes the literature-based NES course reading books investigated in this study.
Finally, literature-based programs affect children's ability to express their ideas. Strickland (1973) found that an experimental group of five year old African American Kindergarten children from low socio-economic backgrounds expanded their standard English forms (without damage to their home dialect) through daily exposure to literature and follow-up activities. Similar results were found when the study was replicated with primary school children (Cullinan et al 1974). Strickland et al (1989) investigated the quality of talk of primary school children when discussing literature in literature response groups. They found that children developed competence in organizing their explanations, learned to modify their speech according to the purpose and audience, and developed their analytical ability.

LITERATURE IN SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING

Increasing popularity

The benefits described above help explain why literature has become also increasingly popular in second language classrooms. In the North American ESL context, the use of literature, or 'real books', for second language teaching has followed the trend observed in the first language reading programs. The popularity of the approach is evident from the proliferation of presentations in professional conferences and papers in educational journals that describe the benefits of literature in ESL. A large selection of teacher support material also exists in the field, and literary selections (albeit many of them abridged and simplified) are now a standard feature in many US-produced ESL textbooks intended for primary school children. In some areas, whole school districts have adopted a literature-based whole language approach to the instruction of bilingual children. One example is the West Contra

Rationale for literature in L2 teaching

That literature should be considered for language teaching is embedded in the notion that 'story is the fundamental grammar of all thought and communication' (Chambers 1985:59). Based on this, MacLean (1990:249) has suggested that literature can 'provide a critical link between languages'. Promoters of literature for language teaching also suggest that literature enables students to move beyond word and sentence-level awareness of language to a more 'overall awareness' that includes differences in discourse sequence, the ways words link, and the understanding of inferences (Lazar 1994: 116). Literature is full of examples of different real life situations, thus providing language in a variety of registers within a clearly defined context of a discourse. It can thus promote awareness of language use, which Widdowson (1978:3 cited in McKay 1986) has defined as knowing how to use language rules for communication. It may also help learners to internalize the language through extensive experiences of linguistic items.

Gregory (1996:117-118) presents a model that is of particular interest in the FLAPPS context. She proposes that story-books can provide scaffolding for young second language learners by developing what she refers to as 'knowledge centres'. For example, the lexical knowledge center reinforces collocation and word association, the orthographic/graphophonic knowledge center helps develop
awareness of letter and sound patterns, and the syntactic knowledge center provides useful chunks of language (see Figure 5.1).

Figure 5.1  *Story-Books and 'Knowledge Centres'*

*From: Gregory 1996:118*

What is especially relevant in Gregory's model for young learners in the FLAPPS context is not only the development of linguistic knowledge centers, but also the semantic knowledge center, which widens the learner's range of awareness of cultural concepts, different ways of life, and universal values. In addition to the
culturally oriented knowledge that Gregory considers, literature can also broaden the learner's knowledge base of history and social issues, depending upon the type of literature chosen.

Although Gregory's model is based on story-books rather than literature-based reading courses, it is relevant in the context of this study because the content of the NES course textbooks is drawn from a variety of story-books, or 'real books', of diverse genres. In addition, due to the dramatic increase in enrollment of minority students in North American public schools (Wood 1989), the literature-based reading books of the NES courses have taken on an increasing multicultural focus. For instance, two of the popular NES course texts on the Lebanese market, Celebrate Reading (Scott Foresman 1995) and The HBJ Reading Program, Laureate Edition (Cullinan et al 1989), both feature multicultural literature. Selections include fables and folk tales from different cultures, realistic fiction with characters reflecting a variety of ethnic backgrounds in diverse cultural settings, multicultural historical fiction, informational selections on science topics, and so on. Young L2 learners are thus exposed to a variety of content that not only helps develop their knowledge centers but also content within which they may well find culturally familiar concepts and ideas.

Influence of literature on ESL

Research evidence from ESL contexts supports the use of literature for second language instruction. ESL context here refers to 'core English-speaking countries', meaning countries 'in which the dominant group are native speakers of English' (Phillipson (1992:17).
For example, Tunnell and Jacobs (1989:472) report findings from a program in New York, where 225 predominantly NNS Kindergarten children (KG children in the USA are about 6 years old) were exposed to an immersion program in English-language children's literature. These NNS children learned to read picture story-books and class dictated stories in English by the end of the year. Some of these NNS Kindergarten children actually reached grade 2 reading level in English, their L2, a remarkable achievement even for NS children. This success could perhaps be understood when examining the interactions in classes using literature.

The positive effects of a story-book are demonstrated in Carger's (1993) study of three 5-6-year old Spanish-speaking Kindergarten children in a low-income section of Chicago. The children were identified by a standardized assessment measure as having little or no knowledge of English grammar and vocabulary. The researcher used a picture story-book where the main character discovers the pleasure of pretend reading. Through the story, the three subjects were introduced to the concept of pretend reading. In the following week, another picture story-book, *Louie*, by Ezra Jack Keats (Greenville Books 1975), was read to the children three times. After each reading, the children worked to make a puppet from the story and pretend read to the teacher. The pretend readings were done individually in a separate room and audiotaped. The results showed increases from the first pretend reading to the third in students' total word counts, in two-syllable or more words, meaning units, and target vocabulary. The increases in total word count ranged from 66 to 106 words, the biggest gains noted in the child who began with the lowest count (30 as opposed to 104 and 169). Increases in two-syllable or more words ranged from 30 to 38, with the target vocabulary increasing from 0 to 4 words in one case and from 4 to 6 and 7 in
the other two cases. The meaning units of the children nearly doubled, displaying growth in their ability to express thoughts about the story.

Urzua's (1992) survey of five North American multilingual grade 5 classrooms, where literature study was a regular feature, found that interaction and dialogue were central to these classes. Teachers in these classes adjusted their interactions in a number of ways, including modification of input, repetitions and paraphrasing, all strategies identified with L2 learning. Children in the program identified the opportunity to interact and share ideas as the most enjoyable feature of the literature study sessions, attesting to Vygotsky's notion of the social nature of learning. What Urzua does not mention, however, and that is worth asking, is how the children in the study fared in the development of the four language skills.

One more example demonstrating the potential of target language literature is that of Eade's (1997) study of three bilingual learners in the UK. Her study, which was carried over a period of four weeks, used a story, Look out he's behind you (Bradman, Methuen Books 1989). A variety of activities that were generated from the story by the researcher were found to have a positive influence on children's word attack skills, especially the use of picture and context clues. Eade also notes the significance of discussion in the process of bilingual children's L2 writing development. She also reports on the high motivational level of the learners.

A Tudor and Hafiz (1989) study that investigated the influence of reading on L2 writing is also relevant here because writing is an essential aspect of academic literacy. The study was a 3-month-long quasi-experimental study of sixteen Pakistani children, aged 10-11, in the UK. The researchers' basic premise was that extensive reading will result in L2 gains. No instruction took place, but children were given a
choice of graded stories to read. Findings show statistically significant (p<0.05) gains in all reading and writing tests. Significant gains were noted in syntactic, semantic and spelling accuracy while syntactic complexity declined. Subjects' writing became more simple and basic while it increased in accuracy. This is not surprising, especially in the light of above cited studies of DeFord (1981), Dressel (1990) and Mikkelsen (1984) from L1 contexts that showed children writing reflecting the style and structures of their reading materials. Tudor and Hafiz state that although subjects' vocabulary increased only slightly, it was used more appropriately. They do not, however, provide any examples of this.

**Influence of literature on EFL**

The positive influence of literature and storybooks on language learning has also been documented in a number of studies from countries, which, using Phillipson's (1992:17) definition, are 'periphery-English countries'. In many of these countries, although English may be one of the official languages or one of the instructional languages in the curriculum, children's exposure to English, particularly in the rural areas may be very limited, or non-existent, outside the classroom. These countries are considered here as EFL contexts. Especially relevant in the FLAPPSS context of this study are countries where development of academic L2 literacy is required. Research conducted about the influence of literature in such contexts, therefore, merits close inspection.

Extensive exposure to high-interest illustrated story-books, or 'book floods' (Elley and Mangubhai 1983:57), are one way to provide extensive exposure to L2 in the challenging contexts where children are obliged to receive their schooling in a non-
native language. This approach, which was envisioned by Warwick Elley and other researchers in New Zealand, is based on the 'Shared Reading' approach, attributed to Holdaway (1979). In the book flood program, students are exposed to either extensive shared reading experience or sustained silent reading of target language story-books. Central to the book flood programs is that teachers are trained to use story-books, which are made available in the classroom, as tools to teach new language through story reading, shared reading, and follow-up activities (Elley 2000).

Several book flood projects have been carried out since a 1978 study on the South Pacific island of Niue (Elley 1991:379-383) indicated benefits of a story-book approach on second language learning. Children (8 years old) in six schools were provided with L2 instruction using a program based on 48 reading books and the 'Shared Book Experience Approach' (Holdaway 1979) during one academic year. Post-tests revealed statistically highly significant differences between the experimental group and the control group in reading comprehension and oral language (p<.01) and in word recognition (p<.001).

One of the most extensive 'book flood' studies is an eight-month quasi-experimental study of over 600 grade 4 and 5 students (380 in two experimental groups and 234 in a control group) and 16 teachers in Fiji (Mangubhai and Elley 1982; Elley and Mangubhai 1983). The findings show that reading of story-books resulted in significant gains in the rate of development of both reading and listening comprehension skills. Two experimental groups in the study were each subjected to a different intervention. The first group was taught using the shared book experience while the other engaged in sustained silent reading (SSR) with no specific instruction. The control group continued with the traditional language program. At the end of the
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intervention, bigger gains were noted in both experimental groups than in the control group. A one-year follow-up program with a hundred additional books showed also significant gains in the two experimental groups' progress as compared to the gains of the control group. A total of seven language tests were administered to assess reading and listening comprehension, writing, awareness of structures, and oral repetition. These showed the effect size ranging from 0.76 to 1.18 in favor of the experimental groups. What is particularly noteworthy from the FLAPPS perspective, is that the greatest gains from extra reading were in reading and listening, and that the positive effects carried over to other subject matter areas.

Several similar projects have been carried out during the past two decades. Elley et al (1996) report results from Singapore and Sri Lanka. In Singapore, two groups of students (256 experimental and 256 controls) in 60 schools were subjected to a 'book flood' of some 60 story-books per class. The results of this Reading and English Acquisition Program (REAP) showed such significant improvements of both reading and writing that the concept was adopted into the primary education curriculum. In Sri Lanka, year 4 and 5 students in 20 schools were subjected to story-reading for 15-20 minutes a day for about five months. Pre- and post-tests of reading, which compared the achievement of the 'book flood' students with a control group, showed 11% growth in the experimental year 4 group but only 4% growth in the control group. The year 5 project group showed gains of 9-10% while the controls showed growth of 3% (Elley et al op cit:12). Particularly significant in terms of FLAPPS classes, is the finding in the Sri Lankan study that performance in writing appeared to be linked to reading, leading to speculation that 'apparently, reading ability is a prerequisite for writing ability in a second language' (Elley et al op cit:13).
In South Africa, a Johannesburg based organization, READ Education Trust, has been working for 16 years with story-books, and, based on teacher ratings, is successful in promoting fluency in reading and confidence in using English (Elley et al 1996). Elley (2000) reports on one empirical evaluation of these programs, which are also known as 'Sunshine in South Africa', based on the Sunshine story series (Wendy Pye, Ltd). Year 2 and 3 students (ages 7-9) in 35 schools in six provinces in South Africa were administered pretests of reading and listening. The intervention program was then implemented in 22 schools during nine months while the remaining 13 schools continued with their regular programs. Post tests showed a Mean difference of 13.2 in reading gains between the year 2 group and 6.71 in the year 3 group, the effect size being 0.64. A writing assessment administered to the year 3 group revealed an association between reading and writing; students who read often, wrote 'coherent and interesting sentences' (Elley et al 2000: 245).

The earlier cited Tudor and Hafiz (1989) study was replicated by Hafiz and Tudor (1990) in Pakistan, where they examined the effect of extensive reading of graded readers on the written production of L2 learners in a 23-week intervention program with fifty (25 E; 25 C) adolescents (ages 15-16). Students chose from a selection of 106 simplified readers, with reading allocated six 40-minute sessions a week. No specific instruction accompanied the reading. The basic premise of the researchers was that extensive reading will improve students' written expression. The researchers report that the control group was stronger in the pre-test while the post-test showed significant gains by the experimental group. Gains were made in writing readiness, vocabulary base, and accuracy expression. No significant gains were noted.
in syntactic maturity. While students wrote more, their vocabulary ratio declined. Hafiz and Tudor argue that the gains resulted from the input provided by the graded readers. However, the gains could simply be due to additional exposure to the language. In other words, they may have resulted from the quantity (a total of 92 hours) and not the type of exposure, since the controls did not benefit from any type of additional exposure to the target language. The authors do not provide any examples of the actual writing output of either group.

Aranha (1985) investigated the influence of sustained silent reading (SSR) on fourth grade students in one school in Bombay. She reports a 2.19 mean change in test scores in favor of the SSR group ($t=2.38, p<.01$). The difference in attitude scores was also statistically significant at alpha level .01. (Aranha does not report detailed figures.)

Two anecdotal reports, one in Lebanon and the other in Hungary, show the strong motivating influence of a well-selected story. Ghosn (1997) describes a week-long Kindergarten project in Lebanon, which involved twenty-six 4-year old L2 learners with Eric Carle's now classic story, *The Very Hungry Caterpillar* (Philomel Books, 1987). Although no pre- and post-tests were administered, the classroom observations and teacher reports show that children used vocabulary and phrases from the story during their free play. Motivational level of the children was high throughout the project and the teacher reported children being reluctant to give up the work on the story at the end of the project. As there was no follow-up to the project, however, it is not possible to say whether any learning took place and, if so, how lasting it was.

The other example that attests to the motivational influence of a good story is reported by Machura (1995). She presents a delightful description of her 'advanced
12-year-olds' in Hungary enthusiastically working through the same caterpillar story mentioned above. Although Machura does not report anything about achievement, she notes the students' level of sustained interest and motivation. The appeal of this particular story to such a large age span demonstrates the power of skillfully constructed narrative, represented through the language that is both rich and predictable in its repetitious features. The skillful and colorful illustrations undoubtedly add to the appeal as they not only clarify and extend the language, but also provide a visually aesthetic experience as well.

The empirical studies cited above suggest that extensive reading of story-books has a positive influence on language learners' receptive skills and may also influence productive skills. Some anecdotal evidence points to the motivational power of story-books. The book based studies cited above, when reflected in the context of the literature review on interactions, give rise to some questions that are pertinent in the context of this research study:

1. Did the recorded gains result from the quantity of exposure to L2, as might have been the case with Aranha (1985) and Hafiz and Tudor (1990) studies? Or,

2. did the gains result from the reading of story-books, and, if so, would extensive reading of some other type of material produce similar gains?

Or,

3. were the gains a result of the interactions that the story-books generated, as might be speculated based on the book flood projects, and, if so, could some other type of material generate similar interactions?
The third question is particularly interesting because Elley et al's (1996) report indicates that, in order for the book flood program to produce gains, teachers must receive training in effective use of the books. Yet, none of these projects investigated how the teachers actually used the books and what kind of interactions took place. This is particularly surprising in the light of shared reading and discussion about stories being an essential element in these projects. It would therefore be important to investigate how different teachers use story-books, and what happens when teachers and students interact around texts. This is particularly pertinent since there are some concerns about the use of literature in language teaching, as will be shown below.

Concerns about literature in language teaching

Although theoretical and research evidence indicates that literature, or 'real books', might benefit the second language learner, some concerns have been raised about the use of literature for language teaching that merit examination. The first concern is the possibly difficult vocabulary, complicated syntax, and use of metaphors common in literature. These are considered by some not to facilitate teaching of grammar or promote academic learning (McKay 1986). The second is the learners' literary competence, meaning the awareness of literary conventions that facilitate interpretation of text (Lazar 1994). This might be of particular concern for young ELLs who have not yet developed this competence in their L1. Literature is also a reflection of culture and, although it can contribute to cultural awareness, it often features culture-specific concepts, which may pose difficulty for learners (Gregory 1996; McKay 1986). Cultural content may be particularly problematic for young learners whose knowledge about the world is still limited. In other words, the content might be too
decontextualized, to use Cummins’ term. In fact, the above arguments against the NES courses were frequently cited by the Lebanese distributor of British ELT texts before the Pearson–Scott Foresman merger.

It appears that, while much of what has been reported about ‘real books’ in terms of first and second language learning and literacy is positive in nature, very few studies have investigated the influence of story-books on EFL or FLAPPS classroom interactions. This is particularly note-worthy, given the recognized interactive nature of successful language learning on the one hand, and the evidence on the influence of story-books on interactions and language learning on the other. Given also the importance of the development of academic L2 literacy for Lebanese children on the one hand, and the current textbook controversy on the other hand, it seems appropriate to investigate the role of the language teaching textbook in classroom interactions and the development of academic L2 literacy.

SUMMARY OF THE LITERATURE REVIEW

From the literature review, presented in Chapters III-V, the following conclusions can be drawn. Second language learning is a complex process involving several interactive variables within the social interaction that happens in a meaningful, interactive context with appropriate scaffolding support. Learners need to receive input, produce language, and negotiate meanings. Evidence from the recent US-based studies show that academic second language skills are even more complex and time-consuming to master and are also characterized by the need for negotiated interaction. The needs of an academic subject matter class pose several challenges to the young ELLs, as it is necessary for them to develop a variety of language skills that
will enable them to access content area instruction in the target language. If, indeed, language learning and development of academic L2 literacy best happen within socially mediated, meaningful interactions, as has been suggested in the literature reviewed in the preceding chapters, the quantity and quality of interactions young language learners engage in become important issues that merit investigation. As far as the FLAPPS context is concerned, one must also keep in mind the evidence from the Canadian immersion programs; excessive focus on meaning at the expense of form may be ineffective in developing academic L2 literacy, which requires accuracy of expression.

Given the concerns raised about the traditional materials and the current interest in the efficacy of literature-based approaches that place emphasis on meaning as opposed to form, research into the use of target language literature for second language teaching is timely. Of particular concern within the context of this research study is what kind of input and what opportunities for negotiated meaningful interactions the FLAPPS class textbooks provide.

At the conclusion of the literature review, the following questions remain unanswered and, having bearing on the problem of this study, form the basis of the research questions in this study:

What actually happens in the classrooms where teachers and students interact around the two types of textbooks? More specifically:

a) Do the observed interactions reflect what is known about second language learning in general and about learning language for academic purposes in particular? In other words, to what extent do learners have the opportunity to receive meaningful input and engage in negotiated interactions about
interesting content, and how much scaffolding and positive reinforcement do they receive?

b) Do classes using the two different types of textbooks differ in terms of interactions? In other words, what type of IRF sequences can be observed, what kind of teacher talk and student output is generated, and what kind of feedback is provided?

c) Do students in these classes differ in their reading comprehension?

The following chapter sets up the research methodology to investigate these questions.

CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter has reviewed the literature on the potential role of language teaching textbooks in language learning and some specific criteria suggested for successful materials. It reviewed literature that addressed the two types of textbooks under investigation. Traditional ELT textbooks have been criticized by some as not meeting the criteria for successful second language course materials, whereas authentic target language literature has been suggested as an alternative to the traditional texts. Evidence from primary school ESL programs suggests that literature provides opportunities for meaningful interaction, thus facilitating L2 learning. Literature has also been argued to foster thinking skills, an important consideration in FLAPPS programs. Some concerns presented about the use of literature were also
described. The chapter has reviewed the rather limited existing research on the role of stories on EFL achievement, which indicate that story reading has a potentially positive influence on some aspects of L2 learning. Research on what EFL teachers and learners actually do and how they interact around literature in the classroom with the materials were not found. The chapter concluded with a summary of the literature review and presented questions remaining to be investigated.
CHAPTER VI - RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Let's pretend there's a way of getting through into it somehow ... Let's pretend the glass has got soft like gauze, so we can get through.

Lewis Carroll, Through the Looking Glass

INTRODUCTION

This chapter begins by re-stating the purpose of the study and defining the research questions. It then defines the paradigm within which the study is situated and provides a rationale for the approach used in carrying out the research study. The chapter presents the main research question and explains how this determined the approach to data collection followed by an outline of the phases of the project and a description of the sampling procedures. It then describes the methods and instruments used and outlines the data collection and recording procedures. This is followed by a description of the data analysis procedures and the rationale for them. The chapter concludes by discussing the methodology in terms of validity, reliability and fitness for purpose.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

As mentioned in the Introduction, this research study examines interactions in six 5th grade English language classrooms in Lebanon in an attempt to discover whether different textbooks could be said to generate different interactions. The main
premise of the study is that it is possible to identify in classroom interactions features associated with L2 learning and development of L2 academic literacy.

**RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

The main hypothesis was that the group using an ELT course would differ in classroom interactions from the group using a NES course. The null hypothesis was that interactions in the two textbook groups would not differ. It was also hypothesized that the aims and tasks of the two textbooks would differ, resulting in different opportunities for interactions. Finally, it was hypothesized that the two groups would differ in their reading performance.

**First research question**

The three major research questions therefore were:

1. What kind of interactions can be observed in the classrooms using traditional English language teaching materials and native English speakers' (NES) reading materials?

   More specifically, the following aspects of interactions were examined:

   a) Teacher talk: What kind of input does teacher talk provide? What kind of explanations do teachers use? What type of questions do teachers ask? What is the nature of feedback that teachers provide, and is there evidence of scaffolding? Do teachers model negotiation of meaning?

   b) Student talk: What type of communication do students engage in? What type of responses do students give? Do students initiate interactions and, if so, what kind? Do students engage in negotiation of meaning?
c) Focus of interactions: What do the interactions focus on: meaning or linguistic form?

d) Content of interactions: What are the interactions about: language, lesson content, real world ideas, or procedures?

Given the purpose of this study—to identify, analyze, and compare interactions—the first research question was formulated in terms of four sub-questions corresponding to three elements (identify, analyze, compare) of the purpose statement. The sub-questions were:

a) What is the frequency and quality of the particular interactions observed?

b) To what extent are the observed interactions associated with what is known about:
   i. L2 learning?
   ii. learning L2 for academic purposes?

c) Do classes using the two different textbook types differ in the observed interactions?

**Second research question**

2. What are the aims of the tasks in the two types of coursebooks, and what opportunities do they provide for interactions?

More specifically, the following aspects of the textbooks were considered:

a) Who are the intended audience of the books?

b) What types of tasks and activities do the books provide?

c) What type of interactions do the tasks generate from learners?
Third research question

3. Do students in these classes differ in their L2 reading performance and, if so, how?

More specifically, the following aspects were investigated:

a) Do students using different coursebooks differ in their general reading comprehension?

b) Do students using different coursebooks differ in their ability to follow written schoolwork directions?

c) Do students using different coursebooks differ in their reading comprehension of specific subject matter texts, particularly science and mathematics?

Variables

The independent variable in the study was the language teaching textbook. The primary dependent variables, which were not manipulated in any way, were the classroom interactions, more specifically the teacher questions, explanations and feedback and student responses, initiations and reading comprehension.

BASIC GUIDING PRINCIPLES

This study is based on the belief that classroom interactions, as any human behavior, are complex phenomena, which are best understood within the contexts in which they occur; any attempt to isolate them or to manipulate the context (such as is the case with laboratory-based experimental research) is likely to have an impact on the phenomena investigated, thus possibly contaminating the findings. As Lincoln and Guba (1985:189) have stated, ‘phenomena ... take their meaning as much from their contexts as they do from themselves’ (emphasis in the original). One cannot
distinguish a single cause for the L2 learning phenomenon, as a number of variables are in constant interaction with each other, thus continuously shaping themselves and influencing each other. There is no ‘single and fragmentable’ reality in L2 learning and development of L2 academic literacy, but the ‘realities are multiple’, generalizations are ‘context- and time-specific’, and must therefore be examined in context and from a holistic perspective. If classroom interactions are to be understood, then they must be studied in their natural context, the classroom. The beliefs delineated above represent the post-positivist paradigm of naturalist inquiry as described by Lincoln and Guba (1985:37). In Johnson’s (2001:9) new classification of nonexperimental quantitative research, this study is of a descriptive, cross-sectional type: it primarily describes and documents classroom interactions, the phenomenon under investigation, and the data are collected during a relatively short period of time and comparisons made across the variables.

**METHOD**

**Rationale for the method**

To answer the research questions, data were collected from six classrooms where teachers and students engaged in their routine daily activities. This enabled the researcher to ‘identify, describe and relate, in intersubjective terms, actions and contributions of participants ... in such a way that their significance for language learning can be understood’ (Van Lier 1988:47).
Stages of the study

This study spanned over a period of four years as shown in Table 6.1 below.

Table 6.1  Timetable of the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer – Fall 1997</td>
<td>Reviewing literature</td>
<td>Off-site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defining limits of the study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring – Summer 1998</td>
<td>Selecting of samples</td>
<td>Off-site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gaining access to the sites</td>
<td>On-site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Piloting of the instruments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1998</td>
<td>Administering the teacher questionnaires</td>
<td>On-site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1998</td>
<td>Administering the NFER-Nelson Non-verbal reasoning test to assure similarity of groups</td>
<td>On-site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1998</td>
<td>First videotaping of observations</td>
<td>On-site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February – March 1999</td>
<td>Second videotaping of observations</td>
<td>On-site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1999</td>
<td>Administering the TORC-3 Reading Comprehension Test to compare groups' reading performance</td>
<td>On-site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring - Summer 1999</td>
<td>Transcribing of the videotapes</td>
<td>Off-site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coding of the transcripts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1999 – Spring 2000</td>
<td>Analyzing the quantitative data</td>
<td>Off-site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2000</td>
<td>Analyzing the textbook objectives and tasks</td>
<td>Off-site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Re-visiting the literature review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2000</td>
<td>Analyzing the qualitative data</td>
<td>Off-site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2001</td>
<td>Writing up the study</td>
<td>Off-site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Approach to data collection

Data collection was carried out during the 1998-1999 school year. Five types of data were collected in this research study. A theory-driven deductive approach was used to collect quantitative data about classroom interactions. Patterns of typical classroom interaction and variables associated with second language and academic L2 literacy development were derived from the literature review and used to develop an observation instrument to collect a priori categorized quantitative data from videotaped transcripts. A priori categories were selected, first because prior research indicated specific categories and, secondly, to avoid collection of excessive data that could compromise the efficacy and power of the analysis (Miles and Huberman 1994:35).

However, because of the recognized complexity of the phenomenon under investigation on the one hand, and the lack of prior research on the role of the textbook in classroom interactions on the other, it was deemed important to remain open and context-sensitive. Therefore, an exploratory, inductive approach was used to collect further qualitative information about classroom interactions from the transcripts. These data provided information about the nature of the exchanges within the interactions that would not have been accessible from a priori categorized data. Information regarding teachers' perceptions about the textbooks and student language learning was obtained through a questionnaire. The questionnaire was chosen as a method of gathering information about the teachers for two reasons. First, the questionnaire avoided the risk of the researcher bias in recording responses and, secondly, it minimized the time demand on the participating teachers who were all on a very tight schedule. Information about the textbooks was obtained by selecting
sample units and tasks found in the two types of textbooks. This enabled the observed interactions to be reflected against the tasks set in the textbook. Information about students' general reasoning ability and their reading comprehension skills was obtained through standardized tests. Detailed data collection and recording procedures are described in the section 'Procedures' below.

Sample selection and negotiating access

The participants in this study come from six 5th grade English classrooms in private English-medium schools in Lebanon. In order to understand interactions in typical Lebanese FLAPPS classrooms, a purposive sampling method was used, the selection of sites being based on informational rather than statistical considerations. The English-medium (EMI) schools in Lebanon can be situated along a continuum depending on the amount of subject matter that is delivered through English language, the onset of English-medium instruction, and the choice of the language teaching course (see Table 6.2 below). Some schools offer a choice of French- and English-medium instruction starting in middle school (grade 6; age 11-12) while delivering Mathematics and Science curriculum through Arabic or French in the primary grades. Social Studies, Civics, and Religion are taught in Arabic in the primary school.
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### Table 6.2  
**School Types Based on Onset and Amount of English Language Instruction and the Coursebook**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Onset of EMI</th>
<th>Medium of Science and Mathematics in Grades KG - 5</th>
<th>Medium of non-academic subjects in Grades KG - 5</th>
<th>English course</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Age 11-12</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ELT</td>
<td>0E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age 11-12</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ELT</td>
<td>0E(F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Age 11-12</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>Some English</td>
<td>ELT</td>
<td>1E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Age 11-12</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NES</td>
<td>0E(F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Kindergarten</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NES</td>
<td>2E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Kindergarten</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>NES</td>
<td>3E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the help of the list of private and charitable EMI schools provided by The British Council, schools within a reasonable driving distance from the researcher's university were identified in each category. Schools in seriously disadvantaged areas and schools with tuition fees above US $ 2000 were excluded, as they could not be considered typical. Personal inquiries were made with school Principals and English program coordinators in a number of schools known to the researcher. This approach was adopted as opposed to the more formal letter of inquiry, as social relationships in Lebanon are of the utmost importance in establishing trust. Once the approval of the Principal was obtained, individual teachers were contacted and the details of the project described (see section on subjects below). Six schools representing all the five 'Mouhafaza' (Governates) were finally selected for the study (see Figure 6.3 and
Appendix B for details). Four of the schools were affiliated with religious organizations (2 Christian and 2 Muslim) while two were secular. The schools can be said to be typical in that the large majority of the private schools in Lebanon fit within the same range in terms of size, cost and type, as shown in the records of the Ministry of Education. The English immersion schools are less typical in that the majority of them are located in the Greater Beirut area and are usually at the upper end of the tuition fee continuum. However, an immersion school was included in the study, firstly because these schools are increasing in number around the country, secondly, to have the complete range of programs included, and thirdly, to provide a point of comparison in terms of students' exposure to English outside the language class.

Codes are used to protect the privacy of the participating teachers and students. Detailed description of the schools is found in Appendix B.

Table 6.3  
Schools in the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Geographic location</th>
<th>Course Text</th>
<th>Code from Table 6.2</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>N. of Sts.</th>
<th>N. in study</th>
<th>Annual tuition at primary level (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1 Mount Lebanon</td>
<td>NES course</td>
<td>E2</td>
<td>Secular</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>700.-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2 Greater Beirut</td>
<td>NES course</td>
<td>0E(F)</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>800.-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3 North Lebanon</td>
<td>ELT course</td>
<td>0E(F)</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>800.-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4 Beqaa Valley</td>
<td>ELT course</td>
<td>1E</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>500.-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5 Greater Beirut</td>
<td>NES course</td>
<td>3E</td>
<td>Secular</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1,800.-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6 South Lebanon</td>
<td>ELT course</td>
<td>0E</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>800.-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 S5 provides extensive scholarships for needy students.
Ethical considerations

One of the core principles of research ethics requires the participants to give their 'informed consent' to be subjects of study (Mertens 1997:24). Amongst other things, informed consent implies awareness of the purpose of research, the procedures used, and the option to withdraw from the study at any time (Anderson 1998:18-19). After obtaining the approval of the principals, teacher consent was secured verbally during individual, face-to-face meetings with the prospective teachers. The purpose of the study was explained and the procedures and time demands of testing and videotaping described. Teachers were told that the videotapes would be transcribed and excerpts thereof analyzed and included in the final report. They were also told that observation sessions would be scheduled at their convenience, and that they could, at any time, deny access to their classroom, or withdraw from the study. The researcher also explained that the participants would have an opportunity to review the draft of the final report for accuracy of reporting. It was made clear to the teachers that their participation was voluntary. The six teachers selected for the study all expressed their enthusiasm to participate.

Since the study involved minors, parental consent to testing and videotaping had to be secured (Anderson op cit.). Once the teacher consent was obtained, the school principals were given a copy of the letter-of-consent form to be sent to the participating students' parents. (See Appendix C for a copy of the Arabic original and the English translation.)

SUBJECTS

The subjects in the study were six English language teachers (all female) and 163 primary grade 5 (ages 9-11) students (76 boys and 87 girls) in six private EMI
schools in Lebanon. Three of the classes (85 students) used an NES reading course as the instructional text in the English class, and the other three classes (78 students) used an ELT course.

**Teachers**

The participating teachers were between ages 27 and 35, with 4–10 years of teaching experience. All six had a university degree and four reported holding also a Teaching Diploma, while two were enrolled in a Diploma program in TEFL at the time of the study. Female teachers between ages 25–40 represent over 70% of all the private school teaching force and nearly 85% of the private primary school sector, and the most common teaching qualifications in the private primary schools are a BA or a Teaching Diploma (Ministry of Education 1998). All teachers in the study were full-time teachers, teaching 25-27 hours a week, a common workload for primary school teachers in Lebanon. The participating teachers fit this profile and could thus be considered to be typical. Individual teacher profiles are found in Appendix D.

**Students**

The students in the study were enrolled in Grade 5 and had received formal English instruction for 5 years, since Kindergarten. Grade 5 was selected as the focus of the study because, at the time when this research study commenced, Grade 6 was the first year in the Intermediate cycle, meaning that also the ELT course students would be receiving EMI instruction in mathematics, science, and technology². The mother tongue of all but two students in the study was Arabic, more specifically the dialect commonly spoken in the Eastern Mediterranean region, known as Eastern
Arabic. Two students were Armenians, bilingual in Armenian and Eastern Arabic. One student had an American mother, with both English and Arabic spoken at home. Students were judged to come primarily from the middle socio-economic group, with parent occupations (as reported by the Principals) ranging from employee to high professional. In each school, the occupations ranged from drivers and company employees to small business owners to doctors and engineers. This is not unusual as in a typical Lebanese private school one can find a relatively wide mix of socio-economic backgrounds, particularly in the schools operated by religious bodies. This is due to the tendency of Lebanese families to make every possible effort to educate their children in private schools. It is not uncommon for families to liquidate assets, such as plots of land, to secure private education for their children. In board-governed, non-profit private schools, such as S5, scholarships are available for needy students to assure a socio-economically mixed student body. A comparison of the NFER-Nelson Non-verbal Reasoning test scores showed the six classes to come from the same population (Fobs 1.492 with alpha level set at 0.01).

INSTRUMENTS USED

Observation schedule

An observation instrument with a category system was used to collect data on interactions. In this system, an event is coded each time it occurs (Chaudron 1988).

There exist hundreds of observation instruments for describing classroom behaviors of both teachers and students (see, for example Simon and Boyer 1974).

---

2 In the new system, which became effective in Fall 2000, Grade 7 is the first grade of the Intermediate level.
and numerous ones have been developed specifically for second language classrooms (see Allwright and Bailey 1991; Malamah-Thomas 1987). Several prior observation schedules were consulted, both those developed for language classes and those aimed at content area classes (e.g. Flanders 1970; Galton 1978; Moskowitz 1967, 1971; Fanselow 1977; Long et al 1976; Sinclair and Coulthard 1975; Ullman and Geva, 1982; Allen et al 1984). However, none of the prior observation schedules was deemed adequate for the purposes of this research study, which attempted to examine interactions germane to both L2 learning and development of academic L2 literacy.

The observation schedule categories for teacher and student interactions were derived from features associated in research literature with L2 learning and development of academic literacy in the second language, and they were guided by the previous observation schedules. A hierarchical coding system was adapted from Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) system as follows. The interactional moves were categorized first by the turn as Teacher (T), Student (S), and Class/ group of students (Cl). Teacher and student turns were further categorized as Initiation, Response, and Feedback moves. The moves were then coded into functional acts and categorized by type (see Appendix F for details of categories). This organization of the categories enabled collapsing of the data in various ways to form super-ordinate categories. This latter feature will enable the findings to be compared to previous research studies. Table 6.4 below shows the previous instruments from which categories were either borrowed or adapted for this research study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument consulted</th>
<th>Author Year</th>
<th>Categories in the original instrument</th>
<th>Categories as used in or adapted for this study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'uses S ideas'</td>
<td>T rejects: brief/verbatim repetition; appropriating/elaborating S ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'Language'</td>
<td>T responds to S elicitation: brief/T own idea; appropriating/elaborating on S idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'Life'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'Subject matter'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'Procedure'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOCUS (Foci for Observing Communications Used in Settings)</td>
<td>Fanselow (1977)</td>
<td>'Language'</td>
<td>These categories were not included in the observation instrument but were considered in the qualitative data analysis: Language Lesson content Personal/real life information Procedures and classroom management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'Life'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'Subject matter'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'Procedure'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'Genuine questions'</td>
<td>Open, referential questions (Student genuine and pseudo-communication)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'Clarification request; elaboration request'</td>
<td>Negotiation of meaning: Repetition; clarification request/comprehension check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* These are similar to 'display' / 'referential' questions of Long &amp; Sato (1983)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAIM-Categories for cognitive levels of Analysis Interaction Model</td>
<td>Shible and Minnis (1974)</td>
<td>'Data recall'</td>
<td>Data recall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'Data processing'</td>
<td>Data processing (incorporates 'data analysis')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'Data analysis'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Elements of classroom interaction included in the observation schedule.

The following provides a brief description of the elements of classroom interaction that were identified in the literature review as being associated with second language learning and development of L2 academic literacy. These elements form the basis for the observation schedule categories:

Teacher talk

1. Teacher uses a varied questioning strategy, but asks frequent open-ended questions that both invite the learners to process the target language and/or new information and provide sufficient cognitive challenge to maintain student motivation.

2. Teacher talk does not dominate; teacher explains and engages in direct teaching when necessary.

3. Teacher models negotiation of meaning through repeating and paraphrasing student utterances, checking for understanding and asking for clarification.

4. Teacher provides support through feedback that is more accepting than rejecting, thus creating a safe environment for learners to try out the new language.

5. Teacher is responsive to student contributions, provides scaffolding through incorporating student ideas in the feedback, and responds to student-generated questions.

Student talk

1. Students engage in genuine communication by displaying their knowledge by recalling and processing data, and by talking about ideas of personal interest.
Pseudo-communication (reading aloud, reciting from memory and producing teacher- or text-prompted language) is minimal.

2. Students negotiate meaning by repeating another's utterance, checking for comprehension and asking clarifying questions.

3. Students initiate questions and make unsolicited statements about language, the lesson content or the real world.

Class talk

1. There is minimal 'chorusing' talk from the class that prevents speakers from attending to individual contributions and thus limiting opportunities for negotiation of meaning and scaffolding.

The observation schedule consists of

a) a general description of the 30 categories (see Appendix E) addressing the above listed elements that are derived from the literature review and the criteria for scoring interactions within the category; and

b) a scoring sheet used for recording interactions from the transcribed lesson excerpts (Appendix F) that provides a brief descriptive summary of each item, as well as space for tallying events.

Unit of analysis

A number of structural and functional units for analyzing second language discourse have been developed (see Crookes 1990 for an overview). A "turn", 'one or more streams of speech bounded by speech of another' (Crookes 1990:185), was first considered as a possible unit of analysis. However, the pilot phase of the observation
instrument confirmed the weakness of a turn as a unit of analysis identified by Van Lier (1988). A turn is too limited and may, in fact, produce misleading findings. For example, a single word interjected into the discourse counts as a turn just as a several-sentences long contribution. To illustrate, here is a series of ‘turns’ as defined by Crookes from one of the pilot classes:

Teacher: Name one season ... Give me the name of one season.
Student 1: Spring
Teacher: We are in Spring. In which month we are?
Student 2: In Spring
Teacher: Which month?
Student 1: In May
Teacher: So, what is the weather like in Spring? How is the weather in Spring?
Class: Very nice

If a turn is used as the unit of analysis, we can accurately say that both the teacher and students had four turns. However, this will not tell us much about the nature of the interaction in terms of how long each turn was and who really held the floor, in this example the teacher. Therefore, a turn was discarded as a unit of analysis.

After a review of the literature of second language discourse analysis, ‘utterance’ was chosen for the unit of analysis as it is defined by Crookes and Rulon (1985:9 cited in Crookes 1990:187) to be:

a stream of speech with at least one of the following characteristics:

1) under one intonation contour
2) bounded by pauses, and
3) constituting a single semantic unit.

This definition is similar to the one presented by Sato (1986:25): ‘a sequence of speech under a single intonation contour bounded by pauses’. For the purposes of
this research study, the utterance was defined as 'a sequence of speech bounded by pauses and constituting a single semantic unit'. Pauses include interruptions and shifts in turn. 'Intonation contour' was omitted from the definition during the pilot as it became evident that neither students nor all the participating NNS teachers demonstrated clear awareness of intonation patterns of the English language.

The choice of 'utterance' as the unit of analysis enabled the researcher to obtain a more representative picture of the classroom interaction and the respective roles of teacher and students than what would have been possible if turn were used as a unit. Using 'utterance' as a unit for the above example reveals a teacher-student talk ratio of 8 to 4. Also, Crookes (1990) has argued that utterance as a unit of analysis does not suffer from problems of validity or reliability.

**Inter-rater reliability of the observation schedule**

The inter-rater reliability of the observation instrument was determined as follows: A transcript of a 5-minute pilot segment was coded by 4 coders, using the adjusted descriptions of the observation schedule. One of the coders was a psychology graduate, one a Ph.D. student in Education and two were university English/TEFL faculty (one being this researcher). An agreement of 77.6% was reached (128 observed matches out of possible 165 matches). It was especially important to determine the inter-rater reliability of the several high inference items. The remaining discrepancies between raters were noted particularly in distinguishing between data recall and referential questions and the subsequent student responses.
Content validity of the observation schedule

Content validity depends on the extent to which the data collection instrument is representative of the content to be measured (Seliger and Shohamy 1989:188). The objective of the observation instrument in this research study was to collect data in a FLAPPs classroom. Therefore, the content of the instrument was selected to reflect the type of interactions that, according to the literature, can reasonably be expected to take place, albeit to varying degrees, in a foreign language classroom and, as research has suggested, can promote second language learning and cognitive development.

In the pilot phase of the instrument, the observation categories were compared to the interactions evident in two language classrooms representing the two types of course materials under study. The pilot observation findings were used to adjust the instrument.

Construct validity of the observation schedule

Construct validity is the extent to which the study investigates what it aims to investigate (Nunan 1992) and implies correct operational definitions to be established (Yin 1984 cited in Nunan 1992). Seliger and Shohamy (1989:188-189) recognize the difficulty of obtaining evidence for construct validity of the data collection procedures. Yet, establishing construct validity is necessary in order to determine the extent to which the data collection instrument can be said to reflect recent, relevant theories. The main constructs in this research study were L2 learning and academic L2 literacy development. A potentially problematic construct was the academic L2 literacy, as its development was shown in the literature to be a very complex phenomenon.
Construct validity was determined by examining the interactions associated with successful L2 acquisition/learning. The theories of the development of academic language proficiency in L2 were then examined; more specifically the types of questions and levels of thinking that were associated with learning of content. The categories in the observation instrument were matched with the type of interactions and questions identified in the theories as conducive to second language learning and L2 academic literacy.

STANDARDIZED TESTS

NFER-NELSON Non-Verbal Reasoning 10&11

Due to the purposive approach to sampling, a standardized non-verbal reasoning test, NFER-NELSON Non-Verbal Reasoning 10&11 (Smith and Hagues 1993), was administered at the beginning of the study. This made it possible to determine the extent to which the two groups of students could be said to represent a normal population and be similar in cognitive ability (see Appendix G for description, technical details and sample items of the test). The test can be administered to groups and does not require more than about one hour to administer, thus causing minimal disruption to the school day.

The NFER-NELSON test is limited in the light of Gardner's (1983) multiple intelligence theory, which has identified seven distinct intelligences, including linguistic intelligence, in that it tests particular non-verbal reasoning, which may or may not be indicative of general intelligence. Different results might be obtained using a test that includes a component for verbal ability, but no such standardized test has been found for young Arabic-speaking English language learners. An intelligence test requiring
English language vocabulary skills or reading, on the other hand, would not have been appropriate in this case as it would have biased the test in favor of students more proficient in English. Thus, in the absence of more suitable tests, the use of the NFER-NELSON is justified, particularly since the aim is not to classify or label students based on the results, but to determine to what extent the groups are similar or different in general cognitive ability.

**TORC-3 Test of Reading Comprehension**

Student reading comprehension was assessed using the *TORC-3 Test of Reading Comprehension* (Brown et al 1995), which was administered towards the end of the Spring term in May to determine the reading comprehension skills of the groups. TORC-3 is a standardized reading test with sub-tests for general reading comprehension and reading comprehension in specific subject matter areas, making the test particularly suitable for the purpose of this study. The sub-tests measure general vocabulary understanding, understanding of syntactic similarities, paragraph reading, and ability to sequence sentences into logical paragraphs. The content area sub-tests assess reading comprehension in mathematics, social studies and science. The sub-test of *Reading the Directions of Schoolwork* is designed to measure understanding and ability to follow written directions common in schoolwork (see Appendix H for description, technical details and sample questions of the test). The test can be administered to groups and requires about one hour to administer, thus causing minimal disruption to the academic program. The reading comprehension scores were not obtained to claim any causal relationship between reading comprehension and the textbook, but to explore possible differences between the two textbook groups.
TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Data for teacher profiles were collected through a questionnaire. The questionnaire aimed to collect information about the English program in each school and to discover the individual teachers' perceptions about the students as language learners, their preferred approaches to teaching, and their level of satisfaction with the textbook they were using. The questionnaire had been used by the researcher in a previous survey study about the English teaching practices in Lebanon (see Appendix I for the questionnaire).

PROCEDURES

Overview

During the time the sample was being selected and access negotiated to sites, the observation instruments and the standardized tests were piloted in schools known to the researcher and outside of the main study. After access to study sites was negotiated and parental consent obtained, each group was first administered the NFER-Nelson non-verbal reasoning test to determine the cognitive similarity of the groups. Teachers were given the questionnaire, which they returned by mail. Videotaped classroom observations were carried out and transcribed. The standardized reading comprehension test was administered toward the end of the project, and samples of the textbooks were collected. Finally, the data were subjected to analysis.

Data on classroom interactions

Collection of data on classroom interactions began with videotaping. Each class was videotaped for two class periods, on two separate occasions, once during the Fall term and once during the Spring term, a total of 12 class hours of videotape. A
small camcorder (Sony CCD-TRV27E PAL) and Sony MP60 8 mm tapes were used for all tapings. Parts of each videotaped lesson were then transcribed using the following method: Three five-minute segments per each class period were transcribed at 10, 25 and 40 minutes into the lesson. The decision was made in order to obtain transcripts representative of the beginning, middle and end of the lesson. This yielded 30 minutes of transcripts per class, a total of 180 minutes (see Table 6.5 below). Transcripts were then coded using the interaction categories developed for this study (see Appendix J for transcription conventions and samples of coded transcripts).

Each utterance was coded in the margin, and the codes entered into a file in the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS 1993), a widely used computer package for analyzing quantitative data. Utterance was used as the unit of analysis and the variables included information about the speaker (teacher/student/class; gender), the class, and the textbook type. The coded transcripts were thus available for later qualitative analysis. Codes from the transcripts were also tallied using the observation schedule and entered into another SPSS file. In this file, the unit of analysis was the class while the variables were the interaction categories. (In the same file, the means of the standardized tests were entered.) This file enabled interaction totals to be calculated across the classes and cross-checked against the totals arrived at through coding the transcripts.

Video recording made detailed transcription possible (Hatch 1992) which, in turn, facilitated coding of the high inference categories as the data could be reviewed several times. Video recording also preserved the social context of the observed interactions for later analysis (Coolican 1994) and made
Table 6.5 *Minutes Videotaped and Transcribed per Class*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Videotaped (minutes)</th>
<th>Transcribed (minutes)</th>
<th>Total transcribed (minutes per session)</th>
<th>Transcribed (minutes per class)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

available the nonverbal aspects that are an important part of human communication (Hatch 1992). Through the video recordings, it was possible to 'illustrate qualitative differences and issues which numerical reports cannot portray' (Coolican 1994:100).
The transcripts also provided a set of data that could be subjected to qualitative analysis not possible from the observation schedule alone. Most importantly, the transcripts preserved the sequence of interactions, which would have been lost when using the frequency counts based on the observation schedule alone. In addition, video recording assured 'retrievability' of data (Seliger and Shohamy 1989:104), enabling the data to be subjected to repeated reviewing.

**Pilots of instruments**

All instruments were piloted with subjects outside the sample of the main study. NFER-NELSON Non-Verbal Reasoning 10&11 test was first piloted with a group of 25 Grade 5 students. No difficulties were found during the administration of the test, the pilot group being able to finish the test in the 50-minute time period allocated for the test. Special attention was given during the pilot to the instructions of the procedure. It was important to determine whether students would be able to follow the English-language instructions or whether instructions had to be given in Arabic. Had Arabic instructions been deemed necessary, these would have had to be planned carefully to assure that all groups received the same instructions. The NFER-Nelson is 'user-friendly' in the sense that it provides a practice set of the type of items in the test itself and allows the examiner to elaborate on the instructions to assure thorough understanding by the examinees. The pilot group reported the test as being fun and enjoyable. The pilot group scored a mean of 92.52.

The TORC-3 Reading Comprehension test was piloted in two grade 5 classes, one using a NES course and the other using an ELT course. Some of the items in the subject matter subtests were clearly unfamiliar to the students, most noticeably some
items in the Social Studies subtest, and a decision was made to omit 3 questions in this subtest as culturally too unfamiliar to the students in the study. These were questions requiring specific knowledge of US government, presidents, and state capitals. Students in the pilot were able to finish the test in the allocated time, scoring a raw score mean of 26.72. Scores were not converted to standardized scores, a practice the authors of the test indicate as appropriate for research purposes, especially when no comparison with a norm group is necessary.

The observation schedule was piloted in two grade 5 classrooms outside the research sample, one using an ELT course and the other using a NES course. The pilot classes were videotaped for one 50-minute class period and the observations were coded using the observation schedule. The initial categories were revised after the observations to clarify ambiguous items, to include items that were not originally considered, and to cancel items that were not observed at all. For example, originally, there was no category for the teacher ignoring student responses or initiations, but one of the pilot observations showed a number of such instances, justifying the addition of this category. The original schedule included a special category for L1 utterances for both the teacher and students. However, during the pilot phase, only one occurrence of student L1 use and none by the teacher were noted. Therefore, a decision was made to code any L1 utterances in the 'miscellaneous' category.

A 5-minute segment of the observations was transcribed, and the transcript was then coded according to the category descriptions by three coders, one Ph.D. student and two university English language teachers (one being this researcher). Ambiguous items were then adjusted and their definitions clarified. The most
discrepancies among the raters occurred between the ‘data recall’ and ‘referential’
questions. The following example illustrates this:

1 T: What's your favorite season?
2 S: Winter.
3 T: Why do you like winter?
4 S: Because it's snowing.
5 T: Because it's snowing or because you like to play in the snow.
6 S: Because I like to play in the snow.
7 T: Right because you like to play in the snow.

Here the teacher questions (lines 3 and 5) initially appear to be referential questions
and were coded as such by two of the coders. The subsequent student responses
(lines 4 and 6) were coded as ‘genuine communication’. However, examination of the
feedback shows that the teacher had a specific response in mind. The provided
feedback (line 7) reveals that the teacher anticipated answers to come from the
textbook dialogue that the class had been studying. The category definitions were
elaborated on to include the need to examine the complete IRF sequence when
coding items. Initially, the raters also differed in their opinion about when teacher
repetition of an utterance would constitute ‘negotiation’. The category definition was
adjusted to include the questioning tone of the repetition that would constitute
‘negotiation’ as opposed to the fairly common teacher feedback behavior of repeating
student utterances verbatim.

The introduction of an observer and a videocamera into the classroom might
result in behaviors different from those in the everyday situation, known as ‘Hawthorne
effect’ (Anderson 1998:128), and consequent distortion of data (Seliger and Shohamy
1989). To ensure a high degree of representativeness of the data obtained through
the videorecordings, the researcher spent one class period in each pilot class, sitting
at the back of the room. The researcher then spent another session in each class, positioned at the front of the room, with the videocamera pointing to the class. The objective was to find out whether any noticeable changes could be observed in the behavior of the teachers and students. With the exception of the initial curiosity and interest towards the observer and the camera for a few minutes, no differences were noted in the behavior of the children. Yet, the observer's presence in itself, even when seated at the back of the room, may have influenced the interactions to some degree. The presence of the camera and the observer in the classroom undoubtedly influenced the teachers. This was verbalized by one of the teachers participating in the pilot phase, who stated at the beginning of the first videotaping that she was "a little nervous" about the camera.

Data on textbooks

Samples of the objectives and tasks in the two types of textbook were collected in order to determine (a) the type of interactions that were indicated in the tasks presented; (b) the apparent suitability of the textbook for its intended purpose as reflected in the official curriculum; and (c) the extent to which the observed classroom interactions reflected the set textbook tasks.

Although a number of ready checklists and guidelines for evaluating language teaching materials were identified (see, for example, Littlejohn 1998; Cunningsworth 1995; Breen and Candlin 1987; Dougill 1987), they were not found suitable for this research study due to the very different objectives and characteristics of the two textbooks. Therefore, the following procedure was adapted from Littlejohn (1998) for this research study. First, one sample of each type of textbook was selected from the
books used in the schools that are included in this study. The selection was based on this researcher's knowledge about the distribution of the books, this knowledge being based on ten years of teacher training workshops in schools around the country. A sample consisting of approximately 15% of the material from the middle part of each of the two books was selected first. Within the selected sections, one lesson was then selected for micro-analysis of the tasks and language.

**DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURES**

Two approaches to data analysis were taken. The quantitative interaction data and the standardized test data were analyzed by applying statistical tests to the data. The transcribed interactions were further analyzed qualitatively.

**Quantitative approach to data analysis**

The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Release 7 for Windows 95 was used in the analysis of both the non-parametric and parametric quantitative data.

**Non-parametric data**

The first approach comprised quantitative analysis of the interaction data through non-parametric statistical tests and the analysis of standardized test data through parametric statistical tests. The quantitative frequency data obtained through the observation schedule were analyzed using chi-square tests. Chi-square allows for comparison of observed frequencies between the groups and indicates whether any found differences are statistically significant. As a non-parametric test, the chi-square is less robust than the parametric tests, especially in cases with low expected cell count (Cochran 1954, cited in Coolican 1999:311). However, the interaction data did
not satisfy the assumptions underlying the parametric tests in that the data were
categorical frequency data. Although it would have been possible to convert the
frequency counts to class means, it was not possible to assert that the frequencies of
the various classroom interactions under study would form a normal distribution.
Therefore, non-parametric chi-square was the only viable option. Alpha levels were
set at <.05, meaning that the probability of any observed differences having occurred
by chance was 5%. Where the difference between the two groups was found
significant at \( p < .05 \), 'goodness-of-fit' chi-square tests were conducted to determine
which individual teachers and classes contributed to the observed chi value.

**Parametric data**

The data from the standardized tests were analyzed using parametric tests as
the data met the conditions for these tests as outlined by Coolican (1999:333): The
level of data was of interval status and it could be assumed that reasoning ability and
reading comprehension ability within a large group of school children form a near
normal distribution.

Means for the NFER-Nelson Non-Verbal Reasoning test were computed and a
\textit{priori} analysis of variance (ANOVA) was carried out to compare the means between
the two groups using different course texts. ANOVA was deemed appropriate as the
conditions for parametric tests were met. Alpha level was set at <.01 to reduce the
probability of type I error, i.e. null hypothesis being rejected when true (Coolican
1999:337).
Means for both the general reading comprehension component and the subtest of Following Schoolwork Directions of the TORC-3 were computed, and analysis of variance (ANOVA) with Tukey’s HSD post hoc pairwise comparison for both was carried out. The Tukey test, although conservative in that it may fail to detect real differences, allows for all possible pairwise comparison while keeping family-wise error rate to 0.05 (Coolican 1999:401). The alpha level for the TORC-3 comparison was also set at $p<0.01$ to reduce the probability of type I error.

Since the two textbook groups differed in the amount of L2 exposure, a positive correlation was expected between the reading scores and the L2 exposure. Exposure to English in other subject matter classes was calculated by counting the number of hours of English-medium instruction (EMI) per week outside the English language class and scoring them as:

- 0 = no EMI
- 1 = 1 – 5 hours of EMI
- 2 = 6 – 10 hours of EMI
- 3 = 11+ hours of EMI

It was also expected that reasoning ability was likely to influence reading comprehension scores. Therefore, Pearson’s coefficient of correlation ($r$) was calculated first for NFER-Nelson and TORC-3 scores, and then for TORC-3 scores and L2 exposure. Pearson’s $r$ was the appropriate choice since the data were of interval level and related. Both reading and reasoning scores of school children can be expected to form a normal distribution.

If a linear relationship were found, as it turned out to be, analysis of co-variance (ANCOVA) would be carried out. ANCOVA takes out the variance which is
assumed to be caused by the co-variate' (Coolican 1999:404), in this case the reasoning ability, and produces an estimate of what the means would be if the groups did not differ in the co-variate (Coolican 1999; Bryman and Cramer 1997). ANCOVA enabled the analysis of the influence of the textbook type and L2 exposure on reading comprehension while controlling for the effect of reasoning ability. Prior to conducting analysis of co-variance, the relationship between co-variate and the dependent variable (reading comprehension) was assessed, as ANCOVA is only appropriate when the relationship between the co-variate and the dependent variable is equivalent in the groups (Mertens 1997:360).

Qualitative approach to data analysis

Interaction Data

The second approach to data was a qualitative analysis. First, the quantitative frequency data were analyzed qualitatively in terms of length, complexity, content, and focus of the utterances. The researcher then used a ‘maximum variation sampling’ (Patton 1980, cited in Lincoln and Guba 1985:200) to collect data on exchanges and exchange complexes from the transcribed data, which were subjected to inductive analysis with the purpose ‘to detail the many specifics that give the context its unique flavor’ (Lincoln and Guba op cit:201). In the transcribed data, units of exchanges and exchange complexes were identified, then examined, coded, and categorized using the process described by Lincoln and Guba (op cit:203) as ‘3x5 card shuffle’ with no a priori categories defined. Exchanges were coded, with codes entered in the transcript margin, the categories thus emerging from the data.
Each of these approaches to data analysis individually provides important data regarding classroom interactions. This enabled a part-whole relationship for the units being studied to emerge, thus providing a broader and more holistic picture of the social interaction of language classroom discourse.

**Textbook Data**

Textbook samples were first analyzed impressionistically in terms of the following aspects:

1. the book as a whole: the intended use and audience; components; design and layout; the extent to which route through material was specified; subdivisions;
2. overview of an extract (approximately 15%): length; sequence of activity; language focus; type of activity; and
3. tasks in one lesson.

The gathered data were then compared against the observed interactions to determine the extent to which these could be said to be generated from the textbook. The exchanges across the six classes were also compared against the relevant sections of the teacher’s guide accompanying the textbook in order to determine the extent to which the teacher adhered to the suggested approaches, and therefore the extent to which the textbook could be said to be influencing the interactions.

**STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

**Strengths of the present study**

This research study is qualitative in nature because the research questions it poses are best answered by observation, and it is heuristic in that the aim of the study was to discover and describe classroom interactions in classes using the two types of
textbooks. Although Anderson (1998) does not consider description as a method by itself, this approach was justified for two reasons. First, while the literature review suggested potential differences between the two types of textbooks in terms of interactions, and despite the fact that these differences might influence both second language acquisition and development of L2 academic literacy, prior research into the role of textbooks in language classrooms was very limited at best. Secondly, a descriptive approach was further deemed appropriate due to the scarcity of classroom-based descriptive research pertaining to language teaching textbooks.

This study, although approaching the research problem from the post-positivist paradigm of naturalistic inquiry, takes an approach to knowledge that represents more the positivist perspective in that every effort was made for the researcher to remain objective. As interpretivist researchers bring into the study their own understandings, convictions, and conceptual orientations (Miles and Huberman 1994:8), it was important to guard against these influencing what was observed. A higher level of objectivity was achieved through the use of observation checklists and teacher questionnaires, than would have been possible through field notes, ‘thick description’ and interviews, particularly in the case of a novice researcher lacking prior experience of ethnographic methods. A priori category data also enables comparison with previous studies and opportunity for subsequent replication; what Miles and Huberman (op cit: 35) have called ‘conversing across studies’.

The use of systematic coding in language classroom research has been criticized, for instance by Mehan (1977), on the grounds that it fails to take account of the complexity of the variables involved in classroom events and treats behaviors and utterances as singular isolated events. Based on Vygotskian socio-cultural theory of
learning, this researcher also recognizes that the intensely social dynamic of language learning classrooms defies any attempt to code the observed events into a priori categories. Because interactions in each individual classroom must be construed as 'the results of the contributors of its particular participants' (Parkinson et al 1998:91), the qualitative approach to data was used in connection with and as a supplement to the quantitative interaction data. The qualitative analysis of data helps illustrate critical differences in interactions that would have been lost if purely quantitative approaches had been employed. The qualitative data provided by the transcripts enabled the researcher to discover connections between the observed interactions, giving rise to development of new hypotheses. The examination of exchanges and exchange complexes provides for 'validation through next turn' (Peräkylä 1997:209, citing Sacks et al 1974).

The videotapes and transcripts further provide what Peräkylä (1997:203) has called 'highly detailed and publicly accessible representation of social interaction', increasing the reliability of the study. The retrievable data collection methods will facilitate eventual replication of the study by this researcher and others.

Triangulation, 'the use of two or more methods of data collection in the study of some aspect of human behavior' (Cohen and Manion 1994:233), increases the confirmability of the findings (Seliger and Shoharny 1989). It allows the researcher to feel confident that the findings are not artifacts of the data collection method (Cohen and Manion 1994, citing Lin 1976).

In this research study, triangulation was achieved through

a) methodology triangulation (Cohen and Manion op cit. 236) by collecting data through observations and standardized test scores;
b) source triangulation (Seliger and Shohamy op cit. 123) by drawing data from coded categories, transcripts, textbook objectives and tasks, and teacher questionnaires; and

c) analyzing the interaction data through both quantitative and qualitative approaches.

Classroom-based research in naturally existing classrooms has not been the norm in SLA research, as Nunan (1992:103) has pointed out. This study thus contributes to the field of classroom-based SLA research.

Limitations in the design of the present study

There are limitations in this study. One of them rests in the research design itself. The exploratory study of a few naturally existing groups without any pre-test/post-test design does not enable causal relationships to be drawn between the variables under investigation. Also, the observations limited to two sessions per class do not allow for generalizations to be made. The purposive approach to sampling that produced groups with un-equivalent amount of exposure to English in other subject area classes, although increasing the external validity of the study, raises a concern of internal validity (Tuckman 1999). The internal validity is, however, enhanced by the comparison of classes S2 and S3, where subjects received the same amount of English language instruction and French-medium subject matter instruction. Also, several confounding variables, such as the amount of learner exposure to L2 outside the language classroom and the school, cannot be accurately measured. Furthermore, students' L1 proficiency, which may influence L2 learning, was not measured.
Another limitation rests with the coding of interactions. In the observation schedule there remain several ambiguous categories, which would need to be refined before any replication of the study is attempted. However, the study does provide a detailed description of interactions in classrooms using two different types of textbooks.

CHAPTER SUMMARY

The purpose of this exploratory study was to observe classroom interactions in six naturally existing primary school classrooms in order to determine whether the language teaching textbook can be associated with the observed interactions. This chapter has described the stages of the study, the sample selection and data collection procedures. The study spanned four years, beginning with the literature review in the summer of 1997 and concluding with the writing up of the findings in the spring of 2001. The sample consisted of 163 grade five students and their teachers in six private schools in different regions of Lebanon. Data collection consisted of a total of 12 videotaped classroom observations (10 hours), and 180 minutes of transcriptions thereof, standardized reasoning and reading comprehension tests, teacher questionnaires, and examination of textbook tasks. The chapter has described the observation instrument and established its reliability and its content and construct validity, and it has described the standardized tests used in the study. It has outlined the procedures of the data collection and recording, which enable possible comparisons with other studies and any further research studies of the similar nature.

Two approaches to data analysis have been described. The interaction data are analyzed using non-parametric chi-square tests while the standardized test data
are analyzed using parametric tests, including analysis of variance (ANOVA), analysis of co-variance (ANCOVA), and Pearson's r. The interaction data and textbook tasks are analyzed qualitatively.

The strengths and limitations of the study were discussed. Triangulation of methodology, source, and data analysis increase the strength of the study. The primary limitation of the study lies in purposive sampling, which does not allow for generalizations of results. Another limitation identified is the ambiguity of some of the observation categories. However, regardless of its limitations, the study provided access into six classrooms and enabled close examination of the interactions therein.
CHAPTER VII – DATA ANALYSIS

Why it’s turning into a sort of mist now, I declare!... And certainly the glass WAS beginning to melt away, just like a bright silvery mist.

Lewis Carroll, Through the Looking Glass

INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the data analysis. It begins by summarizing the results and analyzing the frequency data obtained through the transcripts using non-parametric tests. The interaction data were analyzed following the IRF sequence, beginning with teacher initiations, followed by student responses and teacher feedback, and concluding with student initiations. The quantitative data analysis of the interactions is complemented by examination of qualitative differences in the interactions. The chapter then goes on to analyze the textbook objectives and tasks. It concludes with the analysis of the results of the standardized tests using parametric tests. All tables and figures pertaining to the non-parametric data are presented within the relevant text. Tables and figures pertaining to the parametric data are placed at the end of the parametric data analysis.

QUANTITATIVE INTERACTION DATA

Data collection yielded 10 hours of videotaped observations, of which 180 minutes were transcribed and subjected to statistical analysis. Frequency counts were first obtained using the SPSS software package, and the counts were then subjected to non-parametric chi-square tests. Table 7.1 (pp. 138-139) shows the frequencies of all interactions in the six classes.
Teacher-student talk ratio

A total of 1158 teacher utterances and 544 student utterances were recorded, teacher talk comprising approximately 68% of all transcribed talk. Turn-taking and miscellaneous items were excluded as not contributing to the IRF sequence. No statistically significant difference in the amount of teacher talk was found between the two textbook groups, $\chi^2_{obs} 2. (df=1)$, with a level set at .05. Student talk comprised 32% of the transcribed talk (also excluding turn taking and miscellaneous utterances). Of the total utterances, 435 were responses to TQs, leaving student initiated utterances at a total of 109. Of the observed student utterances, 265 were observed in the NES course group and 279 in the ELT course group. A chi-square showed the difference not to be statistically significant at a level .05, with a chi-square value of 0.36($df=1$).

Teacher initiations

Table 7.2 (p. 140) shows the frequencies of teacher presentation. The NES course teachers initiated more presenting utterances than the ELT course teachers, but the difference failed to reach statistical significance ($\chi^2_{obs} 2.18, df 1, p<.05$ for a one-tailed test). An examination of the presentations, however, revealed some qualitative differences between the individual teachers. While T6 demonstrated the highest number of presenting utterances, her utterances were in general shorter in length than those of T1 and T2. The examples from the transcripts on page 140 illustrate this difference.
Table 7.1  **Interaction Frequencies**  
**Teacher talk**

Key: Cat=interaction category; Spkr=speaker; T=teacher; S=student; Cl=class/group of students  
Init=initiation; Fdbk=feedback; Resp=response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat</th>
<th>Spkr</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>S1 NES course f</th>
<th>S2 NES course f</th>
<th>S3 ELT course f</th>
<th>S4 ELT course f</th>
<th>S5 NES course f</th>
<th>S6 ELT course f</th>
<th>Total f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Recall question</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Data process question</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Referential question</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Init.</td>
<td>Presentation/explanation</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Read/write</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Simple negotiation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complex negotiation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Fdbk</td>
<td>Accept. Feedback (brief)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accept. Fdbk (appropriating)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reject. feedback (brief)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reject. fdbk (appropriating)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ignore response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Resp</td>
<td>Responds to S elicit with T idea</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Responds to S appropriating S idea</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ignores S elicit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>S4</td>
<td>S5</td>
<td>S6</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Talk</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reads aloud</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prod. T- or text-prompted</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data recall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data processing/analysis</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referential response</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirm/negate</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple negotiation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex negotiation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower level question</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher level question</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsolicited initiation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Interactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Cl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorusing response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 T/S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbalized turn-taking</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Miscellaneous</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.2  **Frequency of Teacher Presenting Utterances**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Textbook type</th>
<th>f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>(NES course)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>(NES course)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>(ELT course)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>(ELT course)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>(NES course)</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>(ELT course)</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of teacher explanations:

T1  1. To make it easier, divide it into even syllables or divide it into root word and adding prefixes or suffixes or dividing into compound words.

2. Custom. Custom is a habit. Custom is a habit. As I told you, mistletoe is used as a Christmas decoration. It’s a custom ... OK. So custom is a habit.

T2  1. It’s the same idea of learning how to replace teeth but in ‘C’ you have who taught him this skill and where, the place.

2. The main idea. It’s putting the whole paragraph into a main idea, a main sentence, OK.

So this is somehow similar to a story. The story we summarized here. It’s also working on a summary.

In contrast, the following brief explanations were typical to T6:

T6  1. This table we did is called a bar graph.

2. You begin a friendly letter with the word ‘Dear’ and the name. OK.

T4 also used shorter and simpler explanations than T1 and T2. The following is a typical example of explanations in the class of T4:

T4  Our story is about a famous author. He is Mark Twain. Mark Twain.
The teacher presentations also differed in their function. Both T1 and T2 used much of their presentation time for direct instruction to explain lesson content and how the English language works, as shown in the examples above. In contrast, T3, T4, T5 and T6 used their presentation time primarily for procedural explanations as shown in the following examples.

**T5** I have taken these from 'The Daily Star' Thursday issue, all right. I've written down headlines and I've written down the lead sentences but they are jumbled up. Now what you have to do is to match the same way we did yesterday in the comprehension exercise.

**T3** You ordered already, so the 'for you' is not for you [clarifying the turns in a dialog]

**T4** Now let the others look at the picture and discuss it and then we'll listen to you.

**T6** Count the hands, Samara, with your hand. Count the hands. Count the hands for me. Count loudly.

**Teacher questions**

A total of 336 teacher questions (TQ) were recorded in the six classes. Table 7.3 below shows the frequencies of teacher questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Textbook type</th>
<th>TQ (f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>(NES course)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>(NES course)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>(ELT course)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>(ELT course)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>(NES course)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>(ELT course)</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A chi-square comparison found a statistically significant difference in the total number of TQs between teachers using different textbooks, $X^2_{\text{obs}} = 4.29$, $df=1$, $p<.05$, the ELT course teachers asking more questions than the NES course teachers. A statistically significant difference was further found between the individual teachers, $X^2_{\text{obs}} = 51.74$, $df=5$, $p<.001$). 'Goodness-of-fit' chi square revealed that the scores of T1 and T6 contributed half of the high $X^2$ value, T1 with lower and T6 higher than expected count (see Table 7.4 below).

Table 7.4  
**Teacher Questions in the Six Classes**  
*Goodness-of-fit* Chi square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>T3</th>
<th>T4</th>
<th>T5</th>
<th>T6</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 51.74$ ($df=5$), $p<.005$

A closer examination of the transcripts revealed that while T6 repeated the same question a number of times for different students to respond, T1 posed one question and then took several successive responses from different students, indicating a turn by eye contact or a nod. T2 frequently repeated and paraphrased her questions before calling on students to respond. Teacher questions also differed qualitatively, as will be shown below.

Table 7.5 (below) shows the frequencies and percentages of different types of teacher questions in the six classes. Of all the TQs, 184 (54.7%) were recall questions, 90 (26.1%) data processing questions, and 62 (17.9%) referential questions. An $RxC$ chi-square test revealed a statistically significant difference between the two groups in teacher type of questions, $X^2_{\text{obs}} = 11.61$, $df=2$, 2-tailed test,
While the ELT course teachers asked data recall questions (DRQ) more frequently than expected and referential questions (RQ) less frequently than expected, the NES course teachers asked fewer than expected data recall questions and more than expected referential questions (see Table 7.6 below and Figure 7.1 on p. 144).

Table 7.5 Type of Teacher Questions - Frequencies and Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Recall Questions (DRQ)</th>
<th>Data Processing Questions (DPQ)</th>
<th>Referential Questions (RQ)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>f (%)</td>
<td>f (%)</td>
<td>f (%)</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>8  27.8</td>
<td>4  13.9</td>
<td>17  58.3</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>40  50</td>
<td>31  38.75</td>
<td>9  11.25</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>19  54.15</td>
<td>11  31.35</td>
<td>5  14.25</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>28  40.58</td>
<td>28  40.57</td>
<td>13  18.84</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>22  55</td>
<td>5  12.5</td>
<td>13  32.5</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>67  80.72</td>
<td>11  13.24</td>
<td>5  6.02</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>184  54.76</td>
<td>90  26.1</td>
<td>62  17.98</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.6 Textbook and Teacher Questions - Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Questions</th>
<th>DRQ</th>
<th>DPQ</th>
<th>RQ</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Textbook type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NES Course</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed Expected</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELT course</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed Expected</td>
<td>102.4</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2_{obs} = 11.61, df=2, p<.01$ for a two-tailed test
A 'goodness-of-fit' one-way chi square ($X^2_{\text{obs}} = 67.98$, $df=5$, $p<.001$) further showed that T1 and T6 particularly contributed to the high chi-square value, the former with a considerably lower than expected number of DRQs and the latter with a higher than expected count (see Table 7.7 below). There was no difference in data processing questions (DPQ) between the two groups.

Table 7.7 Data Recall Questions in the Six Classes - 'Goodness of fit' Chi-square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>T3</th>
<th>T4</th>
<th>T5</th>
<th>T6</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Sigma$</td>
<td>15.42</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>42.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2_{\text{obs}} = 67.98$, $df=5$, $p<.001$
Qualitatively, the two teachers' data recall questions differed. The DRQs that T6 asked were often prompts to produce accurate forms as shown here:

Student: Two boyes.

Teacher 6: Two boyes or two boyz?

Some of her data recall questions prompted the student to repeat the teacher explanation (T: This is called a bar graph. What is it called?) while others called for repetition of the previous student's response:

Teacher 6: How many times a week you wash the dishes, Zeinab?
Student: I wash the dishes once a week
Teacher 6: Ramzey, how many times a week does she wash the dishes?

In contrast, the data recall questions of T1 related primarily to lesson content, as in the following two examples:

T1 1. Does the story say anything about his father?
   2. And what did the horse do? [literal recall of a story event just read]

Regarding teachers' referential questions, a one-way chi square ($\chi^2=11.35, df=5, p <.001$) revealed that T1, T3 and T6 especially contributed to the chi value, T1 showing a higher than expected count and T3 and T6 lower than expected count of referential questions (RQ) (see Table 7.8 below).

<p>| Teacher Referential Questions in the Six Classes - 'Goodness of fit' Chi-square |
|-------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>T3</th>
<th>T4</th>
<th>T5</th>
<th>T6</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X^2_{obs}$</td>
<td>11.35, df=5, p&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The referential questions posed by T5 and T6 pertained almost exclusively to classroom and task management. In contrast, the referential questions of T1 and T2 were primarily lesson and real world related. The following examples illustrate the difference. T1's first question is about the lesson content while the second question, with its paraphrased repetition, pertains to students' life outside the classroom:

T1  1. How do you think Alec felt?
    2. What did you disguise yourself as? How were you dressed like?

Both questions of T2 are about the lesson content:

T2  1. What makes you think he was patient?
    2. What do you think will happen next?

Many of T1's referential questions were about students' personal experiences, but often related to the lesson content, as in the following example, where two referential questions are recorded (the first T question is recorded as negotiation of meaning):

Student: [stands up] Near our house there is uh, there is some rocks I climb, climbed, I teach all my friends to climb those rocks.
Teacher 1: You climb those rocks^ . Are they very high?
Student: No, they are like this [moves hand up and down]
Teacher 1: Small hill or something^
Student: Yes, Miss

In contrast, the referential questions posed by T5 and T6 concerned classroom management and procedures:
In one lesson sequence, T6 was observed asking a number of questions that on the surface appear to be referential questions about students' families, but as lines 6 and 7 indicate, the teacher knows the answer. Thus these questions were of display type:

1 Teacher 6: Do you have any sisters?
2 How many brothers do you have?
3 Do you have any aunts or uncles?
4 Who is the youngest child in the family?

5 Student: [raises a hand]

6 Teacher 6: ((youA)) you're the youngest^A

7 What about your brother?

That T6 knew the students' families very well, and thus the answers to the questions she was asking, was confirmed by the researcher after the observation session.

In the classes of T3 and T4, teacher referential questions were primarily about the lesson content.

A total of 80 instances of teacher negotiating meaning were observed across the classes, 39 in the NES course classes and 41 in the ELT course classes. The difference is not significant at alpha level .05, but a closer look reveals some interesting differences. The two teachers, T1 of S1 and T6 of S6, whose negotiation of meaning accounted for over half of all observed negotiation, show qualitative differences in their negotiation and the context of negotiation. While T1's negotiations
were almost invariably initiated by her not understanding student L2 utterances, and
often carried over more than one turn, T6's negotiations were mostly initiated by
student L1 utterances, or focusing on the form. The following examples illustrate these
differences:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>Miss, can we put two prefixes on one word?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>For one word two prefixes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S23</td>
<td>Miss, can we put names? [as compound words]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Names^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S23</td>
<td>Like 'Superman'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Superman^ . . Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>Do you have any sisters?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>((two))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>Do you have two sisters?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>What chores do you have at home?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>((wash car))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>Do you help wash the car?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>No, me I wash.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student Responses**

Table 7.9 and Figure 7.2 below show the distribution of data recall (DRR), data processing responses (DPR) and referential responses (RR) in the two groups. A statistically highly significant difference was found in DRRs between the two textbook groups, $\chi^2_{obs} = 16.65$ ($df=1$), $p<.001$ (see Table 7.10 on p. 150). As expected, based on teacher question frequencies, ELT course students demonstrated significantly more DRRs than NES course students, S1 and S6 particularly contributing to the high chi value, the former with significantly lower than expected count and the latter with a higher than expected count.
Table 7.9  **Textbook and Student Response Crosstabulation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Responses</th>
<th>DRR</th>
<th>DPR</th>
<th>RR</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Textbook type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NES course</td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELT course</td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(X^2_{\text{obs}} = 57.03, \text{df}=2, p<.001\) for a two-tailed test

Figure 7.2  **Student Data Recall, Data Processing and Referential Responses in the Two Textbook Groups**
Table 7.10  
**Student Data Recall Responses in the Two Textbook Groups - Chi square**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NES course</th>
<th>ELT course</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σ</td>
<td>8.32</td>
<td>8.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2_{obs} = 16.65, \, df=1, \, p<.001\]

A statistically significant difference was also found in the frequency of DPRs between the two textbook groups, chi-square test yielding a value of 10.47 (\(df=1\), \(p<.001\), the NES course group recording lower than the expected number of DPRs and the ELT course higher than expected frequency (see Table 7.11 below).

Table 7.11  
**Student Data Processing Responses (DPR) in the Two Textbook Groups - Chi square**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NES course</th>
<th>ELT course</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σ</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2_{obs} = 10.47, df=1, \, p < .001\]

The responses differed in their quality, as shown in the examples from the transcripts. The data processing responses in S4, where nearly half of all data processing questions were recorded, the responses were often very brief as shown in the following three examples:
Teacher 4: Gibran Khalil Gibran, very good.
Is he a foreign one or an Arab or one of the Arab?
Student a: Yes.
Teacher 4: What does an author do? Does he fix cars?
Student a: No.
Teacher 4: What's the ending of our story?
First of all, it is a happy ending or a sad ending^ 
Student b: Happy, happy

In S3, the responses were also often brief as the following exchange illustrates:

Teacher 3: Is that correct? [about a spelling word on the board]
Student a: No
Teacher 3: Which one is wrong, Sally?
Student a: Assistant director
Teacher 3: How to correct it?
[a student goes to the board and makes a correction]
Teacher 3: Is that correct now?
Student b: Yes.

In contrast, in S1 and S2, the data processing responses were longer:

Teacher 1: Where did they get this habit from?
Student: They say that in Norse legends.

Teacher 1: So, what happened to Alec when the ship split into two?
Student: He went to free the Black and they both went jumped into the ocean.

Teacher 2: Why is that summary better than the other choices?
Student: Because it is about main the main idea.

Teacher 2: How did she know that the roads were slippery?
Student: The driver called the principal.
When comparing the two textbook groups on students' referential responses, a highly significant difference was found between the two groups, with the NES course group showing significantly higher count, $X^2 = 34.32$ ($df=1$), $p<.001$ (see Table 7.12 below). While the 39 referential teacher questions observed in the NES group resulted in 51 responses, the 23 referential questions in the ELT group resulted only in 7 student responses. The discrepancy resulted from teachers either calling on a number of students to respond to one question, as was the case with T1, or repeating the same question a number of times before designating a turn, as T3, T4 and T6 were observed doing.

Table 7.12 **Student Referential Responses in the Two Textbook Groups – Chi-Square**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NES course</th>
<th>ELT course</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\Sigma \quad 17.16 \quad 17.16$

$X^2 = 34.32$,$df=1$, $p<.001$

There was no difference between in the confirming and negating responses between the two groups ($X^2_{obs} = 0.62$).

**Student pseudo- and genuine communication**

When student responses were collapsed into two super-ordinate categories, pseudo-communication (PC) and genuine communication (GC), differences between the two groups were noted. Table 7.13 and Figure 7.3 below show the distribution of PC and GC in the two textbook groups. A chi square test yielded a statistically significant difference (Pearson's $X^2_{obs} = 5.02$, $df=1$, $p<.02$ for a two-tailed test; continuity correction 4.5; Fisher's Exact Significance test .03 for 2-sided/ .016 for 1-
sided), with the NES course group featuring higher than expected count of GC while the ELT course group showed a higher than expected count of PC and lower than expected count of GC.

Table 7.13 **Student Communication in the Two Textbook Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Student Communication</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>GC</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbook type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NES Observed</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Expected</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>142.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELT Observed</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>course Expected</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>201.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson’s $X^2_{obs}$ 5.02, $df=1$, $p<.02$ for a two-tailed test, continuity correction 4.5, likelihood ratio 5.15, Fisher’s Exact Significance test .03 for 2-sided/.016 for 1-sided

Figure 7.3 **Student Communication in the Two Textbook Groups**
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Comparing pseudo-communication and genuine communication across the six classes using a $R \times C$ chi square revealed a statistically highly significant difference in PC between the classes ($X^2_{\text{obs}} 76.72$, $df=5$, $p<.001$), S3 particularly contributing to the difference with a much higher than expected count of PC and lower than expected count of GC (see Table 7.14 and Figure 7.4 below). Most of the pseudo-communication recorded in S3 resulted from students producing text-prompted language during drills or when reciting prepared dialogues, while in S1 and S2 pseudo-communication resulted from students reading from the textbook or the workbook while working on vocabulary and reading comprehension tasks. A chi-square comparison of student PC and GC in the two equivalent classes, S2 and S3, which only differed in the textbook type, yielded a chi value of 17.46 ($df=1$), which is statistically highly significant, the critical value at a level .01 being 6.64 for a two-tailed test (see Table 7.15 below).

### Table 7.14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.75</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.41</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15.10</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.37</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.48</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.86</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2_{\text{obs}} 76.72$, $df=5$, $p<.001$
Figure 7.4  

*Frequency of Pseudo- and Genuine Communication in the Six Classes*

Table 7.15 *Student Pseudo-Communication (PC) and Genuine Communication (GC) in S2 and S3 - Chi-square*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PC</th>
<th>GC</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>35.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>30.18</td>
<td>42.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2_{obs} 17.46, df=1, p<.005$
Teacher feedback

A total of 310 teacher feedback utterances were recorded while student responses were ignored a total of 9 times, 0-3 instances per school (see Table 7.16 below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>AF (f)</th>
<th>RF (f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accepting feedback (AF) clearly exceeded rejecting feedback across schools. NES course teachers provided AF about 84% of the time while the ELT course teachers provided AF 73.3% of the time. A 2x2 chi-square comparison of accepting and rejecting feedback (RF) across the two textbook groups revealed a statistically significant difference, $\chi^2 = 5.0$ (df=1), $p<.05$, the ELT course teachers providing more than expected RF than the NES course teachers (see Table 7.17 below). 'Goodness-of-fit' chi squares revealed further significant differences between the individual teachers. Comparison of teacher AF across the six classes produced a $\chi^2$ value of 59.7 (df=5), $p<.001$, with T4 particularly contributing to the high value (see Table 7.18 below). Statistically significant differences in RF were also found between the
teachers, $X^2 27.85 (df=5) p<.001$, with T1 showing considerably fewer rejections than expected while T3 and T6 showed much higher rejection rates than the other four teachers (see Table 7.19 below).

Table 7.17  **Teacher Accepting (AF) and Rejecting (RF) Feedback in the Two Textbook Groups**  
2x2 Chi-square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textbook Type</th>
<th>NES Course</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Feedback Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbook type</td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>89.03</td>
<td>25.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELT course</td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>150.96</td>
<td>44.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>240</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 5.0, df=1, p<.05$

Table 7.18  **Teacher Accepting Feedback in the Six Classes - 'Goodness of fit' Chi-square**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>T3</th>
<th>T4</th>
<th>T5</th>
<th>T6</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 obs 59.7, df=5, p<.001$
Table 7.19  **Teacher Rejecting Feedback in the Six Classes**  
*Goodness of fit* - Chi-square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>T3</th>
<th>T4</th>
<th>T5</th>
<th>T6</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χ²</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>9.32</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² obs = 27.85, df=5, p<.001

Simple teacher feedback (SF) by far outnumbered teacher appropriating feedback in all six classes in both accepting and rejecting feedback. On the average, teachers used appropriating 26.7% of the time. The highest percentage was shown by T2, who incorporated student utterances or ideas in her feedback 45% of the time while T5 and T6 did that only 10 and 7.4% of the time respectively. A chi square failed to show any difference between the two textbook groups in appropriating feedback (χ² 0.32).

**Student initiations**

Student initiations totalled 106 (see table 7.20 below). There were more questions than either negotiation of meaning or unsolicited statements. The instances of student negotiation of meaning (SNM) were very few in number, ranging from 1 in S5 and S6 to 6 in S1. The NES course group totalled 9 of the 14 recorded instances, or 64.3% of all SNMs. The difference is not statistically significant at α level .05.
Table 7.20

Frequency of Student Initiations in the Six Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negotiation Questions</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More student initiated questions (SQ) were observed in the NES course group (40) than in the ELT text group (23), a difference that is shown to be statistically significant ($X^2 = 4.58, df=1, p<.05$) (see Table 7.21 below). Also, a closer look at the SQs revealed further differences. While the SQs in S1, S3 and S2 related mostly to lesson content, SQs in S5 were mainly procedural.

Table 7.21

Student Questions in the Two Textbook Groups – Chi-square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NES course</th>
<th>ELT course</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student questions Observed</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Sigma$</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2$ obs $4.58, df=1, p<.05$
The following are typical examples of student initiated questions from four of the schools:

S1: Miss, he was talking about a parachute
Miss, how can they bring him back to life?

S3: We can't say 'are in the house on the tree'
Can I write 'cherry pie'?

S2: How did Paul Revere die?
Miss, we say in the first of May

S5: Miss what is this word?
What is number 1? [pointing to a word on the board she is copying]
Do we underline the date?

A total of 29 unsolicited student statements were observed in the six classes. The highest counts were recorded at S1 and S5, each showing 9 initiations. A chi-square test shows the difference between the NES course group and ELT course group in student unsolicited statements to be statistically significant, with the NES course group showing more student initiated, unsolicited statements ($X^2 5.82, df=1, p<.05$) (see Table 7.22 below).

Table 7.22 Student Unsolicited Statements in the Two Textbook Groups - Chi-square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NES course</th>
<th>ELT course</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student statements</td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Sigma$</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2_{obs} 5.82, df=1, p<.05$
In S1 and S2, student unsolicited statements were related to the lesson content, as in the following examples:

S1  
Student a: [reads]: The plant to have in your home is mistletoes.
Student b: [raises his hand and is given a turn]: Miss, here they wrote 'is mistletoes'. They have to write 'is a mistletoe'.

In S5, in contrast, the unsolicited statements dealt mainly with 'tattling', as in the following examples:

S5  
Student a: Miss! Samer is doing with his mouth something a sound, like this, Miss [demonstrates]
Student b: Miss, Samer he is putting his copybook in my place.

There was one instance where one unsolicited statement was repeated by one student (the same Samer, who was the subject of most of the tattling). Students were working in groups in the 'English Room', matching lead sentences with headlines:

Student a: [to the group]: I have two lead sentences.
 [no response from the group; group continues working on their sentence strips]
Student a: [after about two minutes] I have two lead sentences.
Student b: [stretching his hand] Give me one.

Teacher responses to student initiations

A total of 74 teacher responses to student initiations were recorded. In five instances student initiations were ignored by the teacher, once by T5 and four times by T6. Close to half of the responses included appropriation of student utterance or idea, but no statistically significant differences were found between the two textbook groups. But a qualitative analysis of teacher responses will be discussed in the next section of this chapter.
QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF INTERACTIONS
Exchange categories emerging from the data

The coding of the transcripts resulted in three basic types of exchange: a) basic exchange (BE) consisting of one initiation, a response and a feedback turn (feedback not always explicit), and b) negotiated exchange (NE) consisting of the initiation and one or more negotiations of meaning and/or feedback turns, and c) teacher direct teaching (DT) consisting of teacher explanations and instructions. Two types of direct teaching were identified: direct teaching (DT), and direct teaching with scaffolding (DTS). Negotiated exchanges were found to be of the three types identified in previous negotiation research: negotiation of meaning exchange (NEm), negotiation of topic exchange (NEt), negotiation of form exchange (NEf). Negotiation of topic and meaning exchanges often contained teacher scaffolding feedback while negotiation of form exchanges involved primarily error repair and scaffolding only rarely.

Examples of the exchange categories

The following examples of basic exchanges (BE) and exchanges negotiating form (NEf) come from S3 (see Appendix J for transcription conventions):

**BE**

Teacher 3: Tony, where's Andres? [referring to the textbook exercise]
Student: I can see her. She is under the table.
Teacher 3: Very good.

**NEf**

Teacher 3: Georgina, where are the boys?
Student: I can see he<

Teacher 3: I can see^
Student: It
Teacher 3: It. OK.
Contrast the above with the following example of negotiated exchanges from S1 below. The exchange complex took place shortly after the local Halloween festival. It was initiated by a student after the word 'custom', the vocabulary word in the text, was read as 'costume' by one student. Long square brackets indicate an exchange; arrows show the flow of teacher scaffolding feedback within and across the exchanges; text in capitals indicates teacher scaffolding (BE = basic exchange; NEt = negotiated topic exchange; NEm = negotiated meaning exchange; DTS = direct teaching with scaffolding):

```
BE
Student a: [reads] This costume started
Teacher 1: Custom

DTS
A custom is a habit. A custom is a habit. As I told you, mistletoe is used as a Christmas decoration. Custom. Costume is different, for example, costume is what you wear for example, you wear your costume [school uniform] to come to school, or Halloween costume or whatever. So they are not the same. It's the -e that makes the difference here, OK. So a custom is a habit.

NEt
Student b: Miss, on Sunday me and my friend [unintelligible]
Teacher 1: What did you DISGUISE yourself as? What were you DRESSED AS?
Student b: Miss, Cleopatra.
Teacher 1: Wow! It's very [unintelligible] famous Egyptian queen. And your friend, did she HAVE A COSTUME?
Student b: Yes, Miss

[3 exchanges later, the topic continues]
Student c: We went to Mastita and Jbeil
Teacher 1: Uh. You had your friends with you
Student c: Yes, Miss. We were ten and Wissam was wearing an Indian, Miss.
Teacher 1: A red Indian
Student c: No, Miss.
Teacher 1: From India
```
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During this exchange complex, which consisted of several exchanges, most of them longer than one IRF sequence, the teacher recycled the word 'costume' and its synonyms several times.

Differences in discourse between the two textbook groups

Data obtained from transcripts revealed that, in addition to the differences in teacher questioning behaviors and student communication, NES course classes and ELT course classes also differed in the observed interaction patterns. NES course classes were characterized by NEms and NEfs, which often resulted in connected, interactive discourse made up of exchange complexes. Negotiated exchanges were created through both teacher negotiating meaning or topic and providing scaffolding, where the teacher bridged to previous utterances or ideas and extended ideas. The NES course classes were further characterized by frequent direct teaching with scaffolding, which at times resulted in student initiated questions and subsequent DT. These characteristics are illustrated by the following examples from the transcripts. The ELT course classes featured fewer negotiated exchanges about topic and meaning and more negotiated exchanges about form. Appendix J describes the transcription conventions used in the examples.
Exchanges typical in NES course classes

The exchanges in the NES course classes featured frequent teacher scaffolding. The first example from S1 shows how T1 uses scaffolding to lead students to the correct response while she is checking the student’s reading comprehension of a story in the textbook:

Teacher 1: So what did Alec do when he tried to ride the Black?
Student: He leaned himself over

Teacher 1: [nods] The horse was big Alec was small, so what did he do?
Student: He lead the horse to a sandbar and he [unintelligible] the horse slowly.

Teacher 1: Uhhuh and what did the horse do?

The following example illustrates how T2 used scaffolding by repeating and paraphrasing her own questions to help student understand the meaning of 'prediction':

Teacher 2: How did she know that the roads were slippery?
Student: The driver called the school.
Teacher 2: OK. So what was the PREDICTION?
[no response]
Teacher 2: What did you THINK WILL HAPPEN? What did you PREDICT?
[several students raise their hands]

Teacher 2: What WILL HAPPEN? [maintains eye contact with S13]
Student: The principal will close the school.
Teacher 2: The principal will close the school. OK.

WHY DID YOU THINK THAT she will cancel school for the day?

The next example, also from T2, illustrates negotiated exchanges and direct teaching and shows how these exchanges built into an exchange complex, which was then carried over several exchanges and contained frequent extending and bridging.
In this example the class is working on paraphrasing a story, a task set in the workbook accompanying the textbook.

BE
Teacher 2: OK. Page 130, 130
Be
OK. If we all look down at the objective.
What's the objective?
Class: Summarize
Teacher 2: Summarize as well, OK.
When we say SUMMARIZE, what do we mean here? Elie.

NEf
Student a: We change all the paragraph to one idea.
Teacher 2: Do we CHANGE it?
Student a: Putting<
Teacher 2: >Putting it in ONE IDEA.
What's this idea?
Student a: The main<
Teacher 2: > THE MAIN IDEA. It's putting the whole paragraph into a main idea, a MAIN SENTENCE.
OK. So this is somehow SIMILAR TO A STORY. The story we summarized here. It's also WORKING ON A SUMMARY.

[Several exchanges later]
Teacher 2: Antoine, did you circle 'B' or 'C'?
Student b: 'C'
Teacher 2: Oh, OK. [surprised tone]
Do you know why?
What's the mistake here? [no response from S19]

NEf
Let's hear [nods to a student]
Student c: [reads] *Paul Revere learned from an Englishman who happened to be in Boston* [unintelligible]
Teacher 2: That's more DETAILS ... and what's the MAIN IDEA?

NEf
Can you give me the main idea? The SUMMARY of the paragraph.
He learned how to replace missing teeth with teeth from ivory, or the teeth from animals.

It's also the same idea of learning how to replace teeth, but in 'C' you have who taught him this and where, the place.

Listen. What I want to do here is this. I'm going to read 'C', OK. And you have to follow with me. Follow the second paragraph. Follow with me while I'm reading.

Just look at the second paragraph and notice IF IT'S THE SAME WORDS, word by word, or IF THERE'S A CHANGE.

Paul Revere learned from an Englishman who happened to be in Boston how to carve teeth from ivory or use an animal's tooth.

The same.

OK. Word by word. And when you SUMMARIZE you have to USE YOUR OWN WORDS. Other than you have some details, a man, an Englishman, Boston. Clear?

Number 3. OK when you choose this sentence you write it here, but we are only circling now.

So why is that summary better than the other choices?

Because it is about about the main idea.

It gives the main idea.

So, this is why it's NOT USING THE EXACT WORDS, the exact words.

OK. It gives the MAIN IDEA BY NOT USING THE EXACT WORDS. You are not using the exact words here. It gives the main idea without using the exact words.
The following extract from S1 illustrates how teacher responsiveness to student initiated questions and clarification requests led to further student questions from the class, thus creating an extensive exchange complex with opportunities for the teacher to further elaborate on the topic at hand. T1 has been explaining about ways to divide words. The first negotiated exchange about the topic of prefixes builds into an exchange complex consisting of a sequence of student initiated basic exchanges, teacher responses and direct teaching.

Student 2: Miss can we put two prefixes on one word?
Teacher 1: For one word two prefixes
Student a: [nods]
Teacher 1: Yes you can add one prefix and one suffix.
Student a: Like unbelievable
Teacher 1: Unbelievable, yes, you can have the root word believe and you have prefix here [writes on the board] and the suffix here.
Yes, you can, the prefix and suffix are also on the same word.
Look at the word. [writes 'mentally' on the board]
Mentally, mentally. Mental, mentally, so the root word stays the same. The word is ‘expect’, expected and it could be also unexpectedly, OK? So you can divide the root word and the suffix, the prefix and the suffix.

Student b: Miss, you can put understood
Teacher 1: Understood, that is right here. [writes the word on the board]
So, there are two ways of how to divide a word. You can divide it into syllables [draws lines to separate syllables].
You can divide it into the root word and then add the prefix
[writes 'understand'].
And the third way? [here, T question is not picked up by students]
Exchanges typical in ELT course classes

In contrast, in the ELT course classes, the above type of connected discourse was more rare and very little scaffolding was evident. Exchanges were often brief, particularly in S3 and S6, and contained little explicit teaching or scaffolding. In the following typical example, the class in S3 was working through an exercise in the
textbook. Students took turns to read the sentence stem in the book and fill in the missing words from a wordbank.

Teacher 3: Ayman, number 2, please
Student a: He has a gorilla. [misreads the word ‘kangaroo’]
Teacher 3: He has
Student a: A kangaroo
Teacher 3: A kangaroo
Student a: I hope he bring it with him.
Teacher 3: With him .. I hope he bring [sic] it with him
           OK. Correct
Class: Yes, yes!
Teacher 3: Elie
Student b: We have a mouse. I hope we bring it with us.
Class: With us
Teacher 3: With us, yes. Very good.

The first exchange contains a negotiation that could be taken to be of meaning; however, it results from the student misreading a word in the text and is therefore classified as a negotiation of form. In T3’s class, there was a heavy focus on accuracy and student utterances are brief and text-prompted. In T6’s class much of the focus was also on accuracy, as the following extract illustrates. Students are generating a bar graph about family members.
Student a: Seven boys and five girls.
Teacher 6: Five girls, seven boys [tallies on the board]
Student b: Five boy five girl
Teacher 6: Five boy
Student b: Five girl [appears to interpret T question as a clarification request]
Teacher 6: Five boy
Student b: Boys
Teacher 6: Five girl or five boyz and five girlz?
Student b: Five boys and five girls

The following example from S3 comes from the same lesson on pronouns as the one on page 170 above. Although there is evidence of student inquiry, similar to that observed in S1, the teacher’s focus on form resulted in an exchange qualitatively very different from that observed in S1:

Student c: Miss, can we say I hope you play with it?
Teacher 3: I hope you play with it.. yeah.
Student d: Miss, can we say, she hopes<
Teacher 3: She [here T apparently misheard S ‘hopes’ as ‘hope’ although in the videotape the ‘s’ is clearly audible]
Student d: She hopes
Teacher 3: She [again, it seems that T does not hear the S correctly]
Student d: She hopes
Teacher 3: She
Student d: Hope
Teacher 3: if she, if we have she, so she
Student d: Hopes
Teacher 3: Yes
Student d: She hopes I bring it with me.
Teacher 3: Yes.
Although the exchange clearly resulted in teacher not hearing the student accurately, it does demonstrate how focus on form and subsequent teacher rejecting feedback discourages student initiated questions; prior to this exchange, four other students had initiated similar questions, but no further student questions were generated during the lesson after this exchange.

In the ELT course classes, much time was spent on clarifying instructions for the communicative activities as the following extract from T6's class shows. The task requires students to interview each other about their family members, but several students have apparent difficulty understanding the task:

Teacher 6: Each one of you will ask his partner and you'll write the numbers here, and then we'll do them straight on the board. OK^ You have ten minutes. You still don't have a book huh^ [to a student sitting without a book] Student: Miss, we only have one question^ Teacher 6: Start asking each other questions 'do you have any sisters?' [to S5] Ask him 'do you have any sisters?' [no response] Teacher 6: [to S4] Do you have two sisters? Write the number two [pointing]

T4 differed from the other two ELT course teachers in that she provided for connected, interactive discourse as illustrated in the following episode from her class. In the following example, she seems to be focusing primarily on meaning rather than form. However, she frequently interrupts the student to offer feedback, correct and prompt, and offer her own elaboration. On line 22, she interrupts to complete the student's response ('<' indicates an interruption in the turn and '>' indicates where the turn was continued). The exchanges are therefore categorized primarily as basic
Students are working on a simplified extract from Mark Twin's 'Tom Sawyer' and are predicting what the story is about based on the illustrations.

Teacher 4: This is her suggestion and she is-e-free, she is free and she is also free to think as she wishes. OK. [unintelligible] We go now to Batul. Let us listen to Batul's suggestion about the first picture.

Student a: Tom Sawyer said for her 'oh, you are you are painting <

Teacher 4: Painting

Student a: >Painting and I'm and I eating and playing

Teacher 4: Yes, I am free, you are busy.

Teacher 4: I am eating I'm not working free to go whatever where ever I like and you are here to whitewash

We'll see

Teacher 4: Sabine

Student b: I think I think so that that Tom saw the apple, so he said for his Ben <

Teacher 4: To his friend, yes

Student b: >Friend Ben that x can you give me the apple and I will let you to to to wash the<

Class: wash wash! [several students calling out answers]

Teacher 4: Wait, wait, listen, yes

She is saying something important and the others, shh.

Student b: >and I will let you <

Teacher 4: Have a turn

Student b: >Have a turn to paint.

Teacher 4: To paint. Maybe, maybe. Very good

Teacher 4: Gibran

Student c: The boy are fighting who want to paint <

Teacher 4: Yes
Following the interaction analyses, the two types of textbooks were examined to determine to what extent the observed interactions could be said to result from the aims and tasks set by the textbooks authors.

ANALYSIS OF THE TEXTBOOK DATA

Holistic comparison of samples from the two textbooks

Table 7.23 on below shows the features that were identified in the two sample texts using an adaptation of Littlejohn's (1998:197) schedule. When a sample representing roughly 15% of student book was examined from both books, the NES course was found to present much more written input (82 pages) as opposed to the ELT course (19 pages). This is due to the NES course containing a total of 570 pages as compared to 126 pages of the ELT course. The tasks presented in the NES course require students to read extensive text across different genres. For example, the pages (242-324) examined in Cullinan et al (1989) presented non-fiction passages on robotics and ballet, a science fiction story, an artist autobiography, three poems, a realistic fiction story, and a multicultural play. In addition, there were two skills lessons, one on distinguishing between fact and fiction and another on study skills.
Table 7.23  **Comparison of the Two Types of Textbooks** 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laureate Reading Program, Crossroads, Level 10 (Grade 5) (1989); Authors: Cullinan, Farr, Hammond, Roser, Strickland. Publisher: HBJ</th>
<th>Amazing English, Level E (1996) Author: Walker. Publisher: Addison-Wesley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOOK AS A WHOLE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main text for use with NSs in upper primary school for reading instruction during one academic year</td>
<td>Main text for use with advanced beginner NNSs learning ESL in upper primary school during one academic year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route through material specified in the teacher’s book, but with options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 'Units' with varying number of reading selections in different genre (fiction, fantasy, biography, poetry) and skills sections. Standardized components: 'Discuss the Selection'; 'Think and Write'; 'Study Skills'; 'Literature Study.'</td>
<td>6 'Themes' of 20 pages each. Standardized components in each theme: 'Communication'; 'Problem Solving'; 'Read and Do'; 'Language power'; 'Check this out'; 'Career corner'; 'Themework/Teamwork'; 'Amazing facts game'; 2 literature selections of various genre; 'Holistic Assessment'.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OVERVIEW OF AN EXTRACT – THEME / UNIT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laureate Reading Program</th>
<th>Amazing English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length: 82 pages from Unit 3; 15 % of student book</td>
<td>Length: 19 pages from themes 3-4; 15 % of student book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequence of activity: 1 read, 2 discuss, 3 think, 4 prewrite, 5 draft, 6 revise</td>
<td>1 class discussion, 2 predict, 3 listen to conversations, 4 problem solve, 5 read and do, 6 read, 7 practice conversations, 8 read and do, 9 read aloud, 10 read, 11 research, 12 listen and read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Focus: 1 reading comprehension, 2 discussion, 3 give reasons</td>
<td>1 listen, 2 formulaic speech, 3 follow written directions, 4 grammar practice, 5 grammar practice, 6 vocabulary development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity: 1 prewrite (list), 2 draft (persuasive speech), 3 revise.</td>
<td>1 groupwork in class (problem-solving), 3 make a wish scroll, 4 card trick, 5 make a puzzle, 6 research (explorers)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Littlejohn 1998:197

The course also requires students to compose a variety of texts, ranging from persuasive and descriptive writing to poetry with similes, and to use pre-writing, drafting and revising strategies. The presented tasks, as confirmed by instructions in the teacher’s guide, aim to develop reasoning skills, discussion skills and study skills. Focus is primarily on reading comprehension, language usage and vocabulary.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
development. No explicit grammar teaching or practice of formulaic language was found in the sample.

In contrast, in the ELT course the reading selections were brief when compared to those in the NES course, although there was a variety of genres. The examined pages (Walker 1996: 57-76) included a simplified folk tale from Africa, a poem, three lessons on role playing conversations and practicing formulaic language, a short lesson on talking about and calculating prices and quantities, a cooking activity (making ‘spoon bread’), a lesson on scanning and skimming, and two lessons on grammar practice. Although some tasks and activities required following written instructions, classifying, carrying out research, and problem solving, the tasks presented in the ELT course focused heavily on interpersonal communication and oral fluency development. Examination of the relevant teacher’s book pages indicate emphasis on listening skills, grammatical structures, and vocabulary development. Formulaic speech was expected to be practiced in pairs and small group role plays.

Comparison of tasks in two sample lessons

Using the teacher’s guides of the two textbooks as a reference, the tasks presented in the two samples were analyzed. First, a lesson from the NES course book (from the beginning of the extract analyzed above) was compared with a lesson from the beginning of the ELT course extract using Ellis’ (1998:227-228) guidelines. The NES course lesson was a 6-page non-fiction reading selection about robots accompanied by full-color photographs. The ELT course lesson consisted of one page of formulaic expressions to show astonishment, which students were expected to listen and then practice in a variety of oral and written activities. The page provided sample dialogues and a word bank of different expressions. Because of the
considerable difference in the focus of the two lessons, a sample reading lesson was also taken from the same ELT course extract for comparison. This lesson consisted of a 4-page African folktale illustrated with colored art on the margins of the text. The analysis of the three lessons revealed differences between the two books in the input to learner, suggested procedures, language activity and expected outcomes (see Table 7.24 on pp. 178-179).

A second level analysis of tasks was then carried out comparing the NES course lesson with the reading comprehension lesson in the ELT course. The two reading lessons were analyzed using Littlejohn's (1998:210) model of textbook analysis. This model distinguishes three major questions, which reflect the processes that control classroom activities: 'what is the learner expected to do? 'who with?' and 'with what content?' Teacher's guides for both lessons were examined in order to determine the process and tasks intended by the textbook authors.

The task-by-task analysis revealed that while the NES students' expected output consisted of both oral and written extended output, the ELT course students' expected output consisted primarily of word- and phrase-level oral discourse. Table 7.25 on page 180 helps illustrate this difference. In both courses, most of the learner output resulted from individual responses to teacher questions, which were presented in the teacher's guide, although some pair- and small-group work was also indicated in both lessons.

The NES course lesson in the student book included also tasks that required both word- and phrase-level and extended written output while written output in the ELT course was included in the optional extension activity section in the teacher's guide. In both lessons, students were working with extended written input, which in the ELT course was accompanied by an audio-recording of the text (see Appendix A for lesson samples).
Table 7.24  
**Tasks Presented in One NES Course Lesson and Two ELT Course Lessons**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crossroads</th>
<th>Amazing English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Input to learner</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 6-page reading selection; photographs with captions; oral teacher questions; written questions; sample chart</td>
<td>A 1-page set of illustrated dialog exchanges of initiation/response each; set of written formulaic expressions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procedures</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher sets purpose through a prediction activity; students read independently or guided by the teacher Teacher stops reading three times to check predictions, set purpose/prediction, confirm prediction</td>
<td>Teacher builds background knowledge and activates prior knowledge through questions and examination of the text page Teacher asks multi-level questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher asks comprehension questions</td>
<td>Students listen to a tape of the model conversation while following along in their books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students discuss the selection with teacher guidance</td>
<td>Teacher and students role-play the exchanges; students attempt to substitute new expressions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students draft a persuasive speech to convince parents of the reasons they need a robot for</td>
<td>Students practice conversations in pairs, using expressions from the data bank of expressions; students attempt to extend conversations by adding expressions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students summarize the story using the guidelines provided in the workbook</td>
<td>Students write sentences and practice role-playing responses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extension suggestions: Students find pictures in magazines and newspapers; students create appropriate conversations about the pictures using the model exchanges given in the text; students classify ideas.

Extension suggestions: In small groups, students dramatize the story; students use the story as a model to write a similar story.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language activity</th>
<th>Outcome(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading, speaking (talking about the reading), writing (persuasive speech), oral rehearsing of speech</td>
<td>Role-play of conversations, Classifying fact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening, reading, speaking (practicing conversations), writing (sentences), speaking about the text, role-playing), writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Ellis 1998:227-22
A comparison of teacher instructional behaviors during the transcribed observations with the relevant teacher's guide sections revealed that, overall, all six teachers followed the set guidelines in terms of how to set up the task and what kind of questions to ask. An exception to this was the personalized discourse observed in T1's class, which linked the lesson content to students' personal experiences.

### Table 7.25  Type of Questions and Expected Output in Two Sample Lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of question</th>
<th>Crossroads</th>
<th>Amazing English</th>
<th>Expected output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes/no</td>
<td>(f) 1</td>
<td>(f) 1</td>
<td>One word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What kind?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Extended discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Extended discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Extended discourse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRES

**Teacher workload**

Data collected from the teacher questionnaires (Appendix I) revealed that the six teachers shared a similar work load of 26-27 hours per week. In addition, each teacher spends several hours a week planning lessons, correcting students' homework and marking tests.
Teacher approach to language teaching

The questionnaire showed that all six teachers perceive the method they use to be 'communicative'. They introduce the new vocabulary by pre-teaching all unfamiliar items through synonyms, pictures or real objects, or miming. T6 occasionally uses Arabic to translate unfamiliar vocabulary items. Their preferred approach to reading was the familiar 'round-robin' approach, whereby students are assigned turns to read parts of the text and the teacher asks comprehension questions on it. In the six classes, the frequency of oral reading ranges from 3-4 times a week to daily.

Use of the textbook

In terms of covering the book, the teachers differed in that the NES course teachers cover only 40-60 % of the lessons in the textbook and the accompanying workbook. They select the lessons that meet the national curriculum objectives and that they believe to be of interest to their students. The ELT course teachers cover all the lessons in the textbook and the accompanying workbook. However, T3 and T6 reported that they omit the science projects and cooking activities and many activities requiring art and craft supplies. They reported the lack of time and materials as primary reasons for their decisions. T4 reported that she covers all the activities in the book.

Supplementary materials

Each teacher uses a separate grammar practice book in addition to the basic language teaching textbook and the accompanying workbooks. All teachers reported also that additional graded readers were at times assigned for reading at home. The ELT course teachers use audiocassettes accompanying the textbook while none of the NES course teachers use them.
Teacher satisfaction with the textbook

With the exception of T5, none of the teachers in the study are free to choose their own textbooks, which are selected by the program coordinator or the principal. The teachers differed in their level of satisfaction with the textbooks they were using. All three NES course teachers were overall satisfied with the textbook they were using, but T5 expressed frustration at not being able to locate a single book that would address all her students' needs in terms of vocabulary, grammar and the four language skills. The ELT course teachers 3 and 6 expressed general satisfaction with the texts they were using but expressed their desire to have grammar integrated into the lessons, as the exercises in the separate grammar course they were using necessitated extensive teaching of new vocabulary. T4 was very satisfied with the textbook she was using. However, all three ELT course teachers expressed a desire for more extended reading selections in the book.

Use of the teacher's guide

Teacher questionnaires revealed that all six teachers considered the guidelines in the teacher's guide to be useful and reported following the procedures 'very closely' or 'fairly closely'. T3 reported that she sometimes creates additional activities for her students if they need more practice with some structures or vocabulary.
PARAMETRIC DATA FROM STANDARDIZED TESTS

NFER Non-verbal reasoning test

Table 7.26 (p. 185) shows the non-verbal reasoning means $X$ and standard deviations (SD) were calculated. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) showed no statistically significant difference in the reasoning means between the two textbook groups; $F_{1.492}$ ($df=5157$, $F_{crit}=3.14$ at a level 0.05). Levene test of homogeneity of variance 1.531; $df=5/157$. The groups can thus be said to come from the same population (see Table 7.27, p. 185). Post hoc tests were not carried out since the a priori hypothesis of similar population was confirmed.

TORC-3 Test of Reading Comprehension

Tables 7.28 (p. 186) and 7.32 (p. 188) show the means ($X$) and standard deviations (SD) for the TORC-3 Test of Reading Comprehension and the subtest of Following Schoolwork Directions (FSWD). One-Way ANOVA revealed a statistically significant difference between the groups, with $F_{19.33}$ ($df=5/156$), $p<.01$ (see Table 7.29). Tukey's HSD post hoc test (see Table 7.30) showed a statistically significant difference in pairwise comparison of means between the NES course groups and the ELT course groups, showing the two subgroups to be from different populations. The variances within the groups were not statistically significant as shown in Table 7.31. The Tukey test, although conservative in that it may fail to detect real differences, allows for all possible pairwise comparisons while keeping family-wise error rate to .05 (Coolican 1999).

Students in S2 and S3, using an ELT course and a NES course respectively, showed a difference in means of 21.947, which is statistically significant at $p<.001$. The English-immersion S5 mean differed significantly from the means of the three ELT course classes ($p<.001$) but not from the means of the other two NES course classes.
The post hoc test reveals the statistically significant difference to result from the overall lower scores of the three ELT course classes (S3, S4, S6) compared to the scores of NES course classes. (However, although homogenous subset test shows there to be no significant differences within the groups, type I error levels are not guaranteed, meaning that there is a possibility that the groups are not homogeneous.)

One-Way ANOVA revealed also a statistically highly significant difference in the means of the Following Schoolwork Directions sub test (FSWD) between the six classes, with $F_{64.6} = 5/156$, $p < .01$ (see Table 7.33). Tukey’s HSD post hoc test showed statistically significant differences in FSWD means between the means of S2 and S1 as compared to the means of the ELT course classes ($p < .001$) and as compared to the immersion S5 class ($p < .002$) (see Tables 7.34 and 7.35). A statistically significant difference was found also between the means of the two French-medium classes S2 and S3, the former using a NES course and the latter using an ELT course. The S2 mean was significantly higher ($p < .001$). The S2 mean was also significantly higher than that of the S5, an English immersion school ($p < .01$).

Inspection of the scatterplot for the correlation between the reading and non-verbal reasoning scores revealed a linear relationship. Pearson’s $r$ was then used to correlate the scores in the six classes. Scores were positively correlated with $r = .467$, a statistically significant result, the critical value with $df = 160$ (N-2) being 0.254 for a one-tailed test with $p < .01$ (see Figure 7.5 and Table 7.36 below). The correlations in the two groups differed, however. In the ELT course group, the $r$ was .607 for a one-tailed test, while in the NES course group it was .425.

As expected, a scatterplot revealed also a linear relationship between reading scores and exposure to English. Calculation of the coefficient of correlation (Pearson’s $r$) revealed a positive correlation of .322 between the reading scores and exposure to English in the other curriculum areas. The correlation is significant, $p < .01$. Analysis of
covariance (ANCOVA) indicated that the textbook type was associated with the reading comprehension scores at a statistically significant level when controlling for reasoning ability (F 58.98, df=1, p<.001) while the L2 exposure in other subject area classes alone did not have a significant effect (F .648, df=2, p<.5) (see Table 7.37).

Parametric Data – Tables and Figures

Table 7.26 NFER Non-Verbal Reasoning 10611 – Means and SDs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>96.07</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>20.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>93.83</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>15.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>87.52</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>86.44</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>17.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>88.22</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>14.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>90.07</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>13.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>90.50</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>16.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.27 NFER Non-Verbal Reasoning 10611 One-Way ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1991.769</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>398.354</td>
<td>1.492</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>41920.980</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>267.013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43912.748</td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 7.28 TORC-3 Test of Reading Comprehension Means and SDs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38.81</td>
<td>27/30/43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>14.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>15/23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23.89</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35.33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>12.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.29 TORC-3 Test of Reading Comprehension One-way ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<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>10902.084</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2180.417</td>
<td>19.33</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>17594.416</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>112.785</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28496.500</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.30  **TORC-3 Test of Reading Comprehension - Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference Test**

Multiple Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(l) Respondent School</th>
<th>(J) Respondent School</th>
<th>Mean Difference (l-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>99% Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>-1.0852</td>
<td>2.817</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td>-10.5616</td>
<td>8.3913</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>20.8624*</td>
<td>3.090</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>10.4685</td>
<td>31.2563</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>14.9183*</td>
<td>2.840</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>5.3647</td>
<td>24.4718</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>3.4815</td>
<td>2.890</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td>-6.2411</td>
<td>13.2041</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>14.8148*</td>
<td>2.864</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>5.1794</td>
<td>24.4502</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>1.0852</td>
<td>2.817</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td>-8.3913</td>
<td>10.5616</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>21.9476*</td>
<td>3.022</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>11.7836</td>
<td>32.1116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>16.0034*</td>
<td>2.766</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>6.7006</td>
<td>25.3063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>4.5667</td>
<td>2.817</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>-4.9098</td>
<td>14.0431</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>15.9000*</td>
<td>2.791</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>6.5131</td>
<td>25.2869</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>-20.8624*</td>
<td>3.090</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-31.2563</td>
<td>-10.4685</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>-21.9476*</td>
<td>3.022</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-32.1116</td>
<td>-11.7836</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>-5.9442</td>
<td>3.043</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>-16.1801</td>
<td>4.2917</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>-17.3810*</td>
<td>3.090</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-27.7749</td>
<td>-6.9870</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>-6.0476</td>
<td>3.066</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>-16.3600</td>
<td>4.2648</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>-14.9183*</td>
<td>2.840</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-24.4718</td>
<td>-5.3647</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>-16.0034*</td>
<td>2.766</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-25.3063</td>
<td>-6.7006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>S4</td>
<td>5.9442</td>
<td>3.043</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>-4.2917</td>
<td>16.1801</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>S4</td>
<td>-11.4368*</td>
<td>2.840</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-20.9903</td>
<td>-1.8833</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>S5</td>
<td>-1.034</td>
<td>2.814</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-9.5682</td>
<td>9.3613</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The mean difference is significant at the .01 level.
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Table 7.31  **TORC-3 Test of Reading Comprehension**  
*Tukey HSD - Means for Groups in Homogeneous Subsets*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Subset for alpha = .01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.9524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23.8966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35.3333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38.8148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sig. .299 .619

Harmonic Mean sample size = 26.64

Table 7.32  **TORC-3 Subtest of Following Schoolwork Directions**  
*Means and SDs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19.2963</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.6807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19.8333</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.1523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.4286</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.2376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6.2414</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.6275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15.4074</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.6822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.6786</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.2952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>13.339</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.5666</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.33  **TORC-3 Subtest of Following Schoolwork Directions - One-Way ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<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>4681.452</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>936.290</td>
<td>64.604</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>2260.875</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>14.493</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6942.327</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 7.34 TORC-3 Subtest of Following Schoolwork

**Directions** - Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference Test

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Schoolwork directions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Respondent School</th>
<th>(J) Respondent School</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>99% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
<td>Upper Bound</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1 S2</td>
<td>-.5370</td>
<td>1.010</td>
<td>.995</td>
<td>-3.9340</td>
<td>2.8600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.8677*</td>
<td>1.108</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>7.1418</td>
<td>14.5936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.0549*</td>
<td>1.018</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>9.6303</td>
<td>16.4796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.8889*</td>
<td>1.036</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>4.036</td>
<td>7.3741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.6177*</td>
<td>1.027</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>6.1637</td>
<td>13.0717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2 S1</td>
<td>.5370</td>
<td>1.010</td>
<td>.995</td>
<td>-2.8600</td>
<td>3.9340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.4048*</td>
<td>1.083</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>7.7613</td>
<td>15.0482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.5920*</td>
<td>.991</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>10.2572</td>
<td>16.9267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4259*</td>
<td>1.010</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.0289</td>
<td>7.8229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.1548*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>6.7898</td>
<td>13.5197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3 S1</td>
<td>-10.8677*</td>
<td>1.108</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-14.5936</td>
<td>-7.1418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-11.4048*</td>
<td>1.083</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-15.0482</td>
<td>-7.7613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1872</td>
<td>1.091</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>-1.4821</td>
<td>5.8564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-6.9788*</td>
<td>1.108</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-10.7047</td>
<td>-3.2529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1.2500</td>
<td>1.099</td>
<td>.866</td>
<td>-4.9467</td>
<td>2.4467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4 S1</td>
<td>-13.0549*</td>
<td>1.018</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-16.4796</td>
<td>-9.6303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-13.5920*</td>
<td>.991</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-16.9267</td>
<td>-10.2572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-2.1872</td>
<td>1.091</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>-5.8564</td>
<td>1.4821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-9.1660*</td>
<td>1.018</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-12.5907</td>
<td>-5.7414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-3.4372*</td>
<td>1.009</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-6.8300</td>
<td>-4.445-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5 S1</td>
<td>-3.8889*</td>
<td>1.036</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-7.3741</td>
<td>-4.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-4.4259*</td>
<td>1.010</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-7.8229</td>
<td>-1.0289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.9788*</td>
<td>1.108</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>3.2529</td>
<td>10.7047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.1660*</td>
<td>1.018</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>5.7414</td>
<td>12.5907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.7268*</td>
<td>1.027</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>2.2748</td>
<td>9.1828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6 S1</td>
<td>-9.6177*</td>
<td>1.027</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-13.0717</td>
<td>-6.1637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-10.1548*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-13.5197</td>
<td>-6.7898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2500</td>
<td>1.099</td>
<td>.866</td>
<td>-2.4467</td>
<td>4.9467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4372*</td>
<td>1.009</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>4.438E-02</td>
<td>6.8300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-5.7268*</td>
<td>1.027</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-9.1828</td>
<td>-2.2748</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean difference is significant at the .01 level.
Table 7.35  **TORC-3 Following Schoolwork Directions Subtest**  
**Tukey HSD - Means for Groups in Homogeneous Subsets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Subset for alpha = .01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6.2414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.4286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.6786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Harmonic Mean sample size = 26.64

**Figure 7.5**  **Correlation between NFER and TORC-3 Scores**
Table 7.36 **Correlation between NFER-Non-Verbal Reasoning Scores and TORC-3 Reading Comprehension Scores**

**Pearson's r**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Verbal Reasoning</th>
<th>Reading Comp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Verbal Reasoning</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.467**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Comp</td>
<td>.467**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. (1-tailed)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Verbal Reasoning</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Comp</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>163</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Non-Verbal Reasoning**

- Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

Table 7.37 **Effect of L2 Exposure and Textbook Type on Reading Comprehension when Controlling for Non-verbal Reasoning - Analysis of Co-variance (ANCOVA)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unique Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sum of Squares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading Comp</strong></td>
<td>4044.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Covariates</strong></td>
<td>8183.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Verbal Reasoning</td>
<td>118.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2_expo (Combined)</td>
<td>5297.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>14395.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model</strong></td>
<td>14101.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residual</strong></td>
<td>28496.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8496.500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANOVAb,c**

- Reading Comp by L2_expo, Text with Non-Verbal Reasoning
- All effects entered simultaneously
- Due to empty cells or a singular matrix, higher order interactions have been suppressed.
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CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter has presented the analyses of the interaction data, textbook data and the parametric standardized test data using both quantitative and qualitative approaches. The non-parametric interaction data were first analyzed using chi square tests. Qualitative differences were noted in the quantitative data. The data provided by the transcripts were then analyzed qualitatively to identify interaction categories that enabled patterns to emerge. The textbook data were analyzed impressionistically, using checklists. Finally, the scores from the standardized non-verbal reasoning and reading comprehension tests were analyzed using parametric tests and subjected to analysis of variance (ANOVA), correlation, and analysis of co-variance (ANCOVA).

No statistically significant differences were found between the two textbook groups in the following: teacher-student talk ratio; frequency of teacher data processing questions; frequency of teacher negotiation of meaning; frequency of teacher appropriating feedback; frequency of student negotiation of meaning.

Statistically significant differences between the two textbook groups were found in the following:

- frequency of teacher data recall and referential questions;
- student data recall, data processing and referential responses;
- frequency of teacher rejecting feedback;
- frequency of student pseudo- and genuine communication;
- frequency of student initiated questions and statements;
- student general reading comprehension performance;
- student reading comprehension of schoolwork directions.

In addition to the quantitative differences, a number of qualitative differences were found between the two groups.

The next chapter will interpret and discuss the findings and draw conclusions.
CHAPTER VIII – DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

'We can talk,' said the Tiger Lily, 'when there is someone worth talking to.'

Lewis Carroll, Through the Looking Glass

INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses the findings and the conclusions of the research study. The chapter begins by summarizing the answers to the main research questions. It then compares the observed interactions in the two textbook groups and their significance to L1 learning in general, and to academic L2 literacy in particular. This is followed by a discussion of the differential reading comprehension performance in the two textbook groups. The chapter then proceeds to explore lessons to be learned from the individual teacher's classes and ends by drawing conclusions from the findings.

MAIN RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the initial hypothesis was supported while the null hypothesis was rejected in that the two textbook groups differed in interactions, task aims and student reading performance. The findings of the study provide the following answers to the main research questions:

First Research Question

What kind of interactions can be observed in the classrooms using traditional English language teaching materials and native English speakers' (NES) reading materials?

The NES course classes were characterized by connected, interactive discourse about language, lesson content and ideas. This discourse featured longer exchanges with negotiation of meaning, topic and form. In contrast, the ELT course
classes were characterized by disconnected Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) sequences with focus more often on form than on meaning. The teacher's questioning strategies influence classroom interactions, either enhancing or hindering discourse.

**Second Research Question**

*What are the aims of the tasks in the two types of coursebooks, and what opportunities do they provide for interactions?*

The NES course textbook provided more varied, and cognitively more demanding, input and tasks that focused on meaning than the ELT course textbook. Consequently, the NES course student had more opportunities for negotiation, which contributed to the development of connected, interactive discourse. The ELT course tasks provided artificially contextualized communicative practice, which focused attention on form, with students reciting from the book as opposed to genuinely communicating. The focus on form and accuracy resulted also in more rejecting feedback than the meaning focus, which characterized the NES course tasks.

**Third Research Question**

*Do students in these classes differ in their L2 reading performance and, if so, how?*

Students using the NES course textbooks outperformed the students using the ELT course books in general reading comprehension test. The NES course students were also able to answer reading comprehension questions about mathematics, science and social studies while the ELT course students were unable to do so.

**GENERAL INTERACTION PATTERNS**

The findings revealed a transmission-oriented, teacher-centered style to prevail in the Lebanese FLAPPS class, with teacher talk constituting nearly 70% of all classroom interactions. This is not unusual in the light of prior research into
classrooms (Bialystok et al. 1978; Chaudron 1988; Fuller and Snyder 1991; Furst and Amidon 1967; Sirotnik 1983; Tsui 1985; Wells 1986). It reflects a traditional belief about teaching and learning that views the teacher as provider of information and the learner as repository thereof. In this approach, the teacher also sets the tasks, poses the questions and evaluates the response to them. This is not surprising bearing in mind two of the salient functions of classroom discourse, which Sealey (1996:78) has identified as 'the management and control of large numbers of children by a small number of adults, and the deployment of language in the process of teaching and learning.'

Data from the transcripts indicate that the six teachers differed in the type of input they provided and that these differences were, to some extent, associated with the type of language teaching textbook they were using. The findings of this study further show that differential teacher input resulted in differential interactions, the NES course teachers generating meaning and topic negotiated exchanges (NEm, NEf) and direct teaching (DT) longer than a single IRF sequence. Some exchanges involved also negotiation of form (NEf).

**Negotiated exchanges of the NES course class**

The following earlier shown examples illustrate the exchanges typical in the NES course classes. The first one includes direct teaching, a basic exchange (without the evaluation move), student initiated negotiated exchange about topic. Within this exchange, there is also direct teaching and another student initiated negotiation of meaning, followed by brief scaffolding (in capitals) response from the teacher:
The following example shows teacher scaffolding (the capital letters and arrows indicate the flow of scaffolding):

Student a: Miss, on Sunday me and my friend [unintelligible]
Teacher 1: What did you DISGUISE yourself as? What were you DRESSED AS?
Student a: Miss, Cleopatra.
Teacher 1: Wow! It's very [unintelligible] famous Egyptian queen. And your friend, did she have a COSTUME?
Student a: Yes, Miss.
[one exchange later]
Student b: Miss, yesterday Ramzy and Wassim we and some friends we were trick-o-treating and we played [unintelligible; giggling]
Teacher 1: They were DISGUISED^ . They were dressed in different COSTUMES^.
Student b: Yes, Miss.

The negotiated exchanges, indeed, often built into 'exchange complexes' (Hoey 1992:79, quoted in Jarvis and Robinson 1997), which involved negotiation of
meaning and extending, bridging, and scaffolding teacher feedback. In the exchange complex, from which the above example about disguises comes, T1 focused on the vocabulary item ‘costume’, which the students were confusing with ‘custom’. She is providing frequent scaffolding by using the word and its synonyms in a context personally meaningful and relevant to students. Another, longer example of an exchange complex with careful scaffolding is shown from S2 in Chapter 7 (pp. 166-167).

The negotiated exchanges were primarily initiated by the teacher but happened also as a result of student raised questions. When these findings are compared with the work of Tharp and Gallimore (1991) on Instructional Conversations, there is evidence that the NES course can facilitate second language learning and help FLAPPS student develop language that they need in order to access the general curriculum. The extended discourse with teacher scaffolding observed in the NES course classes reflects also the Vygotskyan (1978) socio-cultural theory of learning, which views learning as a very social and interactive enterprise.

Although students in this study did engage in some negotiation, the findings support those of Foster (1998) from college level class, which found that only a minority of students engage in overt negotiation, even in small group tasks.

Basic exchanges of the ELT course classes

In contrast, in the ELT course classes, the discourse consisted primarily of teacher initiated basic exchanges (BE) and negotiated exchanges about form (NEf). These exchanges did not build into exchange complexes but rather exchange sequences, where basic exchanges and negotiated exchanges of form followed one another as the following exchange sequence from S6 shows:
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Teacher 6: Where, where were they camping?

Student a: Near Lake Wenda

Teacher 6: Near the lake, right.

Teacher 6: What was the scary experience?

Student b: A bear it scare them

Teacher 6: A bear scare^A

Student b: Scared them

Teacher 6: A bear scared them.

Teacher 6: Look at the picture here on page 34.

What is the bear doing?

Student a: he take<

Teacher 6: He^A he take^A

Student a: It takes ((glasses))

Teacher 6: The bear is taking the binoculars.

What is the bear taking? [points to another student]

One could, of course, argue that the teacher's focus on form, such as in the above example, also constitutes scaffolding of sorts in the sense that it aims to assist the learner to produce what the teacher assumes to be within the learner's zone of proximal development. However, this type of form focused support, whether it is to be considered scaffolding or not, did not result in the kind of connected and interactive discourse observed, for instance in the episodes on page 166 and 168 from S1.
EXPLANATIONS FOR THE DIFFERING DISCOURSE

But what could explain the difference in discourse and scaffolding between the ELT and NES course classes? That the textbook plays a role in the classroom discourse is indicated by the findings, which are consonant with what is known from literature-based first language and ESL classes.

Influence of literature

First, literature, whether fiction or non-fiction, appears to provide opportunities for the kinds of interaction within which teacher scaffolding is more likely to happen than within the kinds of interaction generated by the typical primary school ELT course and demonstrated in the example above. Second, there is the content of the reading selections, which have been chosen from fiction and non-fiction topics popular with the target age group, many authored by award-winning writers for children. Humans throughout history have been drawn to a story, as evidenced by the multitude of epics and legends that have survived over centuries and millennia. Children are no different, and literature, whether fiction or non-fiction, provides something interesting and meaningful to talk about, as shown, for example, by Urzua (1992) and Eade (1997), thus generating opportunities for interaction and dialogue, which in turn can lead to negotiation of meaning and opportunities for scaffolding.

Teacher explanations and interactions

Another explanation for differences in discourse can be found in teacher talk. First, the results show that NES course teachers' direct teaching utterances were longer and cognitively more demanding. They required processing of more language
and more complex information than the explanations provided by the ELT course teachers, as the following typical examples from S1 and S6 illustrate:

Teacher 1: To make it easier, divide [the word] into even syllables or divide it into root word and adding prefixes or suffixes or dividing into compound words.

Teacher 6: This table we did is called a bar graph.

In several occasions, the longer explanations resulted in student initiated output, which in turn provided the teacher with opportunities for negotiation or scaffolding, as in the example from S1 on page 168. These explanations reflect what Tsui (1995) and Wong-Filmore (1985) have identified as effective explanations.

Content and tasks

But why should teacher explanations be influenced by the textbook? Examination of the content and tasks in the two types of books, and their suggested approaches, reveals a possible answer to this, at first seemingly surprising, finding. First, the NES course features content that is more complex and thus might require more elaborate explanations (see Appendix A for sample lesson segments). For example, a lesson on different ways of dividing words is likely to require longer and more complex explanations than a lesson focusing on the practice of formulaic language. Similarly, a lesson on identifying context clues will require more elaborate explanations than a reading lesson with literal comprehension questions. Second, more elaborate teacher explanations generated more student questions, as will be discussed below, thus resulting in more clarifying teacher explanations.

Teacher questions

One more explanation for the connected, interactive discourse characterizing the NES course classes can be found in teacher questions. The results of this study
show that NES course teachers asked more referential questions, which elicited longer and syntactically more complex student responses than closed data recall questions. This was expected, based on, for example, Brock's (1986) and Kubota's (1989) earlier findings. In contrast, ELT course teachers asked more data recall questions, which limited student output, and fewer referential questions, which could have provided opportunities for interactive discourse.

Throughout the data there appears to be a pattern that developed with regards to teacher questioning. When the teacher asked questions that were possible to answer with one word, students often replied in single word answers. When the teacher asked higher order or referential questions, students appeared to respond with longer and syntactically more complex answers, which often resulted in teacher scaffolding feedback and more negotiation.

Examination of the teacher's guide accompanying the textbook revealed the observed teacher questions to be within the guidelines set by the textbook authors. The following two examples help illustrate how the approach to the tasks, specified in the teacher's guide, may contribute to the discourse of the classroom. The first set of questions is from the guidelines preceding the reading selection The Black Stallion by Walter Farley (in Cullinan et al 1989: T211) and guides teacher questions to address literal, inferential and critical reading comprehension:

1. How did the horse and Alec help each other to get to the island?
2. What did Alec do to stay alive on the island?
3. What part of the story did you think was the scariest?
4. What was the first clue the author gave you that the Black was beginning to trust Alec?
5. Why did the ship come to the island?
6. How was Alec's kindness toward the stallion unexpectedly rewarded?
Further extension questions are also suggested:

How will Black get aboard the ship?

What do you think will happen to Black and Alec when they return home? (ibid.)

Contrast these questions with the questions found in the ELT course teacher's guide for another literature selection, *Tom Paints the Fence*, a simplified excerpt from Mark Twain's classic, *Tom Sawyer* (in Walker 1996: T22):

1. What do you think whitewashing means?
2. Did Tom want to do the work?
3. Why not?
4. Who was the first person to come along?
5. What did Ben have?
6. Did Tom's plan work?
7. Where was Ben going?
8. What does Ben want to do?
9. Does Tom let him at first?
10. Was Ben the only one who fell for Tom's tricks?
11. Name some of the things that boys gave him?
12. What great law of human nature did Tom discover?
13. What does that law mean?
14. How many boys do you think helped Tom whitewash the fence?
15. Why did they stop whitewashing the fence?

Close examination of the two sets of questions helps explain why the NES classes may feature more connected discourse. Although the questions in the NES course example, save the question number 3, are display questions, they will require considerable processing of L2 output as they cannot be answered by one word, a short phrase, or by quoting directly from the text. Longer responses result potentially in more negotiation of meaning, possible teacher scaffolding and subsequently in more connected and interactive discourse. In contrast, most of the fifteen questions in the ELT course example can be answered by one word and are thus not very likely to
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generate negotiation of meaning and consequent scaffolding. Question 12 and 13 can be answered by reading from the text. The structuring of the questions in the ELT course example in this way is based on pedagogical reasons central to the multi-level approach advocated by the author in order to accommodate to students who are at different levels of 'developing fluency' (Walker 1996: T1).

These findings can be reflected against the work of Long (1981), Pica (1994), and Gass (1997). These authors have argued interactions to be critical for successful second language learning, while the work of Tharp and Gallimore (1991), Saunders and Goldenberg (1992), Klein (1998), Hall (2000) and others has shown negotiated interactions to be of importance also to ELLs’ academic subject matter learning. In the light of these authors’ work, the findings of this study raise a concern about the appropriateness of the traditional ELT courses in FLAPPS contexts.

EXPLANATIONS FOR DIFFERING STUDENT RESPONSES

The findings of the study suggest that ELT course students engage in more pseudo-communication than NES course students, pseudo-communication here meaning reading, reciting from memory or producing teacher- or text-prompted language. Why should tasks in an ELT textbook generate more pseudo-communication?

Artificial tasks of the ELT course texts

One possible explanation, surprising as it may seem, is the communicative focus of the tasks found in ELT textbooks. These books set up tasks that require students to practice use of formulaic language and complete exercises where they exchange supposedly personal information or ideas in artificially created situations. The following examples from the transcript data help illustrate this artificiality:
Teacher 4: Now, we need two students to come up here to practice the conversation. Who will come up here? Rana and who else? Zeina^  
Now Rana, you congratulate her and she will thank you, OK^  
Student a: Congra-conga<  
Teacher 4: Congratulations  
Student a: (congratulations) [attempt not transcribable]  
Teacher 4: Congratulations. Come on, you can say it  
Student a: Congratulations [not clear]. You were terrific.[reads from the book]  
Student b: Thank you. I can't believe it  
Teacher 4: Excellent. Now Ibtissam and Gibran OK^  
Student c: You were fantastic  
Student d: Thanks a lot  
Teacher 4: You were fantastic! Very good  

This is an example of a situation that is potentially of interest to children, but artificial in that no real need for the exchange exists beyond the one set by the teacher. Moreover, in FLAPPS contexts, children would normally exchange such information in their L1, thus further reducing the purposefulness of the task beyond that of language practice.  

Where the information to be exchanged is already shared by the interlocutors, the potentially communicative tasks become also pseudo-communication when no genuine information is exchanged. In one example from the textbook used in S6, students are expected to exchange information about their free time activities and then tell others about their partner's activities. However, not only is the question provided: ‘What do you do in your free time?’, but twelve suggested responses are also given for students to select from. The following example illustrates how this activity was realized in S6:
Teacher 6: Now you ask her [to St. a, pointing to St. b] about her activities.
Student a: What do you do in your free time? [reads from the book]
Teacher 6: Now you answer him [to St. b, pointing to St. a]:
Student b: I watch TV. [reads from the book]
Teacher 6: Next. Now you tell us about her activities
Student a: She watch<
Teacher 6: She^>She watches TV.
Student a: >She watches TV.
Teacher 6: Now you [points to the next pair of students]
Student c: What do you do in your free time? [reads from the book]
Student d: I play video games. [reads from the book]
Teacher 6: Now you tell us about his activities
Student c: He play the Nintendo

Students continued in this manner through the list. An examination of the teacher’s guide revealed the following guidelines for the activity:

Practicing the conversations. Arrange students in pairs and have them practice the conversations. Then invite different pairs to role-play each conversation. Have students create new conversations using the Data Bank expressions. Make sure they do it expressively with gestures.
(Walker 1996:T90)

In light of the prevailing teacher-centered approach, the observed outcome of these guidelines is not necessarily surprising. The potentially communicative activity, as it was realized in this classroom, was not meaningful. First, children who know each other well after five years together in school will not find this type of activity meaningful, but possibly even rather boring. Moreover, some of the listed activities are culture-specific and, although useful in ESL context, are not necessarily shared by children universally, making them less suitable for EFL or FLAPPS contexts. At the same time, activities and chores perhaps more common among the children in a given cultural context, such as Lebanon, for instance, may be missing from the list. Hence,
instead of functioning as practice for communication, the activity in the above example served more as a reading exercise.

The meaningfulness of the activity as reading is also questionable since the reading demands on the learners did not go beyond decoding the sentences below the pictures of their choice. This is evident in the video, which shows student pairs standing at their desks and bending down to read the text in the book. Such activities are likely to draw the teacher's focus to the form even when an attempt has been made to contextualize the interactions, the context, in fact, being artificially created (Krashen 1981).

Also, the expected learner output is at word, phrase and sentence level, as opposed to production of extended discourse, and it is highly controlled. Such a diet of controlled practice does not prepare students well for access to the curriculum, which requires complex language use and ability to express one's understanding of academic concepts through language. Moreover, if such practice is restricted to decoding ready answers from the book, it does not provide the anticipated short-cut to communication that Hatch (1978) suggests practice of formulaic language chunks might do.

The results of the study support Crystal's (1987) claim about the artificiality characterizing ELT texts in that the interactions generated by the texts are, indeed, artificial, undoubtedly quite contrary to the expectations of the authors, however.

**Meaningful questions and tasks of the NES course texts**

Why should the NES course text, then, generate more genuine communication, which in this study refers to communication that requires processing of information or sharing of ideas, than the ELT course text? One explanation can be found in the open-ended and referential questions that call for personal interpretation.
of the text, which were discussed earlier, and the tasks that focus on meaning and sharing of opinions and ideas. These questions and tasks generate communication involving often rather complex processing of both language and content. In contrast, both closed questions that call for display of knowledge and the practice of formulaic language and conversations often result in rejecting feedback and consequently text- or teacher-prompted language, which is here referred to as pseudo-communication. In other words, although initially aiming for communication, the nature of the questions and tasks alters the intended outcome.

Moreover, the NES course activities include group work activities where learners work on a joint task within the context of the story, as in the following example (italics in the original):

Practice and apply. Form groups of four students and have each group work on the same conclusions. Open your books to pages 102 and 103. Alec makes several decisions in this story. Each decision and feeling is a result of a conclusion Alec makes about the world. To draw these conclusions he uses the evidence and what he knows from past experience. Help me list, on the chalkboard, Alec's major decisions and feelings in this story. ... After groups complete their work, discuss each decision. Have the groups work out any disagreements over evidence or past experience.

(Cullinan et al 1989:T212)

Undoubtedly, this activity provides for more meaningful interactions than the above cited conversation practices. Student responses are also likely to be more varied and, due to the complexity of the task, possibly also more ambiguous, hence offering opportunities for negotiation of meaning, and thus also for genuine, meaningful communication.

If the primary function of language teacher questions is to get the learner to produce language, as Van Lier (1988) has argued, the NES course teachers were not more successful in achieving that goal than the ELT course teachers. However, the same cannot be said if
meaningful communication is the function, which is what research into language learning seems to indicate.

EXPLANATIONS FOR THE DIFFERING FEEDBACK

That teacher feedback, indeed, determines the course of the lesson as Brown and Wragg (1993) and Jarvis and Robinson (1997) have suggested, is supported by the findings of this study, which further indicate that teacher feedback may be influenced by the textbook. The ELT course teachers provided significantly more rejecting feedback than the NES course teachers, consequently generating choppy, disconnected discourse. Why should the textbook influence teacher feedback? One possible explanation can be found in the communicative tasks set in the ELT coursebook demonstrated in the examples in this study. The tasks that aim to provide practice with formulaic expressions appear to focus teacher attention on accuracy of form, as shown in the following two examples from S6 and S4, and thus also result in frequent rejection rather than interactive discourse:

Teacher 6: Next. Now you tell us about her activities
Student: She watch<
Teacher 6: SheA [rejecting feedback]
Student: >She watches TV.

Student: Congra-conga<
Teacher 4: Congratulations
Student: (congratulations) [attempt not transcribable]
Teacher 4: Congratulations. Come on, you can say it [rejecting feedback]

The teacher focus in the above examples is clearly on form; yet, the aim of the activities is not directly on the form. In the first activity, the overt aim is information sharing while the second aims to develop learners' pragmatic competence.

The following example is from an activity, which is intended, as the teacher's guide indicates, to serve as a warm up activity to the presentation. It aims to assess
learners’ prior knowledge and to review and introduce vocabulary. Students are expected to talk about a picture before reading the accompanying short text, and the teacher uses the suggested ‘what’ questions in the teacher’s book. However, rather than focusing on the meaning and getting the children to talk about the picture, which is the stated aim of the activity, she focuses on the form, which leads her to interrupt the student to correct the response (something she does not, in fact, do):

Teacher 6: What is the family doing? [picture shows the family sitting in a tent]
Student: The family sit in<
Teacher 6: sitting
Student: >sitting in the tent.

The closed type of questions posed or suggested in the ELT course text limited the possible answer choices and consequently drew the teacher’s attention to the correctness of the response. Although the teacher’s guides of all ELT courses in this study give alternatives to the closed questions, no suggestions are offered regarding treatment of errors in form or meaning. Both ELT teacher’s books in this study, although providing extension activities and guidance and suggestions for multi-ability groups, presuppose a level of methodological and pedagogical competence from the teacher that may not conform to the realities in many contexts, thus resulting in inefficient use of the material.

In contrast to the aims of the ELT course, the main aim of the NES reading courses is to develop students’ reading comprehension skills, that is getting at the meaning of the text. Therefore, the teacher is more likely to focus on the meaning, and thus accept and develop student responses. This is particularly true about open-ended questions, which allow for a variety of responses as was shown, for example in the questions in the Black Stallion lesson cited earlier (p. 201). Extended text, such as a story, for example, can influence the quality of feedback and subsequent interactions
also in the ELT course class, which is evident from the example where T4 and her students interacted around a story (pp. 173-174). The observed interactions were more meaning-focused and contained less rejecting feedback than the interactions around the communicative tasks. Similarly, non-fiction content that is of interest to the particular learners can generate similar meaning-focused discourse, as was shown, for instance, in the episode about the mistletoe legend in S1 (p. 196).

TEACHER FEEDBACK AND MOTIVATION

From the psychological perspective, the observed teacher rejecting feedback can be related to a number of theories on motivation. First, considering the behaviorist approach of Skinner (1957), accepting teacher feedback may function as a positive reinforcement, increasing the likelihood of more student output while frequent teacher rejections may serve a punishing function, making student output less likely. While from the perspective of Maslow’s (1954) theory of needs, learners’ need to maintain positive self-esteem may be influenced by frequent rejecting feedback, in the light of Bandura’s (1969) social learning theory, such teacher feedback provides also vicarious experiences from which other students can learn. T2, in particular, provided more rejecting feedback than the other NES course teachers, but half of her rejecting feedback contained appropriation of student response and involved scaffolding that helped the student to arrive at the correct response. Hence she helped maintain student self-esteem while providing others with models from which to learn. Although T4 did not provide such scaffolding very frequently, she gave more frequent accepting feedback than any of the other teachers, thus keeping the level of motivation and participation high. This high level of enthusiasm and excitement to participate is very evident in the videotape, which shows the students getting out of their desks and to the aisles, waving their hands as they are bidding for turns.
EXPLANATIONS FOR STUDENT INITIATIONS

The findings of the study suggest that there is an association between the coursebook type and student questions and initiations, with the NES course students initiating more questions ($X^2$ obs 4.58, $df=1$, $p<.05$) and unsolicited statements ($X^2$ obs 5.82, $df=1$, $p<.05$). Several possible explanations for student initiations can be identified when examining interactions in the NES course classrooms. First, the content of the literature-based selections, both fiction and non-fiction, is potentially more curiosity-arousing than the communicative tasks of the ELT courses. The explicit instruction about language and how it works, which forms an essential part of the NES courses, may also motivate students to inquiry. For instance, in S1 and S2 students were curious about both the lesson content and language, as shown in the examples on pages 188-196. In S3, the observed cognitively higher level student questions were about language, as in this example:

Student: Can we say 'I wish we will feed it'?

The single higher level student question observed in S4 was raised in connection to the story of Tom Sawyer and his whitewashing the fence:

Student: Did, did his ant, aunt ((love him)), she didn't like him

The findings further show that teacher responsiveness to student questions and initiations influences subsequent student output. In the classrooms where the teacher took time to provide extended responses to student questions, more student questions were generated from the class, but where teacher responses were brief, no additional questions were generated. Also, teacher's form-focused responses to student questioning resulted in students refraining from further questioning, as seen in the example from S3 on p. 171.
Moreover, the teacher-orchestrated negotiated exchanges and direct teaching characterizing the discourse in the NES course classes may provide more modeling of questioning and expression of ideas than the basic exchanges typical in the ELT course classes. Hence, students may be able to learn linguistic structures, such as question formation, from frequent teacher modeling in the course of the teaching–learning process that may function as 'samples to learn from' (Cazden 1988:108). The discourse characterizing the NES course classes in this study appears to provide plenty of such modeling, thus possibly contributing to students' fluency development, while the interactions and negotiation may contribute to the development of accuracy. The NES course interactions, particularly in S1 and S2, also resulted in many occasions for the teachers to provide specific instruction about language 'in a context where the emphasis was on helping them to say what they themselves had already decided to say' (Lightbown 1991: 211). As Lightbown has suggested, this will enhance the effects of instruction. A post hoc viewing of the videotapes and transcripts revealed that the NES course class students were overall more fluent and syntactically more accurate in their speech than the students in the ELT course classes. Hence, a cycle is created in the NES course class: students generate output, which is accepted, negotiated, and elaborated on; the negotiated output helps develop accuracy; the developing accuracy allows for clearer expression of one's ideas; student feels successful as a learner and is willing to take risks by initiating interactions.

Finally, as noted above, fewer teacher rejections were observed in the NES course classes than in the ELT classes ($X^2_{obs}$ 27.85,$df=5,$ $p<.001$), the primary focus being on meaning, which suggests an environment in which students may feel more motivated to initiate interactions.
EXPLANATIONS FOR STUDENT READING PERFORMANCE

The results of the study show that students using the NES course did better in reading comprehension than their ELT course counterparts. This is particularly evident when comparing the two classes where students had received an equal amount of English instruction per week over four years, but used different coursebooks. NES course students in S2, who had not received any general curriculum subject instruction in English, outperformed all three ELT course classes. They achieved a statistically significantly higher score (p <0.01), as measured by the TORC-3 Test of Reading Comprehension (Brown et al 1995), than students in S3, who were otherwise in a similar program. This finding supports the Gunderson and Shapiro (1988) findings, which show that children who read real books have larger vocabularies than children who read traditional reading scheme books.

As was shown in Chapter 7, the NES course provides more texts in a variety of genres than the ELT course, thus contributing to students' lexical, syntactic and semantic knowledge (Gregory 1996:118). Knowledge of vocabulary is a particularly significant factor in ELLs reading comprehension and academic performance (Carrell et al 1988). The findings thus support Cullinan et al's (1983) claim that reading across diverse genres promotes reading skills more efficiently than reading in only one genre. This is not to say that the ELT courses lack a variety of genres; however, the reading texts in these courses are considerably fewer and shorter in length, hence contributing less to learners' knowledge centers.

The results of the study also show correlation between reasoning scores and reading comprehension, the correlation being lower in the NES course group (r .425 vs. .607). The differential correlations within the two groups suggest that the NES course may benefit students with lower reasoning ability more than the ELT course; in
other words, they may help 'level the playing field' for students with lower reasoning ability.

One might also argue that the NES course prepares students better for test taking. This may be particularly true about the subject matter reading; the NES course includes both fictional and non-fictional content drawn from history, geography and the sciences, thus providing students with information related to academic subject matter even when they do not receive subject matter instruction in the L2. This is suggested particularly by the high reading score of students in S2, who were able to complete all the subject matter sub tests, a task none of the ELT course students were able to accomplish. Yet, they had not received any subject matter instruction in English. Whether S2 students had performed differently in subject matter reading drawn from a cultural context different from that in the NES course is a question that would need to be considered. The explanation could, of course, be a combination of the two factors.

Explanation for the differential reading performance of S2 and S3 students, who differed only in the type of textbook used while having received an equal amount of English language instruction, can be associated with the textbook. The NES reading book offers significantly more extensive reading experiences than the ELT course (even when teachers reportedly need to omit some of the selections from the NES course), most probably resulting in a cycle where students who read more become better readers. However, since it has been argued that in order for second language learning to happen, learners must engage in negotiated interaction, reading alone cannot account for the differential performance.

The observed interaction patterns in the two classes provide another explanation. The NES course class S2 was characterized by negotiated exchanges of both meaning and topic, and direct teaching exchanges with scaffolding, which built into meaningful connected, interactive discourse about language and lesson content.
This supports Saville-Troike's (1984) findings, which show classroom interactions to be associated with reading comprehension.

The data from this study indicate also that the nature of the tasks and the emphasis on reading comprehension may facilitate development of test-taking skills and the skills that are required to follow school work directions. These are important in subject matter classes, where students must be able to access target language text and demonstrate their comprehension by answering questions about the material, both orally and in written tests. The content of the NES courses, drawing from all genres of literature, including non-fiction, provides links to varied subject matter.

LESSONS FROM THE SIX CLASSES

There are a number of lessons to be learned from the individual teachers' classes. Although the data revealed interesting associations between the textbook type, classroom discourse, and student reading performance, suggesting that the NES course provides more opportunities for discourse associated with academic literacy, one must consider other variables that were indicated in the findings as playing a role. One of these variables arises from the perhaps unexpected result of the English immersion class. Students in S5 did not do better in reading comprehension than the other two NES classes, but were outperformed by both (although not at a statistically significant level), including the S2 group who had received English instruction only in the language class. This finding underscores the complexity of variables involved in instructed second language learning and, in this particular case, points to teacher management behaviors as having an influence on student achievement.
Teacher management behaviors

A post hoc investigation of videotapes of the three NES course teachers revealed that T1 and T2 exhibited many of the effective management behaviors operationalized by McGarity and Butts (1984, cited in Tuckman 1999) in their study of effective science teachers, while T5 exhibited only a few of these. For example, both T1 and T2 provided lesson-related directions and opportunities for participation; they maintained and reinforced learner involvement; they followed set routines and were efficient in moving the lesson along; they demonstrated sensitivity to learner needs through scaffolding and clarifications, when necessary, and provided feedback. In contrast, T5 did not maintain learner involvement and did not reinforce it effectively when it occurred. She also deviated from the routines of the tasks often to attend to issues not pertaining to the lesson, as the following example shows (underlined text denotes interactions unrelated to the lesson):

Teacher 5:  This story, 'The Gold Coin' was it is written by a Spanish author< [self-interrupted]
Give it to me, please [walks over to a student]
Who? This is yours^ [picks up a pair of scissors]
Student a:  For Ziad
Teacher 5:  Ziad, is this yours?
((Ok. Enough)) I leave it here whoever it belongs to [signals a student who begins to read]
Student b:  [reading the story but unintelligible due to noise in the room]
Teacher 5:  What's that? [to another student]
Student x:  (unintelligible) [seems to be a question addressed to the teacher]
Student b:  [continues reading] .. thatch < [continues reading aloud all throughout the episode transcribed below]
Teacher 5:  Thatch, so he waited until the woman left, he went into her house and he ransacked<
Student c:  What is ransacked?
Class:  [several students offer definitions]
Teacher 5: Searched everywhere, but he couldn’t find the gold coin.
So, he even removed the thatch. These are pieces of wood that
hold the ceiling together. This is a wooden house, made out of
wood, a hut.

He moved those and still he could not find the coin

Teacher 5: Eric [to another student] Where is the (unintelligible) that
the nurse gave you?

Student d: [... (unintelligible)]

Teacher 5: But didn’t she sign it when you<

Student d: Yes

Teacher 5: You (unintelligible)

Student d: [points to a box on the wall]

Teacher 5: In the box^ I’ll check it. OK. All right

Student b: [continues reading aloud]

Teacher scaffolding

Although T5 did provide direct instruction, her feedback and explanations
provided scaffolding less frequently than those of the other two NES course teachers
(10% as opposed to 20% by T1 and 42% T2).
The scaffolding feedback, may, in fact, explain the somewhat surprising result that
showed the S2 class outperforming the immersion class of S5 in both the general
reading comprehension test and the subtest of following schoolwork directions.
Although the difference did not reach statistical significance, it is surprising that the S2
students would at all even equal immersion students, who had received all instruction
in the curriculum in English, and the S1 students, who had also received some general
curriculum instruction in English. At the same time, S2 students significantly
outperformed in reading comprehension the comparable ELT course class in S3 (with
Mean difference 21.94, p<.001). Their performance can be argued to be related not
only to the textbook and teacher classroom management behaviors, but also to teacher scaffolding. This further indicates the complexity of variables involved.

**Error treatment**

Another lesson can be learned from T4's class. The example on pages 173-174, demonstrates how even a simplified story can generate connected interactive discourse, provided the teacher keeps the focus of interactions on the meaning as opposed to form. However, although she created connected interactive discourse during the two story episodes observed, T4 provided students with little feedback that would help develop their syntactic accuracy, which has been shown by Saville-Troike (1984) to be related to reading achievement, an important aspect of academic L2 literacy. In the same example, T4 also demonstrated how extensive accepting feedback can contribute to maintaining student enthusiasm. However, the accepting feedback did not result in error repair, which might have helped students develop syntactic accuracy that, in turn, might have facilitated their reading achievement. This supports the evidence from the Canadian immersion programs, which suggest that excessive focus on meaning at the expense of form is ineffective in developing academic L2 literacy (Chaudron 1986), where accuracy of comprehension and expression is important.

The reading scores of students in S4 did not differ significantly from those of students in S3 and S6 (mean difference between S3 and S4 was 5.94 while the difference between S4 and S6 was only 0.103), which suggests that connected interactive discourse without attention to errors of accuracy does not facilitate reading comprehension any more than the form-focused approach observed in S3 and S6. In contrast, T2, whose class scored the highest reading comprehension mean, provided explicit feedback on errors, which resulted in students reformulating their utterances in
what Lyster and Ranta (1997:49) refer to as 'uptake'. Although T1 did not provide such
direct feedback on syntactic errors, her students had many opportunities to talk about
language and how it works. The findings raise the question whether students in S1
would have performed better than students in S2 had they received more direct
feedback on errors, which might have resulted in uptake. Another question along the
same lines is whether students in S5 would have performed better had the teacher
provided more explicit instruction and maintained a more focused lesson pace.

On the other hand, the practice of the formulaic expressions, a frequent feature
in the ELT courses, resulted in many teacher rejections in both S3 and S6, thus
possibly influencing student participation. Yet, despite the focus on form and frequent
explicit error correction, these two classes did not differ from S4 in their reading
comprehension performance. Furthermore, because of the structure and artificiality of
the communicative tasks, students in the ELT course classes depended heavily on the
written text during the language practice instead of truly communicating. The
questions accompanying the reading selections in the ELT coursebooks encouraged
brief responses of one word or phrase as opposed to more extended responses
observed in the NES courses.

**Dominance of the textbook**

The findings resonate with some of the findings of Martin (1994) and others in
that the textbook, indeed, was a participant in much of the classroom interactions. This
was particularly true about the ELT course classes, with teacher self-reports showing
that teachers tried to 'cover everything in the book'. The control and authority
delegated to the textbook is reflected in the six teachers' frequent, rather curious, use
of the personal pronoun 'they' in reference to some authority within the textbook. The
teachers used this pronoun quite often when initiating activities specified in the
textbook, as shown in the following four typical quotes:

   Teacher 6: They want us to practice conversation here.
   Teacher 1: Let's see what they want us to do here.
   Teacher 3: They always give us problems to solve.
   Teacher 2: They want us to circle the answers here.

There is a strong sense that the textbook is firmly in control of what is permissible and
what needs to be accomplished. The only one of the teachers to digress in any
significant way from the textbook was T1, who deviated from the plan of the book to
link the lesson content to students' personal experiences.

Yet, the textbook may also lose some of its control as a result of what Sealey
(1999:88) has referred to as 'the non-consensual dimensions of language.' In other
words, the aims of the textbook authors may be in conflict with the needs and interests
of the users, both teachers and learners. When this happens, the aims of the text may
be undermined. For instance, T3 and T6, although both seemingly following the text,
used it to meet their own interest in accuracy of form – whether the interest was pre-
determined or sparked by the nature of the task-in-context – resulting in the
communicative intent of the task not to be realized. An example from S3 shows
students also 'seeking to promote their own interests in interaction' (Sealey op cit),
sifting the textbook goal of language practice and the teacher's goal of accuracy to
metalinguistic knowledge. In this activity, students are expected to practice orally the
use of correct pronouns, which they choose from a given set to fill in the blanks in the
text:
We have a mouse. I hope we bring it with us.

Student a: I With us
Class: With us
Teacher 3: With us, yes. Very good.
Student b: Miss, we can say I hope it was black or<
Teacher 3: I hope it was black.
That's a correct sentence [teacher elaborates with an explanation of further 2-3 sentences]
Student c: She says<
Teacher 3: Yes, Jennifer
Student d: Can we say 'They hope we bring it with us'?
Teacher 3: They hope we bring it with us. Yes, that's right, yes.
Student e: Miss you can say 'I hope we bring with you'
Teacher 3: We yes. Very good.
We're telling somebody that we have something that they hope we bring it, that's they're talking to us, that's correct.
Student f: Can we say 'I hope we will feed it'?
Teacher 3: You will feed it... not we will feed it. I hope we can feed it.
Because it's the meaning.
[three exchanges later]
Student g: Miss, can we say 'I hope you play with it'?
Teacher 3: I hope you play with it, yeah.
Student h: Miss, can we say 'She hopes<

The teacher apparently mishears the student and the episode continues with an exchange described in Chapter 7 (p. 171), after which no more student questions were generated. Although the overt goal of the students appears to have been to obtain knowledge about language, for some students, the questions may have also functioned to fulfill another, hidden, goal, namely that of demonstrating interest and participation (perhaps even to the benefit of the observer).
The theoretical statements and anecdotal accounts about the benefits of 'real books' abound in the recent ESL literature, and empirical studies of Aranha (1985), Elley (1991; 1989), Elley et al (1996); Elley and Mangubhai (1983), Hafiz and Tudor (1990) and Tudor and Hafiz (1989) and others have demonstrated the positive influence of story-books on second language achievement. When the data from this study are compared with the findings of these researchers, who found relationships between story-books, both original and simplified, and second language learning, there is further evidence that extensive reading in L2 has a positive influence on L2 reading comprehension, a critical skill for FLAPPS students.

There are few empirical studies up to now that would have examined the influence of 'real books' on interactions in the second language classroom, Urzua (1992) and Eade (1997) being two exceptions. When the data presented here are combined with the Urzua and Eade results, and those cited above, a picture begins to emerge that might help explain the achievement noted in the literature-based language programs. The evidence from this study suggests that literature results in the kind of connected, interactive discourse in the classroom that SLA research has indicated promotes both second language learning and the development of academic L2 literacy.

The results of this study support Krashen's (1982) input hypothesis, but raise questions about the non-interface position of creative construction theorists (Dulay and Burt 1973; Krashen and Scarcella 1978). Students performed better in classes where there was more extensive input, both from the teacher explanations and the textbook, but where there was also explicit study of syntax and language usage. These findings thus support the notion that extensive comprehensible, meaningful and grammatically natural input promotes language development. However, the findings
also raise a question about the value of explicit instruction, which, according to the creative construction theorists, is not important because what is learned through explicit instruction cannot become automatized. Yet, students who had received explicit instruction performed better in both in reading comprehension and syntactic accuracy of oral expression than students who practiced language through communicative activities. Although no conclusions can be made based on the data collected in this study, it is not outside the realm of possibility that some automatization might, in fact, have taken place during the years that the NES course students had been exposed to both extensive input and explicit instruction about language. For example, post hoc examination of the transcripts revealed that the students in the NES course classes were able to formulate questions by inverting the word order and using auxiliary verbs while students in the ELT course classes signaled questions by declarative sentences with a rising tone. It is possible, however, that the explicit instruction of syntax and usage available to the NES course students was not necessarily of the kind that Krashen and Scarcella (op cit), for instance, might have had in mind, and the usefulness of which they questioned. In other words, the type of, and approach to, instruction might have some bearing on the learning and automatization.

The findings of this study, although they support Swain and Lapkin's (1995) conclusions that learner output is necessary for development of syntactic accuracy, also indicate that learner output alone is not sufficient for syntactic accuracy to develop. Students in S4 produced more output than any of the other classes but demonstrated weaker syntax than, for example, students in S2, who produced less output but engaged in explicit study of language. Also, students in S4 did not demonstrate better syntax than students in S3 and S6, who produced less output. It is, of course, also possible that the syntactic accuracy demonstrated by the NES course
students is a result of acquisition, and not the explicit instruction they received, or a combination of both.

The earlier concern raised about the suitability of ELT coursebooks in FLAPPS programs is further strengthened by findings of this study, especially as the ELT course books were found to generate pseudo-communication and disconnected discourse as opposed to meaningful, connected discourse associated with development of academic L2 literacy. The ELT course classes further reflect the traditional teacher-centered and passive English language classrooms, which have been argued to limit students' opportunities to produce language and develop academic language skills (Lightbown and Spada 1987; Ramirez et al 1991; 1994; Tsui 1995; Valdez 1998). That is not to say that the ELT course authors would intend this outcome; quite the contrary. The teacher's books provide many interesting suggestions and tasks, but the intent is not realized in the classroom. At the same time, the ELT courses lack explicit instruction on language usage, which was found in the NES course classes to generate the type of interactions that promote both language learning and development of academic L2 literacy.

CONCLUSIONS

Based upon the findings of the study and the discussion above, the following conclusions were drawn:

- The ELT course texts and tasks seem to generate discourse consisting of disconnected teacher initiated Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) sequences, whereas the NES course texts and tasks appear to generate connected, interactive discourse constructed of exchanges that build into elaborate exchange complexes. These exchanges include frequent negotiation of topic, meaning, and
form, whereas the limited negotiation that occurs in the IRF sequences typical of the ELT course classes tends to be primarily on form.

- The questions in the NES course texts appear to generate longer and syntactically more complex responses from the students than the questions posed in the ELT course books. These questions and responses seem to influence the interactions patterns, as they appear to result in more negotiation and scaffolding teacher feedback.

- ELT course tasks tend to result in more rejecting teacher feedback, and consequently in more teacher- and text-prompted pseudo-communication from the students, than the NES course tasks. A possible reason for the more frequent teacher rejections appear to be the communicative nature of the tasks characterizing the ELT course books, which tend to draw the teacher attention to accuracy, rather than promoting communication, as intended.

- The interaction patterns and teacher feedback seem to influence student initiations, which appear to be encouraged by the connected, interactive discourse and the accepting teacher feedback that characterize the NES course classes. Student initiations appear also to be encouraged by teacher explanations, which tend to be longer and demanding more processing in the NES course classes.

- The type of texts and reading tasks presented in the NES course textbooks, and the subsequent connected, interactive discourse prepare FLAPPS students for the type of reading that they are required to do in other academic subjects.

- Literature, both fiction and informational texts, appears to have a bearing on classroom discourse, as it is motivating and relevant to learners and seems to promote meaningful interaction.

- The teacher’s books, although providing extensive guidance and suggestions for multi-ability groups and extension activities, seem to presuppose a level of methodological and pedagogical competence from the teacher that might not conform to the realities in many contexts, thus resulting in inefficient use of the material.
CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter has discussed the findings of the study, which suggest that classroom interactions differ, to some extent, as a function of the language teaching textbook. These differences, which are apparent in teacher explanations, questions, and feedback as well as in student type of communication, can be related to both second language learning and development of academic L2 literacy.

Firstly, the chapter has shown that the input available in the two groups differed in terms of direct teaching, types of questions asked by the teachers, and the feedback teachers provided. Teacher questions and subsequent student output, both of which were shown to be a function of the textbook, resulted in different interaction patterns. Secondly, the input received by students from the textbook differed quantitatively and qualitatively. The NES course text provided not only more input but also syntactically more complex input. Thirdly, the language teaching textbook appears to influence students' general reading comprehension performance, particularly in academic subject matter. Subjects using the NES book did better in general reading comprehension than the ELT course subjects and were also able to answer written comprehension questions about mathematics, science and social studies, which the ELT course subjects were unable to do.

The findings of this study suggest that a number of other variables need to be considered when determining how academic L2 literacy develops and what role the textbook might play in the process. These will be explored in the next chapter, which summarizes the study and its findings and discusses the implications.
CHAPTER IX - SUMMARY, LIMITATIONS, IMPLICATIONS, CHALLENGES, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR RESEARCH

"Why," said the Dodo, "the best way to explain it is to do it."
Lewis Carroll, Through the Looking Glass

INTRODUCTION

This chapter first summarizes the main features of the study. It summarizes the results obtained and the conclusions drawn from the results. The chapter then discusses the limitations of the study and the implications of the findings. Finally, it situates the findings within a theoretical framework, which attempts to describe the many highly complex and interactive variables influencing interactions and subsequent language learning and development of academic L2 literacy. The chapter concludes with recommendations for further research.

SUMMARY OF THE STUDY

Before exploring the implications of the findings, a brief summary of the study is in place. This research study set out to investigate interactions in primary school English language classes in Lebanon where students need to study subject matter in English, which is, in effect, a foreign language to them. More specifically, this exploratory study aimed at identifying and describing observed interactions in classrooms using different types of language teaching textbooks. More specifically, it aimed at determining whether the interactions observed reflected what is known about second language acquisition and development of academic L2 literacy, the null hypothesis being that the interactions in the two groups would not differ in this regard. Because of the recognized complexity and highly contextualized character of any human interaction (Lincoln and Guba 1985), including classroom interactions, both
quantitative and qualitative data were collected from naturally existing classrooms. On the one hand, the study was motivated by the less than satisfactory student achievement in English language and the spreading practice in Lebanon of using literature-based texts that are intended for native speakers' reading instruction for second language teaching. On the other hand, there was the increasing research evidence that showed the positive influence of literature on development of second language skills.

**Sites and participants**

Six primary school grade five classes in different parts of Lebanon were observed (see Chapter 6, pp. 105-106) for description of sites and participants. The observations were videotaped and segments thereof transcribed. A total of ten hours of videotaped observations and 180 minutes of transcripts were collected and analyzed, using both quantitative and qualitative approaches. Triangulation was achieved by collecting data through different methods (observations, standardized tests, and questionnaires), and from different sources (observation categories, transcripts, textbooks, teacher questionnaires), and by analyzing the data, employing both quantitative and qualitative techniques.

**Instrumentation**

An observation schedule, described in detail in Chapter VI, was used to collect data from the transcripts. Videorecording was used in order to preserve the social context of interactions (Coolican 1994), to make a detailed transcription possible (Hatch 1992), and to enable data to be retrieved for further analysis (Seliger and Shohamy 1989). Because of the purposive sampling methods, NFER-Nelson Non-Verbal Reasoning 10 & 11 test (Appendix G) was used to determine intellectual similarity of the groups. TORC-3 Test of Reading Comprehension (Appendix H) was used to assess the reading comprehension skills of the participating students. Data
about teacher perceptions were collected using a questionnaire, and data about the textbooks were collected through checklists.

**Data analysis**

Parametric data from the standardized non-verbal reasoning and reading comprehension tests were analyzed by first computing means and standard deviations, and then by applying analyses of variance (ANOVA) to the data. The observation data were analyzed as follows: First, two lesson sequences were videotaped in each of the six classrooms. Second, three five-minute segments from each lesson were selected for transcription, one from the first third, one from the middle third, and one from the last third of the lesson. Each videotaped segment was then transcribed and coded, using the observation schedule. Finally, the coded data were transferred into an SPSS file for quantitative statistical analyses. The accuracy of the transcript was verified by simultaneously viewing the videotape while reading the transcript. Inaccuracies and errors were adjusted. The data collected from the transcripts were further analyzed qualitatively, enabling patterns of interaction to emerge.

**SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS**

The null hypothesis was rejected by the findings as interactions in the classrooms differed depending upon the textbook.

Teacher input in NES course classes, particularly the explanations and questions, differed from teacher input in ELT course classes, with NES course teachers engaging in more direct teaching and providing longer and more elaborate explanations than the ELT course teachers. The NES course teachers asked more referential questions while the ELT course teachers asked more limited data recall type questions ($\chi^2$ 11.61, df=2, $p<.01$).
Student output in the NES course classes was characterized by genuine communication, meaning recalling and processing data and talking about ideas, while in ELT course classes it was characterized by pseudo-communication ($\chi^2 = 5.02$, $df=1$, $p<.02$), and NES course students initiated communication more often than ELT course students ($\chi^2 = 4.58$, $df=1$, $p<.05$). The student communication was related to both the textbook aims and tasks, and to the subsequent teacher questions and explanations. The focus on form, albeit not intentional from the authors of the texts, seems to have influenced teacher feedback, with teachers in ELT course classes providing more rejecting feedback than their counterparts in the NES course classes ($\chi^2 = 5.0$, $df=1$, $p<.05$). The rejections, which often interrupted students' output, resulted also in brief and fragmented exchanges. In contrast, the focus of interactions in the NES course classes was on meaning, which appears to have resulted in fewer teacher rejections of student responses. This, in turn, appeared to foster student participation and initiation of interactions.

The input NES course students received from the textbook differed quantitatively and qualitatively from the input available to ELT course students. The NES course textbooks provided not only more input but also input that was syntactically more complex than that of the ELT coursebook. The NES course textbook aims to develop students' reading comprehension while fostering also their reasoning, discussion, and study skills. The diverse text genres and tasks in the NES course textbooks provide students with numerous opportunities to 'move between the language modes' (Sealey 1996:13) of listening, speaking, reading, and writing, thus contributing to the development of academic L2 literacy.

In contrast, the ELT course has as its primary aim to develop students' communicative competence. These aims give rise to different interaction patterns, which can be said to restrict second language development and the development of
academic L2 literacy in so far as they generate disconnected discourse. This is particularly true if the texts are not used as intended by their authors.

The way the aims and tasks in the two types of textbooks were realized in the classroom differed in the two groups. The observed classroom interactions in the NES course classes tended to reflect the aims and the meaning- and content-focused tasks of the textbook. In contrast, the observed interactions in the ELT course classes could not be said to reflect the intended communicative aims of the course, mainly because the content and nature of many of the tasks focussed teacher attention to accuracy of form as opposed to communication of ideas.

Although the textbook was in rather firm control of the lessons in all the six classes, its intended aims were often undermined, particularly in the ELT course classes, where teachers deviated from the set aims of the textbook authors. These deviations appeared at times to be purposeful, but more often than not resulted indirectly from the communicatively oriented texts and tasks, which seemed to have led the teacher to focus on form as opposed to communication of ideas and meaning. Hence, what purported originally to be communicative practice of language in personally meaningful contexts was, in the reality of the classrooms, converted into form focused practice. A question remains whether this was due to the teacher's lack of pedagogical or methodological knowledge, presupposed by the textbook authors, or due to the task itself as it was enacted in the context of the classroom.

Students using the NES course book performed better than students using the ELT course book, not only in general reading comprehension (F 19.33, df=5/156, p<.01) but also in specific subject matter reading. The content of the NES course textbooks, which comprises a wide variety of genres and topics, helps explain the better reading performance. Another explanation is that the NES course texts prepare students better for test taking.
SUMMARY OF THE CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions from the findings can be summarized briefly as follows:

The NES course texts seem to contribute to the construction of connected, interactive discourse about language, lesson content, and the real world. Together with its negotiations and scaffolding teacher feedback, this type of discourse facilitates development of both receptive and productive language. Such interactions, along with the content and structure of the tasks, facilitate development of academic L2 literacy critical to students in FLAPPS classes. In contrast, the ELT course texts appear to generate more fragmented discourse with a focus on form. The way many ELT course tasks are realized in the classroom differ from the original intent of the textbook authors, partly because of the artificial context of the tasks and partly because of the instructional strategies employed by the teachers.

The findings of this study contribute to the heretofore limited body of research on the impact of the textbook on classroom interactions and the subsequent development of academic L2 literacy of children in FLAPPS programs. More specifically, the findings shed light on the previously unexamined question of how the texts and tasks of the language teaching course influence teacher questioning and feedback behaviors and how these help shape the classroom interactions.

LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

Although every effort was made to assure that the research was as rigorous as possible, there are recognized limitations in the methodology. First, the purposive sampling raises a concern about generalizability of the findings to a wider population. Although comparison of the questionnaire results and official government statistics show the participating teachers representing typical primary school teacher population in Lebanon, the population validity (Mertens 1997:255), as regards the students, may
be threatened. Some sampling bias (Henry 1990, cited in Mertens 1997) may have resulted from under-representation of the elite schools on the one hand, and the very underprivileged schools in remote regions on the other. Interactions in other classes using similar materials may, therefore, differ from those observed in this study. Also, it is dangerous to create stereotypes of ELT course and NES course teachers based on the small number of teachers observed. Still, the findings provide sufficient evidence to show that, at least in some ELT course classes, the nature of interactions does not provide sufficient opportunities for students to develop academic L2 literacy, while, at least in some NES course classes, such opportunities are frequently provided. The non-verbal reasoning test scores strengthen the external validity of the study as they show the scores to be normally distributed.

Secondly, limiting the observations to two sessions per class raises also a concern about how representative the observed interactions can be claimed to be of those in a given class. In other words, the reliability of the study, or what Kirk and Miller (1986, quoted in Peräkylä 1997:203) define as ‘the degree to which the finding is independent of accidental circumstances’, could be challenged. It could be argued that subsequent observations might have produced different findings. The reliability was enhanced by collecting data from teacher questionnaires, which confirmed the observed teacher instructional strategies being in line with teacher self reports. Further validation for the observation findings was obtained from the textbook data, which show the observed teacher questioning behaviors conforming fairly closely to the set guidelines in the teacher’s book. It is therefore reasonable to speculate that the observed interactions do not significantly differ from those that could be observed in these classes at other times. Even the misinterpretation of the teacher’s book guidelines is likely to occur by the same teacher at other times, consequently resulting in interactions similar to those observed in this study.
In this study, validity, or whether 'the researcher is calling what is measured by the right name' (Kirk and Miller 1986, quoted in Peräkylä op cit), is concerned first with the categories of the observation schedule, particularly the high inference items and, second, with the emerging exchange categories. The validity of the observation schedule was improved by using multiple coders in the pilot phase of the study and by cross-checking and adjusting category definitions (Mertens 1997). When categorizing the utterances, relations between turns of talk were examined, in other words, the analysis was validated through the 'next turn' (Peräkylä 1997: 209), a criterion suggested to be 'the primordial criterion of validity' in conversation analysis (ibid).

Member validation was not sought for the interpretations due to the hierarchical social relationships in the Lebanese culture. The researcher, being a university teacher and, at the time of the study, a materials developer at the Ministry of Education, would be considered as 'the more powerful person' (Smith 1996:194) than the school teacher. Therefore, it was expected that the participating teachers would only confirm, rather than disagree with the presented interpretations. However, sufficient raw data about the exchanges is presented in Chapters VII and VIII to allow the reader to participate 'in an interpretative dialogue with the data' (Smith 1996:192). In other words, validity of the qualitative analysis derives from the 'presentation of evidence' (ibid). The validity of the inferences drawn was further supported by exploring of various explanations.

Student exposure to English outside the language classroom is a variable that is difficult to measure accurately. Although a measure was taken of students' exposure to English in other subject area classes, it was not possible to measure the amount and quality of contact that individual students may have had with the target language outside school. Depending on the quantity and quality of exposure, both student output and reading performance can be argued to be influenced. This poses a
threat to the internal validity of the study, in other words, questioning the extent to which the findings might have been influenced by it. In order to obtain data from naturally existing classrooms, which is important for the external validity of the study, meaning any generalizations to the real world, some of the internal validity had to be sacrificed (Brown 1988). The inclusion of the total English immersion class in the study helps counter this threat to internal validity, as it provides a comparison point of exposure within the school.

Finally, there is the intensely social nature of all human interactions. Like any human interactions, the social interactions between the teachers and students are always unique to the situation and context, and can be expected to differ from one classroom to another. Thus, they defy replication, even given similar conditions. The findings further underscore the difficulty of accurately and reliably coding and analyzing interaction data, particularly without considering both quantitative and qualitative aspects of communication, including non-verbal and para-linguistic features of human communication.

The credibility of the study has been maintained through accurate and detailed reporting of data collection and analysis procedures, and the detailed transcript data provide 'publicly accessible representations' (Peräkylä 1997:203) of the observed interactions, and can be used as data sets for future research and replication studies. Although sample to population generalizations cannot be made from this study, the study does give rise to a theory that can be further investigated in other settings. The findings also have some implications for language teaching practice, particularly in the FLAPPS context, and these will be discussed in the following section.
IMPLICATIONS OF THE FINDINGS

This study sheds light on a heretofore rather unexplored area of instructed second language learning in primary school, namely the non-native speaker teachers and language learners interacting around the language teaching textbook. The study shows the central role that the language teaching textbook plays in a FLAPPS classroom interactions and the development of academic L2 literacy. The findings demonstrate the potential of literature-based language teaching materials in developing both learners' second language skills and academic L2 literacy.

When discussing the consequences of these findings, one must return to the interactive nature of language learning and the importance of interactions for development of academic literacy. With this in mind, one can begin to examine how the textbook that limits FLAPPS students' opportunities for connected, interactive discourse affects their development of second language in general and their development of academic L2 literacy in particular.

Implications for second language learning

As has been discussed in Chapter III, interaction allows for negotiation of meaning, which, in turn, facilitates second language learning. If the classroom discourse is limited to fragmented Initiation-Response-Feedback exchanges, learner output can be limited to word and phrase level, hence, diminishing opportunities for interaction and negotiation. Consequently, the opportunities for developing syntactic accuracy are also diminished.

Motivation influences learning (Csiksentimihalyi 1990), and if language learning is comparable to learning of other cognitive skills (McLaughlin 1987; Anderson 1983), it is then also subject to motivation. If the tasks in the language lesson are artificial, or so removed from the learners' reality that they are not meaningful, the discourse around the tasks becomes equally artificial or irrelevant.
and, thus, un-motivating. Consequently, language learning will be negatively influenced. If language, as has been suggested, develops best when learners have opportunities to interact in meaningful ways, then un-motivating materials that do not promote meaningful interactions will hinder development of language skills and consequent development of academic L2 literacy.

**Implications for academic L2 literacy**

The frequent use of closed, data recall type questions limits students' opportunities for higher order thinking. If such questions also result in short, word or phrase level responses, students will not have the opportunity to develop ways of expressing their knowledge and understandings accurately, which is an important skill in the FLAPPS context. As Lemke (1990:91, emphases in the original) has stated: ‘In teaching science, or any subject, we do not want students to simply parrot back words. We want them to be able to construct the essential meanings in their own words, and in slightly different words as the situation may require.’ Open-ended and referential questions that result in scaffolding feedback and interactive discourse will facilitate the development of the ability to construct and verbalize meanings in the way suggested by Lemke.

Granted, data recall questions do require students to process language; however, if they result in frequent teacher rejections and disconnected discourse, which serve a punishing function, these questions contribute to diminishing motivation to participate.

The findings are consistent with the Vygotskian (1978) socio-cultural approach to teaching and learning, and with the Instructional Conversations described in Chapter III and IV, respectively. The findings also resonate with Cummins' (1984a:4) notion that cognitive academic language proficiency is 'socially grounded and only able to develop within the matrix of human interaction' in that interactions were
associated with academic L2 literacy. However, the findings indicate the quality of interactions to be of significance, with interactions containing scaffolding resulting in more meaningful discourse than interactions with limited or no scaffolding. When taken together with the theories of Vygotsky and Cummins, the findings of this study suggest that FLAPPS students’ academic L2 literacy development will benefit from connected, interactive discourse that contains frequent teacher scaffolding.

The findings further indicate that literature-based language teaching textbooks, which provide extensive exposure to a variety of genres, generate the kind of interactive discourse that characterizes successful second language learning and development of academic L2 literacy. Moreover, the findings indicate that students’ L2 reading comprehension is favorably influenced by explicit instruction about, and study of, language and its usage.

**Implications for materials development**

The findings of this study bolster the case for inclusion of more substantial and diverse reading selections in FLAPPS course texts that would help students to develop their academic reading skills.

The findings also support the inclusion of explicit teaching about language in FLAPPS course texts in addition to, or instead of, the currently prevailing language practice and cued ‘conversations’.

Clearer pedagogical and methodological guidelines and suggestions in the teacher’s guide will be beneficial to assure that the intended aims are not undermined and failed to be realized, due to possible lack of the presupposed professional knowledge. This is of particular concern in contexts where teacher preparation programs and pre-requisite teacher qualifications may significantly differ from those in the target language context, where the textbooks are often authored.
Although favoring NES courses, the findings do not, however, imply that only texts intended for native English speakers should be used for FLAPPS instruction in Lebanon, or other similar contexts. This is an important point, bearing in mind the researcher's responsibility toward the community within which the study took place, and the potential of the findings resulting in positive action within this community (Lincoln 1995). In Lebanon, there is the earlier described concern of the high cost of the NES course books that places a difficult burden on many parents, particularly at the time of the current economic situation, suggesting that alternative solutions must be explored. One possibility would be to develop English language teaching texts, which mirror those aspects of the NES course materials that seem to be most beneficial to young English language learners in FLAPPS classrooms. These materials, if developed locally, with guidance and assistance from experts in the field, could be produced at a less prohibitive cost and thus made available to all learners. Another solution would be to introduce book floods described in Chapter 5 into the ELT course classes along with the coursebook. It is imperative that solutions be found which will guarantee optimal development of academic L2 literacy of all the young FLAPPS students, as their eventual socio-economic status and quality of life will be influenced by the level of education they attain.

**CHALLENGES POSED BY THE FINDINGS**

Although the findings of this study suggest that a textbook is, indeed, a variable influencing classroom interactions, a number of other variables aside from the textbook appear to be interacting and influencing classroom interactions and subsequent student performance. One such variable appears to be the reasoning ability, with student reading scores being highly correlated with their reasoning scores. Another variable is exposure to L2 in subject matter classes, which, not surprisingly, appears to influence student L2 performance. However, teachers' classroom
management behaviors appear to also have bearing on the outcomes, either enhancing or hindering interaction conducive to second language learning and development of L2 academic literacy. Moreover, what the teacher perceives to be important for language learning may be reflected in the ways he or she makes use of the texts and how the subsequent activities are realized in the classroom.

The dissimilar interactions and performance of the six classes, particularly the intragroup difference observed in both textbook groups, underscores the difficulty of predicting interactions and learning outcomes of any given group without considering the potential influence of several interconnected and interactive variables. The findings resonate with Spolsky's (1989) concerns about a single theory of second language learning by underscoring the complexity of conditions in second language learning. This view is in line with the systems theories, which assume that, within a given system, there are numerous, mutually interactive forces, or variables, that all influence the outcomes. The strength of a given influence is often not predictable because of the complexity of the system (Sameroff 1983, cited in Bee 1995). An example from child psychology is the theory of resilient vs. vulnerable infants and their respective ability to withstand the stresses placed on them by the environment (Horowitz 1990). It is not possible to estimate the extent of the influence that emotional deprivation, for example, may have on children, since children differ widely in their resilience. In terms of the language classroom, and the role of the textbook in interactions, this means that, although one can predict the general influence of the textbook on the amount of connected interactive discourse, one cannot predict the exact quantity and quality of the discourse itself. This is due to the many interactive forces that impinge upon it and that are concerned with both the individual students' and teachers' characteristics, as well as their particular needs and interests, which may, at times, be at cross-purposes with those of the textbook.
Such a conceptualization mirrors Bromfenbrenner's (1979, 1993) bi-ecological model of child development, according to which the developing child is in continuous reciprocal relationship with various systems, both physiological and psychological. These systems, in turn, are in relationships with each other, with changes occurring as a result of these interactions at various levels. And, although global patterns can be identified, we cannot accurately predict the local details of the pattern. In other words, although we can perhaps predict that teacher rejecting feedback has a potentially detrimental influence on student output and the resulting interactions, we cannot anticipate the exact influence on individual students, who differ in their perceptions and sentiments about such feedback.

As students develop both their accuracy and fluency, they are likely to perceive themselves as successful language learners, which in turn will keep high their motivation and participation, the latter providing further opportunities for learning.

More broadly, if one views classroom second language learning and development of academic L2 literacy from a systems perspective, the outcomes can be said to be influenced by reciprocal interactive variables, both within and outside the individual learners and teachers. Figure 9.1 below attempts to demonstrate the interactive nature of the many variables that need to be considered when attempting to understand language classroom interactions. Interactions are influenced directly by the participants within the classroom and the texts they are interacting around, but all these are influenced both directly and indirectly by numerous variables. For example, teacher's classroom behaviors are influenced by his or her beliefs about teaching and learning, as well as about language. Both teachers and learners bring into the interactions their own individual dispositions, intelligence, and prior experiences. They also bring in their own personal needs and interests, which are continuously shaped by, and shaping, the texts and the on-going
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Figure 9.1 Interactive framework for understanding
interactions. How the teachers and learners perceive authority and relationships, and their own role within the classroom, is influenced by their cultural beliefs and values. SLA research, economy, and publishing policies all have a bearing on the kinds of texts that are available to teachers and learners. The type of tasks and content and their relevance to learners, in turn, influence the interactions.

Therefore, although it is possible to predict that NES course texts may generate interactions more conducive to development of academic L2 literacy than ELT course texts, it is not possible to accurately predict the interactions and outcomes in individual classrooms regardless of what is known, for instance, about texts and their influence on interactions. Some common patterns could be detected in this study, yet there were sufficient differences within the two groups to support the systems view.

The findings, while supporting the systems view of language learning and language classroom, place the teacher 'at the center stage' for 'organizing the classroom for learning' (Macnamara 1994:4). This study shows that in this process, the language teaching textbook shares the center stage with the teacher, helping orchestrate the interactions, either restricting or enhancing discourse.

To sum up, the findings of this study challenge the practice of using the traditional ELT texts in FLAPPS context for two main reasons. Firstly, the ELT course texts, although appropriate for their original purpose, are limited in their content and do not provide sufficient access to the type of language associated with subject matter learning. Secondly, the way ELT course texts and tasks are structured results in classroom interactions that do not promote connected, interactive discourse associated with academic L2 literacy development. In fact, the findings also raise a question about the appropriateness of ELT materials for language teaching in general,
especially in contexts where teachers may lack the methodological and pedagogical knowledge that would enable them to make full use of the materials.

The findings further raise a concern about the prevailing approach to research into instructed second language learning, which tends to be limited to investigation of a single variable or a limited set of variables, often in artificially created contexts. Findings from such research, if considered when designing instructional materials, may result in materials far removed from the realities of diverse classroom contexts. Moreover, until ample empirical, classroom-based research will be available to guide materials development and pedagogy, the hegemony of a few multinational corporations over language teaching textbooks is likely to result in materials development motivated more by concerns over sales revenue than the needs of teachers and learners.

The study has implications for future research, and some pertinent suggestions for research are made below.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH**

The findings of this study have some implications for further research. Further studies should continue to investigate interactions in more classrooms. Given the limitations in the study, it would be important to replicate the study in order to obtain confirmation for the findings and allow for generalizations to be made. This could be obtained by collecting

a) further similar, cross-sectional data from other similar classrooms, both in Lebanon and in other cultural contexts, and

b) more similar, but longitudinal data from similar classroom.

The findings from S4 showed a difference in the discourse between interactions associated with communicative language practice and those involving literature selections. One important project, therefore, would be to have a number of
teachers work alternately with both textbook types and then compare their questioning and feedback behaviors and subsequent classroom interactions across texts.

If it is assumed that findings of this study can be attributed to the textbook and its tasks influencing interactions and subsequent student performance, why then was different performance observed in S5 than in S1 and S2, although all three used the same textbook? Future research might explore the extent to which language teachers' classroom management strategies influence student interactions and performance.

As regards research on instructed second language learning, the findings of this study underscore the complex nature of the variables involved in the language classroom. It is difficult to conceive of a research study that would be able to consider all the numerous, constantly interacting variables that both shape, and are shaped by, classroom interactions, and impinge upon both teachers and learners. Yet, such research would be necessary if we are to gain a deeper and clearer understanding of the language learning phenomenon. Such research would perhaps best be accomplished through collaborative efforts of a team of researchers, each investigating different variables, and using different research methods and data analyses, but within the same context.

CHAPTER SUMMARY
This chapter has presented a summary of the main aspects of the study and its findings. Based on these findings, conclusions were drawn and their implications discussed. The findings of this study suggest that a number of other variables need to be considered when determining how academic L2 literacy develops and what role the language teaching textbook plays in the process. The limitations of the study were discussed and the implications of the findings explored. Finally, the findings were explored within a systems framework and recommendations for future research were made.
13. **Ask about free time activities.**

Work with a partner. Does your partner like to do any of these activities? Tell someone else about your partner's activities.

What do you do in your free time?

- I collect coins.
- Read
- Listen to music
- Garden
- Care for pets
- Paint
- Play soccer
- Play music
- Cook
- Bowl
- Play video games
- Collect coins
- Watch TV

14. **Think about it!**

How can you group free time activities?
Add questions to the list.

- Which activities do you do with other people?
- Which activities do you do outside?
- Which activities are sports?

---

Herrera and Zanatta (1996:15)
One Saturday morning, Tom Painted the Fence. He knew the man who owned the fence of him, because he had to work, but as he was working, had no idea. What if he could somehow get the boys to help? As he was thinking, Ben Rogers came along.

Ben was eating an apple, and pretending to be a steamboat.

"Ling-a-ling-ling! Chow! Dong, dong! Ling-a-ling!"

Tom went on whitewashing, and paid no attention to the steamer. Ben stared a moment, and then said, "Hy-ya! You're up a stump, aren't you?"

No answer.

Ben ranged up alongside Tom. Tom's mouth watered for the apple, but he stuck to his work.

"You've got to work, hey?" said Ben.

"Why, it's you, Ben! I wasn't noticing."
"Are you quite sure he will be at home?" said Jane, as they got off the Bus, she and Michael and Mary Poppins.

"Would my uncle ask me to bring you to tea if he intended to go out, I'd like to know?" said Mary Poppins, who was evidently very offended by the question. She was wearing her blue coat with the silver buttons and the blue hat to match, and on the days when she wore these it was the easiest thing in the world to offend her.

All three of them were on the way to pay a visit to Mary Poppins's uncle, Mr. Wigg, and Jane and Michael had looked forward to the trip for so long that they were more than half afraid that Mr. Wigg might not be in, after all.

"Why is he called Mr. Wigg—does he wear one?" asked Michael, hurrying along beside Mary Poppins.

"He is called Mr. Wigg because Mr. Wigg is his name. And he doesn't wear one. He is bald," said Mary Poppins. "And if I have any more questions we will just go back home." And she sniffed her usual snuff of displeasure.

Jane and Michael looked at each other and frowned. And the flown meant: "Don't let's ask her anything else or we'll never get there."

Mary Poppins put her hat straight at the Tobacconist's Shop at the corner. It had one of those curious windows where there seem to be three of you instead of one, so that if you look long enough at them you begin to feel you are not yourself but a whole crowd of somebody else. Mary Poppins sighed with pleasure, however, when she saw three of herself, each wearing a blue coat with silver buttons and a blue hat to match.

She thought it was such a lovely sight that she wished there had been a dozen of her or even thirty. The more Mary Poppins the better.

"Come along," she said sternly, as though they had kept her waiting. Then they turned the corner and pulled the bell of Number Three, Robertson Road. Jane and Michael could hear it faintly echoing from a long way away and they knew

---

Thinking About It

1. If Mary Poppins came to your home, whom would she take care of and what would she do?

2. There is no doubt about it, Mary Poppins is one of the most famous baby-sitters of all time. Interview her. Find out her rules for behavior and her special talents.

3. What do you think will happen next time Mary Poppins takes the children on an outing? Explain why.

---

Another Book of Fantasy

The Borrowers by Mary Norton is another example of a fantasy. In this story, any people borrow what they need from the unsuspecting humans in their house.

Scott Foresman (1995:A85/103)
Robots never become sick or tired. They do jobs that are too boring, dangerous, or difficult for people to do.

Of course, these machines cannot really think as people do. A robot's "brain" is a computer. People must plan every step of an action they want a robot to do. Then they write a set of instructions, called a program, for the robot's computer. The computer follows these instructions and makes the robot's body move. Television cameras act as "eyes" and send pictures to the robot's computer brain.

Where Robots Work

Most robots today work in factories. Many car factories in Japan, the United States, and other countries use robots. Almost all the workers in one Japanese factory are robots. One set of robots can paint a car after other robots have assembled the car. Another kind of robot can sort machine parts more quickly than people can. It pulls out any parts that are not made right.

You may soon see robots in stores, too. They already do most of the work in the big Seiyu market in Yokohama, Japan. A robot car rolls along the market's aisles. Signs on it show what foods are on sale that day. A "butcher" robot slices meat, following orders that buyers give by pressing buttons. The robot then weighs the meat, wraps it, and shoots it out a slot. Other robots work at night, when the store is closed. They bring carts of food out of a warehouse behind the store. People put the food on the market's shelves.

Robots can go where people cannot. One kind of robot works on the bottom of the sea. It is guided by a person on a nearby ship. A television screen aboard the

Discuss the Selection

1. If you could design a robot to work for you, what kinds of jobs would it be able to do?
2. Name four ways in which robots are being used to help people.
3. Do you think a robot would make a good friend? Explain your answer.
4. How do you know who is responsible for making the robot a successful machine?
5. Why are more and more robots being used every day?
6. How does the saying "There are two sides to every story" apply to this selection?

Prewrite

Imagine you have a robot of your very own. Copy and complete the chart on the next page. List five things you would like your robot to be able to do. Think of things that would help you the most.
Appendix B
Geographic Locations and Description of the Schools

Geographic locations of the participating schools
Description of the Schools

School 1 (S1):

School 1 is a privately-owned, for-profit establishment in a small, well established coastal community in North Lebanon, with a student body of approximately 600. The student body comes from within a 10-km radius of the community. Tuition ranges from the equivalent of US $ 700 in the lower Primary grades to approximately US $ 1,800 in the matriculating class, depending on the student’s major. The teaching language for all subjects in S1 is English with the exception of the the Arabic language, Social Studies and Civics curriculum. The basic English course text in Grade 5 is Crossroads Laureate Edition (Cullinan et al. 1989).

School 2 (S2)

School 2 is a semi-charitable, religious sisterhood-run establishment in the predominantly Christian region north of the Beirut city-center, with a total student body of about 2,300. The community where the school is located is relatively newly built and affluent. Tuition ranges from the equivalent of US $ 800 in the Primary grades to US $ 2,000 in the matriculating class. S 2 is a trilingual school, with some of the instruction offered in French and/or English and some on Arabic. Students in the study had received math and science instruction in French and Social Studies, Civics, and religious instruction in Arabic. S 2 students come from a wide geographical radius, the majority from the city and the immediate suburbs of Beirut. The basic English course text at S2 is also Treasury (Cullinan et al. 1989).

School 3 (S 3)

School 3 is a semi-charitable, religious brotherhood-run establishment in the predominantly Christian region in North Lebanon, with a student body of about 600. The

---

1 This means that teachers’ salaries are partially subsidized by the Government in order to keep the fees low. The Order manages the school without charge.
community where the school is located is a cluster of small rural villages, a popular summer retreat with people from the coastal regions coming to spend the hottest summer months in the relative cool of the mountains. The student body comes almost totally from the immediate community. Tuition ranges from the equivalent of US $ 800 in the Primary grades to $ 1,500 in the matriculating class. The instructional language in S 3 has traditionally been French, but recently the school has adopted a policy to offer also an English-medium option. The Grade 5 students in this study had received mathematics and science instruction in French and civics and Social studies instruction in Arabic. They will have an option to enroll in either English or French instruction in Sciences and Mathematics as they reach grade 6. The English course used in 'North School' is KIDS (Walker, 1989).

School 4 (S 4)

School 4 is a non-profit, religious establishment in the predominantly Muslim region in the Beqaa Valley, with a student body of about 1,500. The community where the school is located is a town that is one of the major tourist attractions in the country. The student body comes almost totally from the immediate community. Parents' socioeconomic status is primarily middle class. Tuition ranges from the equivalent of US $ 500 in the Primary grades to 1000 in the matriculating class. The tuition is kept low with subsidies from an organization that runs a number of schools. Students are in mixed classes until grade 5, at which point boys and girls are segregated. In this study, both grade 5 classes were observed, but only one group was selected for analysis in order keep the numbers in the two course text groups roughly equal. The girls' group was selected as the profile of this group's teacher matched the profiles of the other teachers better than that of the boys' teacher. The instructional language in S 4 in the Primary grades is Arabic while the upper grades can opt for Mathematics and Science instruction in either English or
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French, starting in Grade 6. The basic English course book at S 4 is *Amazing English* (Walker 1996).

**School 5 (S 5)**

School 5 is a non-profit, board-governed school originally established by British missionaries. The school is located in an upscale mountain town overlooking Beirut, with a student body approaching 1000. The student body comes from a wide radius as S 5 is a sought-after school with limited enrollment. Tuition ranges from the equivalent of US $2000 in the Primary grades to $4000 in the matriculating class. The instructional language in S 5 is English, with the exception of the Arabic language and literature. Many of the students in S 5 are native or near-native speakers of English, with English predominating in the playgrounds. Students are tracked in classes for native speakers and ELLs. The ELL group was selected for his study. The basic English course text at S 5 *Treasures* (Cullinan et al 1989).

**School 6 (S 6)**

School 6 is a non-profit school operated by a religious foundation and located in a large coastal town in South Lebanon. The student body of about 800 comes primarily from the town. Tuition ranges from the equivalent of US $800 in the Primary grades to $2000 in the matriculating class. The instructional language in S 6 has been French, but currently the recently established English-medium instruction is gaining popularity. Schools in South Lebanon have suffered during the past 20 years of war and conflict and at the time of this study, a school only a few kilometers from S 6 was hit by a rocket, which injured several children and teachers and caused considerable property damage. During one observation session, intense shelling could be heard at a distance through the open classroom window. The basic English course at 'South School' is *Parade* (Scott Foresman).
Appendix C
Purpose of the Study: Letter to participating children's parents and guardians

Dear Parent or Guardian,

My name is ____________________. I am an education and applied linguistics doctoral student at the University of Leicester. I am interested in identifying and describing classroom interactions in an effort to determine the influence of different instructional materials. This study is a core requirement of my doctoral studies. The students participating in the study will be videotaped on two separate occasions during their regular class periods, and they will be administered a non-verbal reasoning test and a reading comprehension test during a time selected by the school administration. Your child's participation in this study will help me determine the effectiveness of the currently used teaching materials on language learning. I respectfully ask for you to grant permission for your child to participate in this study. Your child's participation is completely voluntary.

I _ _ (parent or guardian name)____authorize my child _____(child’s name)______ to participate in the above mentioned study.

(Signature of the parent or guardian)

(Date)
هدف البحث: رسالة إلى أهل أو أولياء أمر التلاميذ المشاركين

أعزائي الأهل أو أولياء الأمر،

تحية طيبة وبعد،

إسمحوا لي في البدء أن أذكر لكم أنني أُعد في الوقت الحاضر لِنيل شهادة الدكتوراه من جامعة ليست البريطانية في التربية واللغويات التطبيقية. ومن المتطلبات الجوهيرية لهذه الشهادة، معرفة ووصف التفاعلات في الصفوف بغية تحديد مدى تأثير المواد التعليمية المختلفة. ولسوَف يجري تصوير التلاميذ المشاركين في هذه الدراسة بالفيديو في مناسبتين منفصلتين، خلال حصصهم الدراسية المعتادة; كما يجري امتخاهم في التحليل غير اللفظي، وفهم القراءة، في وقت تختاره إدارة المدرسة.

إن مشاركة ابنكم/ابنتكم في هذه الدراسة سوف تساعدني على تحديد فعالية المواد التعليمية المستعملة حالياً في تدريس اللغة. وأتمنى عليكم بكل احترام السماح لابنكم/ابنتكم بالمشاركة في هذا البحث؛ لافتِ الانتباه إلى أن المشاركة فيه طوعية كلياً.

إيرما كارينا غصن

أنا (والد/الوالدة أو ولي أمر التلميذة) أُسمح لابن/ابنتي بالمشاركة في الدراسة المذكورة أعلاه.

(التاريخ)

(توقيع الوالد/والدة أو ولي الأمر)
Appendix D

Teacher Profiles

Teacher 1 (T 1)
Teacher 1, who teaches at S1, is in her late thirties and has been teaching for ten (10) years. She holds a BA in Education and a TEFL Diploma from a local American university. Her native language is Arabic, but she is also fluent in Portuguese. T1 assessed her English proficiency as "fairly fluent" in the scale of "Native speaker – near-native fluency – fairly fluent – adequate". T1 is responsible for 34 grade 5 students, five of them in a special class for native English speakers.

Teacher 2 (T 2)
Teacher 2 of S 2 is in her thirties and has been teaching for nine (9) years. She holds a BA degree and a Teaching Diploma. She is a native speaker of Arabic and rates her English proficiency as "fairly fluent". T 2 is responsible for teaching 155 students on grades 4, 5 and 6.

Teacher 3 (T 3)
Teacher 3 teaches at S 3. She is in her late twenties and has a BA degree and a Teaching Diploma. She has recently returned from Canada and has been teaching in Lebanon for two (2) years. Her native language is Arabic (or "Lebanese" as T 3 reports), and she also speaks French. She rates herself "near-native fluency" in English proficiency. T 3 is responsible for teaching English to approximately 100 students on grades 4, 5, 6 and 7.
Teacher 4 (T 4)
Teacher 4 of School 4 is in her late twenties and is currently enrolled in a degree program in applied linguistics and TEFL. She has been teaching for seven (7) years. T 4 is a native speaker of Arabic and rates her English proficiency as "near-native fluency". Teacher 4 is responsible for teaching 83 students in grades 5 and 8.

Teacher 5 (T 5)
Teacher 5 teaches at S 5. She is in her late thirties and has been teaching for nine (9) years. She holds a BA degree and a teaching Diploma. Her native language is Arabic and she rates her English proficiency as "fairly fluent". Teacher 5 is responsible for teaching English to about 80 students in grade 5.

Teacher 6 (T 6)
Teacher 6 of S 6 is in her late twenties and is enrolled in a degree program in TEFL. She has been teaching for four (4) years and tries to keep up with the developments in the field by attending workshops and seminars provided by textbook publishers. Her native language is Arabic and she rates her English proficiency as "fairly fluent". Teacher 6 is responsible for teaching English to approximately 90 students in grades 3, 4, and 5.
Appendix E
Definitions of Observation Schedule Categories

Teacher Talk

Teacher Questions
1. **Display Question (Closed) Type 1 – Data Recall**
   These are questions that either elicit simple knowledge/comprehension; questions that require students to respond with a descriptive statement, to use recall, to recite, to enumerate, to list, and so on. For example: *List the personal pronouns. What is the past tense of *go*? Who was the main character the 'Wizard of Oz'?* Note, this applies when the teacher clearly knows the answer, not if the teacher is seeking information unknown to him or her. The third sample question above, for example, is display question only if the teacher knows who the main character was.
   - Cueing questions in drills. For example: *The weather in summer is warm. The weather in winter is cold. The weather in summer is*¹
   - Prompts to elicit Teacher-regulated language. For example: *What was Tom going to paint? He was going to paint*. Teacher has a specific answer in mind.
   Long and Sato (1983) refer to these type of questions as display questions while Allen et al (1984) use the terms pseudo questions. Sharble and Minnis (1974) refer to them as data recall.

2. **Display question (Closed) Type 2 – Data Processing**
   These questions require students to apply acquired knowledge—or the new language—to a new situation or to solve new problems.
   - Questions (or directions) that require student to apply knowledge to a new situation or solve new problems. For example: *How would you re-tell the story if it will happen tomorrow instead of yesterday? Use the word *x* in a sentence of your own.*
   - Questions (or directions) that require student to use information to show relationships or cause and effect; to synthesize, classify, analyze, compare, contrast ideas. For example: *Why do we say *he could go* and not *he can go*? How is this story similar to the one we read the other day?* Teacher still expects a given answer/has a range of acceptable answers in mind.
   Long and Sato (1983) would refer also to these questions and display questions. Shrable and Minnis (1974) would make distinction between data application and data processing, which in this study have been combined into one category.
3. Referential questions (Open)

These are questions to which the teacher does not necessarily know the answer, or to which the teacher does not have a predetermined set of acceptable answers in mind. These include questions about personal information (What did you do to celebrate Halloween?), questions about events in the community at large (Were there many people ‘trick-or-treating’ in your area?), questions that call for evaluation or opinion (Which word best describes the main character? Do you like Halloween? Why or why not?). Long and Sato (1983) refer to these questions as referential while Allen et al (1984) refer to them as genuine questions.

Teacher presentation

4. Teacher explanations

Teacher presents new material, explains concepts, gives examples, or gives instruction about tasks verbally. Note: One teacher turn may include several utterances.

5. Teacher reads aloud, dictates or writes on the board

Teacher reads aloud from the textbook, from the chalk board or other text source; dictates text, or writes on the board.

Teacher negotiation of meaning

6. Simple negotiation (Repetition / paraphrase)

Teacher repeats student response verbatim with a questioning tone or paraphrases it. Note: This does not include the typical teacher behavior of ‘echoing’ students’ responses verbatim; these are classified as either brief verbal accepting or brief verbal rejecting feedback and can be distinguished from negotiation of meaning only within the context of the particular interaction.

7. Complex negotiation

Teacher uses one of the strategies of negotiation such as comprehension check (Do you mean to say slippery?), clarification request (Could you explain what you mean by ‘slippery’?), or check for understanding (Did you understand what a ‘suffix’ is?). This is similar to COLT (Allen et al 1984) category of clarification request and elaboration request.
Teacher feedback

8. Simple accepting feedback

The teacher signals acceptance of a student response by a non-verbal sign (e.g. a nod, a smile, etc.) or a brief verbal sign (e.g. 'uh huh', 'yes', 'that's right', etc.). Interruptions such as "Yes, go on"; "Right ...", which allow the student to continue, are also coded here.

Note: If student response is included one way or another, the utterance is coded as scaffolding.

9. Accepting appropriating feedback

The teacher signals acceptance and includes all or part of the student's response or idea in the feedback either by restating it as a paraphrase, elaborating, extending, reflecting on it, or posing a further challenge. For example: S: Swim in summer. T: Yes, you can go swimming in summer. S: Can swim [in summer]. T: uhhuh, the water is warm enough to swim then. S: I went rock-climbing with my friends yesterday. T: Rock-climbing! That must have been exciting. But was it scary?

Note: If teacher turn exceeds accommodation and becomes an explanation, the explanation portion will be coded as 'teacher explanation'.

FLint (Moskowitz 1971) has one category for teacher feedback that uses student ideas. In this research study, the appropriation of student ideas is referred to as scaffolding (Berk and Winsler 1995), and a distinction is made between accepting and rejecting feedback.

10. Simple rejecting feedback

Teacher signals rejection of student response by a non-verbal sign (a shake of the head, a frown) or a brief verbal remark (e.g. 'no', 'not quite'). Interruptions such 'no', 'not exactly', etc. are also coded here. Note; if student response is included one way or another, code 07.

11. Rejecting appropriating feedback

The teacher signals rejections and includes all or a part of the student's response or idea in the feedback, either by restating it as a paraphrase, elaborating, extending, reflecting on it, or challenging it. For example: S: I can go swimming in winter. T: You can go swimming in winter...; I don't think you can go swimming in winter. You can go swimming in winter*. hmm, how is that? The first two teacher utterances are examples of scaffolding feedback while the next utterance represents a scaffolding rejection, followed by a referential question.

Note: If teacher turn exceeds accommodation and becomes an explanation, the explanation portion is coded as 'teacher explanation'.

12. Teacher ignores student response

Teacher ignores student's response by moving on to another student without reacting to the response, or teacher repeats the original question without recognizing a given response.
Teacher response to student initiations

13. Simple teacher responses
   Teacher responds to student's initiation with a brief verbal comment, or with his or her own idea (S: Can we say 'I wish I had a gerbil?' T: Yes, we can say that. S: How can they bring him back to life? T: Remember that some stories are not real.)

14. Appropriating response
   Teacher responds to student initiation appropriating some or all of it in his or her response (S: Can we say 'I wish I had a gerbil'? T: If you wish for something that you don't have, yes, you can say 'I wish I had. S: How can they bring the boy back to life? T: You are wondering how they could bring him back to life...)

15. Teacher ignores unsolicited initiation / question
   Teacher ignores student initiation.

Student talk

Student responses

16. Pseudo-communication Type 1 – Student reads aloud or recites from memory
   Students respond to the teacher by reading aloud from the textbook, a copybook or the chalkboard. This type of response gives the teacher information about students' decoding and pronunciation ability. Students respond to the teacher by reciting parts of text, grammar or spelling rules, or parts of a dialogue.

17. Pseudo-communication Type 3 – Student produces T-prompted language
   Students respond to a prompt or a cue provided by the teacher or the text. (T: The weather in winter is not warm. The weather in winter is... S: cold.) This includes 'conversations', which give students a set of model phrases to be used in mock conversations. The task requires students to pick one of the limited set of given phrases.

18. Genuine communication Type 1 – Data Recall
   Students respond by recalling data without the need to apply the data to a new situation or to process it. This includes giving descriptive statements, using recall, listing and enumerating. Although the teacher knows the acceptable answer, students are engaging in real communication as they try to communicate their knowledge to the teacher. Although students are not required to process information, they are processing their response in the target language, thus providing the teacher with information about their interlanguage.

19. Genuine communication Type 2 – Data Processing
   Students respond by processing data by engaging in application, analysis, synthesis or evaluation. These responses include applying a learned rule to a new context, distinguishing between main ideas and details, summarizing and evaluating.
20. Genuine communication Type 3 – Referential Response
Students respond by sharing opinion or ideas or providing information about events in their own lives or in the world at large. Responses may relate to lesson content or to the students’ personal experiences, related or unrelated to the lesson.

21. Genuine communication Type 4 – Confirming or Negating
Student responds to teacher (or peer) negotiation by verbally confirming or negating its accuracy (S: I went as a lion. T: Oh, you were disguised. S: Yes, Miss.)

22. No response.
Student does not respond to teacher (or peer) initiation.

Student initiations
Students engage in negotiation of meaning, topic, or form with the teacher or other students.
Two types of student negotiation have been distinguished in this research study

23. Simple negotiation
Students repeat teacher or peer utterance, either verbatim or paraphrasing it, with a questioning tone.

24. Complex Negotiation
Students use one of the strategies of negotiation: comprehension check (Do you mean slippery?), clarification request (I don’t know what ‘slippy’ means. What does ‘slippy’ mean?), checking for understanding (Do you understand what I mean by ‘slippy?’)

Student questions
When students ask questions, they are actively involved in the lesson and in processing target language. In this research study, student questions have been distinguished as lower and higher order questions.

25. Student question Type 1 – Lower level
Students ask questions on the lower level of the cognitive domain about language, lesson content, the real world, or classroom procedures. (What’s ‘wizard’ in Arabic? How did Paul Revere die? Where is Kansas? What do we underline here?)

26. Student question Type 2 – Higher level
Students ask questions that demonstrate higher order thinking or critical thinking about language, lesson content, or the real world. (Can we use the word ‘tradition’ when we talk about things we do in Halloween? Why did they want to go to Oz? Can we make compound words using names? Why do we say ‘the Lebanon’ but not ‘the France?’)
27. **Student unsolicited statement**

Students make statements or offer unsolicited opinions about language, lesson content, the real world, or classroom procedures.

28. **Class choral response**

The whole class or a group of students respond chorally to teacher elicitation.

29. **Turn-taking**

Teacher calls on a student or allocates a turn after student soliciting. Student solicits a turn.

In this observation schedule, only verbal turn allocations are recorded.

30. **Miscellaneous**

Any other event not belonging to any of the above categories. For example: Teacher reprimands a student for being late. Supervisor interrupts the class to make an announcement. Any interaction in L1 (Arabic).
### Appendix F - Scoring sheet for observation schedule

Total of observed Interactions in ______________

T= teacher; S=student; Cl=class/group of students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Initiation / Elicitation</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Display question - Data recall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Display question - Data processing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open referential question</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Explaining/ instructing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading aloud/dictating/ writing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td>Simple negotiation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complex negotiation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback to student</td>
<td>Accepting</td>
<td>Simple accepting feedback</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriating accepting feedback</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rejecting</td>
<td>Simple rejecting feedback</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriating rejecting feedback</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ignoring response</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response to student</td>
<td>Information providing</td>
<td>Simple response</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriating response</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ignoring student response</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Pseudo-communication</td>
<td>Reading aloud/ reciting</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Producing prompted language</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Genuine communication</td>
<td>Data recalling</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Data processing</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Referential response</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Confirming/ negating</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td>Simple negotiation</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complex negotiation</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Lower level</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Higher level</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsolicited opinion/ sharing of information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>Chorusing from the class / group of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/S</td>
<td>Verbalized turn-taking by teacher and students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miscellaneous/ unintelligible noise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G
NFER-Nelson Non-verbal Reasoning 10&11 technical data

NFER-Nelson Non-Verbal Reasoning 10&11 (Smith and Hagues 1993) is designed to measure the non-verbal reasoning of upper primary school students, ages 10-11. The test can be administered to groups and takes approximately 40 minutes, including 25-minute timed test and the time allocated for instructions.

The test assesses the ability to process new information and relate it to the what is already known. It does this through tasks that require recognition of similarities, analogies and patterns in unfamiliar designs (see sample tasks on the next page).

The NFER-Nelson yields standardized scores. It was standardized in 192 randomly selected schools from the national register in the UK and stratified regionally. The sample consisted of 5773 Year 5 and Year 6 students (2921 boys and 2852 girls) ranging in age from 9:09 to 11:09.

The authors report about reliability as follows. Kuder-Ricardson 20 formula was used to obtain the internal consistency of the test, which was 0.93. The standardized scores have a standard deviation of 14.8, with a standard error of measurement (SEM) of 3.9. The test has a confidence band of 68 percent.

The content validity was achieved through trialling a large pool of items and by discarding those that were found to be gender biased and those weak in discriminating between high and low scores.

Concurrent validity and predictive validity have not been yet established.
These questions are all about shapes and patterns.

There are two basic types of question.

In the first type, you are given three figures inside a large oval. You have to decide how they are alike and then find which of the five figures next to them also belongs inside the oval.

Look at Example 1.

*The answer letter has been circled for you.*

All the other questions have figures arranged in a pattern. In each question, one piece is missing. Its place is shown by a question mark. You have to decide which of the five figures is the missing one and circle its letter.

Look at Examples 2, 3 and 4.

*The answer letters have been circled for you.*
Appendix H
TORC-3 Test of Reading Comprehension - Technical Data

TORC-3 Test of Reading Comprehension (Brown et al 1995) is norm referenced test designed to measure reading comprehension of school-aged children and youth. The complete battery of subtests takes approximately one hour.

The core batter consists of general reading comprehension subtests that measure general vocabulary, understanding of syntactic similarities, ability to answer comprehension questions related to short paragraphs, and ability to order sentences into logical paragraphs. The diagnostic supplements measure reading comprehension relative to content areas (mathematics, social studies, and science) and school work (See sample items on the following page).

TORC-3 yields standardized scores, with raw scores usable for research and situations where comparisons to a norm group are not necessary. The test was standardized in nineteen states in the United States in 1993 and 1994. The sample consisted of 1,962 racially and ethnically diverse individuals ranging in age from 7 to 17, including English as a Second Language children.

The authors report internal consistency reliability coefficients for the different subtests as ranging from 92 to 97. This was derived by applying Cronbach's coefficient alpha method. Standard error of measurement (SEM) is 1 for each subtest and 3 for the composite score, the reading comprehension quotient.

Criterion-related validity of the test has been determined by correlating the TORC-3 subtest scores and composite scores with scores from six other reading tests. The results show moderate to high relationships between TORC-3 and the other six tests, with coefficient correlations for most subtests significant at alpha level .01 and some at .05 level.
TORC-3 SUBTEST 1: GENERAL VOCABULARY

DIRECTIONS for each item:
1. Read the three words in the box. Think about why they might go together or how they are alike.
2. Read all the words under the box. Choose the two you believe are most like the words in the box.
3. Put Xs over the letters that stand for the two words you choose.

Examples ▲ yellow red blue ▼ teeth nose arm
A. black
B. grass
C. green
D. yes
A. hair
B. air
C. legs
D. toe

TORC-3 SUBTEST 2: SYNTAXIC SIMILARITIES

DIRECTIONS for each item:
1. Read all five of the sentences.
2. Think about which two sentences mean almost the same thing.
3. Put Xs over the letters that stand for the two sentences that mean almost the same thing.

Examples ▲ A. Sam plays.
B. Sam will not play.
C. Sam has played.
D. Sam is playing.
E. Sam is going to play.
▼ A. It was her wagon.
B. It was not her wagon.
C. It was his wagon.
D. The wagon was not hers.
E. It was not his wagon.

TORC-3 SUBTEST 3: PARAGRAPH READING

DIRECTIONS for each item:
1. Read each story to yourself.
2. Answer the five questions that follow each story.
3. For each question, put an X over the one letter, A, B, C, or D, that best answers the question.

Juan wanted to watch cartoons on TV. Mother said, "No, Juan. You may not watch TV because you did not do your work." Juan jumped up and went to work.

1. What is the best name for this story?
A. TV Cartoons
B. Juan Watches Cartoons
C. Mother Watches Cartoons
D. No TV for Juan

2. What did Juan do?
A. go to school
B. go to play
C. go to work
D. go to bed

3. What did Juan want to see?
A. a game show
B. the news
C. Bugs Bunny
D. a bad game

4. What could not go in the story?
A. Juan did not work.
B. Juan worked fast.
C. Juan did not do his work.
D. Juan did not watch cartoons then.

5. Who told Juan to get to work?
A. cartoons
B. teacher
C. father
D. mother

TORC-3 SUBTEST 4: SENTENCE SEQUENCING

DIRECTIONS for each item:
1. Read the five sentences. These sentences are not in the right order.
2. Think about how they should go. What order would make the most sense to you?
3. Put them in the right order by writing the letters that stand for the sentences in the order you chose.
4. Write the letter in your order on the five blanks for the item number.

Example ▲ — — — — —
A. Soon it will be noon.
B. Next it will be night.
C. It is morning.
D. Then it will be morning again.
E. Then it will be this afternoon.
Dear Educator,

This survey is part of a research project at the Lebanese American University, Byblos, aiming to collect information about English language teaching in the Lebanese Primary schools. Please take a moment to fill out the questionnaire below. Your responses will be treated confidentially, so do not put your name on the questionnaire. Return the form, sealed in the enclosed, stamped envelope to: Irma K. Ghosn, Lebanese American University, P.O. Box 36, Byblos. I thank you for your time.

Irma K. Ghosn
Lebanese American University

### Part A - Personal Profile

For each of the following items, please put a tick next to the appropriate item.

1. **Age**
   - a. below 20
   - b. 21-29
   - c. 30-39
   - d. 40-49
   - e. 50+

2. **Gender**
   - a. female
   - b. male

3. **Level of education (check one)**
   - a. Bacc II
   - b. Some college
   - c. Ba/BS
   - d. Other:

4. **Number of years in teaching**
   - a. 1-3
   - b. 4-6
   - c. 7-10
   - d. 10+

5. **How would you describe yourself in terms of English proficiency?**
   - a. native speaker
   - b. near-native
   - c. fairly fluent
   - d. adequate

6. **Grade level you teach (check all that apply)**
   - KG
   - Gr 1
   - Gr 2
   - Gr 3
   - Gr 4
   - Gr 5

### Part B - Program and materials

For each of the items below, fill in the requested information or circle appropriate choices as indicated.

1. **What is the primary instructional language in the school in grades K-5?**
   - Arabic
   - English
   - French
   - Armenian
   - Other:

2. **How many hours of English is provided in the following grades? (Fill in the hours as appropriate)**
   - KG
   - Gr 1
   - Gr 2
   - Gr 3
   - Gr 4
   - Gr 5
3. How many hours of subject matter instruction is provided in English in the following grades? (Fill in the hours as appropriate.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Art</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. What is the basic coursebook that you use?

Title: 

Publisher: 

Level/s: 

5. What grammar book do you use? (If none, go on to item 6)

Title: 

Publisher: 

Level/s: 

6. List any other books that you use on a regular basis (i.e. handwriting, spelling, language arts, graded readers, etc.)

a. 

b. 

c. 

d. 

e. 

f. 

7. Do you cover all the lessons in the coursebook during the academic year? 
   Yes | No 

8. If you answered ‘No’ to item 7, briefly explain the reason.

9. Do you do all the activities in the lessons that you cover? 
   Yes | No 

10. If you answered ‘No’ to item 9, check below the type of activities that you omit.

   a. arts and crafts | b. use of audio tapes | c. physical activities |

   d. group work | e. cooking activities | f. science activities |

   g. other (list):
11. If you omit any of the above activities, what is the main reason for it? (Check all that apply)
   a. lack of time | | b. lack of materials | | c. lack of space | |
   d. do not consider it/ them important | |

12. In your opinion, does the coursebook include content that you consider culturally inappropriate for your students?
   Yes | | No | |

13. If you answered ‘Yes’ to item 12, explain briefly what kind of content you consider inappropriate:

---

**Part C – Methods and approaches**

1. Which one of the following best describes the method you use? (Check only one)
   a. communicative | | b. content-based | | c. natural approach | |
   d. other (explain)

2. What is your preferred method of introducing new vocabulary? (Check the one you use most often.)
   a. give a definition in English | | b. give a meaning in Arabic | |
   c. use pictures or objects | | d. act out the meaning | |
   e. other (explain)

3. In your opinion, how important is explicit grammar instruction in the Primary school? (Check only one.)
   a. very important | | b. somewhat important | |
   c. not very important | | d. not at all important | |

4. In your opinion, how useful are the guidelines provided in the teacher’s guide of the coursebook that you use?
   a. very useful | | b. somewhat useful | | c. not useful | |
5. How closely do you follow the procedures set in the teacher's guide?
   a. very closely |   b. fairly closely |   c. not very closely |   d. do not follow them at all |

6. If you checked 'd' in the item above, briefly explain why you do not follow the suggested procedures.

7. How often do you provide oral reading activities (children taking turns reading aloud)?
   a. every session |   b. 3-4 times a week |   c. 1-2 times a week |   d. rarely |   e. never |

8. How often do you use pair work?
   a. every session |   b. 3-4 times a week |   c. 1-2 times a week |   d. rarely |   e. never |

9. How often do you use group work?
   a. every session |   b. 3-4 times a week |   c. 1-2 times a week |   d. rarely |   e. never |

10. If you do not use any group, or use it very rarely, what is primary reason? (Check one.)
    a. not useful |   b. difficult to organize |   c. children speak in Arabic |   d. lack of time |   e. high noise level |

11. What is the most frequently observed procedure in your classroom? (Circle only one.)
    a. teacher explaining the lesson |   b. children engaged in activities where they use English |   c. children working independently at their desks |   d. teacher and children going over homework assignments |   e. other (explain briefly)
Part D – Planning and evaluation

1. How many hours do you teach per week? |

2. Approximately how many hours a week do you spend for lesson planning? |

3. Approximately how many hours a week do you spend correcting student work? |

4. Which of the following homework assignments do you give every week? (Check all that apply)
   a. compositions |
   b. dictation |
   c. vocabulary work |
   d. spelling |
   e. grammar work |
   f. workbook activities |

5. Approximately how many graded assignments/tests do you give in a month? |

Part E – Other

1. How do you rate your level of satisfaction with teaching as a career?
   a. very satisfied |
   b. satisfied |
   c. not sure |
   d. not satisfied |
   e. unsatisfied |

2. Briefly explain the main reason for your answer to the above item:

3. How important do you believe it is for your students to learn English?
   a. very important |
   b. important |
   c. not very important |
   d. not at all important |

4. Briefly explain your answer to the above item:
5. How satisfied are you with the main coursebook you are using?
   a. very satisfied  
   b. satisfied  
   c. not very satisfied  
   d. not at all satisfied

6. If you checked 'c' or 'd' in the above item, explain the reasons for your dissatisfaction:

7. Are you free to choose your own coursebooks?
   Yes | | No | |

8. If you answered 'No' to the above item, explain how the coursebooks are selected in your school:

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire!
Your response will make a valuable contribution to the research.

😊

274
Appendix J
Transcript Conventions

All names within the transcripts are pseudonyms, and different student speakers are identified as 'a', 'b', and so on.

The following transcript conventions were used in all the transcripts:

*Italics* indicates student or teacher is reading aloud

```
((       )) utterance in L1
(       ) unintelligible or best guess
[       ] transcriber's comment
^ indicates a rising intonation (as in a question)
```

```
go\_went vertical line indicates overlapping utterance
< indicates an interruption
> continuation of a previously interrupted utterance
```

**CAPITALS** indicate teacher scaffolding element

```
\_arrows within the transcript indicate links from one scaffolding element to another
```

**BE** basic exchange

**NEt** negotiation of topic exchange

**NEm** negotiation of meaning exchange

**NEf** negotiation of form exchange

**DT** direct teaching

**DTS** direct teaching with scaffolding

```
long brackets indicate the length of one exchange
```

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
A sample transcript (MS)

Teacher: There is a message here. It's exciting but it's also DANGEROUS. It seems exciting but it's RISKY.

Student a: Miss, one day I climbed, one day I climbed in the (unintelligible) it was fun

Teacher: Yes, so it was fun, but was it SCARY?

Student a: Yes, Miss

Student b: [raises his hand]

Teacher: Yes^ [to student a] you were tied to a rope^

Student a: [nods]

Student b: Miss, was he talking about a parachute?

Teacher: [waves arms indicating a gliding motion]

Student b: [turns to look at student b asking the question]

Class: It has a ((handle)) and he does like this<

Teacher: Yes. I've seen it [several students simultaneously]

[nods to student b, then nods to another student indicating a turn]

[stands up]

Near our house there is uh, there is some rocks I climb,

Teacher: I climbed, I teach all my friends to climb those rocks.

Student c: You climb those rocks^. Are they very high?

Teacher: No, they are like this [moves hand up and down his waist]

Student c: A small hill or something^

Yes, Miss.
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