LEARNER CONTRIBUTIONS IN THE EFL CLASSROOM

A THESIS
PRESENTED TO
THE DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE
INSTITUTE OF LANGUAGE STUDIES
ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN TEACHING
ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE (TEFL)

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
ILS LIBRARY

BY
KEDIR ASSEFA
MAY, 2000

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

LEARNER CONTRIBUTIONS IN THE EFL CLASSROOM

BY

KEDIR ASSEFA

Approved by _____

_____ _____

Advisor Signature

_____ _____

Examiner Signature

_____ _____

Examiner Signature

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am indebted to all people who helped me conduct this study. But my special thanks are due to Dr. Geremew Lemu, my advisor, who gave me insightful corrections and comments throughout the study. I am also grateful to Ato Seife Bekretsion and Teshome Imana who allowed me into their classrooms to video-record their lessons. Ato Endale Amenu was also helpful by providing me with most of the materials I used during the study. And I owe many thanks to all freshman students who participated in the research.

Finally, I would like to thank Alemaya University for allowing me a two-year leave, which I spent attending a graduate degree programme in TEFL.

ABSTRACT

This study was intended as an exploration of a FL classroom concerning the contribution making behaviour of learners and their perceptions in relation to contribution. Based on video-taped data and learners self reports, the study revealed some apparent information on how students contribute and perceive contribution making.

An analysis of lesson transcript showed that the amount and types of contributions students made tended to be variable from one interaction pattern to another. A thirty-minute group interaction produced far greater contributions than a one-hour whole class interaction both in terms of quantity and quality.

According to the transcript analysis three students in the group work who made considerable contributions failed to make any in the teacher – fronted discussions. Moreover, a group participant who contributed the most during the group-work failed to maintain the lead during the lockstep interaction. A difference was also observed in the quality of contributions students made. In the group interaction, the students' contributions were characterized by a wide variety of functional moves whereas the contributions in the teacher – fronted interaction were responses to teacher questions and short utterances.

Students' responses to questionnaire and interview questions indicated that students preferred participating in a small group interaction to whole class interaction. The responses also showed that students' reasons for participating in the classroom is primarily to obtain good marks rather than practising target language. Furthermore, the results displayed students' positive perceptions of bidding and self-selection in making contributions. These last perceptions of students seemed to match with the students' contribution making behaviour observed in the classroom.

Although these findings are limited to a freshman classroom where the data were collected, the pedagogical implications are possibly applicable to similar classrooms since there were findings (e.g. Long, et al. 1976; Cathcart 1986; Allwright 1980) that corroborate the results of this exploration. But further studies need to be conducted to come up with more information especially on the relationship between contribution and perception.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements

Abstract

Table of Contents

List of tables

List of transcript extracts

Table of Contents

Page

Chapter One: Introduction 1

1.1. Statement of the problem 1

1.2. Objective of the study 3

1.3. Significance of the study 4

1.4. Limitations of the study 5

1.5. Definitions of terms 6

Chapter Two: Theoretical Framework and Survey of Literature 7

2.1. The L_2 Classroom: A Setting for Learner Contributions 7

2.2. Conceptualizing Learner Classroom Contributions 10

2.2.1. Sources of input for interaction 11

2.2.2. Sources of input for interaction management 13

2.3. The Relationship between Learner Contributions and Classroom L_2 Development 14

2.4. Learner Contribution Making Behaviour 17

2.4.1. Turn-taking and turn allocation 18

2.4.2. Implications for research and teaching 21

2.5. Differences in Making Contributions in L_2 Classrooms 23

2.5.1. Learner factors 24

2.5.2. Teacher classroom behaviour 25

2.5.3. Classroom organization 26

2.5.4. Task types 27

2.6. The Notion of 'Active Participation' in Making Contributions 29
2.7. Learner Perceptions of Contribution and Contributing 31

Chapter Three: The Research Methods 34
3.1. Source of Data 34
3.2. Data Collection Procedures 35
3.2.1. Video – recording 35
3.2.2. Questionnaire 36
3.2.3. Interview 36
3.3. Data Analysis Procedure 37
3.3.1. Procedures of coding and transcript analysis 37
3.3.2. Procedures followed in analysing the self-report data 39

Chapter Four: Results, Interpretations and Implications 40
4.1. Results 40
4.1.1. Some biographical data of students 40
4.1.2. Tabulations and description of learner contributions 41
4.1.3. Tabulations and description of questionnaire responses 49
4.1.4. Analysis of interview responses 54
4.2. Discussions 59
4.2.1. The Nature of learner classroom contributions 59
4.2.2. Learners perceptions of contribution and contributing 64
4.2.3. Some relationships between learner contributions and perceptions 68

Chapter Five: Conclusions and Recommendations 71
5.1. Conclusions 71
5.2. Recommendations 74
Bibliography
Appendix 1 Transcript
Appendix 2 Questionnaire
Appendix 3 Interview

List of tables

Page

Table 1: Classroom composition in terms of sex 40

Table 2: Classroom composition in terms of age 40

Table 3: Classroom composition in terms of the types of school students attended before they joined university 41

Table 4: Classroom contribution of students made in Group work 43

Table 5: Classroom contributions students made in lockstep discussions 44

Table 6: Students' responses to questionnaire items in terms of all the response categories 50

Table 7: Students' responses to questionnaire items in terms of two categories: positive and negative 51

List of transcript extracts

Extract 1 46

Extract 2 46

Extract 3 46

Extract 4 46

Extract 5 48

Extract 6 48

Extract 7 49

Extract 8 61

Extract 9 61

Extract 10 61

Extract 11 63

Extract 12 63

CHAPTER ONE

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Statement of the problem

Classroom research raises various issues pertinent to classroom teaching and learning process. By employing methodological approaches ranging from relatively simple observations to controlled experiments, several researchers have explored learners' errors, learners' classroom organization and interaction, etc.

One of the classroom research issues this paper is concerned with relates to learners' classroom contributions. Most of the studies with regard to learners' classroom contributions have been done under the title of learners' classroom participation. The most notable examples are Seliger's (1977, 1983), Day's (1984) and Slimani's (1987), cited in Allwright angd Bailey (1991), correlational studies which attempted to investigate the relationship between participation and learners' L2 development. Another related research was Sato's (1984), which looked into the relationship between ethnicity and participation. Furthermore, the various types of students' behaviour during participation, such as hand–raising (Naiman, et al. 1978) and competitiveness (Bailey, 1983) have been explored. In local settings, Fikirte (1996) has tried to explore the influence of pedagogical and social factors on students' classroom participation. Also, Amanuel (1996) has attempted to find out whether sex determines students' classroom participation. Nevertheless, the attempts made either to replicate or conduct original studies about students' classroom participation in local settings seem to be insignificant. As a result of inadequate explorations in local settings, information about students' classroom contribution appears to be

contribution appears to be scarce, and often there is a reliance on intuition and experience to offer an explanation on this and similar issues.

The notion that prevails among teachers concerning learner classroom participation or contribution seems to be contrary to what some research findings show. For instance, when teachers find classrooms where the students' participation is low, they tend to blame learners for the presence of general reticence. However, research findings show that there are many ways in which teachers could affect learners' participation in the classroom. For example, teachers' questioning behaviour (White and Lightbown, 1984) and wait time (Holley and King, 1971) can influence learners' participation, particularly learners' responsiveness.

There are also cases when teachers fail to realize the presence of differences among students with regard to their participation styles and types of contributions they make. But learners tend to vary in their pattern of participation (Allwright, 1980) and the types of contribution they make (Delamont, 1983). Despite such research indications about learners' participation difference, many teachers would in most cases insist on a similar solution to minimize students' classroom reticence – for example, forcing students to participate (a notion which is termed as 'forced participation' by Allwright and Bailey 1991). The use of 'forced participation' as a classroom technique itself is debatable because there is research evidence that shows its negative influence (e.g. Felix, 1981). Teachers' frequent insistence on oral contributions and less emphasis on other types of contribution would also show the lack of thorough understanding of learners' contributions. As Allwright and Bailey (1991: 145) state "--- in turn distribution, as in error treatment, teachers are faced with highly complex decision making ----" Such problems of teachers concerning participation management may be attributed, in part, to lack of knowledge about students' participation behaviour. Therefore, there is a need for a study which would examine how students participate in making contributions in the classroom.

Along students' classroom contribution, it would also be beneficial to explore their perceptions about what constitutes learner classroom contributions. This is based on the assumption that an understanding of learners' classroom contribution making behaviour could help us develop our insights into how students should be handled in the classroom, especially during their classroom participation. It is with this belief that this study would try to explore learners' classroom contributions along with their perceptions about what constitutes learner classroom contributions.

1.2. Objective of the study

In general terms, this study is concerned with an exploration of learners' classroom contributions and their perceptions about their contributions. In an attempt to relate learners actions to their thoughts, the study, first, describes students' classroom contributions – both verbal and non – verbal – on the basis of the speaking turns they take, and the non – verbal activities they accomplish in the classroom. Then the students' perceptions concerning the contributions they make in the classroom are analysed based on the self – report information the students' give. And finally, the study would try to relate the contributions to the perceptions. In other words, it seeks to explore the kind of relationship that exists between what students actually do in the classroom and what they think about their classroom actions.

More specifically, the aim of this study is to explore the following questions:

(i) How frequently do learners contribute in the L_2 classroom?
(ii) What types of contribution do students make in the L_2 classroom?
(iii) What are students' perceptions about what constitutes learner classroom contribution?
(iv) What kind of relationship does exist between students' classroom contribution and their perceptions?

In order to address these questions, an L2 classroom is used as data-base. Based on the data obtained from the L2 classroom a quantitative count of learners' spoken turns and observable activities will be carried out. At the same time, the recorded and transcribed data will be used to label the students' contributions in terms of the distinctive features they have. Then, with regard to the learners' perceptions, the students' self–report information would be taken as a basis to offer possible explanations. In other words, with the help of the data obtained through the interview and questionnaire an explanation will be given as to how the students perceive learner classroom contribution. That explanation is subsequently used to account for the learners' classroom contributions with a particular view of relating the learners' contributions to their perceptions. The aim of this research is thus to identify, describe and relate contributions and perceptions of students in L2 classroom in such a way that their significance for participation management can be understood.

1.3. Significance of the study

Lorenz (1971), as cited in van Lier (1988), argues that there are two main reasons for engaging in research: 'wanting to know' and 'wanting to help'. What this means, as van Lier (1988) explains, is that research can be seen as a 'knowledge gathering' or as a 'problem – solving' activity, or both. However, both purposes are usually present in any piece of research though the degrees of prominence and emphasis vary. Chaudron (1988) also elaborates the significance of research, particularly classroom research:

> Careful evaluation of results [classroom research results] can lead to well - informed decision making at all levels of educational planning: development of the curriculum, preparation of materials, training of teachers, preference for classroom teaching activities and techniques, decisions about individualization of instruction, and even teacher's modification of speech in explanation (p.1).

Like all other classroom research endeavours, the general contributions of this particular study can be viewed in terms of what has been said by the above quoted authorities. But more specifically, this research might be important in increasing awareness concerning students' contribution making behaviour in $\mathbf{L_2}$ classrooms. It is part of an attempt to understand how students behave in the $\mathbf{L_2}$ classroom, especially their behaviour regarding their classroom contribution. In relation to this, this study might also present clues in what ways the learner's perceptions can influence their contributions. Understanding learner contribution making behaviour, in turn, will have major relevance to many facets of teaching, syllabus design, materials development, testing and teacher education. In sum, the benefit of this research could possibly be to all people who are involved in L_2 education both directly and indirectly.

1.4. Limitations of the study

This research has certain limitations that relate to research methodology. First, the data obtained through video – recording were limited to two aspects of L_2 classroom lesson. In other words, the recorded lessons include only aspects of critical reading and guessing the meanings of words in teacher – fronted and small group interactions. It was found unmanageable to record and transcribe all lesson types, for example listening, speaking, writing, etc. discussions in all types of classroom organizations. During the group work recording it was also found impossible to video – record all the groups in the classroom simultaneously because of the recording technology at hand. Because of this, only a single group was recorded, and the rest were ignored.

The second limitation of this study has to do with the data size and sampling procedure. Like most classroom research, particularly naturalistic enquiry, the data

used in this research were collected from a single classroom through an availability sampling. Although this procedure would limit the generalizability of the findings, the depth of information and analysis can be considered as a merit. Allwright and Bailey (1991: 49) state that "generalizability has to remain more a matter of apparent similarity of groups than a matter of statistics. So much of our research can only be conducted on very small samples, and we so often have to rely on friendship networks and accessibility for help in obtaining volunteer teachers and classes. ----'' Van Lier (1988: 2) also argues that generalizability cannot be a major goal in L_2 classroom research because "the first concern must be to analyze the data as they are rather than to compare them to other data to see how similar they are."

Lastly, the self – report data collection instruments were developed by me because it was impossible to find standardized instruments which could have been used entirely or with some modification.

1.5. Definitions of terms

In this study, 'contribution', 'perception', 'turn', 'bidding' are used with the following meanings:

(i) 'Contribution' refers to what the learner accomplishes both verbally and non-verbally in the process of classroom interaction. It includes the learner's requests and responses.

(ii) 'Perception' refers to what the learner says about what constitutes contribution and contributing through self – report methods.

(iii) 'Turn' refers to an opportunity to hold the floor to utter something .

(iv) 'Bidding' refers to the way students signal to the teacher that they wish to make requests or responses.

CHAPTER TWO

2. Theoretical Framework and Survey of Literature

2.1.The L2 Classroom: A Setting for Learner Contributions

Before examining learner classroom contributions, I will try to describe first the setting, i.e. the L_2 classroom, in which the contributions are made. The classroom, as the term is used in classroom research tradition, is defined as 'the gathering, for a given period of time, of two or more persons (one of whom generally assumes the role of instructor) for the purposes of language learning' (Van Lier, 1988: 47). This definition offers us a broad perspective of the L2 classroom, because we can consider tutorial meetings, with few participants as one learner and one teacher, as well as larger traditional educational contexts.

L2 education researchers and commentators identify several features and characteristics of L2 classroom. Breen (1985), for example, mentions eight essential features, and according to him the L_2 classroom is:

(i) *interactive*;

(ii) *differentiated* – i.e., consists of many social realities with often conflicting views of the world, of language and of learning;

(iii) *collective* – i.e., there is a constant interplay between individual and collective processes;

(iv) *highly normative* – i.e., it is evaluative in nature, engaging teacher and taught in continually judging each other in various respects and on various levels;

(v) *asymmetrical* – i.e., there exists asymmetrical relationships with respective roles and role expectations between teacher and taught as well as between groups and sub-groupings; in institutionalized settings there is a clear

connection between asymmetry and power relations, which have a decisive impact on the learning process;

(vi) *inherently conservative* – i.e., like any group, language classes tend to establish their own rules, develop their own rituals and styles, which may become quite resistant to innovation and change;

(vii) *immediately significant* – i.e., the learning experience itself takes place in the here and now;

(viii) *jointly constructed* – i.e.,

> what someone learns in a language class will be a dynamic synthesis of individual and collective experience. Individual definitions of the new language, of what is to be attended to as worth learning of how to learn and personal definitions of progress will all interact with the particular classroom culture's definitions of each of these things. The language I learn in a classroom is a communal product derived through a jointly constructed process (Ibid, 148– 9).

Emphasizing the interactive nature of the classroom, Gaise (1980), quoted in Tsui 1995, also describes this L2 learning setting as the 'crucible' – the place where teacher and learners come together and language learning happens. According to Allwright and Bailey (1991), the teacher and the learners do not go into the classroom 'empty – handed'. The learners bring with them their experience of learning and life, along with their own reasons for being in the classroom, and their own particular needs. And the teacher also brings experience of life and leaning, and of teaching. In addition, the teacher brings into the classroom the syllabus, often embodied in teaching materials. But no matter what they all bring, everything still depends on how they react to each other (learner to learner as well as teacher to learner) when they all get together in the classroom. It is more a matter of their constant interaction which actually helps the learners to learn.

Van Lier (1988) describes the classroom in both pedagogical and social terms :

> In pedagogical terms, there is a tacit contract in the classroom between teacher and learner, or school and learner, which governs purposes, roles and relationships and rules for appropriate classroom conduct. In social terms, the classroom is a group of people with overt and hidden aims, patterns of behaviour, standards for judging participation, efforts and solidarity, etc., similar to other social groups (p. 78).

The classroom is also a place where expectations are conveyed. But, these expectations may not be fully set. Rather, as the teacher and students move from one activities to another expectations are continually being 'adjusted', 'negotiated', 'modified', 'elaborated', and 'refined'. Classroom events and instructional arrangements are continually shifting in both overt and subtle ways (Cazden 1986; Doyle 1986). Both socially and academically, students are expected to construct and interpret meanings as guides for action when they are engaged in different activities. Students and teacher alike are faced with the challenges of continually monitoring classroom events. Students are especially expected to monitor how their rights and obligation with regard to participation change. As they do so, they are actively engaged in some way in cooperative and joint construction of classroom events (Evertson and Weade, 1991).

Although the features which have just been mentioned are generally prevalent in L_2 classrooms, it is essential to note that some of the features are more apparent in classrooms where students are usually given opportunities for much negotiation work and interaction. For example, the 'interactive' feature is more characteristic of dyads and small groups than teacher – fronted classes.

2.2. Conceptualizing Learner Classroom Contributions

The concept of learner classroom contribution is investigated into in various guises. Some of them are learners' turn – taking behaviour, learner's participation behaviour, learners' negotiation of meaning, learners' interaction, etc. They, nevertheless, tend to lay much emphasis on verbal aspect, particularly oral contributions of students.

Broadly speaking, learner classroom contributions refer to what the learner does verbally and non – verbally in the process of classroom interaction. Verbal contributions include oral and written contributions while non-verbal contributions encompass contributions that are manifested in the form of performative body actions. Commonly, the $\mathbf{L_2}$ classroom is characterized by much more verbal contributions than non-verbal ones. It is also essential to note that learner classroom contributions are highly variable. For example, in teacher – fronted format the dominant contributions students make are responding and requesting while in dyads and small groups students are likely to make all sorts of contributions in high quantity.

According to Breen (1983), cited by Legutke and Howard (1991), learner classroom contributions take two forms, namely, implicit contributions and explicit contributions. Implicit contributions indicate classroom 'moments' which exist in any formal language learning situation and which make for the variety and uniqueness of any given group of learners. These include what the learners bring into the classroom, namely, their prior knowledge, their experience of the world in which they live, their experience of and with the world of the target language and its culture, their social, cultural and ethnic background and value system. Furthermore,

it includes the learners' preferences with regard to other people, to themes and ways of working, their knowledge of learning strategies and their expectation. Explicit contributions, on the other hand, are concrete actions of the learner. These contributions, by setting up interactions, bring to the surface what the learner implicitly means and feels. They generally pertain to areas of activity such as negotiation of meaning (as intra + personal and inter + personal) and exploring the target language in various contexts.

In the L_2 classroom, learners' contributions serve as sources of input for interaction and interaction management:

2.2.1. Sources of input for interaction

Students make classroom contributions by serving as sources of input for interaction in two major ways. The first is through solicitation of input from others. This is done by the various types of request they make in which the teacher or another student responds. Chesterfield and Chesterfield (1985) identify two forms of students' requests: appeal for assistance and request for clarification. In appeal for assistance, students spontaneously ask another person (as the case may be the teacher or another learner) for the correct term or structure, or for help in solving a problem. In request for clarification, students attempt to broaden understanding or knowledge of the target language by asking another person to explain or repeat a previous statement. In both cases, students' requests might prompt an interesting interaction in which members of the interaction participate by making various types of contribution. The contributions the student interactants make become points of further discussion and arguments. In this way, then, it is possible to consider learners' questions as sources of input for interaction. More technically, Foster (1998) explains:

> interactional adjustments. When confronted with a gap in understanding, they signal the problem and request clarification from their interlocutor, who then obliges with a repetition, elaboration or simplification of the original utterance --- (p. 2).

The second way in which students serve as sources of input for interaction is by responding to questions or requests. As research into classroom discourse indicates a large proportion of learners' classroom contributions are responding. Delamont (1983) states:

> In most classrooms, playing the teacher's game means responding – that is, answering the teacher's question, preferably correctly. Thus, the pupils' first strategy is to provide 'correct' – that is, acceptable to the teacher-answers. To do this, they must concentrate on the teacher enough to discover what the right answers are – or are likely to be. Similarly, pupils responses have to be solicited in some way (pp. 124-5).

Bellack et al. (1960) also in their investigation into the four classroom speech moves – structuring, soliciting, responding, and reacting found that responding is typically what students do in most classrooms.

In general, both requests and responses of students are essential for classroom interaction. It is possible to imagine that in L_2 classrooms where students make no or a few requests and responses the interaction is often short-lived. By contrast, long and useful interactions can take place in classrooms where students participate actively by asking questions and responding at various stages of their discussions.

> interactional adjustments. When confronted with a gap in understanding, they signal the problem and request clarification from their interlocutor, who then obliges with a repetition, elaboration or simplification of the original utterance --- (p. 2).

The second way in which students serve as sources of input for interaction is by responding to questions or requests. As research into classroom discourse indicates a large proportion of learners' classroom contributions are responding. Delamont (1983) states:

> In most classrooms, playing the teacher's game means responding – that is, answering the teacher's question, preferably correctly. Thus, the pupils' first strategy is to provide 'correct' – that is, acceptable to the teacher-answers. To do this, they must concentrate on the teacher enough to discover what the right answers are – or are likely to be. Similarly, pupils responses have to be solicited in some way (pp. 124-5).

Bellack et al. (1960) also in their investigation into the four classroom speech moves – structuring, soliciting, responding, and reacting found that responding is typically what students do in most classrooms.

In general, both requests and responses of students are essential for classroom interaction. It is possible to imagine that in L_2 classrooms where students make no or a few requests and responses the interaction is often short-lived. By contrast, long and useful interactions can take place in classrooms where students participate actively by asking questions and responding at various stages of their discussions.

2.2.2. Sources of input in interaction management

Unlike the traditional classroom, the modern interactive L2 classroom allows the learner a great deal of autonomy in managing his or her own work. Consequently, there are a wide range of contributions students make in the management of interaction. Some of the contributions are manifested covertly while others are observable. With regard to learner contributions to interaction management, Allwright and Bailey (1991) argue:

> In choosing to cooperate (or not ---), the learners make a significant contribution to the management of the interactions that take place in the classroom. And these contributions are crucial to the success of the interaction---. We all know how easy it is for one or two uncooperative learners to spoil everything. In a sense, the learners have power of veto over any of our attempts, as teachers, to manage interaction as if we were in sole charge, and their power is still there even if they choose, for the most part, not to use it (p. 19).

In addition to their willingness and cooperation, students have other contributions to make in interaction management. In the classroom, learners participate in interaction by asserting influence on five different areas of interaction management. These are 'turn distribution' (i.e. by nominating contributor), 'topic' (i.e. by deciding what to talk about), 'task' (i.e. by determining what each participant should do with the various opportunities they have), 'tone' (i.e. by creating conducive atmosphere), and 'code' (i.e. by deciding what accent, dialect, or language to use) (Allwright 1980). These contributions are particularly evident in dyad and small group activities. In these types of task, students have important contributions to make to grouping arrangements and group composition. More specifically, most of the teacher's roles in teacher – fronted format are taken by students during group work.

In more extreme cases, students are also sources of input in peer – correction and peer–teaching conditions. Many L2 education scholars emphasize the importance of exploiting students in error treatment and in peer teaching (better students teaching weaker ones). More recently, peer–correction has been suggested strongly in the sense that it is more practical in terms of time. Therefore, this is another area of classroom interaction where students exert their influence by correcting errors and teaching their peers.

2.3. The Relationship between Learner Classroom Contributions and their L2 Development

Several studies have been conducted to see the relationships between learners' classroom oral contributions and their L2 development. There are also other studies which have tried to investigate into students' classroom behaviour and its relation to FL/SL learning.

Presumably, Seliger's (1977) study, quoted in Seliger (1983), represents one of the earliest attempts in investigating into learner classroom contribution and language proficiency. In his study, Seliger posed the question: 'Does practice make perfect?' seeking to know if learners' contributions were in any case related to their progress in mastering the target language, i.e. English. In order to answer this question he conducted an observation on a small number of students who were labeled as 'High Input Generators' and 'Low Input Generators'. In addition, he studied their performance on two English language tests. He also administered a questionnaire to the subjects to get information about their use of English outside class. He found that the High Input Generators (HIGs) out performed the Low Input Generators (LIGs) in English tests. He, then, made the conclusion: 'Students who initiate interaction, i.e. (HIGs), are better able to turn input into intake' (p. 257).

Day (1984) followed up on Seliger's study using refined procedures with learners from different cultural backgrounds. However, his results were different from what Seliger found. The results Day found showed that no observable relationship existed between the frequency with which the students made contributions and their achievement on an English test.

Moreover, Slimani (1987), quoted in Allwright and Bailey (1991), building on both Seliger's and Day's work and using their procedures to analyse the data, was unable to confirm Seliger's positive findings. She had to conclude that there seemed to be no satisfactory strong evidence that interaction or contributions should be interpreted as causing progress. Her study suggested that the more proficient learners in her class did seem to be more willing to interact. Following this, she argued that the students were more willing to participate, perhaps, because they were more proficient and found interaction less stressful.

Another similar study was Naiman, et al's (1978), which tried to find out the relationship between handraising and student–teacher questioning behaviours. They found that there was a positive relationship between hand–raising of students and their language proficiency.

Finally, Strong (19983) also studied the relationship between learners' oral contributions and their knowledge of vocabulary. He found that there existed a positive relationship between his subjects' talkativeness (i.e. initiation of contributions) and their target language vocabulary.

Generally, while Seliger's (1977), Naiman et al.'s (1978) and Strong's (1983) studies showed positive relationship, Day's (1984) and Slimani's (1987) studies indicated negative relationship. As Chaudron (1988) and Ellis (1994) point out, correlational studies of learner participation are not easy to interpret because there is

studies of learner participation are not easy to interpret because there is no way of telling whether a 'participation causes learning' or 'proficiency causes participation' conclusion is correct when the finding shows a significant relationship.

Although research findings reveal mixed results, there is a general tendency that learners' participation or interaction is essential in FL/SL classrooms. The significance of learners' interaction is because of the following reasons: 1) it is only through interaction that the learner decomposes the target language structures and derives meaning from classroom events; 2) interaction gives learners the opportunities to incorporate target language structures into their own speech; and 3) the meaningfulness for learners of classroom events of any kind, whether thought of as interactive or not will depend in the extent to which communication has been jointly constructed between the teacher and learners (Allwright 1984; Breen 1985).

The importance of learner classroom contributions can also be viewed from the angle of target language input and output. There are strong arguments that comprehensible input is an essential element for learners to learn target language in the classroom (Krashen 1982). For Swain (1985), it is not only comprehensible input that is required, but also comprehensible output is quite essential. On the basis of her research findings she concluded that while comprehensible input may be sufficient for acquiring semantic competence in the target language, comprehensible output is needed in order to gain grammatical competence. That is, language learners must struggle with producing output, which is comprehensible to their interlocutor, if they are to master the grammatical markers of the language

In support of Swain's (1985) argument, there is some evidence that shows more production and more correct production is associated with target language proficiency (Naiman et al. 1978; Strong 1983). Concerning learner classroom contribution, it is possible to suggest that a contribution (for example, a student's

question) could be considered as an output for the contributor and an input for other students who are listening. Although this explanation tends to be simplistic in the light of preceding statements it would not be difficult to see how crucial learners' contributions are.

Research and theoretical explanations in general tend to show the importance of classroom interaction. In all types of interaction, an essential element is the participation of members by making various types of contribution. Therefore, although most of the research has been done under the guise of interaction or participation, they all relate to learners' contributions.

2.4. Learner Classroom Contribution Making Behaviour

In the classroom as in any social setting, there are certain rules of action that the interactants are expected to adhere to. The degree to which the rules are observed strictly varies from one classroom to another depending on the type of teacher. It is the contention of many classroom researchers (e.g. Cazden 1987; Doyle 1986; Evertson and Weade 1991) that classrooms are bound to be governed by certain participation rules or rituals which develop as time passes. It is argued that as participation evolves, norms become established that serve to guide actions. Students are particularly expected to monitor the need for adjustments that are essentially social. That is, the rules about who may talk to whom, when, about what, in what ways and for what purposes are adjusted (Cazden 1986; Doyle 1986). The classroom participation procedures, nevertheless, are not as systematic and patterned as it has been argued, because the classroom rules are very often violated and in some cases also learners might impose their own preferences of participation which will be accepted willingly (or without) by the teacher.

Assuming learner classroom contributions are not made randomly, various attempts have been made to find out the pattern and procedure in which contributions are made. The attempts have focused on studying the turn – taking and turn – giving behaviour of classroom participants. Therefore, students' behaviour with regard to their turn opportunities will be taken as a basis to analyze the procedure in which learner classroom contributions are made.

2.4.1. Turn – taking and turn – allocation behaviour in the L_2 classroom

The procedure Van Lier (1988) suggests to classify oral contributions in terms of turn –taking and allocation is the most comprehensive and detailed. He employs four major distinctions. These are:

1) *Prospective*: which refers to the way the turn is linked to subsequent turn(s). He identifies three ways, which include 'allocating' 'soliciting', and 'ending'. Allocating implies a move by which contributor for the next turn is specified. This is done by 'nominating', i.e., by verbally selecting a next contributor through some kind of name, description or pronoun (e.g. 'you there'); by 'signaling; i.e., by pointing with finger, etc.; by 'eye gaze'.

   Soliciting refers to the specifying of the content of the next contribution without specifying the next contributor. This may include the following requests: a verbal action (e.g. an answer to a question), a bid for a contribution (e.g. 'Hands up if you know the answer'), or a non – verbal action. When a general solicit is made all or any of the students can volunteer to answer. There is thus initiative on the part of the contributors; and potentially simultaneous contributions may be made.

   Ending a contribution may be done in three ways: 'ending', 'giving up', and 'giving way'. A contribution may be terminated without implications for content

or contributor of subsequent turns). This is termed 'ending'. The second way, giving up (or trailing) occurs when a contributor cannot (or will not) bring the contribution to its projected (or projectable) conclusion due to various reasons, for example, planning problems, 'Giving way' occurs when a contribution stops short before the projected completion of turn in order to give way to competition, for example, when another contributor interrupts.

2) *Retrospective*: refers to the way the turn is linked to preceding turn(s). This is again further divided into 'allocated', 'unallocated', and 'ok – pass'. A contribution is allocated when its contributor has been specifically given the right or obligation to contribute either through 'pre – allocation' or 'local allocation'. Pre – allocation rule may be set up specifically at the start of an activity or event (e.g. 'we'll go round the table clockwise'). Local allocation is made immediately before the present contribution.

A contribution is unallocated when speakership has not been specified either by local – or pre – allocational means. However, contributors may make contributions in five different ways. The first is 'response to solicits'. Learners can respond to solicits by 'self – selecting' or by bidding for a turn. A next subcategory of unallocated turn is 'self – select'. This occurs when the preceding contributor has ended or given up a turn. Thirdly, there is 'floor – seeking'. This happens when a contributor begins to contribute during another contributor's turn. The fourth is 'intra – turn negative feedback'. This is closely related to floor – seeking, since a negative signal during another person's turn has the potential effect of cutting that turn short. Finally, a 'stolen turn' is another way in which contributions are made without allocation. This occurs when a slot designated for a contribution specifically allocated to another contributor is occupied.

An ok – pass can be either allocated or unallocated. That is, it is freely made. These contributions are made upon the conclusion of a previous turn and do not seek the floor, but merely acknowledge, express approval, understanding, etc.

3) *Concurrent*: refers to a turn that is taken during a current turn which is related to that turn in a servicing sense. This category includes brief turns which are distinguished as 'listening responses' and 'intra – turn repair' / 'repair initiation'. Listening responses are short turns such as 'which' , 'yes', etc. which fulfil important functions by signaling approval, attention, encouragement, etc. Intra – turn repair / repair initiation includes brief requests for clarification, replacements of errors, and also instances of prompting and helping.

4) *Neutral*: refers to turns which are indeterminate as 1), 2), and 3) explained above. 'Rehearsal' and 'private' turns are identified here whose purpose is to comment on other turns or use items in them for personal trial purposes. When contributions are addressed to another (usually neighboring) learner or a small subset of learners relating to the main business of the moment or to other business, it is referred to as 'private' oral contributions.

Although this classification appears to be quite satisfying, there are distinctions where the differences are not so clear. For example, the difference between ok – passes and listening responses is not straightforward, and it may lend an analysis to subjectivity.

Allwright and Bailey (1991) have also tried to offer a classification of classroom turns. They identify two types of contributions: 'self – initiated' contributions and 'teacher – initiated' contributions. Teacher – initiated contributions are in turn further divided into 'personal solicit' and 'general solicit'. Personal solicit (or direct nomination) occurs when teacher calls upon a particular learner to contribute.

Alternatively, general solicit occurs when teacher throws the turn open to the whole class. In both cases, contributor may volunteer through verbal and non – verbal cues. Concerning self – initiated contributions, students may forward their contributions either by 'bidding' or without bidding. Bidding may take place either verbally or non – verbally.

According to Tsui (1995), students' turn – taking behaviour can be divided into 'solicited' turns and 'unsolicited' turns. An example of the former is a turn taken when a teacher seeks an answer from students, students may answer when they are specifically nominated to do so or they may take the initiative to answer it (this is referred to as a 'self – selected' turn). An unsolicited (or 'initiating') turn is one in which a student initiates a contribution. Initiating turns are always 'self – selected'.

2.4.2. Implications for research and teaching

Although enough research has not been conducted in this area, several useful pieces of information have been obtained about learners' participation behaviour from what has been researched so far. Some of the useful and interesting information pertain to the way students participate and the way they respond to turn – taking rules in the classroom.

A turn – taking behaviour even whose existence is known only by few teachers is 'private' turns. This is a turn that many teachers are either not aware of or attach little importance to. This is evident in Allwright's (1980) study, in which he found that one of the students he observed, who was considered passive and uninterested in the language lesson by the teacher, took many private turns. Private turns, as discussed earlier, are not audible enough to the teacher. They are usually addressed to the contributor himself or herself and neighboring students in a very low voice. Students' preference to participate in such a way might emanate either from shyness

or intolerance to bid. Teachers need to look out for students taking private turns and, if it is agreeable to the students, to get him or her to make their turn public. The sensitivity of the teacher towards students' turn – taking behaviour is particularly important in classrooms where the students are passive and reticent.

Another point worthy of consideration pertains to constraints related to turn – taking and allocation behaviour of classroom participants. One problem relates to turn transition and distribution. In L_2 classroom, as in any multi – party settings, these problems can occur and may cause communication problems. This happens simply because there are many potential participants, especially in teacher – fronted and small group situations. In some cases, rules of turn distribution may emerge or are instituted, and the matter of who speaks when is predetermined. Transition, then, may not be problematic, and consequently it may cease to be governed by negotiation, competition, or personal initiative. However, what this means is that, because of the turn – taking rules, participants are restricted in their power and initiative to change and influence the lesson (Van Lier, 1988).

Another interesting point is, as suggested by Allwright (1980), the participation behviour in which some learners obtain more than their 'fair share' of contributions. There are two possible ways in which learners obtain more participation chances than other students. These are through 'stolen turns' and due to teacher's unfair allocation of turns. Consequently, there prevails 'forced participation' to encourage public learner contributions and to maintain fair distribution of turns. The notion of forced participation, in fact, is not always productive. Although teachers assume that through forced participation reticent students could make more public verbal contributions, research seems to show mixed results. Felix's (1981) study suggests that teachers need to be aware of the linguistic demands the participation imposes upon learners. Similarly, Vanpatten (1987) suggests that the emphasis on whether or not learners should be expected to interact verbally needs to consider their

interlanguage development, with different expectations for participation placed on learners at different levels of development. Therefore, learners should be made to contribute when they are ready to contribute.

2.5. Differences in Making Classroom Contributions

There are both intra–person and inter–person differences in making classroom contributions. The differences, the variability of a student's contributions and the differences among students, can be in terms of quantity or type of contributions. Delamont (1983), using classroom observations, found that there are differences both quantitatively and qualitatively among students in making classroom contributions. Her study was carried out with a help of a set of observation categories. The observation categories were designed to tally students' contributions of those related to the academic content (content–oriented) and those tangential to it. The system was used in 98 lessons, in which she tallied 1,503 content–oriented contributions and only 852 tangential ones. That is, there were twice as many content–oriented utterances as tangential ones. An 'average' lesson had 24 pupil contributions, of which fifteen (63 percent) were content–oriented.

Seliger's (1977) findings also lent empirical support to the notion that learners' participation in making contributions is highly variable. Seliger identified, on the basis of a numerical count of classroom contributions, two broad categories of learners who were labeled as 'High Input Generators' (HIGs) and 'Low Input Generators' (LIGs):

> Some students, the HIGs, are actively involved and, like the child, cause input to be directed at them by calling out, answering out of turn, and working out answers to questions or drill cues directed to others. Still others, the LIGs, sit quietly but rarely and in some extreme cases never participate unless specifically asked to do so (Seliger 1983, 268 – 7).

orally and writing) rather than through receptive activities involving listening and reading.

There is also a research finding which relates students' perception of participation to teacher's praise. Morline – Dershiner (1982) studied student perceptions of teacher praise and found that the way learners perceive teacher's praise can influence the learners' participation behaviour. Praise perceived as deserved by the learner led to greater participation in classroom discussion.

It is possible to recognize from the foregoing review that learner contribution is very significant for classroom interaction. The significance of learner contribution as discussed earlier, is that it is a source of input for interaction and interaction management. Therefore, understanding the nature of learner contributions, the way students make contributions, and students' perceptions of contributions will have relevance to several issues pertinent to classroom participation. It is with this belief that an exploratory study was carried out, and the report of the research methods and the findings will follow in the next two chapters.

Although a number of factors can be identified for the differences, the following reasons are the major ones:

2.5.1. Learner factors

Differences in learning strategies, perspectives, personality, proficiency and cultural background may contribute to the differences in making contributions. Concerning strategies learners use, for example, Allwright and Bailey (1991) state that some students keep talking while others wish to be quiet and listen in order to learn. A case of Schumman (1977) whose preference was 'eavesdropping' is a clear demonstration of this argument. Schumman, in learning a language, usually preferred reticence to speaking.

Another factor for the difference, according to Delamont (1983), is the students' perspective of schooling or education. In her case study, Delamont found that the very different perspectives the subjects held 'explain' why their classroom contributions are so different in form and content. Her study suggested that those students who prided them- selves on intellectual independence and creativity were significantly more likely than their classmates to make tangential contributions aimed at broadening the focus of lessons.

The cultural background of the students is also considered as a causative factor for the differences. Sato (1982) investigated this factor in a study of two university ESL classes. She was especially concerned with the different turn – taking styles of Asian and non – Asian students. One variable studied was the number of self – selected turns taken by the groups, that is, student – initiated turns that were not dependent on prior solicits. Sato found that the Asians as a group, although greater in numbers than non – Asians, took significantly fewer self – selected turns in class

(38% of turns were bid for by Asian 18% by non – Asians). Duff's (1986) study of Japanese and Chinese dyads also revealed a significant tendency for the Chinese subjects to dominate the interaction in every measure of linguistic productivity (turns, length of utterances, etc.).

The other factor contributing to learner differences in making contributions is proficiency. A large – scale study carried out by Narman et al. (1978) found significant correlation between learners' classroom production measure and their performance on tests. The more proficient the ESL learners were, the more likely they were to produce correct and complete responses, and to be among the most frequent responders. Strong's (1983) findings also support the notion that greater proficiency is related to responding. He reported that the subjects' responsiveness as measured by responses to utterances of others showed significant correlations with proficiency measures.

Lastly, personality of a student is also correlated with participation behaviour (Chaudron 1988). As human beings there are differences among students: some are vociferous, others reticent, some are vocal, others diffident, etc. (Prahbu, 1988). Therefore, such differences among students in terms of personality traits can possibly result in participation differences.

2.5.2. Teacher classroom behaviour

Teacher's differential treatment of students in the classroom may influence the type and quantity of contributions students make. Research shows that teacher's questioning behaviour and their wait – time could affect students' contribution making behaviour. Such behaviour of teachers, according to some studies, is related to students' ethnicity, academic and social status. Laosa (1979) argues that teachers in academically, socially, and ethnically heterogeneous classrooms behave

differently toward students who are perceived either as low – achieving, of low socioeconomic status, or belonging to a minority ethnic group. The different behaviour is often more negative, in that teachers address these students less, react less positively to their contributions, criticize them more, and so on. In agreement with this, Brophy and Good (1974) also point out that teachers give 'clever' students every advantage over their classmates during instruction. They wait longer for the better students to answer, offer more clues, rephrase their questions more helpfully, and accept a wider range of responses.

In Sato's (1982) exploration of the relationship between ethnicity and the distribution of interactional turns, it was found that teachers called upon the Asian students significantly less often than the non – Asian students. She suggests that the relatively greater reticence of Asians to participate may have caused their teachers to perceive them as "unwilling" to participate; thus, the teachers were led to call upon them less often.

2.5.3. Classroom organization

The type of classroom organization might contribute to the differences in participation as students tend to favour one type of organization over another. In an early study of college students learning EFL, Long et al. (1976) compared the amount and types of the target language the learners used when they worked in pairs (called 'dyads') and when they interacted with the teacher and the rest of their classmates (called the 'lockstep' condition). They found some striking quantitative and qualitative differences in the amount and types of the target language used by the learners in dyads, compared with the lockstep classes. Not only did the learners in pairs get more turns, but they also performed a wider range of communicative functions with the language. That is, many of the contributions which were

normally the teacher's responsibility in lockstep lessons (such as asking, clarifying questions) were taken over by one or the other of the learners in the dyads.

Doughty and Pica (1986) also building on the ideas proposed by Long et al (1976), carried out a similar study. These researchers wanted to know which of the two types of group work activities – small groups and dyads – would produce more modified interaction compared with teacher fronted activity. While the researchers found no differences between the verbal interaction of the small groups and the dyads, both of these conditions resulted in significantly more modified interaction, more negotiation for meaning, than did the same task in teacher – fronted conditon.

Apart from simple arithmetic, i.e. few number of students, a very important reason for there being more student talk or contributions in group work is the removal of the figure of authority, that is, the teacher. When students work with their peers, their contributions will not be evaluated as right or wrong because there is nobody who has the authority to do so. The removal of authority in small group work changes the mode of interaction from an evaluative mode to a sharing mode. This encourages students to take risks in the sense that they will verbalize their ideas even when these are not fully developed and coherent and they will use the target language even when they are not sure whether it is grammatically right or wrong (Tsui, 1995). This kind of talk is referred to as 'exploratory talk' as opposed to 'final draft talk', in which whatever is expressed is a final product presented for evaluation. While teacher – fronted classrooms typically generate 'final draft talk', small group work typically generates 'exploratory talk' (Barnes, 1976).

2.5.4. Task Type

Experimental studies on interaction tasks (e.g. Long 1981; Gaies 1983b; Gass and Varonis 1985; Doughty and Pica 1986; Duff 1986) indicate that information

exchange tasks can substantially promote the number of turns taken by interactants, as well as the quantity of their interaction.

Long (1981), in his attempt to determine the task type that initiates more negotiation, designed two types of task which he called 'one – way' task and 'two – way' task. One – way task involves no exchange of information to complete the task at hand. Two – way task, on the other hand, requires information exchange. An example of one way task (which was used by Gass and Varoris 1985) is the one in which one member of a dyad or triad describes a picture which has been drawn by the other. Long has compared the two types of task and found that two way tasks produced significantly more negotiation work than one way tasks.

Later on, Doughty and Pica (1985) pursued this issue and their findings support the original claim for the importance of task type. In their study, they compared language use in teacher-fronted lessons, group work and pair work on a two – way task. The participants (or subjects) had the same level of proficiency. In the study, they had to give and obtain information about how flowers were to be planted in a garden. At the end of the activity, all participants were supposed to have constructed the same picture. Finally, they found that the two – way task generated significantly more negotiation work than the one – way task.

Duff (1986) also studied the effect of task type on the amount of student talk. She distinguished between convergent and divergent tasks on the basis of the goals set for participants in two problem – solving and two debate tasks. She found that the learners took significantly more turns each in the problem – solving tasks than in debates.

2.6. The Notion of 'Active Participation' in Making Classroom Contributions

Customarily, active participation is measured on the basis of frequency of questions and answers students forward in the classroom. Students who bid or volunteer frequently are considered as 'active contributors' while students who are less vocal are often deemed as 'passive'. Nevertheless, this notion of active participation is changing as more systematic and objective methods of measuring participation has evolved.

Van Lier (1988) suggests different ways of measuring participation:

> We can look at it in quantitative terms, i.e. how much there is of it, in time and volume, in terms of the class as a whole, or in terms of individual participants. We can also study it qualitatively, i.e. in terms of the different ways in which they participate, or how intensely, spontaneously, and actively they do so (p. 92).

Researchers such as Allwright (1980) and Seliger (1983) have employed the quantitative method. Crucial in their quantification was the identification of the learners' initiative, for example, whether a particular contribution was initiated by the learner or made in response to a teacher's specific allocation. According to Van Lier (1988), studying participation in terms of initiative and teacher allocation is not a sufficient measure of participation. He adds two more aspects of participation: topic management and activity management.

> --- at least potentially, initiative is expressed in two ways: through retrospective and through prospective actions, that is, by acting on prior talk and by influencing future talk. But this is not all. At times topics may be changed, a denial may be made, a certain piece of information may be questioned, etc. It seems clear that over and above issues of selection and allocation, topic control and management are important manifestations of initiative (p. 123).

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY ILS LIBRARY

Van Lier suggests a series of questions intended to permit a detailed coding for active participation. The questions relate to: 1) whether the contribution is within the territory of the present topic; 2) whether the contribution is self – selected or teacher – allocated; 3) whether the contribution identifies the next contributor and activity, and 4) whether the contribution is an extension of preceding contribution or a repeated one or original.

However, not all forms of participation are observable. Participation with the language learning task at hand, may in some instances be largely an internal, mental phenomenon. Alternative research techniques (for example, the diary studies and other form of self – report) are being explored to try to tap into some of the largely unobservable issues related to language learning (Allwright and Bailey, 1991).

It follows from what has been said that the notion of active participation in making contributions needs to be viewed from a wider perspective. Apart from observable contributions, such as oral contributions, there are several others including private and written contributions. Furthermore, research and experience show that learners participate both verbally and non–verbally in classrooms to very different extents. Some are verbally reticent but active in private and written contributions. Therefore, teachers need to be sensitive to students' patterns of participation. In relation to this, Allwright and Bailey (1991) state:

> By systematically speaking less, waiting longer after posing a question, or calling on learners we might have previously ignored, we may see different patterns of behaviour emerge. We can be aware of how our own participation in negotiated discourse influences the type of practice and learning opportunities that result --- we can and should be sensitive to learners' preferred interaction patterns and realize that apparent passivity in classrooms can mask a great deal of active attention (p. 135).

2.7. Learner Perceptions of Classroom Contributions

Little is known about learner perceptions concerning classroom contributions because no empirical research has been conducted to date. However, studies related to perception, such as belief, attitude, opinion, etc. suggest that language learners bring a variety of perceptions to the L_2 classroom. According to Hosenfeld (1978), cited by Ellis (1994), the perceptions are brought to the classroom in the form of 'mini theories' about L_2 learning.

Various explanations and findings indicate that students perceive learner classroom contributions in different ways. Learner perceptions of appropriate contributions, the size and quality of contributions, contribution making procedures, and the importance of making contributions are variable and gradually changing. According to Tsui (1995), many students place much emphasis on 'correct responses'. As a result, they spend a great deal of time deciding whether a certain contribution is correct or not. This perception of giving correct responses might emanate from the teacher's emphasis on correct responses or the students themselves may develop the notion. When students worry about giving correct responses, they may decide not to contribute in situations of uncertainty. Therefore, such learner perceptions are assumed to affect the quantity and quality of contributions to be made in the L_2 classroom.

Students' perceptions of bidding before contributing vary from student to student. Sato (1982) found that Asian students would strictly adhere to a bidding procedure before they contribute as compared to non – Asian students. The students perceive that any contribution made without bidding is inappropriate. This strict adherence to bidding resulted in fewer contributions in comparison to contribution made by the non – Asians.

Students also vary in the reaction and acceptance of various arrangements in which they participate. Some will find worth participating in teacher – fronted lessons while others choose to participate in pair and group discussions. Tann (1981) studied students who were asked to participate in small group activities. She found that the students did not regard what they did as 'work' or 'learning' at all. Ninety-five students were involved, and ninety said they had enjoyed the tasks.

> In experimental group work it was not facts, but opinions and interpretations which were exchanged, and this, by the pupils' criteria was not 'learning' --- the majorities of the pupils, when asked what they thought they had learnt or gained from group work, replied that they gained nothing (p.36).

The students' perceptions about working in pairs or groups, in part, relates to their perceptions about error correction and form – focused lessons. Many students have a tendency to place much emphsis on teacher error treatment and grammar explanations. The absence of error correction or grammar explanation makes the lesson not worth attending in view of these students. Wenden (1986a) conducted a study on 25 adults enrolled in part time advanced level class at an American University. Her findings suggest that learners emphasize the importance of learning grammar, vocabulary and receiving feedback on errors. Horwitz (1987a), cited by Ellis (1995), also found that many of his respondents viewed that the best way to learn English was to spend most of their time memorizing vocabulary and grammar rules. What these fundings suggest is that most learners would prefer to participate in form – focused teacher led discussions. Other studies also lend support to what has been said. In a qualitative study Abraham and Vann (1987) carried out on two students, they found that both subjects of the study believed it important to participate actively in class. One of the subjects believed that paying conscious attention to grammar was important. Little and Singleton (1990), cited by Ellis (1995), also found that students preferred to learn by production activities (repeating

CHAPTER THREE

3. The Research Methods

This section will present descriptions of data source, data collection and data analysis procedures.

3.1. Source of data

The data for this study are students' classroom verbal contributions and students' self – reports about classroom contribution and contributing. It was collected from freshman students who were enrolled in 1999 – 2000 academic year to attend higher education at Addis Ababa University. The students were admitted as regular students to the Natural Science stream. When the data were collected they were taking the second freshman English course after having completed the first part.

The reasons which led me to select a freshman English classroom as data – base were convenience and accessibility. A naturalistic enquiry like this needs recordings of naturally occurring classroom interactions. Freshman classrooms are relatively suitable to conduct such recordings partly because of the small size of the classes as compared to high school classes. Furthermore, freshman classes are relatively accessible though still some teachers are reluctant to allow researchers in to their classrooms. Several teachers had to be asked in order to get access to the particular classroom from where the data for this study were obtained.

There were thirty-five students in the classroom when the recording took place. According to their bio-data reports, the class was heterogeneous in some respects.

CHAPTER THREE

3. The Research Methods

This section will present descriptions of data source, data collection and data analysis procedures,

3.1. Source of data

The data for this study are students' classroom verbal contributions and students' self – reports about classroom contribution and contributing. It was collected from freshman students who were enrolled in 1999 – 2000 academic year to attend higher education at Addis Ababa University. The students were admitted as regular students to the Natural Science stream. When the data were collected they were taking the second freshman English course after having completed the first part.

The reasons which led me to select a freshman English classroom as data – base were convenience and accessibility. A naturalistic enquiry like this needs recordings of naturally occurring classroom interactions. Freshman classrooms are relatively suitable to conduct such recordings partly because of the small size of the classes as compared to high school classes. Furthermore, freshman classes are relatively accessible though still some teachers are reluctant to allow researchers in to their classrooms. Several teachers had to be asked in order to get access to the particular classroom from where the data for this study were obtained.

There were thirty-five students in the classroom when the recording took place. According to their bio-data reports, the class was heterogeneous in some respects.

There were differences among the students in terms of sex, age and educational background.

3.2. Data collection procedures

3.2.1. Video recording

This data collection method was used to obtain information about students' classroom contributions. It was employed to obtain data on both verbal and non-verbal behaviours of students during classroom interaction. In this procedure, a portable video – recorder was used and the researcher was present in the classroom during the recording to take notes on the interaction as it progressed. All together, a 30 – minute 'dummy' recording and a one-hour and a 30-minute lesson recording were conducted. Out of this, a one-hour recording was done in a teacher-fronted format of discussions. The discussion was based on reading and vocabulary activity found on pages 49 and 50 of College English volume II. A thirty-minute recording was also conducted on a group who was discussing the same topics. Although there were six small groups engaged in similar activities, only one group was randomly selected for the recording. The groups consisted of six students each. Recording all the groups simultaneously was not possible because the camera lens was too narrow to view all the six groups. It was hoped that recording the entire process of a group work, rather than recording fragments of each group's interaction, would be more beneficial in such studies because analysis of interaction needs to consider the whole interaction process in its context.

A purposeful attempt was made not to influence the normally occurring patterns of interaction. The researcher did not exercise any control over the teacher, the

learners and the lesson contents. Thus the video-recorded data were collected through a naturalistic enquiry method.

3.2.2. Questionnaire

This method was used to collect data on the perceptions of students who participated in the video-recorded lesson. It was administered to thirty-five students. In other words, all the students who were present during the video-recordings were asked to complete the questionnaire. Accordingly, they filled in the questionnaire just immediately after the lesson recording ended.

The questionnaire the respondents completed had fifteen closed items. It was of a Likert type and students were required to respond on a five-point scale showing agreements and disagreements to each statement. The contents of the items focused on eliciting information about students perceptions concerning (i) reasons for classroom participation; (ii) importance of bidding before contributing; (iii) appropriate contribution, and (iv) the 'not contributing' phenomenon.

Prior to its administration, the questionnaire was tested through pilot studies conducted on similar students. Based on information obtained from pilot studies, the instrument was redesigned which resulted in the reduction of the number of items and modification of certain items.

3.2.3. Interview

The interview method was employed to supplement the questionnaire. Besides, it was used to collect information that would refute or validate responses obtained through the questionnaire. The number of respondents who volunteered to participate in the interview was twelve.

The questions of the interview were open-ended. They focused on three topics related to contribution. These are: (i) reasons for classroom participation; (ii) bidding before contributing; (iii) factors that influence participation.

Like the questionnaire, the interview was also tried on a small-scale respondents before it was conducted on the actual interviewees.

3.3. Data analysis procedures

3.3.1. Procedure of coding and analysis of transcript

The analysis of video-recorded data was carried out in a procedure derived from what Van Lier (1988) suggests. The procedure Van Lier suggests makes use of a series of questions which are intended to conduct a detailed coding of active participation, based on recorded and transcribed data. A slight change has been made on the questions and coding chart in such a way that it suits the purpose of this study. Accordingly, the video-records were transcribed and checked by others for completeness and accuracy of speaker identification. Then, coding of learners' contributions was conducted on the basis of students' verbal moves and turns.

The following features were made use of to distinguish the learners' contributions when coding took place.

'A' – on – stream contribution, i.e., continuing, convergent or contributory
'B' – off-stream contribution, i.e., introduces something new, it denies / disputes a proposition

'C' – the contribution is solicited by another (teacher or student) and it is self – selecting

'D' – the contribution is unsolicited (unsolicited contributions are always self-selecting)

'E' – the contribution is nominated (or directed) by another

'F' – long contributions, i.e. longer than listening responses and ok- passes or long utterances

'G' – short contributions, i.e. short utterances such as listening responses and ok-passes

These features are generally concerned with 'topic', 'origin' and 'length' of contributions. Topic denotes whether or not the contribution is made without departing or digressing from the present topic of discussion. 'A' and 'B' are included to determine such differences. Origin implies the way the contribution is prompted or caused. 'C', 'D', and 'E' are concerned to determine this aspect of learner contribution. Length, as the word suggests, means the extent to which the contributor maintains or holds the floor. 'F' and 'G' help to differentiate this difference.

In coding the contributions, a distinction is also made between 'major' contributions and 'minor' contribution. To make this distinction, 'B', 'C', 'E' and 'F' features are taken to code 'major' contributions while the rest are used to code minor contributions. This distinction is based on Van Lier's (1988) suggestion which was used to determine 'initiative' in participation.

In order to determine what constitutes a contribution, two approaches were used. The matter of contribution is more straightforward in teacher – fronted lessons than in pair or group work. Therefore, in the teacher – fronted lesson, a contribution was measured in terms of the move students make, for example, to ask or answer a

question. But in the group work, speaking turn was the basis to determine a contribution since the presence of more negotiation and oral interaction makes contribution identification very difficult.

3.3.2. Procedures followed in analysing the self – report data

The self-report data, which were collected through questionnaire and interview, were analysed both quantitatively and qualitatively. Since the questionnaire had five response categories for each item, the analysis of the questionnaire responses required converting the responses to each item to frequencies and percentages. Having converted the responses to frequencies and percentages, an attempt was made to display the results in tables. A further computation of the responses was also made in order to determine how much of the responses were made positively and negatively.

Students' responses to the interview questions were analysed qualitatively. First, an attempt was made to sort out the responses, which led to the development of response categories. Then, the students' responses were analysed descriptively on the basis of the response categories.

CHAPTER FOUR

4. Results, Interpretations and Implications

4.1. Results

4.1.1. Some biographical data of students

The research setting, i.e. the classroom, was compossed of students coming from different backgrounds. Some of the major bio-data of the students are summarized as follows:

Table 1: Classroom composition in terms of sex

Sex	No. of Students
Male	31
Female	4

Table 2: Classroom composition in terms of age

Ages	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
No. of students	3	7	15	5	1	2	1	1

Table 3: Classroom Composition in terms of the types of school students attended before they joined university

School type	No. of Students
Government	29
Private	5
Both	1

4.1.2. Tabulations and description of learner contributions

This part presents results concerning learner contributions that were made in the teacher – led discussions and the group work. Two separate tabulations are made to make possible comparisons. Table 4 presents contributions which were made by six group participants in a group work. The group work followed a 10-minute teacher – led discussion. It lasted for about thirty minutes in which the participants discussed two topics. First, the students in the group discussed aspects of critical reading based on a reading text entitled "Television brings population issues to life in Mozambique" (College English Vol. II on page 50). Having discussed the text, the students passed to working out the meanings of words selected from the reading text. Table 5 presents contributions which the students made during the teacher-led discussions. The discussions were conducted before and after the group work.

The columns of the tables are explained as follows:

'Contributors' identifies the individual learners who were contributing in the discussions.

'Total contributions' refers to all the contributions each contributor made. The fifth column presents contributions in percentages.

'A' identifies on – stream contributions.

'B' " off – stream contributions.

'C' " solicited, self – selected contributions.

'D' " teacher or student nominated contributions.

'E' " unsolicited, self – selected contributions.

'F' " contributions longer than ok – passes or listening responses.

'G' : short contributions such as ok-passes, listening responses and one word answers.

'Total BCEF' identifies quality contributions.

'Rank order' identifies the ranks of contributors in terms of the quality contributions each learner made.

Table 4: Learner contributions in the small group discussions

Contributors	Total Contributions in frequency	Total Contributions %	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	Total BCEF	Rank Order
L_1	47	32.6	45	2	-		47	38	9	85	1
L_2	22	15.2	20	2	-		22	15	5	39	4
L_3	6	4.2	5	1	-	1	5	5	1	11	6
L_4	24	16.6	24	-	-		24	21	3	45	2
L_5	10	6.8	10	-	-		10	8	2	18	5
L_6	3	2.1	3	-	-		3	2	1	5	7
L	32	20.2	32	-	-		32	11	21	43	3
Total Contributions	144		139	5	-	1	143	100	42		

Table 5: Learner contributions in the teacher – fronted discussions

Contributors	Total Contributions	Total Contribution %	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	Total BCEF	Rank Order
L_1	2	6.89	2		2			1		3	3
L_2	5	17.24	5		5			4	1	9	1
L_3	-	-	-		-			-	-	-	-
L_4	2	6.89	2		2			1	1	3	3
L_5	-	-	-		-			-	-	-	-
L_6	-	-	-		-			-	-	-	-
L_7	2	6.89	2		2			1	1	3	3
L_8	1	3.44	1		1			-	1	1	5
L_9	1	3.44	1		1			-	1	1	5
L_{10}	5	17.24	5		5			4	1	9	1
L_{11}	2	6.89	2		2			2	-	4	2
L_{12}	1	3.44	1		1			-	1	1	5
L_{13}	1	3.44	1		1			-	1	1	5
L_{14}	1	3.44	1		1			-	1	1	5
L_{15}	2	6.89	2		2			-	2	2	4
L_{16}	3	10.34	3		3			1	2	1	5
L_{17}	1	3.44	1		1			-	1	1	5
Total Contributions	29		29		29			14	15		

As the two tables depict, learners' contributions vary to a great extent both qualitatively and quantitatively. First, there is a difference between the number of contributions which were made in the teacher – led discussions and the group work. Second, there are also differences among students in both whole – class and group activities.

Overall, there were about 144 contributions in the group work. Out of these, 10 contributions were made through reading from text, i.e., the students were reading aloud sentences and paragraphs from reading text to facilitate their word guessing activities. There were no written as well as non-verbal contributions students made in the 30 – minute discussions. On the other hand, the number of contributions students made in the teacher-led discussion is 29. All of them are oral contributions. These contributions were made before and after the group work, which lasted almost an hour. As the transcript shows almost the times for the lesson were taken up by the teacher's explanations. By comparison, there were far more contributions in the group work than in the teacher-fronted discussion. Conversely, the teacher – led discussion took more time than the group work did. As far as the number of contributors is concerned, all the six group participants contributed to the discussion in the group work while in the teacher-led one, only 14 students made contributions. In relative terms, there were far more contributors in the group work than in the teacher – fronted format.

The type of contribution students made in both the teacher-led and small group discussions seem to differ to some extent. But the dominant types of contribution were oral, on-stream and self – selected contributions in both cases. Out of the 144 contributions students made in the group work, 137 were on – stream and 7 were off – stream. That is, while the vast majority of contributions were convergent, the few ones were divergent. Again, out of the 144 contributions, 143 were self-selected.

That is, the students made the contributions without someone making personal nomination on them. That single nominated contribution is L3's:

Extract 1

64 L_4: if x media if xx try to x some sort of education to teach the nation .. or the people .. part of .. some part so that (they will get) education ... Any of us to say .. something [signals at L3 with eager]

67L_3: xxx I don't think .. the same idea .. because .. x have been limited time .. we have xx to use what you say educate population .. we have to .. educate all people .. how for the people to have .. high education .. that is .. that may be true for that.

With regard to the length of the contributions, 100 were extended contributions whereas 44 were short responses in the form of one word, ok-passes and listening responses. Examples of one word utterance, ok – pass and listening response are:

Extract 2

One word 205L_4: strain [from the text] .. you know the word strain?

utterance 206 **L** : Stress

Extract 3

200L_2: we have to find –

Ok – pass201L_3 yeah

Extract 4

210L_1: Strain in environment

Listening 211**L**: yeah

Response 212 **L1**: pressure exerted on environment

In the teacher-fronted discussion, on the other hand, all the contributions were on-stream. That is, the students made no off-stream contributions. Again, the entire contributions were made through self – selection in response to teacher general solicits. Concerning the length of contributions, the number of contributions students made in the form of extended turns and short responses is comparable. In other words, there were about 14 long contributions and 14 short contributions.

A comparison of the types of contribution students made in both discussion styles indicates that the group work was superior in terms of both quality and quantity of participation. The differences are significant. For example, the total number of contributions in the group work is 144 while it is only 29 in the teacher – class format. As far as the quality of contribution is concerned, there were more varied types of contribution in the group work. For example, there were contributions which students made through reading from text (for example: 35L_1,; 72L_4; 186L_2; see the transcript for further information). Moreover, there were off-stream as well as more extended contributions.

There are also differences regarding individual contributors from one interaction pattern to another. The tables show that the most frequent contributor in the group work (L_1) could not maintain the lead in the teacher – fronted discussion. Rather it was the third frequent contributor (L_2) who managed to lead in the teacher-led lesson. Three students (L_3, L_5 and L_6) who made considerable contributions in the group work (6, 10 and 3 contributions in that order) did not contribute any during the whole-class discussion. Nevertheless, the other three students (L_1, L_2 and L_4) were able to compete with the rest of their classmates by making comparable number of contributions during the whole – class discussion.

Apart from the types of contributions that have been coded with the help of the pre-designed coding system, there were other several contributions related to interaction management. During the discussions, especially during the group work, participants made verbal contributions whose discourse functions are allocating, soliciting and suggesting procedures. In other words, some of the students' oral contributions were specifically aimed at determining who should talk, what to talk about and how to go about concerning the task at hand. For example, look at the following extracts:

Extract 5

Soliciting (who should talk)

31L_1: if you have any idea possibly

33L_2: what's .. uh it is not eastern Africa

34L_1: I think it is Ki Swahli .. I guess .. ki swahili

Extract 6

Soliciting (who should talk)

64L_4: it x media .. if x try to x some sort of education .. to teach the nation or the people .. part of .. some part of so that they will get education.. any one of us to say something? [signals to L_3]

67L_3: xx I don't think the some idea .. because xx have been limited .. time we have to use .. what you say educate population .. we have to educate all people .. how for the people to have high education .. that's .. that may be true for that

Extract 7

Topic nomination (what to talk about)	79L_1: we go to the next question xx [Reads from the text] "the text is divided into three sections .. what is happening? Why is it happening? Background to health and population issues."
Suggesting procedure (How to go about)	82L_4: I think we have to read the text. [Reads the entire text]

4.1.3. Tabulations and description of questionnaire responses

The tables below display responses to the questionnaire items in frequency and percentage for each item in each response category (Table 6) and in terms of positive and negative responses (Table 7). The questionnaire had 15 items all together, and the number of respondents was 35.

Table 6: Students' responses to questionnaire items in frequencies and percentages

Items	SA		A		U		D		SD	
	F.	Per.	F.	Per.	F.	Per.	F.	Per.	F.	Per.
*1	10	28.57	20	57.14	1	2.86	3	8.57	-	-
2	3	8.57	9	25.71	3	8.57	14	40	6	17.14
3a	10	28.57	17	48.57	2	5.71	4	11.43	2	5.71
3b	18	51.43	17	48.57	-	-	-	-	-	-
4a	8	22.86	12	37.14	3	8.57	8	22.86	3	8.57
*4b	2	5.71	4	11.43	6	17.14	18	51.43	4	11.43
*5	5	14.29	11	31.43	7	20	5	14.29	6	17.14
6	1	2.86	10	28.57	1	2.86	13	37.14	10	28.57
7	10	28.57	18	51.43	2	5.71	4	11.43	1	2.56
8	9	25.71	15	42.86	2	5.71	8	22.86	1	2.86
9	10	28.57	20	57.14	3	8.57	2	5.71	-	-
*10	7	20	18	51.43	3	8.57	3	8.57	3	8.57
11	12	34.29	14	40	3	8.57	6	17.14	-	-
*12	4	11.43	9	25.71	-	-	18	51.43	3	8.57
13	11	31.43	19	54.29	14	40	1	2.86	-	-

* One student did not respond to

Key ⇒ SA = Strongly Agree
A = Agree
U = Undecided
D = Disagree
SD = Strongly Disagree
F. = Frequency
Per. = Percentage

Table 7: Students' responses in three categories as negative, positive and neither of the two

Items	Positive response		Neither positive nor negative response		Negative response	
	F.	Per.	F.	Per.	F.	Per.
*1	30	85.71	1	2.86	3	8.57
2	12	34.29	3	8.57	20	57.14
3a	27	77.14	2	5.71	6	17.14
3b	35	100	-	-	-	-
4a	21	60	3	8.57	11	31.43
*4b	6	17.14	6	17.14	22	62.86
*5	16	45.7	7	20	11	31.43
6	11	31.43	1	2.86	23	65.71
7	28	80	2	5.71	5	14.29
8	24	68.57	2	5.71	9	25.71
9	30	85.71	3	8.57	2	5.71
*10	25	71.43	3	8.57	6	17.14
11	26	74.29	3	8.57	6	17.14
*12	13	37.14	-	-	21	60
13	30	85.71	4	11.4	1	2.86

* One student did not respond to

Key ⇒ as in table 6

The responses obtained through the fifteen-item questionnaire and which have been tabulated as above relate to five topics of learner perceptions. These are:

(i) Rationale for classroom participation

As was the case with the opinions expressed regarding rationale for classroom participation, responses indicate mixed views. The vast majority of respondents (30 or 85.76 %) agree with the statement, 'I make a lot of effort to participate because I want to get a good grade." Only 3(8.57%) students responded negatively. But contradictingly, 28 (80%) students indicated that when they ask or answer a question their aim is to get things clear and to practise speaking in English rather than getting good grades. Only 5 (14.29%) responding students expressed negative view. Although both rationales of classroom participation are viewed positively, there is a 5.71 percentage difference between the grade rationale positive and practise rationale positive. Therefore, it appears that participation to earn good grades is a more likely rationale than participation to practise target language.

(ii) Students' preferences of interaction patterns

Responding students were generally disposed fovourably toward making contributions in small group discussions (items 2 and 8). Twenty (57.14%) students expressed negative view to the statement, "I consider participating in a pair or group work less important than participating when the teacher lectures." Only 12 (34.29%) students agreed to the proposition. When the statement was worded the other way, i.e. " I always prefer to participate actively in pair and group discussions rather than during lecture," 24 (68.57%) respondents indicated agreement. The statement was opposed to by 9 (25.71%) responding students. Students seemed to be consistent in responding to the statements.

(iii) The notion of appropriate contribution

The items dealing with the notion of appropriate contribution are 3, 4, 5 and 9. One of the two statements in item 3 is worded, " I take care not to repeat what another student has already said." 27 (77.14%) respondents indicated positive view while 6 (17.14%) students displayed negative attitude. In responding to the second statement which checks whether students "try to raise an idea that has not been raised by another student," the entire responding students held positive stance. The other item (item 9) checks if students try to decide whether their question or answer is important before they ask or answer questions. The vast majority of students, i.e. 30 (85.72%), was of positive opinion. Only 2 (5.71%) students disagreed. Item 4 also had two statements, which tried to elicit responses on the concept of appropriate contribution. Twenty-one (69%) respondents agreed with, "I always try to be among the students who participate most by volunteering to answer a question even if I am not sure whether the answer is correct or not." The number of students who held a negative view was eleven (31.43%). But 22 (62.86%) students objected to the idea of "asking any question whether it is related to the topic or not." Only 6 (17.14%) respondents had positive view. The respondents were asked whether they "consider a trouble to the teacher to ask something for clarification when the teacher is not interested," and 11 (31.43%) students were of discordant opinion. But there were 16 (45.7%) respondents who held a favourable opinion. Interestingly, 7 (25%) respondents were undecided whether to agree or disagree.

(iv) Bidding before contributing

There were two items that elicited information about students bidding behaviour. Responding students tended to reflect positive perceptions to bidding before making any contribution. Twenty-three (65.71%) students expressed negative view to,

"when I have something to say, I do not worry about raising my hand to get the teacher's permission." However, eleven (31.43%) responding students played down the importance of raising hand before contributing. Similarly, the item worded "I always ask or answer a question after getting a permission from my teacher" (item 11) attracted positive responses from 26 (74.29%) students though 6 (17.14%) respondents were discordant about it. Consistently, students' perceptions of bidding appeared to be positive on both items.

(v) Not contributing, self-selection, and initiative during classroom participation

The number of students who indicated that they would refrain from making contributions in certain situations is 25 (or 71.43%). On the item, "There are times when I have questions and do not ask the teacher," (item 10), 25 (71.45%) responding students held positive stance. On the other hand, only 6 (17.14%) students expressed negative view. Students did not disclaim the importance of making contributions though they would sometimes refrain from contributing. This is supported by students' responses to items 12 and 13. Twenty-one (6o%) respondents indicated negative view to the statement, "sometimes I do not participate unless the teacher specifically calls on me to participate." But 13 (37.14%) students were in agreement with the concept of teacher personal solicits. Initiative in making contributions seemed to be acceptable to 30 (85.7%) responding students. Only one (2.86%) respondent disagreed while four (11.4%) students chose to remain undecided.

4.1.4. Analysis of interview responses

The number of responding students during interview sessions was twelve and each respondent took approximately seven minutes to respond to all questions. The responses were recorded as field notes.

The results of the interview are described in terms of the topics that were used to elicit responses of the students. Since the interview was open-ended, tabulating the responses obtained is difficult. Therefore, a descriptive analysis of the responses will follow under four thematic categories:

(i) Reasons for participating in L2 classroom

All the respondents in the interview were asked to reason out the importance of participating in the English classes. The first respondent stated that classroom participation is an opportunity in which students will be able to communicate in English. As a result of communicating in English, students will enhance their knowledge of the language as well as developing communicative competence. The second respondent also expressed a similar view emphasizing the notion of communication. He further explained that the English class is the only setting where students' practise communicating in English. The following extracts are taken from the interview responses:

... *since we are afraid of speaking in English out side the classroom ... we have to participate in the English class*

... *to communicate in English and get knowledge ... also learn grammar of good communication*

Three respondents emphasized that they would participate in the classroom because they were told by their teacher to do so actively if their aim is getting good marks. When they participate their objective is to fulfil one of the requirements to pass the course. Therefore, these students' attempt to participate is grade oriented. Extracts from the responses are:

... *most of us participate to get good grades*

... *grade is the main reason because if we participate as our teacher told us, we can get an 'A' or a 'B'.*

... *we want to score an 'A' in English*

Furthermore, there were two respondents who pointed out different reasons for participation. According to these students, participation is a means of practising English. Through participation learners would learn how to give and obtain information. In addition, participation offers ample opportunities of practising how to use correct and acceptable expressions. Another female respondent shared this latter view with those students who mentioned it. She stressed that participation is a means of getting exposure to English. The following extracts are meant to illustrate the respondents' opinions:

--- *to practise spoken English*

--- *through participation we can learn how to exchange ideas --- and it is also possible to learn correct grammar.*

--- *unless we participate we cannot get correct English*

--- *English class gives you good chance to practise English and to listen to beautiful language.*

Two interviewees also pointed out that when compared to other classes and settings the English class offers better opportunities in which English is spoken. In the English class, there are enough English practises. Another student explained that the teacher is there to correct errors and participation helps to get feedback.

--- *other classes are devoid of correct English, so it is a good chance if we participate*

--- *to get corrections from the teacher*

Lastly, a respondent explained that participation helps to develop self-confidence, particularly learners learn how to speak publicly.

--- *to develop self-confidence especially in speaking in front of students.*

These results concerning rationale for classroom participation are consistent with results obtained through the questionnaire. Besides they presented further information that were not obtained by the questionnaires.

(ii) Frequency of contributions

This is another major theme in the interview. Concerning how frequently a student should contribute, all the respondents except one underlined the importance of contributing on every point. The reason the respondents gave for this relates to practise opportunities. They pointed out that the more a student participates, the better the practise opportunities are. In addition to these, participation guarantees grades and the most frequent contributor will be able to secure one of the best marks in the course. One respondent was opposed to making as many contributions as possible. He stated that quality should be given precedence over quantity. The following are some of the responses.

--- *to me, every question needs to be answered; they are important*

--- *as much as possible, I have to answer all questions. They are all important; as you participate you improve your English*

... *asking question or answering questions means practising your English; so it is necessary. Otherwise it is not practise*

... *I have to participate only when it is very useful; for example, I should not answer very simple questions.*

(iii) Classroom reticence

With regard to learner reticence in the classroom, three factors were identified by the respondents. Ten responding students indicated that lack of self-confidence is the major contributory factor for reticence. The fear of making errors and being laughed at is an obstacle according to these interviewees. Another factor mentioned by the respondents is inability to express oneself in English. Although some students have many things to contribute, since they are unable to express their ideas in English they prefer to remain silent. The third reason relates to motivation. According to the respondents, most of the freshman English lessons are not motivating to participate. Some of the responses are these:

--- *lack of confidence is the main reason ...*

--- *many of us do not participate because we have no confidence. If we make big mistakes the whole class will laugh at us ---*

... *English is the problem; we cannot use correct grammar, so we choose to be silent*

... *FLEn is boring. It doesn't interest me*

(iv) Factors that influence contributions

The respondents were also asked whether topic, classroom organization, teacher and task type influence the quantity of their classroom participation. All of them emphasized the influence of these factors on their classroom participation. When asked to rank the factors according to their influence, the respondents mentioned 'topic' as the most influencing factor followed by classroom organization, teacher and task type in that order.

Furthermore, the students were asked whether freshman English has helped them in becoming better classroom participators. The responses were mixed. Three students reported that there were certain degrees of improvement in their participation as compared to their high school class participation. Seven students felt no change at all, while two students reported a negative change.

According to the respondents the teaching material they were using and their teachers were responsible both for the positive and negative changes. Those respondents who reported positive change praised the textbook and their teachers for motivating them to make as many contributions as possible. On the other hand, those students who felt either negative change or no change held the textbook responsible. They stated that the teaching material they were using had no flavour and variety. The following extracts are taken from the interview:

--- *both the teacher and the textbook are boring.*

--- *my teacher and FLEn have contributed a lot; they helped me improve my participation*

--- *the teachers are good, but the textbook is not interesting.*

4.2. Discussions

4.2.1. The Nature of learner classroom contributions

In most cases the findings in this study appear to be similar to other studies conducted in different settings. The results concerning quantity of participation tend to concur with the findings reported by Long, et al (1976), who compared the amount and types of contributions students made in group work and lockstep condition. The results also confirm Cathcart's (1986) findings which showed that

'situations where the learners had control of the talk were characterized by quality of participation whereas the situations where the teacher had control produce single – word utterances and short phrases. Moreover, the results on students' behaviour of interaction management are consistent with Allwright's (1980) findings which indicated that students contributed by soliciting contributor and nominating topics. Nevertheless, Seliger's (1977) classification of students on the basis of their verbal contributions as High Input Generator (HIG) and Low Input Generator (LIG) is not confirmed, as there were intra-person variations from one participation pattern to another.

Almost all the contributions in the classroom were made orally. Learners both in the group work and teacher-led situation took turns to make oral contributions. In the group work, there were certain contributions which were made through reading from the text. In the process of discussing aspects of critical reading and working out the meanings of words taken from a reading passage, the learners had to refer back to the text. There were no written or non-verbal contributions in the lesson observed.

In relation to the types of contributions, the large proportion of turns (139 out of 144 in group work and all the 29 contributions in teacher-led) were on-stream. What this means is that most of the contributions were made on continuing or convergent topics. There were only few cases in which disputation of preceding contributions (5 out of 144 contributions in group work) came to the fore. The reason for this, in part, is related to the task type. The task was more of a closed type. The topic of the discussion did not trigger an intensive debate and negotiation of meaning. As a result, there were far more on – stream contributions than off-stream contributions.

With regard to the length of the contributions, there were both short utterances and extended turns. The short utterances can be described in three ways. These are one-

word contributions, ok – passes and listening responses. The one word contributions were more evident during vocabulary discussions in the teacher-led (15 out of 29 contributions) discussions. The ok – passes and listening responses were mainly prevalent in the group work and they were usually used to demonstrate approval, attention and understanding. The following are possible examples:

Extract 8

168L_1: I don't think it is an advice leaflet for married couples

Approval 169L: yeah

Extract 9

234L_1: Something like abstract something which is not visible .. right?

Understanding 235L: yeah

Extract 10

256L_6: embracing –

Attention 2257L_1: yeah

258L_6: including everyone

The long contributions were usually one sentence long. They were used to explain ideas, to offer examples and to suggest meanings (see transcript, appendix 1, for examples).

In the teacher – fronted discussions, the teacher first made solicits and followed by student self – selecting contributions (all the 29 contributions were made in this way). While most of these contributions were made following non-verbal biddings, there were a few contributions, which were made without bidding.

In the group work, the contributions were also self-selected. Almost the entire contributions (143 out of 144 contributions in group work) were made through self – selection. But they were made without the teacher's solicits because he was not among the group participants. Concerning bidding, the turn-taking procedure did not necessitate any kind of permission request as it is often the case in group work. Therefore, unlike in the teacher-led discussions, the contributions in the group work were made entirely without bidding.

Perhaps because of the absence of teacher direct nomination or teacher's insistence on bidding, students were not competitive or actively bidding to make contributions. Moreover, teacher's acceptance of unbidden contributions without any reluctance can also be mentioned as a reason for the absence of high bidding competition. Some students also got more opportunities to contribute unfairly than their share. This might suggest that students who were strict in adhering to bidding procedures would be denied the opportunities they deserved as a result of students who would not wait for the 'go-ahead' signal from the teacher (as observed in Sato's 1982 study). Therefore, although imposing strict adherence to bidding may discourage contributions, it is essential to institute a moderate bidding rule to distribute turn fairly. The importance of bidding is to allow a fair distribution of turn. However, it is essential to reduce the level of control because as Van Lier (1988) notes interaction would not optimally promote language development in the rigidly controlled classroom settings.

The discourse contributions in the teacher-fronted situation had a very restricted range of verbal functions to perform. Contributions having discourse functions such as requesting for clarification, requesting for confirmation, repetition request, etc. were not apparent. Most of the students' verbal contributions were response. It appears that the topic of the discussion confined the range of the contributions. On the other hand, the students' contributions in the group work had a wider range of

language functions such as agreeing, disagreeing, proposing etc. It is possible to present examples from the transcript:

Extract 11

145L_2: xx figures and the entire situations

Agreeing 146L_1: yeah figures

Proposing 147 L_4: so what does that mean? We go to the second question

Extract 12

246L_4: broad based means with a broad base

247L_4: firm background

Disagreeing 248L_2: no .. not firm x

Apart from the types of contribution mentioned thus far, students were contributing in a variety of ways in the classroom, especially in the group work. The most notable contribution types relate to interaction management. More specifically, the group participants were making various verbal contributions, which helped them manage their own discussion. First, the contributions helped them to distribute turns without any disruption. Some participants were taking the initative to nominate contributor as well as nominating contribution. Second, some of their contributions were also geared towards maintaining the pace and the procedure of the task. For example, the group participants would introduce topics, end topics and suggest alternative ways of tackling issues. They were also contributing by reading some tokens from the text.

As the foregoing discussions suggest the contribution making behaviour of students changes as the patterns of interaction shifts. This has been evident in the comparisons made between the contributions students made in the group work and whole – class activities. In the small group interaction, students were able to make

more contributions. Foster (1998) mentions some reasons why students make more contributions in small group interactions: (i) group work increases the amount of class time available to an individual student to make contributions, (ii) group work decreases the amount of time students spend listening (or not listening) to other class members interacting with the teacher; (iii) group work avoids the anxiety and self consciousness that prevents some students from speaking up in front of the whole class.

Similarly, the quality of students' contributions increases in the group work. The main reason for this relates to the degree of control students have over their interaction. According to Cathcart (1986), situations where learners have control of talk are characterized by a wide variety of communicative acts and syntatic structures where as the situations where the teacher has control seems to produce single word utterances, short phrases, and formulaic charts.

In sum, group work tends to enable students to produce more and better contributions as compared to the contributions in lock-step conditions. Arguably, thus, if there are more group works in the L2 classroom, it may be beneficial for students. However, it should be noted that the whole-class situation can also be more beneficial in certain cases. In the lock-step activities, for example, students might get enough feedback on their contributions. Apart from this, the lockstep class can provide students with more modified and correct target language.

4.2.2. Learner perceptions of contribution and contributing

In order to have a general picture of what the learner perceptions of contribution and contributing are like, we need to look at how students perceive the various aspects of classroom participation. The themes of the questionnaire items and the interview

questions are used in this respect to offer possible explanations about the learners perceptions. The themes include reasons for participation, participating in small groups vs. in teacher-fronted discussions, the notion of "appropriate" contribution, quantity of contribution, bidding for contribution, self-selected contribution and reticence in the classroom.

There are two general perceptions concerning the reasons for participating in the L2 classroom as results of interview and questionnaire show. They can possibly be termed as achievement-oriented goal and communicative competence-oriented goal. In achievement - oriented goal, learners perceive that the major reason for participating in the classroom is to obtain good marks. Both questionnaire and interview results confirm that students are predisposed to gaining good grades by participating actively in the classroom. Even those reticent students perceive the reason for participation in terms of marks though they do not participate in such a way that the teacher observes. A possible explanation for this would relate to the socio-economic condition. The students' future career and professional development is determined by the grade they get in freshman courses. In other words, placement of students in various departments is carried out based on the grades they obtain. The students are aware of the value teachers give to oral contributions in evaluating them and that is why students relate classroom participation with grade. The second one, communicative competence-oriented goal, is also perceived by the students to be essential. This is evident both in the questionnaire and interview results. Some of the reasons mentioned in this regard include practising English, getting feedback from the teacher, developing self-confidence and learning how to speak publicly. But these reasons were mentioned as secondary in comparison to getting good grades. It would appear from this that as a consequence of such perception the L_2 classroom might abound in students' participation which are not genuinely geared towards lively classroom interactions. This would affect the quality of participation that contributes to L_2 development.

With regard to participating in group work vs. in teacher - fronted discussions, most students seem to favour the former. The tendency to favour small group participation in classroom discussions might emanate from the students' beliefs about language learning. Small group discussions are supposed to be effective in generating interactions and this is supported by research (e.g. Long, et al 1976; Pica and Doughty 1985). Students are either aware of this or their teachers might have communicated to them about the advantages of working in small groups. The students' perceptions of participating in group work seems to contradict with their perceptions of the rationale for classroom participation. But it appeared to be consistent with their participation behaviour because there were more participation in the group work than in the teacher-led discussions. The results concerning appropriate contribution indicate that students have nearly similar views. According to the students they would not try to contribute what has already been contributed by another student. They would also take time to determine whether a certain contribution is worth contributing or not and whether it is related to the topic or not. Therefore, for the students, appropriate contributions are those which are original in content and related to the topic. This seems to be consistent with what Van Lier (1988) states:

> Learners --- spend a lot of time trying to determine what may constitute an appropriate response or a valid contribution to whatever it is that appears to be going on at any particular time (p. 146).

In relation to bidding before contributing, the students tend to have positive views about some kind of bidding. The results obtained through the questionnaire show that most students would bid before they make contributions. In fact, bidding, particularly non-verbal bidding, is more apparent in teacher-led classes than in small group situations. Although most respondents (items 6 and 11) favoured bidding before contributing, the number of students who played down the importance of

Voluntary contribution is positively viewed by most students who participated in the study. As questionnaire results indicate students perceive that involvement in various activities should originate from the student rather than from the teacher (item 12). According to the students, waiting for the teacher to make direct nominations is not appropriate behaviour in classroom participation. However, the type of initiative in teacher - fronted situation and small group activities should be different. In teacher - fronted classes the teacher should first make a general or personal solicit and the student's contributions will follow. Depending on the type of contribution the student makes, there could be feedback from the teacher. Therefore, the pattern may be there is teacher initiation, student response and teacher feedback. The case in small groups is different. The work of specifying the content or substance of the next turn (allocation of content or activity) is carried out by students.

However, a considerable number of respondents (as questionnaire results show) expressed that they would sometimes refrain from making contributions even when they have one to make (item 10). Such students might be those students who are usually reticent in the classroom and shy away from speaking publicly. The reasons for reticence as explained by the students (see interview results) are lack of confidence and fear of making errors. Although the pressure to give the right answer is present in every classroom (as noted by Morgan and Saxton 1991), the requirement to contribute in the right target language expression is another pressure on the students in the SL/FL classroom. When students feel that their English is not good enough they will prefer to remain silent rather than run the risk of making mistakes or errors. It appears that this kind of pressure is often self - imposed. But sometimes it might be teacher-induced in classrooms where teachers humiliate students in front of their peers by giving harmful feedback. Therefore, there are times when teachers contribute either negatively or positively regarding students' participation behaviour.

It is almost all students' preference to participate in the classroom by making various types of contributions. Nevertheless, there are certain constrains that influence students not to make contributions. The 'not contributing' phenomenon in the main is characteristic of shy and apprehensive students. Vocal and vociferous students, too, might sometimes refrain from making contributions due to factors such as teacher, materials and the social context.

4.2.3. Some relationship between contributions and perceptions

As it has been noted earlier, the study was not carried out under controlled conditions. Therefore, it is difficult to conclude that the students' perceptions influenced their participation behaviour based on the self-report information obtained. But there are certain apparent similarities between what the students said and the way they participated in the classroom. To begin with, the students had a positive perception concerning contributing during group work (item 2 and 5). In addition, the students were enthusiastic about the importance of taking initiative in interaction management (item 13). These views of students are consistent with what group participants were doing in the group work. The students in the group work participated with high willingness and motivation. Their contributions were wide ranging aimed at negotiation of meaning and interaction management. Their initiative was not restricted to requesting and responding. They were also introducing topics, moderating the pace of the discussions, and suggesting possible procedures in accomplishing their task (see the examples mentioned earlier from the transcript). However, the contributions the students made during whole-class discussions were not as varied and many as their contributions in the group work (see the comparisons made under 4.1.2). Similarly, the students perceived that participating in group work is more beneficial than participating in lockstep conditions (see questionnaire results).

There also seems to be a conformity between students' perceptions of voluntary contributions and their contributing behaviour. As it has been noted from the students responses through the questionnaire and interview, the students expressed positive views about self-selected contributions (items 12 and 13 in the questionnaire). Similarly, students volunteered all the responses both in the teacher-led and group discussions. In other words, the teacher did not nominate students directly to make contributions. The teacher simply specified the content or substance of the contributions. Technically, the students made the contributions in response to teacher allocation of the contents of contributions. Therefore, the contributions were made through students' self - selection. This concerns mainly the contributions in the lockstep condition; in the group work, as is often the case, allocation of contributions was done by the participants themselves.

Another area where students' perception and actions seemed to match is bidding before contributing. As students indicated they were enthusiastic about raising hand before making contributions (items 6 and 11). That is, most students, as questionnaire results show, tend to favour bidding in order to contribute. In the classroom, too, most of the responses of students (25 out of 29) followed bidding, especially hand-raising. But in some few cases (about 4 contributions) were not bidden. There were students who would not wait for the teacher's approval to make contributions. It was also observed that students in the classroom, especially in the whole-class discussion, were not as competitive as they claimed during the interview.

Finally, as the bio-data of the students indicate there seems to be a correlation between students long turns and target language proficiency. Both in the group work and lockstep discussions students who come from private schools (and who were seen to be interacting fluently and with less difficulty) made almost all the longer contributions. Besides, these students were better in using discourse

lubricants such as topic introducers (such as 'you know', 'I guess') and various kinds of agreeing and disagreeing moves. Nevertheless, further explorations need to be carried out to confirm the correlation between proficiency and extended turns.

CHAPTER FIVE

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

5.1. Conclusions

This study tried to explore learners contributions and perceptions in the L2 classroom. It raised four questions that relate to the issue. These are: (1) How frequently do learners contribute in the classroom? (2) What types of contributions do they make? (3) What are the perceptions of the students concerning contributions and contributing? (4) How do contributions and perceptions of students relate? In seeking answers to these questions, a naturalistic enquiry of classroom interaction was carried out through data collection procedures that involved video-recording, questionnaire and the interview.

There are some possible conclusions to be drawn in the context of the particular classroom where data for this study were collected. To begin with, frequency with which students contributed in the classroom imply that students will not contribute uniformly or at a similar rate in group- work and teacher - led discussions. What this means is that students who contributed the highest in group interaction failed to maintain that in teacher - led discussions. Students who contributed the most in teacher-led activity were not those who contributed the most in group work. Therefore, classification of students as 'high contributors' and 'low contributors' in the classroom (as Seliger 1977 did) is impossible in this particular context. It appears that students who contribute the most in one interaction arrangement might not contribute in a similar fashion in another interaction situation.

The types of contribution students made appeared to be dissimilar in the whole-class and small group interactions. In other words, in this particular study, students made more varied contributions in the group work. Moreover, students showed more negotiation of meaning in which they were able to use discourse lubricants and various kinds of interactional adjustments. On the other hand, contributions of students in the teacher-led discussions were confined to responding.

Another finding of interest relates to bidding before making contributions. The single bidding procedure which students used in the teacher-led discussions was hand-raising (Sato 1982 found a similar situation with Asian students). Bidding served two functions in the teacher - student interactions. The first was as a signal to mediate turn-taking and turn distribution. The second function was that bidding would indicate whether students understood a certain point or not. So the teacher's further steps of modifying questions and concepts seemed to be determined by students' bidding. But bidding of similar types were not necessary in the group interaction because no one had the authority to manage participation like the teacher.

Although the teacher was the sole contributor to the interaction management in the teacher-led discussions, the students took over this role from the teacher when they began their group-work. Throughout their discussions, the group participants made various oral contributions which were aimed at managing interaction. More specifically, some of the discourse contributions were related to decisions concerning who should talk, how to talk and how to proceed.

There are also points to be made with regard to the students' perceptions of contributions and contributing. The first concerns learners perceptions of the reasons in participating in the L2 classroom. Students perceived the reasons for participations in one or both of the following ways: getting good grades and

practising the target language. Since many teachers relate good performance with high oral contributions in the classroom, most students learnt to think in a similar way. In consequence, many students would participate in the classroom more with a view of obtaining good grades than improving their target language.

In relation to students' preferences concerning participating in various interaction patterns, the results tend to reveal that the students would prefer to participate in small group interactions. The importance of bidding before contributing was also viewed positively. Moreover, the students were enthusiastic about voluntary contributions.

With regard to the relationships between learners' classroom contributions and their perceptions, there are some indications of the relationships between the two. The students' preference to participate in group work rather than in teacher-led discussions appears to be consistent with the students' participation observed in the classroom. There were more quantity and quality of participation in the group work. Even some students who participated in the group work failed to do so during the lockstep situation. In addition to this, the students perception of voluntary contributions seemed to be matched with their behaviour of voluntary participation in the classroom. All the contributions the students made in the classroom were volunteered. Bidding is another area where perceptions and contributions of students seemed to match. The students perceptions of bidding is positive. Similarly, most of the contributions students made were through hand-raising. However, there were some students who were not patient enough to bid before making contributions. The positive view the students indicated to competitiveness was not observed in practice during their classroom participation.

It should be acknowledged that there were some factors, which seemed to affect coding and analytic work in this research. The salient ones include (i) difficult to

match speaker and utterance in some cases; (ii) inability to identify the exact number of students who raised their hands before each contribution, and (iii) incomprehensibility of some of the utterances due to constraints related to video - recording. As a result, there were some missing information especially on students' bidding behaviour.

Moreover, the results with regard to the relationship between learner contributions and perceptions are not quite revealing because the data were not collected across skills and varying tasks. So further explorations are needed to find out the way learner perceptions relate to contributions on the basis of video-tapped data obtained from various lessons of the same classroom.

5.2. Recommendations

In the following I will try to make certain recommendations on the basis of the foregoing research reports. The recommendations primarily concern the teacher and the types of materials the teacher should use in the L2 classroom.

(i) Participation management

A crucial point in encouraging more student classroom contribution relates to teacher efficiency in participation management. For the teacher to have efficient participation management there should be a change of perception both among students and teachers.

Very often, the teacher's attempt to motivate students to participate actively turns out to be counterproductive. This is because of the kind of motivations teachers use - there is a tendency to reward students who make many oral contributions with grades or marks. As a consequence of this, many students misperceive the reasons

for participation. Therefore, instead of creating a counterproductive impression on the students, it would be more useful to create awareness among students with the proper rationale of classroom participation.

The change of perception is also essential among FL/SL teachers. Teachers need to view participation from a wider perspective. It is important to note that there are various ways in which students participate in the classroom. Besides, different patterns of interactions suit different types of students. What this implies is that all students would not participate enthusiastically in dyad, group and teacher-fronted activities. As the interaction pattern varies, students' interaction preferences and needs can be addressed.

Another point worthy of consideration with regard to participation management relates to the level of teacher control. In turn distribution as well as in reacting to students' contributions, the teacher may exercise control. In turn distribution the teacher may impose a strict adherence to bidding of some kind. Conversely, the teacher may also be very lenient in allowing students to contribute without bidding. In both cases, it would be possible to imagine that the teacher's behaviour could reduce or affect the initiative of the students. Thus it is possible to suggest that the teacher need not go to the two extremes. As the case may be students can also be taught the importance of 'appropriate' turn taking. Any interaction has certain turn taking and giving rules. In reacting to students' contributions, teacher's behaviour should be productive rather than destructive. Teacher's feedback as well as other related issues, such as wait-time and questioning styles should be handled in such a way that students are encouraged to contribute in the classroom.

(ii) Classroom tasks

Another important set of suggestions to be made concerns the classroom tasks the teacher uses to promote interaction. As the review of research about task types and interaction revealed, certain task types are superior over others in encouraging oral negotiations and discussions. For example, as Long (1989), quoted by Ellis (1994) maintains, 'two-way' tasks produce more negotiation work and more useful negotiation work than 'one-way' task (p. 13). He also concludes that 'planned' tasks "stretch" inter languages further and promote destabilization more than 'unplanned' tasks (p.14). Similarly, he compares 'open' and 'closed' tasks. 'Closed tasks produce more negotiation and more useful negotiation work than open tasks' (p.16).

What the above comparisons of task types suggest is that task types need to be matched with the specific aims teachers intend to promote. When teachers aim at developing negotiation competence, they can possibly and usefully use tasks in which students would exchange information and make bargaining to solve the task. On the other hand, students can be engaged cognitively with tasks which require the students to reach a single and correct solution. But, in general, more varied tasks need to be brought to class or designed or adapted so as to address the wide range of students' needs and demands in the L2 classroom.

(iii) Evaluation of learners

In most cases, the evaluation of students seems to disregard important aspects of interaction competence. The evaluations are inadequate in terms of the learners' interaction with peers. If useful wash back effect is sought, learners' competence in managing interaction, negotiation of meaning, and use of discourse lubricants need to be evaluated. A possible way of doing these is through continuous assessment. In this way, teachers can possibly encourage learners to make as high and varied contributions as possible.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abraham, R. and R. Vann. 1987. 'Strategies of two language learners: a case study.' In A. Wenden and J. Rubin (eds.) Learner Strategies in Language Learning Englewood Cliff, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Allwright, R.L. 1980. 'Turns, topics and tasks: Patterns of participation in language learning and teaching.' In D. Larsen – Freeman (ed.) Discourse Analysis in Second Language Research. Rowdey M.A: Newbury House .

_____. 1984a. 'The importance of interaction in classroom language learning.' Applied Lingustics 5/2: 156 – 71.

_____. 1984b. 'Why don't learners learn what teachers teach? The interaction hypothesis.' In D.M. Singleton and D.G. Little (eds.) Language Learning in Formal and Informal Contexts. Dubline : IRAAL

_____. and C. Bailey. 1991. Focus on the Language Classroom: An introduction to classroom research for language teachers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Amanuel, G. 1996. 'Gender differences in participation'. Unpublished M.A. Thesis. Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa

Bailey, K.M. 1983. 'Competitiveness and anxiety in adult second language acquisiton: looking at and through the diary studies.' In H.W. Seliger and M.H. Long (eds.) Classroom Oriented Research in Second Language Acquisition. Rowley, M.A. : Newbury House

Barns, D. 1976. From Communication to Curriculum. Harmondsmith: Penguin.

Bellack, A., Herbert M., Ronald T., and F. Smith. 1966. The Language of the Classroom. New York: Teacher College Press.

Breen, M.P. 1985. 'The social context for language learning – a neglected situation?' Studies in Second Language Acquisition 7: 135 – 58.

Brophy, J. and T. Good. 1974. Teacher – Student Relationships: Causes and Consequences. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Wingle.

Cathcart, R. 1986. 'Situational differences and the sampling of young children's school language.' In R. Day (ed.) Talking to learn: conversation in second language acquisiton. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.

Cazden, C. 1986. 'Classroom discourse.' In M. Wittrock (ed.) Handbook of Research on Teaching (3rd edition). New York: Macmillian, pp 432 – 463

Chaudron, C. 1988. Second Language Classrooms: Research on teaching and learning. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chesterfield, R. and K.B. Chesterfield. 1985. 'Natural order in children's use of second language learning strategies.' Applied Linguistics 6: 45 – 59.

Day. R. 1984. 'Student participation in the second language classroom, or some imperfections of practice.' Language Learning 34: 69 – 102.

Delamont, S. 1983. Interaction in the Classroom (2nd edition). London: Routledge.

Doughty, C. and T. Pica. 1986. "Information gap" tasks: do they facilitate second language acquisition?' TESOL Quarterly 20: 305 – 25.

Doyle, W. 1986. 'Classroom organization and management.' In M. Wittrock (ed.)

Duff, P. 1986. 'Another look at interlanguage talk: taking task to task.' In R. Day (ed.)

Ellis, R. 1994. The Study of Second Laguage Acquistion. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Everston, R. and R. Weade. 1991. 'The social construction of classroom lessons.' In H.C. Waxman and H.J. Walberg (eds.) Effective Teaching: Current Research. Berkeley: McCutehen Publishing Cooperation. Pp. 135 – 57.

Felix, S. 1981. 'The effect of formal instruction on second language acquisition.' Language Learning 31: 87 – 112.

Fikirte, G. 1996. 'The influences of pedagogical and social factors on classroom participation.' Unpublished M.A. Thesis. Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa

Foster, 1998. 'Classroom perspective on the negotiation of meaning.' Applied Linguistics. 19/1: 1 – 23.

Gaise, S.S. 1983a. 'The investigation of language classroom processes.' TESOL Quarterly 14: 205 – 17.

_____ 1983b. 'Learner feedback: an exploratory study of its role in the second language classroom.' In H.W. Seliger and M.H. Long (eds.)

Gass, S.M. and E.M. Varonis. 1985. 'Task variation and non-native / non-native negotiation of meaning' In S.M. Gass and C.G. Madden (eds.) Input and Second Language Acquisition. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, pp 189 – 161.

Holley, F. and J. J.K. King. 1971. 'Immitation and correction in foreign language learning.' Modern Language Journal 55: 494 – 498.

Johnson, D. 1983. 'Natural language learning by design: a classroom experiment in social interaction and second language acquisition.' TESOL Quarterly 15: 169 – 181.

Krashen, S. 1982. Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition. Oxford: Pergamon.

Laosa, L. 1979. 'Inequality in the classroom: observational research on teacher-student interaction.' Aztlan 8:51 – 67.

Legutke, M. and T. Howard. 1991. Process and Experience in the Language Classroom. London: Longman.

Long, M.H. 1981. 'Input, interaction and second language acquisition.' In H.Wintz (ed.) Native and foreign language acquisition. New York: New York Academy of Sciences, pp159 – 78.

Long, M.H., L. Adams, M. McLean, and F. Castanos. 1976. 'Doing things with words – verbal interaction in lockstep and small group classroom situations.' In J.F. Fanselow and R. Crymes (eds.) On TESOL' 76. Washington D.C.: TESOL.

Morgan, N. and J. Saxton. 1991. Teaching, Questioning and Learning. London: Routledge.

Morine – Dershimer, A. 1987. 'Pupil perceptions of teacher praise.' Elementary School Journal 82: 421 – 434.

Naiman, N., M. Frohich, H.H. Stern, and A. Todesco. 1978. The good language learner. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Pica, T. 1985. 'Adult acquisition of English as a second language under different conditions of exposure.' Language Learning 33: 465 – 97.

Pica, T. and C. Doughty. 1985. 'Input and interaction in the communicative language classroom: a comparison of teacher – fronted and group activities.' In S.M. Gass and C.G. Madden (eds.)

Porter, P. 1986. 'How learners talk to each other: input and interaction in task – centred discussions.' In D. Day (ed.)

Prabhu, N.S. 1992. 'The Dynamics of the language lesson.' TESOL Quarterly 26/2: 23-35

Sato, L. 1982. 'Ethnic styles in classroom discourse.' In M. Hines and W. Rutherford (eds.) On TESOL 81. Washington D.C.: TESOL.

Schumann, J.H. and J.H. Schumann. 1977. 'Diary of a language learner: an introspective study of second language learning.' In H.D. Brow, C.A. Yorio and R.H. Crymes (eds.) On TESOL 77 teaching and learning English as a second language: trends in research and practice. Washington D.C.: TESOL.

Seliger, H. 1977. 'Does practice make perfect? A study of the interaction patterns and L2 competence.' Language Learning 27: 263 – 78.

_____ 1983a. 'Learner interaction in the classroom and its effect on language acquisition.' In H. Seliger and M. Long (eds.) Classroom – centred Research in Second Language Acquisition. Rowley, mass. Newbury House.

Strong, M. 1983. 'Social styles and the second language acquisition of Spanish – speaking kindergartners.' TESOL Quarterly 17: 241 – 258.

Swain, M. 1985. 'Communicative competence: some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development.' In S.M. Gass and C.G. Madden (eds.)

Tann, S. 1981. 'Grouping and group work.' In B. Simon and J. Willocks (eds.) Research and practice in the primary classroom. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Tsui, A.B.M. 1995. Introducing interaction in the classroom. London: Longman.

Van Lier, L. 1988. The Classroom and the Language Learner, Ethnography and second language classroom research. London: Longman.

Van Patten, B. 1987. 'On babies and bath water: input in foreign language learning.' Modern Language Journal 71/2: 156 – 64.

Wenden, A. 1986a. 'What do second language learners know about their language learning? A second look at retrospective accounts.' Applied Linguistics 7: 180 – 20.

White, J. and P. Lightbown. 1984. 'Asking and answering in ESL classes.' Canadian Modern Language Review 40: 228 – 244.

Appendix 1: Transcript

A brief description of the lesson

The lesson combines reading and vocabulary. The teacher starts the lesson by explaining what the students will do and how. He also explains two aspects of critical reading, namely, identifying the source and identifying sections. Then students discuss both the reading and vocabulary in groups of 6.

Transcription Symbols

T = teacher

$\mathbf{L_1}$,$\mathbf{L_2}$, etc = identified learner

L = unidentified learner

$\mathbf{L_3}$**?** = probably learner 3 (L3)

LL = learners simultaneously

/ / = overlapping or simultaneous utterance

[ ] = commentary

( ) = uncertain transcription

x = incomprehensible item, one word

xx = incomprehensible item, phrase

xxx = incomprehensible item, beyond phrase

" " = items read from text

.. = short pause

... = long pause

? = rising intonation (e.g. question, confirmations)

_ = interruption

Transcript

T: [recording begins after the teacher has gone some way] questions .. questions will lead us directly to the content of the passage.. you'll be (debating) in-groups .. in groups … you discuss these questions .. you also .. discuss activity number 1 and 2 .. then we have the vocabulary from the text .. so xxx these words are taken from the passage xx … you discus these in groups .. so we start from activity number 3 task 1 and pass to task 2 activity 1 and 2.. ok, for this you'll form groups of .. perhaps 6 students .. move on chairs form groups .. so some elements of critical reading we discussed.. [writing on the blackboard].. identifying sections.. identifying sections simply discusses the logical build up of the story.. what does the writer do first? then identifying source is one aspect of critical reading because if we know the source.. and we decide or xx.. so.. the intended readers.. the others we have.. [writing] the objective of the writer.. why was the text written? so if you remember xx (all the discussions we had).. to inform the reader.. to persuade the reader.. to take action.. So what's the purpose? one aspect of critical reading.. the audience.. when you identify the source you'll identify.. audience the intended readers.. this can be applied xxx the selected text.. which one suits my purpose? xxx we have part III vocabulary from the text [writing on the blackboard].. vocabulary from the text.. taken from this particular text.. try to give meanings of the words meaning xx.. what's the meaning of the word? what can be the meaning in this contexts so use try to explain xx.. what clues we used.. contextual clues so xx are used.. so the focus is on clues not only on the meanings this is what you'll be doing in the next minutes .. and the other one following the vocabulary with words x. One meaning of the phrase 'population matters' means population issues.. if you x.. it has also another meaning.. what's the other meaning of this phrase xxx? so x please form groups to discuss xxx so you'll do all the activities in twenty to twenty-five minutes xxx.

[The group discussion begins after a while]

L_1: [recording starts after the students have already begun discussions] if you have any idea possibly –

L_2: what is uh.. it's not eastern Africa

L_1: I think.. it's ki swahili.. I guess kiswahili … it's democratic –

L: xx

L_1: government.. it's democratic government

L_3: I think it is like government forgot the role of democratic.. that it is dictatorship xxx.. there is no freedom.

L: southern part of

LL: (south eastern)

L: south eastern

L_1: politics is dictatorial type of government. the language is.. I think ki Swahili the second question.. [Reading from the text] 'what does the text tell you about Mozamibique?"

L_2: [Reading from text] "television picks population issues".. well probably there is some kind of population iss-

L: crisis

L_2: yeah crisis

L_2: xxx

LL: xxx

L_1: [Reading from text] "why are population issues important to the peoples of Arica?"

L_4: because there are lots of.. there population increase in Africa.. so there is retardation of economic standards.. most countries of Africa.. so it is one of the issue.. population issues in Africa.

L_1: population growth like.. what's another pressure on the natural resources of x Africa? what else can we say?

L: xx

L_1: retardation of economic development.. so is pressure on the natural

resources.. you know economy is too poor.. x so you cannot provide basic facilities

LL: xxx

L_1: what do you think the role of television?

L_4: if x media if xx try to x some sort of education.. to teach the nation or the people.. part of.. some part so that (they will get) education.. anyone of us to say something? [Signals at L_3]

L_3: xxx I don't think the same idea.. because xx have been limited time.. we have xx to use what you say educate population.. we have to educate all people.. how for the people to have high education.. that is.. that may be true for that.

L_1: most people like to watch TV a lot.. and they believe xx.. and I think they will have more impact on the people than other media like the radio.. newspaper and I think.. it is effective in raising the awareness of the people xx and the remedies.

L_5: I think the role of the television is to communicate.. the people the things that are happening at that time to show them the up-to-date news to get to know about the population issue at that time.. what they face at that time.. to communicate with the people with the situation.

L1: we go to the next question xxx.. the text is divided in to three sections. [Reading from text] "what is happening why is it happening background to health and population issues." X find the sections.

L_4: I think we have to read the text.

LL: xxx

L_4: [Reads from the text] "The streets of Maputo are abuzz with talk of population issues.. There is lively chat in market places and bus stops throughout the Mozambican capital as citizens grapple with topics such as population growth and distribution environmental strain, and material mortality... The cause of it all is an innovative weekly television programme aired by Mozambique's national television under a

government-UNFPA project.. The chat-cum-documentary show is a first for Mozambique.. The show combines interviews with the public, demographers, government officials, and development programmers with films on population issues and programmes in their own and other countries, particularly Latin America... The idea is to breathe life and relevance into issues that are usually discussed as academic abstractions.. The show is part of an information and communication strategy aimed at transforming the country's population and family planning programme into a broad-based movement involving people from all walks of life, says UNFPA Country Director Rogelio castilla.. The strategy includes training journalists and public-service workers to more effectively report on and communicate about population matters. The show has won a great deal of public attention despite the fact that there is only one television for every thousand Mozambicans, according to UN figures.. We had no doubt of the media's great influence, says UNFPA's Carlos Samaniego... Our goal is to get the message across to the people. But the show is serving another purpose it is putting programmers in touch with people's perceptions, because television reporters fan out each week to ask members of the public. Are we many or few?

What? Look here we were not may to start with, one Mozambican replied. And with the war, we have become even fewer.. In fact, Mozambique's health, education, and other social systems are hard-pressed to meet the needs of its United Nations-estimated population of 15.7 million.. Half of all Mozambicans are out of reach of the country's health services only one-fourth have access to safe weather and sanitation Seven in ten adults are illiterate Six in ten Mozambicans live in what the government classifies as absolute poverty Mozambican women have 6.3 babies on average United Nations figures show that 300 women die from causes related to pregnancy and childbirth for every 10,000 live births. Some 400,000 Mozambican babies are born every year, according to government figures. But 173 infants die before

their first birthday for every 1,000 live births. 300 die before reaching the age of live. Although some 70 percent of the population still live in the rural areas, vast portions of the countryside remain uninhabited in the wake of migrations forced by poverty and the years of fighting that have afflicted Mozambique and Africa's other Frontline States. The country's population growth rate is estimated by the UN to be 2.7 percent per year, its urban population is thought to have grown at a yearly rate of 9.5 percent since 1960… so now we go to the first question [Reads the question from text] the text is divided in to three sections.. "what is happening.. why is it happening… background to health and population issues in Mozambique."

LL: /xxx/

L_2: what is the first one? uh.. I think xxx.

L: xxx

L_1: the third one is the cause of the talk.. right? so -

L: the third one.. it is not the third one.. the third one talks about the reason

L_1: the first two paragraphs

L_2: why is it happening? (asks) for the reasons

L_4: that's part of the paragraph.. upto the end of the chapter xxx

L_1: I think the main reason xxx.. the role of TV.. population -

L: why

L1: issues

LL: that is why it is happening because -

L_1: I think background to Mozambique xx.. the second

L_2: xx figures and the entire situations -

L_1: yeah figures

L_4: so what does that mean? we go to the second question

L_1: the second question xx

LL: /xxx/

L_5: what is happening?

L_2: the second question.. what kind of xx it is? [Reads from the text] "academic article.. government brifings.. newspaper or magazine article.. advice leaflet"

L: definitely the second.. government briefings

L_6: xx journalists

L_2: xxx

L_6: since the role of the television xx.. it is writing of a journalist.. the population living in that area xxx program transmitting x may be lives that xx. What do you think?

L_3: x is that academic article. Yes, xx show us some of figures like figure like about the education an Mozambique health xxx. So we see also xxx. So I see that it is academic article.

LL: /xxx/

L_4: I think it is academic article –

L: yeah

L: I think it is a newspaper article because you see xxx.

L: yeah

L_1: I don't think it is an advice leaflet for a married couple

L: yeah

L_1: because there is nothing about advice

L_4: we haven't agreed on which one xx

L_1: a government briefing.. if it is a government briefing.. there is a sort of question and answer xxx.. there is nothing mentioned what the government is doing.

LL: /xxx/

L_4: the government is briefing the xx.. some sort of xx about the country's xxx.. they ask the government questions.

LL: /xxx/

L_1: it cannot be an academic article.. if it is an academic article.. you see.. an academic article focuses entirely on population issues.

LL: /xxx/

L_1: x focusing on the role of TV –xx it starts by mentioning.. you know.. what happening as a result of xx chat-cum – documentary program and then you know the results and then of course xx for this program why it is x and the problems that are existing xx.

L_2: xxx

L_5: I think it is a newspaper or magazine article.. because it show x of data x how many people are dying x.. how many people x are in the country xx people have xx.

L_1: it is this style of writing .. it's just like xxx -

L_3: also like xxx is to give understand to give xxx.. that's why

L: Ok

L_4: let's now pass to the words.. and the paragraphs.. the contextual meanings.

L_1: exactly

L_4: before we find the contextual meanings.. it's good if any one of us know 'abuzz with'.. what.. what's the meaning of the word? I know it before I read this article.. do you know the word 'abuzz with'? [facing to L3]

L_3: I have no idea x

L_2: we have to find –

L_3: yeah

L_2: [Reads from the text] "the street of Maputo abuzz with talk of population issues" ..so some kind of every day talk

LL: /yeah & yes/

L_4: strain [from the text] you know the word 'strain'?

L: stress

L_4: one word.. strain means –

L: stress

L: /no/

L_1: strain in environment

L: yeah

L_1: pressure exerted on environment

LL: /xxx/

L_1: environmental why not xxx ?

L_2: chat-cum-documentary [Reads from the text]

LL: chat-cum-documentary

L_2: it's a kind of xx

L_4: xx second class x, and then educate the literate people .. general show to x through the media .. through the media what the xx

L: program

L_4: xxx

L_5: someone to xx –

L_4: yeah in a studio

L_5: yeah

L_4: the guy walks around and reporting

LL: (yeah)

L_4: the taxi driver xx asking few questions and goes and asks another guy .. x and then they compile it and present it in a presentable form.

L: x

L_2: academic abstraction

LL: /xxx/

L_2: [Reads from the text] "the idea is to breathe life and relevance into issues that are usually discussed as academic abstractions"

L_1: something like abstracting some thing which is not visible .. right?

L: yeah

L_1: it is not concrete

L: xx

L_1: yeah it takes time .. x so like it's academic .. something in academic areas

L_4: (Reads from text] "to breathe life into academic abstractions"

L_5: it is hard to figure out

L_1: x general public like.. you know.. like population growth.. things that are xx

L_4: xxx so that it is academic teachings to teach –

L_1: ok .. it's alright

L_2: broad based

L_4: broad based means with a broad base

L_4: firm background

L_2: no.. not firm x

L_1: wide-ranging

L: what is the sentence?

L_2: [Reads from text] "the show is part of an information and communication strategy aimed at transforming the country's population and family planning programme into a broad-based movement involving people from all walks of life"

LL: /xxx/

L_6: embracing -

L_1: yeah

L_6: including everyone

L_2: putting in touch with

L_1: yeah .. putting in touch with

L: xxx

L_1: yeah [Reads from the text] "it is putting programmers in touch with people's perceptions."

LL: /xxx/

L_1: hard-pressed x

L: [Reads from text] "Mozambique's health .. education and other social systems are hard- pressed to meet the needs of its UN – estimated population"

L_1: under a lot of stress .. what's the next word?

270 **L**: afflicted

L_1: yeah afflicted. [Reads from the text] "the years of fighting that have afflicted Mozambique and Africa"

L_2: caused

L: affected

275 **LL**: /caused/ /affected/

L_1: so I think affected is a better word

LL: /xxx/

L_1: grappled with

L_2: [Reads from the text] "there is lively chat in market places and bus stops

280 throughout the Mozambican capital as citizens grapple with topics such as population growth and distribution, environmental strain and maternal mortality

L_4: xxx

L_1: x

285 L_5: deals with

L: to talk about

L_1: yeah to talk about

L_4: renovate

L_1: to make something –

290 L_4: re – innovate

L_1: re x

L_4: x

L_1: renew not x

L_4: re

295 **LL**: /re new/

L_1: that's why x

L: demographic

L_1: demographic –

L: yeah demographic

LL: /xxx/

L_1: [Reads from text] "the show combines interviews with the public .. demographers.. government officials.. and development programmers with films on population issues and programmers in their own and other countries"

L: like the people distribution

L_3: xx people issue .. profession issue something like that xxx .. it is a knowledge

L_4: x when you say xx census what kind of ..?

LL: /xxx/

L: what is the next word

LL: /strategy/

L_5: [Reads from the text] "The strategy includes training journalists and public-service workers to more effectively report on and communicate about population martters"

L: so that .. it is system

L_5: xxx

L: people from all walks of life

L_4: all refers to first class second class.. all sorts of x

L: all walks of life

L: life different standards

L_1: [Reads from the text] "people from all walks of life"

LL: /xxx/

L: in- the wakeof

L_1: [Reads from the text] "although some 70% of the population still live in the rural areas.. vast portions of the country side remain uninhabited in the wake of migrations

L_2: because of

L_1: yeah.. it's because of

LL: /xxx/

L: population matters

L_1: population issue .. right? if you take matters as a noun

L_5: it is a population matters –

L1: population matters

[After a few minutes break the teacher comes in]

L_1: population matters is population issue

T: how about the second one? [silence] the second one.. take population as subject and matters as verb so population .. subject matters third person singular .. so does it matter? yes it matters xx. it's just playing with words x any parts you have found particularly challenging?

L_2: chat-cum-documentary

T: chat-cum-documentary .. what's .. what meaning did you get?

L_4: x it's a sort of argumentation .. that's x goes out .. and talks about .. for example .. a taxi driver xxx you find all this presentable to those watching that's it.

T: so you mentioned variety of people. this variety of people xxx these people are from all walks of life that x indicates?

L: /background, status/

T: background – when you say chat-cum-documentary .. take the meaning .. part of the word you have two words on one hand you have

L: xx

T: what is the other?

L: chat

T: what do we mean by that?

L_2: /talks, talk/

T: so you have reporters xx you have

L: documents

T: what do we mean by documents? [silence] it is facts.. so it is partly facts partly.. discussion.. so the general xx different people you compile it x it

and present it that's now you have all the peoples interested in it about population issues.. another word?

L: fan out

L_1: disperse

T: fan out .. it is disperse it comes from the idea of fan to fan to different direction. [Stops here and continues the whole class discussion after a few minutes]

[The whole-class discussion starts]

The first exercise xx -- firstly x page 49 that is simply to help us x -- go into x read the text. So there are general questions -- locations xx its location from the text x about Mozambique and -- what are the facts the text tells you about Mozambique -- if you look at the title, it tells you something -- I mean by looking at the tittle you can fairly say you can fairly tell what is X – ok -- this is the title so xxx. So let's see the title together – and what it tells us – [Reads the title from the textbook] "Television brings population issues to life in Mozambique".. here .. you don't have to take everything for granted .. television brings population issues to life in Mozambique -- uh .. first television .. ok .. as I said you don't have to take Mozambique .. just like .. we have some countries which don't have TV .. very recent experience .. do you know?

L_4: Brundi

T: Brundi ? – Botswana

LL: [they langh]

T: xxx under 21 national team .. we can't watch matches as a result.. Mozambique has TV .. population issues .. they also have programmes related to population and they giving the media to deal with x.. so the question is how TV .. that is .. what xx find out from the text --- ok number 3 says [Reads from the text] "why are population issues important to the peoples of Africa? "--- well this is simply common sense question .. simply

it is general knowledge about population and Africa.. in other words, why should .. African countries be concerned about population growth?

L_{10}: xx being updated .. the issue .. population brought us great problem … to a lot of countries

T: so as you stated x -- we have a couple of (imbalance) -- the growth of what this population and economy -- so x population is growing -- ok -- and the economy is not -- and the imbalance -- to deal with that we should be concerned with that facts -- the --what'll be the role of television in this context? what do you know about TV? what are the things we can use .. when you compare with other media? what's the advantage of TV .. and how can we use or exploit it?

L2: TV is .. a kind of informative way .. uh .. a way of giving information to a public .. and what the people could be informed about the population issues .. and they can ---

T: xxx about the media .. television when we say what kind of media is it .. we call it .. what are the two things we combine in TV?

LL: /picture and sound/

T: the picture and the sound .. we call it audiovisual .. audiovisual .. ok sounds .. the visuals .. the picture .. so the question is .. we give them information but pictures what kind of text can we present? ok .. that's .. facts .. pictures related to population and the one and number two .. what is happening [Reads from textbook] why is it happening and backgrounds .. simply tell us paragraph numbers .. what's happening .. why is it happening .. tell me the paragraph numbers.

L: one to four

T: xx what is happening? the people of Maputo [looking through the reading text] are -- discussing population issues -- why is it happening? Because of the television programme -- the other one -- is the people of Mozambique are discussing population issues – because of the television programme --

this is what's happening -- ok -- why is it happening? why do we have the programme? it is information and education strategy -- so one to four -- five to seven -- eight to ten -- are two three four [writes on the blackboard] 1 -- 7, 8 -- 10 so you have -- what is happening why is it happening and background -- number two -- which does some information xxx -- academic article -- government briefings -- newspaper or magazine article -- advice leaflet for married couples -- ok first which one is the source? [Writes on the blackboard].

L_1: newspaper or magazine article

T: newspaper or magazine article -- so why do we say it is a newspaper or magazine article?

L_1: xx in a very attractive way -- and it starts like -- what -- like about TV programmes .. and then .. it goes x the reader .. it is written in a very attractive way .. if it is academic it focuses on issues ---

T: so .. what is the focus? uh .. so we have academic articles .. you know the audience and you know what the audience expect .. uh .. we have attractive way .. and we call that dramatic kind of presentation .. that is to make the people interested .. it is a kind of entertainment .. so entertainment at the same time .. facts .. if it is an academic article, no entertainment .. the focus is on the facts .. so it is pure facts .. sometimes we call it dry facts .. we call it dry not because they are dry .. they lack entertainment .. entertainment is not the focus xx --- a magazine article is dramatic sentences .. if you look at the first one [Reads from the textbook] 'streets of Maputo are abuzz with talks of population issues" .. this is not the way of starting academic article .. so immediately you form a question .. why? .. what is happening? so entertainment plus facts --- Advice leaflet for married couples [By reading from the textbook] .. there is a series of dos and don'ts .. ok .. uh .. advice leaflets x .. do you have xx first semester discussing AIDS .. the writing part was .. transcript of radiobroadcast .. advice leaflet .. do this instruments .. ok .. keep medicine

away from the reach of children .. so dos don'ts .. these are sets of rules .. ok .. if you succeed in life .. do this don't do that xxx … Newspaper or magazine article again .. if you remember the discussions on Pokot tribe in Kenya .. what was his name? Swareg .. Swareg and his wife .. so the story was about these two people you have what you call a xx in the story you have facts xxx .. so the first two concentrates on the facts .. the third one concentrates on facts and also .. tries to capture your attention .. the last one is dos and on'ts .. that is task two .. Now the words [Referring to the textbook] .. uh .. what is the possible .. what is the sense of these words as they are used in the text? So what? raise your hands .. and contribute to the discussion .. one number one .. the first one [Looking at the task in the textbook] .. abuzz with .. the streets of Maputo are abuzz with talks of population issues .. so what is abuzz with?

L: crowded

T: crowded with .. the streets are crowded with talks? Crowding the streets? You have the idea .. but not crowded.

L_7: full of

T: ok .. full of .. filled with .. so what type of x talk? So filled with talks .. what makes abuzz sound?

L: bees

T: bees .. right? So what type of sound .. what kind of sound xx? That's the idea .. that's what the article xx … a lot of excitement .. people are interested .. lots of people discuss with interest .. so excited discussions .. grapple with is the next word .. grapple with [Reads from the text] "there is lively chat in market places and bus stops throughout the Mozambican capital as citizens grapple with topics such as population growth …" grapple with

L_8: deal with

T: deal with ..

L_9: engage

T: engage .. they discuss the issues .. what type of issues are these? .. like population growth and distribution .. environmental strain .. and maternal mortality .. these are issues .. what type of issues? These are population matters like .. maternal mortality .. in fact .. these are .. positive or negative?

L: negative

T: so .. we can call them problem .. so grapple with is ..?

LL: /x/

T: you discuss .. and the objective is to ..?

L: solve

T: solve .. they were trying to solve .. grapple with problems .. you try to solve problems xx of population .. the other context we can use is .. word x … first … you can sometimes usually grapple with .. mathematical question .. mathematics .. physics .. etc .. if you deal with problems what is the focus? The idea is to solve … strain looking environmental strain .. what is environmental strain?

L_2: stress

T: strees ok ..

L: crisis

T: environmental crisis .. environmental crisis ?

L: problems

T: so .. population growth creates pressure on the environment .. that is what we call environmental strain … when we use a lot of resources .. when we cut down trees .. there is environmental strain … Innovative [As he refers to the textbook] .. innovative weekly television programme .

L: creative

T: creative .. so .. uh .. innovative something innovative .. creative weekly television programme ... ok .. what is the other? [Checks in the textbook] chat-cum-documentary … what do we mean by that? Uh .. it says [Looking through the text] paragraph .. all the beginnings say.. the chat-

cum-documentary show is the first [Writes chat-cum-documentary on the blackboard] … so what xx chat-cum-documentary? So .. what was the chat documented? Mix the two…

L_2: it is a kind of factual .. actual talking

T: factual talking?

L_2: x documentary .. xx factual xx .. so .. and the chat is talking

T: so documentary refers to facts .. chat refers to talk partly chats and partly discussion .. you interview people and interview xx journalists interview the public .. they also interview experts .. experts and for example .. demographers .. programmers .. they are interviewed that is facts .. chat so xx .. mix that facts about population so programmers xx partly facts .. chat-cum-documentary.. demographers .. demographers .. so we can also xx discussion about xx .. components of the word are also clues for the meanings. … Demographers [As he refers to the book]

L_{10}: about people .. with population .. the problems the growth the xx population

T: ok .. right .. so what we call birth rate growth in relation to development .. so the people who specialize in this .. demography .. are demographers ... academic abstrations [Looking at the text] .. ok we have to look at the sentence … "The idea is to breaze life and relevance into issues that are usually discussed as academic abstractions…" And the aim objective of this programme is to breaze life into these issues .. and what is the idea? Academic abstractions x are academic abstractions what type of abstractions are academic abstractions? Right …

L_{10}: academic abstractions are those topics who are .. which are .. always discussed in the academic fields .. but hidden for the general audience .. there are two types of audience .. academic audience and general audience .. so these xx discussed on academic are as .. those parts hidden for the general audience but known to academic audience

T: ok .. so these are facts that are discussed only in the academic circle .. so

xx usually full of x right .. because of xx in the academic area (discuss) in their offices .. in the libraries .. ok what do you think is the idea when you breaze life into this issue? What happens? These are discussed at the theoretical level .. and you will breaze life into them .. that means what are we trying to do if we breaze life into issues that are highly theoretical? What are we trying to do?

L_{11}: may be x whether that person have knowledge or not ..x trying to express his feelings opinion .. so

T: So .. so here when we breaze life into them the theoretical aspect xx … In addition to that .. bring down to the people .. you make it concrete or practical .. theoretical discussions .. we try to bring practical solutions to the problems .. so academic abstractions are purely theoretical .. to breaze life into them is to make them practical.. all contribute to solutions... practical .. so if something is discussed in the academic circle .. nobody cares about what happens .. down the public .. so what is the subject so that you can xx to the lives of the ordinary people? Strategy is our next word [Looking at the text] … what is strategy?

L_{12}: plan

T: plan .. strategy is plan?

L_{13}**:** mechanism

T: mechanism .. strategy is mechanism?

L: aim

T: strategy is not an aim .. rather it is a means you have objective .. ends .. how xx pseudo objectives the things xx .. so it is a means .. so plan .. broad based is the next .. broad based what is the idea? Ok .. the next phrase to do with broad based .. it says broad based and people from all walks of life .. let's read what it says .. it says [Reading] "the show is part of an information and communication strategy aimed at transforming the country's population and family planning programme into a broad based movement involving people from all walks of life.." so what is broad?

Broad refers to ..

L_{14}: large

T: yes

L_{14}: large scale

T: large scale?

L: large scale

T: so large scale .. broad refers to

L: wide

T: ok .. wide what .. broad based wide based?

L: wide spread

T: wide spread?

L_2: all over xx from all walks of life

T: so we have

L_{15}: wide approach

T: yes?

L_{15}: wide approach

T: wide approach .. so what is wide? It refers to xx of the people .. ok one we have a lot of people and these people come from all walks of life .. people from all walks of life that is simply the number .. broad based refers to the number .. walks of life refers to what? if I say .. if you go to the market place you have people from all walks of life

L_{11}: different people different background

T: backgrounds .. so people such as housewives .. teachers students .. farmers .. drivers .. many people they are from different backgrounds .. putting in touch with .. it's strait from [Refers to the text] paragraph eight .. it says the show is x the purpose .. putting programmers in touch with people's perception because xxx fan out to the streets of xx .. are we many or few? .. putting in touch with .. so we have programmers [Writes on the blackboard) .. people's perceptions .. so putting programmers in touch with people's perceptions .. because of the term x we have programmers in

touch with people's perceptions .. so putting in touch with

L_{16}: be informed

T: who is informed?

L_{16}: the programmers

T: the programmers are informed about people's participation .. ok they are informed .. or

L_{10}: closer

T: making them closer? The programmers and the perceptions closer? What is the idea?

L_{10}: the idea is the people .. the people the programmers have got the people's perceptions the things the programs that xx issue x the programmes are about the people.

T: ok the other possibility is ..

L_7: making aware of .. conscious the people's perception

T: ok .. so the programmers are made aware of the people's perception the focus (is to make) the programmers understand the people's perceptions ok .. so that is part of breazing life into academic abstractions .. what is the effect because we are discussing at the theoretical level .. abstract x .. what is the perception of our people? What do they think about population? So they ask the people questions .. are we many or few? We can not say everybody supports family planning because as we see the answer .. paragraph nine [Refers to the text] there is one x (since he surprised) .. the very fact the people xx what we are x with xx one Mozambican replies .. and we are becoming ever fewer .. ok this individual does not say the Mozambican population is growing at fast rate .. so it is very far xx .. ok to begin with .. originally we are not made few .. we have civil war and because of that we lost many people .. no we are fewer so he mentions this .. so what do the people understand? wHat is the perception of the people? That is how xx. So put in touch with … fan out is the next one .. [Reads from the text] "reporters of television fan out to ask members of the public

'are we many or few?' " … fan out

L: to spread

T: spread .. xx going to people .. so xx you know what fan is .. when the weather is too hot you have fan .. people are x .. so it just spreading in different directions .. so spread throughout the different directions … we have hard-pressed next .. [Refers to the text] "Mozambique's education and social system are hard-pressed" .. hard-pressed .. the health and the social services are hard-pressed.. we have the services on one hand .. and the needs of the people on the other .. the services are hard-pressed .. that is

LL: xx

T: next .. in-the-wake-of—just one word – in-the-wake-of .. let's look at the context [Refers to the text]" in the wake-of migrations .. so we have migration of people .. because of x .. people migrate in-the-wake-of the migration the rural areas are empty .. that means xxx .. so in-the-wake-of the migration the places are empty

L_{17}: after

T: after .. right? After the migration .. so in-the wake-of-the migration simply means after the migration … The last one afflicted .. [Refers to the text] .. .. afflicted

L: damaged

T: what?

L: damaged

T: damaged .. ok

L: affected

T: affected .. or

L: hurt

T: they hurt .. they have damaged .. they have affected .. so .. ok these are the words .. part I activity number 1 .. part III .. the next one number 2 simply a kind of game .. but it is language .. population matters .. so what are the two meanings of population matters? It says .. population matter means

population issues .. what is the other meaning of population matters? .. and give this another meaning

L_{16}: great attention is given to population

T: ok .. great attention is given to population .. because this is .. why is great attention is given?

L_{18}: affect

T: affect .. take another

L: population problem

T: problem or [writing on the blackboard] population .. this the sentence .. this is subject .. this is verb [showing on the black board] take .. xx something like yes, population matters xx..

L_4: does a population matter

T: does population matter? Ok .. the other meaning is ..

L: what does xx ?

T: so .. one who teachers is teacher .. one who speaks is a speaker .. and one who reports is reporter .. so one who lives is ..

L: / x /

T: one who lives .. it is like the phrase population matters .. it says xxx .. noun singular verb .. xx so you have also flies .. what do we mean by love flies .. [writing on the black board] love flies .. so it tails wings .. so it flies .. the other one .. third person singular subject .. simple present tense .. love flies .. it flies .. the other one is plural xx .. so it is command .. imperative .. love flies xxx .. so population matters population issues.

Appendix 2: Questionnaire

Dear Respondent,

This questionnaire is designed to gather information about freshman students' classroom participation and perceptions. Since there are no right or wrong answers, you will not be marked as 'wrong' or ' right'. What is needed is your frank responses. Please try to complete the questionnaire because your responses to each item is quite NECESSARY.

THANK YOU

Please complete the following before you proceed to the next page

Name : _____
Age : _____
Sex : _____

The type of Schools you attended : A/ private or B/ Government

Please read the following statements carefully and mark with tick (Π) to show your agreements or disagreements in the spaces given in front of each statement

Undecided (U) Strongly Agree (SA) Agree (A)
Strongly Disagree (SD) Disagree (D)

	SA	A	U	D	SD
1. I make a lot of effort to participate because I want to get a good grade.					
2. I consider participating in a pair or group work less important than participating when the teacher lectures					
3. When I ask or answer a question a) I take care not to repeat what another student has already said. b) I try to raise an idea that has not been raised by another student					
4. I always try to be among the students who participate most a) by volunteering to answer a question even if I am not sure whether the answer is correct or not b) b) by asking any question whether it is related to the topic or not					
5. I consider a trouble to the teacher to ask something for clarification when the teacher is not interested					
6. When I have something to say, I do not worry about raising my hand to get the teacher's permission.					
7. When I ask or answer a question my aim is to get things clear and to practise speaking in English rather than getting good grades					
8. I always prefer to participate actively in pair and group discussions rather than during lecturer.					
9. When I sometimes participate during teacher's lecture, I first try to decide whether my question or answer is important.					
10. There are times when I have questions and do not ask the teacher.					
11. I always ask or answer a question after getting a permission from my teacher					
12. Sometimes I do not participate unless the teacher specifically calls on me to participate.					
13. When I participate in a group work, I always take the initiative to generate ideas and organize the group.					

Appendix 3: Interview

1. Why do you participate in English classes?
   - To get good marks ?
   - To practise the various skills of target language?
   - Or what else?

2. How frequently should a student ask or answer questions?
   - Selectively?
   - Unselectively?

3. Why do you think some students do not participate during classroom discussions?

4. Which of the following factors influence the frequency with which you participate? Rank them according to their influences.
   - Topic of the discussion (for example, the subject of a reading passage)
   - Classroom organization (such as pair work, group work, whole-class)
   - The teacher
   - The task type (for example, debating, completing a chart)

5. How much have freshman English courses helped you to improve the way you participate?

DECLARATION

I, the undersigned, declare that this thesis is my work and that all sources of material used for this thesis have been duly acknowledged.

Name: Kedir Assefa

Signature: _____