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ABSTRACT

The primary purpose of this study was to describe: 1) the predominant types of interaction behaviors encountered in a foreign language video program; and 2) the types of teacher-student interaction features that resulted from use of the instructional video in elementary school classrooms. Based on the findings, the second purpose of the study was to examine how these interaction behaviors shaped amount of teacher and student talk in the two sources of data. The researcher examined two sources of data: the language video program and elementary level language classes in two schools in Southeastern United States.

The examination of interaction behaviors involved the description of interaction behaviors between all the players in the video program and those in the classroom scene. For the description of interaction behaviors in the video program, twenty-five video lessons were analyzed and coded (N=3,269 behaviors) using The Observational System for Instructional Analysis (OSIA) (Hough & Duncan, 1970). In order to examine features of classroom interaction, twenty-four groups of elementary level language classrooms in grades K through five were videotaped during their twenty-minute language lessons on
one occasion each during a four-week period (N=3,223 behaviors). Classroom behaviors were also coded using the OSIA system.

Analysis of the video program revealed three predominant teacher behaviors that accounted for 81.3% of the total teacher behaviors: initiation of information (39%), solicitation of information (33%), and response to solicitation (9.3%). The predominant student behavior in the video program, which accounted for 9.8% of the student talk, was response to solicitation (9.8%). Total video talk was represented by 86.71% teacher talk and 9.8% student talk.

Analysis of the classroom settings revealed three predominant teacher behaviors that accounted for 46.6% of the classroom teachers' behaviors: solicitation of response (33%), initiation of information and positive personal judgment (13.6%). The predominant student behaviors in the classroom settings, which accounted for 37.3% of the student talk, were response to solicitation (28%), silent overt behaviors, silent covert behaviors and solicitation of response (8.5%). Total classroom talk was represented by 54.33% teacher talk and 37.53% student talk.

Data from the live classroom settings revealed that language teachers stimulated interaction with students, interaction among students, and interaction between classroom students and the studio teacher, despite the less frequent chains of interaction presented in the video lessons.
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CHAPTER 1
THE PROBLEM

Introduction

The purpose of instruction is to facilitate student learning and to add to or expand upon prior learning. In order to instruct, teachers make use of a variety of instructional strategies and materials with the intent of producing meaningful learning (Ausubel, 1968; Hough & Duncan, 1970; and Cazden, 1988). Meaningful learning entails relating incoming information to existing aspects of the learner's cognitive structure. Based on this conception, effective learning suggests that learners "manifest a meaningful learning set", that is, a disposition to associate the new material "nonarbitrarily and substantively" to their cognitive structure (Ausubel, 1968, p. 38), and that the material learned be potentially meaningful to them. For the purposes of the present study, meaningful learning involves the contextual learning in a beginning foreign language (L2) classroom, as an audio/lingual mechanical, automaticity oriented environment, and hence the results of the behaviors noted.

Given that effectiveness in instruction is determined by learning that is of value to the learner (Ausubel, 1968), an analysis of the instructional act becomes necessary to verify the relationship between instruction and the development in the student structure of knowledge (Hough & Duncan, 1970, p. 115). The analysis of instruction should then, center on the traits of the teacher instructional behavior, and how these behaviors influence student meaningful learning.
Research on effective teaching shows that student achievement is increased by indirect instruction (Flanders, 1965; Silvernail, 1986; Moskowitz, 1976; Wintergerst, 1994; and Johnston and Milne, 1995). Indirectedness in teaching presupposes that learners are given more opportunities to interact and to play an active role in their learning process. Therefore, learning is facilitated when teachers and students interact in ways that maximize the students’ comprehension of the content as well as their communication skills (Kramsch, 1987; Wintergerst, 1994). Interaction behaviors in indirect instruction are represented by teacher solicitation, pupil response and student-student interaction (Flanders, 1960; and Morine-Dershimer, 1985).

The purpose of the proposed study was to describe the interaction behaviors in a language video program and the verbal and nonverbal interaction behaviors of language teachers and students as a result of the video-based program used in elementary level language classrooms. From the data obtained, the researcher examined how these identified behaviors shaped patterns of communication, specifically in terms of amount of teacher and student talk, in the two sources of data.

Interaction is understood in the context of this study as the ability of the speaker and the listener to communicate through the use of verbal and nonverbal symbols (Canale, 1983). The description of given instances of teacher-student interaction or a sequence of these interaction behaviors made it feasible for the researcher to observe how teachers use the language to control the patterns of communication in the two observed second language environments. In addition, through these interaction features it was possible to identify the interactional adjustments that need to be made so as to increase the learner language production. The findings generated by this study could become a powerful tool for the revision of the video-based program and, as a result, for changes in teacher behaviors to enhance student performance.
Statement of the Problem

The primary purpose of the proposed study was to describe: 1) the types of interaction behaviors encountered in a video-based program developed for elementary language learners; 2) the interaction features between language teachers and students generated by the video selections in live language learning settings; and 3) to examine how these behaviors of interaction shaped patterns of communication (amount of teacher and student talk) in the video program and in the classroom settings.

The incorporation of media in language programs has increased steadily since the 1960s (Smith, 1987). The modern second language classroom is teeming with all kinds of helpful resources, such as video assisted language teaching, integrated video, and computer assisted instruction, that are believed to facilitate and strengthen student learning. However, utilizing these powerful resources inadequately may actually do more harm than good (Ariew, 1987). Particularly in video-based instruction, it is believed that misuse of this tool may encourage the passive role of the learner, fail to reinforce the four language skills equally, and impose a non-interactive atmosphere for learning.

Focusing on the issue of interactivity, the general research questions to be investigated in the study are:

1) What are the predominant types of interaction behaviors in a language video program?

2) What are the types of teacher and student interaction features that result from using the instructional video selections in elementary language classrooms?

3) How do the identified interaction behaviors in the video program and in the classroom settings shape patterns of communication (amount of teacher and student talk) in the two sources of data?
In order to answer these questions, an examination of the structure of the language video program from the perspective of instructional strategies, lesson design and lesson content was done. In addition, features of interaction in the video lessons were described and analyzed using The Observational System for Instructional Analysis (OSIA). A description of the types of teacher-student interaction generated by the video selections in language classrooms is provided. From these findings, it was possible to examine the patterns of communication in terms of teacher and student talk in the two sources of data.

Numerous studies (William, 1973; Morine-Dershimer, 1985; Cazden, 1988; and Rosenbusch, 1995) have shown a positive relationship between teacher-student interaction and improvement in learner language performance. It is hypothesized then, that the greater the occurrence of patterns of teacher and student solicitation, patterns of teacher and student response, and patterns of student-student interaction, the higher the student involvement and participation in second language classes.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to examine the communicative and interactive activities in the language video program; to analyze the verbal and the nonverbal behaviors of the video teacher and her students in the language video program; and to investigate the degree of interactiveness generated by the video selections in live classroom settings. In order to analyze these three identified purposes, the researcher described the interaction behaviors in the language video program developed for elementary language learners, and the types of teacher-student interaction behaviors that resulted from this method of language instruction in live language classes. From the description of the interaction
behaviors in the video program and in the classroom settings, amount of teacher and
student talk in the two sources of data was examined.

The study was developed in the context of elementary language classes. The
description of interaction patterns in the video-based program and in the language
classrooms was directed by the following general research questions:

1) What are the predominant types of interaction behaviors in a language video
program?

2) What are the types of teacher and student interaction features that result from
using the instructional video selections in elementary language classrooms?

3) How do the identified interaction behaviors in the video program and in the
classroom settings shape patterns of communication (amount of teacher and
student talk) in the two sources of data?

Significance of the Problem

Interaction between students and teachers has proved to be highly valued as a way
to stimulate the learners' thought (Cazden, 1988), and to provide students with
opportunities to drill and practice the target language (Kramsch, 1987). Striking evidence
generated by research in this area has shown that teacher-student interaction affects
student language performance positively (Wintergerst, 1994; and Johnson, 1995). The
present study is based on the hypothesis that the frequent occurrence of specific patterns
of teacher-student interaction, such as teacher and student solicitations, teacher and
student response to solicitations and student-student interaction, can actually increase
student involvement and facilitate second language learning.
As a way to facilitate learning, instructional materials have placed stronger emphasis on communication. As a result, attempts have been made in material design to make learning interesting, and to provide learners with meaningful and interactive input as a way to help them gain communicative skills more rapidly. In response to teachers' requests, increasing technological advances in instruction have been made available to the foreign language classrooms.

Modern media, including video-based programs, has made a valuable contribution to the foreign language curriculum (Ariew, 1987). Using video to teach listening skills is undoubtedly an effective resource because not only it reinforces the oral features of the foreign language, but it also displays all the body language and facial expressions that accompany those utterances, which in turn facilitate second language (L2) comprehension considerably. In addition, viewing images while listening to a soundtrack is specially appealing to elementary level children (Omaggio, 1979). Regardless of its disadvantages, video instruction offers "certain capabilities that are otherwise either difficult or impossible to introduce into the average classroom" (Ariew, 1987, p. 46). This statement relates specifically to peculiarities of the target culture such as patterns of behavior, forms of discourse, or use of space that without an authentic and visual demonstration can easily be misrepresented (Johnston & Milne, 1995).

Guided by the forementioned reasons, the significance of the study lies on investigating the types of behaviors that are generated in live classrooms as a result of video instruction; examining how much the identified behaviors in the video program influence classroom language teaching, describing teacher's control over the patterns of communication in the two modes of instruction, video and classroom instruction; and evaluating student participation and involvement in elementary second language classes when specific patterns of interaction are predominant in the instructional act. The
description of the types of interaction behaviors in the language video-based program and in the classroom settings that used video-based instruction provided evidence that teacher-student interaction relates to student higher class participation and involvement in second language learning.

Assumptions

The proposed study describes the predominant types of interaction behaviors in a language video program, the types of teacher-student interaction features that occurred as a result of video-based instruction in elementary classrooms, and how these interaction behaviors shaped teacher and student talk in the two environments.

The first assumption was that because video-based instruction was not highly emphasized in the targeted schools and therefore was not part of the students' routine classroom instruction, students' behavior would be overly enthusiastic, participatory and interactive in the language classes.

The second assumption was that because language instruction was a relatively new experience to students in the observed classrooms, the majority of these learners would be motivated to learn Spanish. The researcher anticipated that student motivation would possibly affect the interaction behaviors of students in all levels of language instruction, specially those in the early levels of language instruction, grades K through three. The reason was that for a significant portion of the students in the early levels of language instruction, learning a second language in a classroom situation would actually be their first experience learning a language other than their own.

Considering that the targeted schools were located in a rural and isolated area, the third assumption was that the observed learners were likely to have very little or no
exposure to any language other than their own. It was assumed then, that students in later
levels of language instruction, specifically in grades four and five, would not see the
purpose in learning a foreign language. As a result, behaviors of apathy and indifference
were expected among the population of fourth and fifth graders.

The fourth assumption was that older learners would feel inhibited interacting with
the studio teacher which would eventually result in altered patterns of student behavior in
the later levels of language instruction. A final assumption was that the sample utilized for
the assessment of the teacher-student interaction behaviors through the video portions of
the ELF program in elementary language classrooms was representative of instances of
teacher-student interaction behaviors through video-based instruction in the universal
population of elementary language classrooms with similar characteristics as those
observed.
**Definition of Terms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition/Exemplar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>ability of speaker and listener to exchange information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective instruction</td>
<td>activity that resulted in a change in student behavior that was consistent with an instructional objective (Hough and Duncan, 1970, p. 115)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELF program</td>
<td>Elementary Language Fundamentals program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign language</td>
<td>language that learners are learning, in this case Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar-oriented instruction</td>
<td>instruction with emphasis on reading and translation (Clifford, 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>ways to facilitate one's learning or the learning of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>the way utterances by different speakers sequentially contribute to the meaning that is jointly and collaboratively constructed (Wells, 1981)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive input</td>
<td>samples of the target language available to the learner for interlanguage construction through classroom interaction (Ellis, 1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive language teaching</td>
<td>elicitation of willing student participation and initiative (Rivers, 1990, p. 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language interaction</td>
<td>ability between the speaker and the listener to communicate through the use of verbal and non-verbal symbols (Canale, 1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>native language or English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>target language or the language being taught, in this case Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language consultants</td>
<td>student aides preparing to become language teachers. Also referred to as language teachers in the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial objectives</td>
<td>objectives that aim at establishing the instructional conditions in which substantive objectives can be achieved (Hough and Duncan, 1970, p. 118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal symbols</td>
<td>gestures in general such as head nodding, hand movement, hand-raising, eye gaze, etc. (Hough and Duncan, 1970)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterns of communication</td>
<td>how, when, where, and with whom language is to be used in the classroom (Johnson, 1995, p.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productive language skills</td>
<td>speaking and writing (Rivers, 1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>group of instructional materials: videotaped lessons, audio tapes, realia, puppets, paper and pencil activities, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptive language skills</td>
<td>listening and reading (Rivers, 1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to solicitations</td>
<td>responses to directions and questions (Hough and Duncan, 1970)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicitations</td>
<td>behaviors in the form of questions, direction, or commands (Hough and Duncan, 1970)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantive objectives</td>
<td>objectives that aim at achieving the goals of education (Hough and Duncan, 1970)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student language performance</td>
<td>L2 learner's language development (Ellis, 1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio students</td>
<td>students on the video program, also referred as video students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio teacher</td>
<td>teacher on the video program, also referred as video teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic instruction</td>
<td>instruction that aims at recycling material for the sake of better memorization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR</td>
<td>Asher's Total Physical Response - a method that requires the learner to respond nonverbally to instructions for a lengthy period before production is allowed (cited in Ellis 1990: 103)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional instruction</td>
<td>instruction that is hardly recycled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video-based instruction</td>
<td>instruction done through videotaped lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video students</td>
<td>same as studio students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video teacher</td>
<td>same as studio teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Delimitations of the Study

The study was limited to the description of the interaction behaviors between the video teacher and her students in a language video program, and the interaction features of language teachers and students in live elementary language classrooms.

A second delimitation of the study was that it concentrated mostly on objectives related to the goals of the program, or substantive objectives. Managerial objectives, or conditions through which teacher-student interaction was achieved, were not described. The reason for excluding managerial issues from the study was that data on managerial behaviors would not contribute to the examination of student participation and involvement in language classes for the purposes of language learning. In short, teacher and student solicitations, teacher and student response to solicitations, and student-student interaction that directly attempted to meet objectives related to the content of the lessons were of interest in the study.

Another delimitation of the study related to its generalizability. The results and conclusions drawn from the present study concentrated on the Spanish version of the ELF program. The French and German versions were not considered because these versions had not been used in the settings in which the study was conducted. Study of interaction behaviors using the French and German video programs could constitute a topic for future research.

A fourth delimitation concerned the length of time students were exposed to the foreign language in the observed elementary language classrooms. Although the video-based language program was implemented in one of the targeted schools one year prior to the implementation of the same program in the other school, the researcher treated language instruction in both schools as if there was no difference in amount of language
exposure. The reason was that during the first year in which the language program was implemented in one of the schools, it was still in its experimentation phase, and therefore treated as a pilot study rather than a language program per se. Due to that, differences in amount of exposure to the foreign language in the two observed schools were not considered significant.

A fifth delimitation was that this was the first study that used The Observational System for Instructional Analysis (OSIA) (Hough & Duncan, 1970) in an elementary school foreign language situation. Previous studies using the OSIA system in second language classrooms focused on language learning at the high school levels. As a result, the instrument had to be adapted to the situation of elementary level language instruction.

Limitations of the Study

The study presented a number of limitations. The first was the lack of articulation of the elementary foreign language program with the upper level language program, specifically with the middle school language program. This resulted in the isolation of the program within the elementary schools affecting its long-term instructional objectives.

A second limitation of the study was the lack of articulation across sections within a level and across levels. The functioning curriculum for language education had not been organized in a sequential order suitable to the various grade levels. The result of the lack of articulation was that students in different grade levels were presented with repeated video lessons while other segments of the video program remained uncovered. In addition, the ELF program does not consider variation of content according to the developmental levels of the students. In order to control for the lack of sequencing and content variation of the video program, the researcher tentatively organized the program
in a sequential order taking into consideration the different linguistic stages of the students in the various grade levels. Furthermore, the researcher systematically guided and instructed language consultants on the development of lesson plans and on the incorporation of the video lessons into their classes. Appendix A presents a tentative organization of the video lessons across grades K through 5 for approximately three months of language instruction.

The third limitation related to the number of contact hours of language instruction in the observed schools. The allocated time for language instruction for the entire academic year was not sufficient for language acquisition purposes. Language learners in both schools receive in average a total of 3 hours of foreign language instruction during three months in the fall semester. The average number of contact hours for the same number of months in the spring semester is increased to roughly 10 hours. During the semester in which data was collected, each grade level in both schools was exposed to the foreign language on 10 occasions for 20 minutes; a total of 2 hours and 20 minutes of language exposure during approximately four months of instruction.

The final limitation of the study concerned the availability of language consultants to represent the language program in the targeted schools. The number of language consultants was regulated by the number of available student aides and student teachers with expertise in Spanish in a foreign language methods class in a state-supported university in Southeastern United States. These language consultants differed in background and teaching experience. Inevitably, this resulted in different instances of language experience for the language learners. As a way to control for teaching ability differences, the researcher worked closely to these language consultants during the entire semester, and helped them design lesson plans, develop instructional activities, create assessment instruments, and emphasize communication and interaction during classroom
teaching. Description of the researcher experience working with the language consultants is presented in Appendix B.
Organization

Chapter Two includes the literature review related to four areas of research: interaction behaviors research, communicative language teaching research, video-based instruction research, and methods of evaluation of educational programming research.

Chapter Three presents the methodology and research design. This includes a description of the population, sample selection, research design, variables, instrumentation used in the study as well as data collection, validity and reliability, and data analysis.

Chapter Four describes the results and analyses of the findings. Description of the interaction behaviors in the language video program and those in elementary language classes whose instruction resulted from the video instruction is presented. In addition, examination of how these behaviors of interaction shape the patterns of communication (amount of teacher and student talk) in the two sources of data is included.

Chapter Five contains the summary, conclusions and recommendations of the study. Recommendations regarding interaction through the use of video-based instruction in language classes are emphasized.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This study described the types of interaction behaviors in a language video program and those in elementary language classrooms that resulted from the use of the instructional video selections. The study also explored how these interaction patterns shaped the patterns of communication in terms of amount of teacher and student talk in the two sources of data. This chapter focuses on four areas of research. The first presents research related to interaction behaviors of teachers and students in the last thirty years, and investigates interaction behaviors in second language classrooms. Then, research in communicative language teaching is presented highlighting studies on goals and learning tasks in communicative language teaching and the role of teachers and students in communicative classrooms. A similar presentation is made for classroom interaction, communication and learning, and new literacy in second language education. The third area presents an overview of video-based instruction, its advantages and disadvantages, and the issue of interaction and video instruction. The last section of this review presents an overview on methods of evaluation of education programming since the 1940s. A variety of systems of evaluation are explored. The chapter concludes with a summary of the important issues raised in these areas of research.
Interaction Behaviors Research

Conceptualization of interaction

Interaction involves the ability between the speaker and the listener to communicate through the use of verbal and nonverbal symbols. This conceptualization of interaction deals with the interpersonal relationships between the teacher and the students during the instructional act. It is through this relationship that the "tone" or social climate (Nelson, 1969; Allwright, 1980; Wintergerst, 1994; Bouwhuis, 1995; and Johnson, 1995) of the class is set, and consequently the climate for classroom interaction established.

Classroom interaction is interpreted and viewed differently by a number of researchers. Bellack et al (1969) view classroom interaction as a series of language games in which language represents a function of the roles played by the pupils and the teacher during the instructional act (p. 95). In order to arrive at some definition for the term interaction, Bellack et al conducted a study in which verbal interaction in the classroom was observed. The interplay of students and teachers were classified in four major categories: structuring, soliciting, responding and reacting. Their findings revealed that certain patterns predominated as the game was played. The teacher was the chief player who set the rules and spoke for the longest time. Teacher talk time was three times as much as student talk time. Students, on the other hand, spent two-thirds of their time responding to the teacher's solicitations. Findings suggest that "the teaching game is a tightly structured, static process, with the rules of the players well defined from the outset" (Nelson, 1969, p. 87).

Another conceptualization of classroom interaction is offered by Smith (1969). Smith views classroom interaction as a series of cognitive operations between teachers and
students in the substantive aspects of instruction in order to develop a theory of interaction. His research emphasizes teaching as it emerges in daily classroom interactions rather than from epistemological theories. Although Smith's study is significantly different from Bellack's in emphasis and scope, both researchers studied the effects of teaching strategies on learning outcomes.

In his study on teaching strategies, Smith attempts to identify and describe teaching behaviors. Through examinations of instructional events, Smith was able to identify twelve operations used by teachers: defining, describing, designating, stating, reporting, comparing and contrasting, substituting, classifying, opining, valuing, conditional inferring, and explaining (Smith, 1969, p. 113). It was noted that teachers tend to select operations to ensure that certain expected behaviors are manifested by the students. For instance, if the teacher wants to engage students in an exchange of ideas, he/she will use specific strategies to trigger the desired behavior. Among the logical operations, Smith identified that describing, designating and explaining were the three most frequent strategies used by teachers. He also observed that the occurrence of certain logical operations were more prevalent in certain subject fields compared to others. Findings from Smith's observations are very similar to Bellack's conclusions in that direct instruction dominates classroom discourse.

Sister Mary William (1973) conceptualizes classroom interaction as the behavior of teachers representing a predictor for student achievement. William conducted a study with twelve ninth-grade Spanish classes to quantify the verbal dimensions of the classroom teaching-learning situation. Analysis of the data revealed that students exposed to indirect teaching obtained better results in attitude and achievement than those taught by direct instruction. William emphasizes that "the more the teacher takes the initiative, the more likely pupils are to respond. The more a teacher responds, the more likely it is that pupils..."
will make statements which show initiative" (p. 158). Silvernail (1986) agrees with William and points out that "teacher indirectness leads to more thought-provoking questions on the part of the students" (p. 13).

Moskowitz (1976) utilizes the same conceptualization of classroom interaction used by William. In her study of the patterns of language interaction used by outstanding foreign language teachers, she identified a number of teacher behaviors that relate to excellence in teaching and to greater student achievement. Through the use of the Foreign Language Interaction System (FLINT), an adaptation of the Flanders System (Flanders 1970) to foreign language teaching, Moskowitz was able to identify 37 behaviors commonly displayed by outstanding teachers. Those related to classroom interaction are: less amount of teacher talk, frequent use of nonverbal signals and hand gestures, more teacher indirect behavior to reinforce and encourage student participation, less time devoted to students doing silent reading and written tasks, greater amount of questions, review and focus on the skill of speaking. A number of researchers conceptualize interaction from the perspective of teacher directness and indirectness. Others examine interaction through the analysis of the rules of classroom discourse (Morine-Dershimer, 1985; Green, Weade & Graham, 1988; Cazden. 1988; and Wintergerst, 1994).

**Classroom discourse**

There are a number of studies that focus on the rules and dominance of classroom discourse. Morine-Dershimer (1985) conducted a study that investigated the dominance of the teacher in classroom discourse. She found that students adapt their listening and speaking skills to the requirements of the instructional setting. Within any classroom setting, Morine-Dershimer found that patterns of student participation are controlled by
explicit and implicit rules for participation. Explicit rules are rules agreed upon by teachers and students commonly revealed by student responses. They are:

1) I don't talk when the teacher or someone else is talking.  
   (83% of pupils responding);
2) When I want to ask something, I raise my hand.  
   (81% of pupils responding);
3) If I know the answer to a question, I raise my hand.  
   (75% of pupils responding);
4) If I don't know the answer to a question, I don't raise my hand/I listen/I keep quiet.  
   (83% of pupils responding) (Morine-Dershimer, 1985, pp. 103-4)

These rules define when student participation is appropriate and the types of behaviors required to get a turn to talk. Some of the rules are established by teachers explicitly. Others are stated explicitly by students as rules of classroom communication. Implicit rules are revealed by actual patterns of participation regulated by pupil-induced rules (Green, Weade & Graham, 1988). It is concluded then, from Morine-Dershimer's observations that turn-taking rules establish the social climate for classroom interaction. Focusing on the issue of turn-taking rules, Hatch (1992) maintains that long-term exposure to turn-taking rules may hinder learners' conversational discourse competence.

Through observations in a number of classroom discourse situations, Cazden (1988) identified the types of communication patterns that are present in most classrooms. She calls these patterns the three-part sequence, namely IRE. This sequence is the most common pattern utilized in classroom discourse at different grade levels. The IRE refers
to the sequential order through which classroom interaction is organized. It involves
teacher initiation, student response and teacher evaluation. In agreement with the results
obtained from Cazden's observation, Green, Weade and Graham (1988) found that
participation in lessons requires that students "monitor and interpret the actions and
messages of the teacher and other students on a moment-to-moment basis" (p. 14-15).

In order to examine student classroom participation, Wintergerst (1994) conducted
a study in which she explores solicitations and responses in 12 ESL lessons. She
examined three main sections in classroom discourse: moves, solicitations, and
solicitations yielding extended student responses. Results of her study show that teachers
structured information in 7% of the total classroom discourse; solicited 56%; responded
6%; and reacted 32%. Based on the data obtained, Wintergerst concludes that teachers
tend to talk too much. In her exploration of oral communication, she maintains that
"student language proficiency has been shown to correlate positively with the amount of
language production in classrooms" (p. 81).

Kinginger (1994) analyzes the role of conversation in educational settings, and
agrees with Wintergerst that instructional conversation is the "ideal vehicle for learning"
(p. 30). Oral communication is examined by Kinginger from the perspective of
Vygotskian theory. Based on this theory, it is hypothesized that through the
conversational act learners can be placed in their zone of proximal development at the limit
of their actual capacity, and gain proficiency with support from the teacher and from other
pupils. More specifically for language learners, it is the support learners receive from the
teacher and classmates that encourage their self-initiative (Bouwhuis, 1995). Self-
initiative, according to Van Lier (1988), is a prerequisite for learning the morphosyntactic
and discourse features of the second language. Johnston and Milne (1995) also agree with
Van Lier that in order to develop performance in a second language, students should
engage in communicative discourse in the target language and be given greater opportunities to speak.

From research conducted in the past three decades on interaction behaviors of teachers and students in the last thirty years, it can be concluded that indirect instruction promotes more interaction and student participation in classroom discussion. Evidence has shown that by encouraging learners to interact, teachers are giving students more opportunities to actually use the language they are learning, as well as providing them with more practice in particular points of pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary in the second language. Through soliciting behaviors, teachers are able to invite students to take part in the discourse. This participation results in greater teacher-student and student-student interaction, greater involvement in classroom talk, and consequently better conditions for language acquisition.

Interaction in Second Language Classrooms

The teaching of foreign languages has undergone dramatic changes in the last decade. A growing concern with meaning replaced the discrete-point grammar focus of the grammar/translation classroom and the stimulus/response mechanism of the audio-lingual classrooms. The importance of meaningful language for the acquisition of a foreign language became recognized by researchers and teachers worldwide. With this new view in language acquisition, social interaction became a more popular issue in the context of language education. According to Kramsch (1987), functionally oriented, interactionally based foreign language education was the distinguishing characteristic of the 80s. She points out that foreign language education should be "socialization into and
literacy in a foreign language and culture" (p. 243). Hatch (1992) agrees with Kramsch and maintains that classroom interaction is the matrix for language acquisition.

**Linguistic competence versus communicative competence**

The advent of an interactionally-based concept to language instruction stimulated researchers to explore the relationship between the teaching of the discrete rules of the language and the actual use of these rules for communicative purposes. The results of this exploration led researchers to formulate a number of distinctions that would eventually have an impact on language teaching.

The first researcher to investigate the role of meaning in language classrooms was Hymes (1971). He examines Chomsky's formulation of linguistic competence, and realizes that in his conception of the real speaker-listener, Chomsky gives no account to social interaction. Hymes's concern with the integration of linguistic theory and theory of communication in language education triggered a number of researchers to investigate what was going on in language classrooms.

Krashen (1981) examines the distinction between conscious/formal learning and unconscious acquisition. He maintains that "language acquisition is more central than language learning in second language performance" (p. 101). He explains that language acquisition is a result of what is called *intake*, linguistic input that helps the learner acquire the language. In order to arrive at some definition of *intake*, Krashen examines the role of *caretaker* speech. He identifies caretaker speech as communication. Its purpose is not language teaching, rather "it is to convey messages and often to get the child to behave in a certain way" (p. 102). According to Krashen, caretaker speech is effective in promoting language acquisition.
Another distinction in language learning is formulated by Rivers (1983). She makes the distinction between skill-getting, the careful teaching of the language, and skill-using, opportunities for autonomous interaction. Rivers defines autonomous interaction as "messages that contain information of interest to speaker and listener in a situation of importance to both" (p. 4; Rivers, 1990). She maintains that second language learning should be expanded from skill-getting to skill-using through regular and frequent opportunities for autonomous interaction. Therefore, language instruction, from the earliest levels, should focus on situations where learners are given opportunities to use the language for the normal purposes of communication (p. 47). She recommends that autonomous interaction be incorporated into the language program as another vehicle to promote students' learning.

A third distinction is introduced by Savignon (1983). She explores the distinction between linguistic competence and communicative competence. Linguistic competence is understood as the command of the structural patterns as well as the sounds of the language. Communicative competence, on the other hand, is defined by Savignon as the "ability to function in a truly communicative setting" (p. 22). By investigating the distinction between linguistic and communicative competence, Savignon intended to examine the connection between the mastery of the language rules and the actual use of the language for communicative purposes.

In general terms, the researchers mentioned explored exactly the same issues in their studies: communicative versus instructional interaction. What sets them apart is the jargon each one adopts to address the different types of instruction. Apart from the terminological differences, all of them agree that in order to make acquisition of communicative language possible, it is necessary that classroom social conditions be
created to emphasize the socially appropriate use of the language in real communicative situations.

Conclusions

Despite the several controversies raised in the scenario of language education there is agreement among researchers that both linguistic and communicative skills are important elements in the process of acquiring a language. Andrews (1983) maintains that in the context of communicative language teaching, controlled practice of the language is still necessary for communicative purposes. He recommends, however, that controlled oral practice activities be modified so as to incorporate information gap and to ensure spoken interaction. Based on this suggestion, Andrews recognizes the breadth and depth of teaching ability required of the language teacher who wishes to teach communicatively (p. 133).

Kramsch (1987) points out that even in the communicative teaching context, mastery of the linguistic structures of the language is needed. She emphasizes that "the functional uses of the foreign language in various social contexts have to be taught, along with its structural properties" (p. 244). She believes that classroom verbal exchanges must be based on strategies that provide opportunities for the speakers to deal with the social and cultural aspects of the dialogues or polylogues. Strategies such as turn-taking, interrupting, gaining time, piggybacking each other's topic constitute some of the strategies Kramsch recommends to allow interaction and communication to proceed successfully. She concludes that traditional forms of teacher-student interaction promote communication that does not apply to the outside world. In addition, these forms of
communication "fail to socialize the learners into the natural verbal patterns of thought and behavior required by the new language and culture" (p. 246).

After observing samples of language classroom verbal exchanges, Kramsch concludes that the type of interaction promoted in language classrooms is what she calls "instructional interaction" (p. 245). By instructional interaction she means an asymmetric dialogue in which the teacher has entire control of the classroom talk, the topic, and the turns and repair tasks to direct the students. Johnson (1995) agrees with Kramsch in the issue of teacher control of classroom communication. She notes that teachers "retain this control through question-answer mode of interaction" (p. 9).

**Dominance in classroom discourse**

When learning a new language in a classroom environment, learners are introduced into a communication context in which norms of communication are traditionally determined by the teacher. The learner’s understanding of these norms is often based on the way they perceive and respond to the teacher’s teaching style, and their perceptions of what is appropriate in classroom communicative behavior.

Based on students’ perceptions of the patterns of communication in the classroom, Johnson (1995) arrives at the same conclusion as Cazden (1988) that classroom discourse is shaped by the teacher. The structure of classroom verbal exchanges follow a structured pattern. This pattern of act is commonly referred to as the IRE: an initiation act done by the teacher, a response act from the student, and an evaluation act from the teacher.
Student-student interaction

Although the underlying structure of classroom discourse is organized by teachers in the majority of language classroom settings, studies on students' communicative behavior in language classrooms show that effective learning occurs when there are frequent instances of student-student interaction (Wintergerst, 1994; Bouwhuis, 1995; and Johnson, 1995).

In a study conducted on second language classroom interaction, Wintergerst (1994) found that when students ask each other multiple questions, the responses tend to be more extended than when solicitations are made from the teacher. She reports that multiple solicitations in student-to-student solicitations produced higher mean extended student response than teacher-to-student solicitations. In the words of Wintergerst, "when more than one question was asked by a student of another student in one speaking turn, the answer given was longer than when more than one question was asked by a teacher of a student " (p. 85).

Johnson (1995) also considers student-student interaction an advantageous element in language learning. She hypothesizes that this pattern of interaction is likely to generate meaning-focused communication among students through a range of linguistic functions; to stimulate negotiation of meaning helping learners engage in planned and unplanned discourse; to provide opportunities for students to perform different roles in that interaction; and to help them initiate, control the discussion, and decide when to participate. Johnson emphasizes that "student-student interaction in second language classrooms will more than likely have a positive impact upon students' opportunities for both classroom learning and second language acquisition" (p. 128). Similarly, Bouwhuis
(1995) points out that "superior methods of teaching should involve far more interaction, which is not only feasible but also far more effective for learning" (p. 22).

Research on the role of interaction in second language classrooms reveals that teachers control "most of what is said and done in classrooms" (Johnson, 1995, p. 16). It is true that their use of solicitations facilitate interaction (Wintergerst, 1994). Nevertheless, researchers claim that the ideal model of classroom communication is the one that maximizes student-student interaction and prepares learners to participate in natural second language settings successfully.

**Communicative Language Teaching Research**

In general terms communicative language teaching identifies teaching as a way to achieve communicative competence (Johnson, 1981). Communicative competence is understood as "the underlying systems of knowledge and skill required for communication" (Canale, 1983, p. 5). It is precisely this goal of language teaching that differentiates communicative language teaching from more traditional approaches whose ultimate goal was structural competence. The shift of goals in the different language approaches has determined language interaction as one of the key elements for successful second language acquisition in the communicative classroom (Long, 1981).

The act of interacting is rather complex. It involves a number of skills far more complicated than producing structurally correct utterances (Johnson, 1981). Widdowson (1978), Breen and Candlin (1980), Johnson (1981), Canale (1983), and others agree that successful communication involves a number of conditions. The setting, topic, context, purpose, and information represent some of them. Information is specially important to communication because it involves an infinite number of signs (Savignon, 1983) of which
language represents just one of them. Other signs are related to the conceptual, socio-cultural, and affective contents of the message making the information tightly connected with the concept of meaning (Canale, 1983). In this view, information is not fixed, but in constant change, influenced by factors such as context of communication, choice of language forms and nonverbal behavior.

Social interaction is another characteristic of the communicative methodology. As Johnson (1981) points out, communication is a form of social interaction. Based on this assumption, it can be said that successful communication depends on a rapid formulation of utterances that are appropriate on several levels of language discourse.

The complexities of the communication act affect the teaching operation and generate interesting methodological problems. Viewed in light of the communicative approach, language teaching is a result of the perceived language needs of the students. This implies that student needs have great influence on the method of instruction and on the syllabus design if communicative goals are to be met (Johnson, 1981).

Keeping the learners' needs in mind, it is fair to say that the goal of the communicative language teaching approach is to help learners become linguistically and communicatively competent in the target language. One central issue then, is the method of instruction (Johnson & Morrow, 1981). Johnson (1981) claims that it is undoubtedly easier to reach communicative goals within a semantic framework. However, it is certainly possible to design a notional/functional course that is far from being communicative due to its methodology. Morrow (1981) points out that "a crucial feature of a communicative method will be that it operates with stretches of language above the sentence level, and operates with real language in real situations" (p. 61).

Morrow's claim that language be presented through structures just beyond the learner's current competence is originated in Krashen's input hypothesis (1981). Besides
the important role of simplified input to facilitate language acquisition, it is also
hypothesized that interaction is especially important for the process of acquiring a second
language (Long, 1981). The role of interaction was originated in the work of Long
(1981), and is referred to as the interaction hypothesis (Ellis, Tanaka & Yamazaki, 1994).

**Krashen's Input Hypothesis**

Production in second language happens only after comprehension takes place.
This was the conclusion of a number of researchers after investigating how second
language learners acquired linguistic competence to communicate (Asher, 1977; Krashen,
1985; and Di Pietro, 1987). Krashen's input hypothesis maintains that a condition for
second language acquisition is that the input be comprehensible (Krashen, 1992). By
comprehensibility Krashen means that the input be used within a context or situation, and
with the help of extralinguistic cues to provide the needed clues to meaning. In order for
this input to lead to acquisition, structures in the target language must be a little beyond
the learner's level of competence. Based on this hypothesis, the first step to language
proficiency is the focus on meaning. The *what is said* is then replaced by the *how it is said*
(Scarcella & Oxford, 1992). Nevertheless, Krashen explicitly states that the only
condition for the learners to obtain comprehensible input depends on the level of their
affective filter. These filters need to be low enough to allow the input in (Durkin, 1995).

Comprehensible input is an important element in second language development.
However, it does not represent the only condition for second language acquisition.
Modifications in the interactional structure of conversations are sensitive to
communication demands (Long, 1981), and can help make the input comprehensible to the
learner (Ellis, Tanaka, & Yamazaki, 1994).
Long's interaction hypothesis

Long (1981) was one of the researchers to question the importance of Krashen's comprehensible input. In his study of the conversational modifications involved in meaning negotiation, Long shows that second language acquisition is only possible through modified interaction regardless of the amount of comprehensible input learners receive. By modified interaction, Long means negotiation of meaning. Long observed that in order to communicate, learners make use of a number of devices to solve their communication problems. They make constant use of comprehension checks, confirmation checks, and clarification requests (Ellis, Tanaka, & Yamazaki, 1994).

Based on the interaction hypothesis, a necessary condition for second language acquisition is that learners use the input to interact and resolve communication difficulties through conversational modifications. Long makes a point that negotiation of meaning may be a key element to generate the type of interaction necessary for second language acquisition. He recommends that this can be achieved by increasing the opportunities for learner-learner interaction in the classroom, implying that the learner's role should be that of "active conversational participants" (Kramsch, 1987; Shrum & Glisan, 1994; Clifford, 1995; and Johnston & Milne, 1995), rather than passive input receivers in their process of acquiring a language.

Goals and learning tasks in communicative language teaching

The goals of a program are represented by the intentions that learning tasks aim to reveal (Nunan, 1992). These intentions can metaphorically represent connectors between
the task and the curriculum. Goals are generally broad. It means that often they are not explicitly stated, instead they can be inferred from an evaluation of the instructional tasks.

Researchers maintain that in trying to define instructional tasks, it is necessary that special attention be given to a number of conditions that underlie school tasks such as: the goals, the input, the activities, the roles of teachers and students, and student's work. According to Shavelson and Stern (1981), designing a learning task involves consideration of the content, the materials, the activities, the goals, the students and the social community or class as a whole. Doyle (1983), on the other hand, defines academic tasks in terms of the "general categories of cognitive operations that are involved in task accomplishment" (p. 162). Due to his interpretation of academic tasks, he focuses attention on three aspects of student's work when designing tasks: 1) the products students are to formulate; 2) the operations to be used to generate the product; and 3) the resources available to students to generate the product (p. 161). For Wright (1987), this same task would simply involve the input data and the directions on what to do with the data. In his opinion, outcomes should not be part of the design since these outcomes may differ from the teacher's expected goals. Therefore, goals correlate with a number of outcomes. Also, tasks may cover more than one single goal (Nunan, 1992).

The nature of classroom tasks determine student learning. These tasks direct student attention to the substantive objectives of the lesson (Bloome & Theodorou, 1988). Tasks involve a "social and communicative dimension" (p. 221). By that Bloome and Theodorou mean that even though some students do not react verbally to the task, they are expected to signal their participation to the teacher by showing some sort of involvement in the task.

Student engagement in learning tasks is one of the challenges that teachers are faced with in communicative language classrooms. Based on this statement, Met (1994)
recommends the use of tasks involving experiential, hands-on activities because these can make the input comprehensible to the students (p. 164). Also, experiences that allow for student-student interaction provide opportunities for language production as well as collaborative group activities (Johnson, 1995). By tailoring learning tasks to students’ real needs, teachers can contribute to students’ achievement of curriculum goals.

**Role of teachers and students in communicative classrooms**

Nunan (1992) defines *role* as "the part that learners and teachers are expected to play in carrying out learning tasks as well as the social and interpersonal relationships between the participants" (p. 79). Traditionally, the role of teachers was to direct instruction, set tasks, provide corrective feedback, while the students assumed a rather passive role. With the development of communicative language teaching, the roles of teachers and students were defined very differently from those determined by the traditional classrooms.

The learner became an active agent in the communicative classroom. In this approach to language learning, students are expected to negotiate meaning and contribute in the same proportion as they receive information (Richards & Rodgers, 1986). Furthermore, the nature of the activities leads students to learn independently (Dickinson, 1987), and be more reflective and critical learners (Nunan, 1992).

The role of teachers, on the other hand, had to be reshaped in accordance with the new philosophy of the communicative classroom to correspond to student’s role. They became facilitators of the communicative process, participants in the students' learning process, and observers and learners as well (Breen & Candlin, 1980).
Conceptually, the role of teachers and students in communicative settings become complementary. Each role is closely related to the other. This means that if students are provided with greater opportunities for self-initiated behavior in the classroom, teachers are required to adopt a different role, and adapt themselves to play a less dominant role during the instructional act (Nunan, 1992; Erust, 1994; Johnston & Milne, 1995; Clifford, 1995; and Durkin, 1995).

Classroom Interaction, Communication and Learning

Research on classroom interaction shows that teacher talk dominates verbal interaction in classrooms. The routine classroom interaction is characterized by the teacher as the focal point of this interaction. In addition, classroom interaction tends to involve the teacher and the individual student, and the teacher and the large group (Gayle, 1980; Kramsch, 1987; Oxford, 1990; and Johnston & Milne, 1995). Patterns of student-student interaction are representative in just a few instances of the total classroom discourse.

Communicative interchanges between teachers and students are organized to facilitate the acquisition of the content and to meet substantive objectives (Wilkinson, 1982). The source of variability in students' learning is the teacher. That means that the teacher decisions are an important component in creating the conditions for learning.

Research suggests that communication through language is crucial for learning (Wilkinson, 1982; Omaggio, 1986; Van Lier, 1988; Scarcella & Oxford, 1992; Durkin, 1995; and others). Through the interaction act of communication, educational objectives embedded in teaching and learning can be accomplished. According to Erickson (1982),
teachers can gain insight into what students know and do not know through direct questioning.

Cazden (1988) maintains that the goal of classroom discourse is that learners acquire the skill to communicate through practice to the point that performance is automatic. In order for this skill to be acquired, it is necessary that learners be given opportunities to display conversational initiative (Ernst, 1994; and Kinginger, 1994).

Van Lier (1988) agrees with the previously mentioned point that the interactional context of the classroom should be enriched, and emphasizes that the learner's conversational initiative is an important element for language acquisition because it implies attention, and attention is a prerequisite for all learning (Kinginger, 1994).

Investigation of a number of researchers on classroom discourse shows that classroom discourse is characterized by the teacher structuring, soliciting and reacting to student response. Students, on the other hand, "are mainly responsible for responding moves" (Wintergerst, 1994, p. 10). What several of these researchers concluded is that patterns of classroom interaction that accent learners' active participation in the instructional act are powerful tools to promote communication (Ernst, 1994; Clifford, 1995; Durkin, 1995; and Johnson, 1995). Such communicative exchanges allow students to apply what they have learned and grow in their language learning process.

New Literacy in Second Language Education

The linguistic, analytic approaches in language education did not succeed in preparing language learners to communicate in the target language. As a result, foreign language pedagogy began to adopt new objectives in language learning and advocate a new type of literacy in second language education (Kramsch, 1987; and Rosenbusch,
This new conception of language learning prompted researchers as well as educators to develop national standards for foreign language learning to ensure that students are prepared to communicate successfully in the increasingly pluralistic American society of the 21st century.

The movement towards creating standards for language learning started in 1993. In this year, four national language organizations (the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, the American Association of Teachers of German, the American Association of Teachers of French, and the American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese) received a grant to develop national standards for foreign language learning focusing on grades K through 12.

The task was undertaken by eleven members who were representative of a variety of languages, levels of instruction, program models and geographic regions. These members defined what students should know and be able to do in the foreign language. The goals identified by the task force for language proficiency do not describe the current scenario of foreign language education in the American language classrooms. Instead, they reflect the best instructional practice to achieve the five goal areas identified by the standards task force.

The five identified goal areas are: Communication, Cultures, Connections, Comparisons, and Communities. These goal areas encompass all the purposes and reasons that lead students to learn foreign languages. The five C's of foreign language education emphasize: communicating in the foreign language; gaining understanding of the target culture; establishing connections with additional bodies of knowledge; developing insight into the nature of language and the concept of culture through comparisons; and enabling students to participate in multilingual communities in and out of the classroom.
In the past, language teaching concentrated on the how, the grammar, and on the what, the vocabulary. These are indeed important components to language acquisition. Nevertheless, the current organizing principle for foreign language study is communication. When communication is added to the process of language learning, it is important to consider the why, the whom, and the when. "The ability to communicate in meaningful and appropriate ways with users of the other languages is the ultimate goal of today's foreign language classroom" (extracted from the Standards for Foreign Language Learning: Preparing for the 21st Century, 1996).

**Video-Based Instruction Research**

With the advent of the communicative approach, comprehension and its role in second language acquisition were given increased attention. As a consequence, oral language became the focus of most current approaches to teaching. Although traditional models of language are still in use in a number of language classrooms, there is visible effort, even by the most traditional educators, to recreate the target culture within the classroom boundaries.

Video-based instruction constitutes one of the resources incorporated into language classrooms to emphasize the oral target language and the target culture. In the words of Altman (1989), "video is extraordinarily well suited to display the connections between language and the real world upon which comprehension depends" (p. 8). Johnston and Milne (1995) agree with Altman and emphasize that "the video brings reality to the classroom" (p. 326). In addition, its audiovisual combination is beneficial for language acquisition because it provides students with a great deal of comprehensible input.
Through video-based instruction, input is made comprehensible via contextualization. The contextualizing capacity of this model of instruction is striking (Altman, 1989). A message expressed in a video segment brings a wide array of features that are extremely important for comprehension. Paralinguistic features, gestures, specific uses of words or utterances are displayed. These subtleties of communication are presented in the video as aids for comprehension, and they help learners perceive the reciprocal relationship between language and culture.

Based on a culturally related perspective, language is presented through three distinct levels of expression: oral language, written language and culture. Each level of expression originates separate linguistic aspects such as sounds, segmentation, semantics, syntax, systems of discourse and systems of culture (Altman, 1989, p. 4), that may impede comprehension if specific pedagogical activities are not devised. For instance, in order to understand words one needs to recognize specific sounds, be able to fragment the continuous flow of sound, and understand how individual words are used in the target culture. In order to help hearers decipher the linguistic aspects of the target language, teachers can devise activities to facilitate oral comprehension, vocabulary building, grammar work, and cultural awareness.

Because video-based instruction is sensitive to oral language and culture, students gain comprehension "through repeated recognition of the relationship between the oral and written versions of the target language and the target culture's apprehension of the real world" (Altman, 1989, p. 5). Herron and Hanley (1992) also maintain that through video-based instruction a contextually rich classroom environment can be created in which "the link between language and culture is easily recognized" (p. 419).

In summary, video-based instruction is a resourceful tool to be used in the language classroom. It can promote significant language and cultural gains for the
learners. In addition, video instruction allows learners to experience authentic examples of situations in the target language. It also helps create a meaningful classroom environment which enhances comprehension and retention of information which are necessary conditions for successful language acquisition.

**Advantages and disadvantages of video instruction**

**Advantages**

A number of studies (Omaggio, 1979; Herron & Hanley, 1992; Herron, 1994; and Johnston & Milne, 1995) have addressed the video as a valuable tool in the language classroom. There are a number of advantages to the use of this resource in promoting comprehension, infusing the classroom with culture, and creating better conditions for second language acquisition.

Dale (1969) in his analysis of the effectiveness of audiovisual materials points out some of their positive contributions in enhancing learning. He maintains that these materials heighten students' motivation for learning, provide freshness and variety, appeal to students of varied abilities, encourage active participation, give needed reinforcement, widen the range of student experience, assure order and continuity of thought, and improve the effectiveness of other materials.

Willis (1983) examines the characteristics of video and concludes that it is a versatile resource. Movies can be shown in black and white or color, with or without sound. Besides the versatility component, it is easily adaptable to be used by an individual student or a group of students. Willis also claims that videos are easily operated. The fact that they are easily manipulated represents an advantage specially for teachers. Teachers
can view the video segments and choose the ones to be presented to the students. This feature of the use of videos gives teachers greater control over the linguistic content to be taught.

Altman (1989) agrees with Willis on the control issue. He also points out that through the video it is possible for teachers to plan ahead, and establish connections between segments to facilitate comprehension and enhance retention. In addition, the combination of visual and aural channels permits the learners to have a reliable picture of the world associated with the target language.

According to Herron and Hanley (1992) through the video it is possible to present real-life cultural situations of the target culture, and make it easier for learners to understand cultural differences. Herron (1994) concludes that "video has the advantages of permitting students to witness authentic linguistic and cultural interactions between native speakers, and it is a medium with which students are very familiar" (p. 190).

Disadvantages

Willis (1983) and Ariew (1987) agree on the positive contributions video can make to learning. However, both admit that there are potential problems to the use of this instructional resource. Video instruction presents a number of disadvantages that can affect language learning directly, including lack of interactivity. Ariew claims that "video is a one-way medium" (p. 47). It reinforces the passive role of the learner and does not always provide opportunities for interaction, if teachers do not stimulate students to interact with the screen. Furthermore, video does not lend itself to develop reading and writing skills.
Altman (1989) recognizes that the video capabilities may not go beyond that of "enrichment" (p. 28) in the language classroom. He emphasizes that "the best learning will take place in programs where an integrated approach to the use of video materials complements an integrated approach to the overall process of language learning" (p. 28).

In short, as in all aids there are advantages and disadvantages that must be considered if successful learning is to be achieved. In order to be maximally used, video-based instruction should be adapted to the different levels of language proficiency in order to produce positive effects and yet reinforce learning. Careful preparation of the in-class use of this resource is required. With preparatory and follow-up activities the video use can become a powerful and integral part of the foreign language education program.

**Interaction and video instruction**

Willis (1983) emphasizes that the teacher's goal in video programs should be "to move the student from the observer/learner role towards the native/speaker participant role" (p. 23). Ariew (1987), on the other hand, points out that a disadvantage to the use of video programs is its non-interactive feature. In order to make the video viewing experience more profitable to the students, it is necessary that teachers recognize their roles in assuring more lively interaction between students and the video program.

Teachers play an important role when it comes to video instruction. They carry "the responsibility for activating aspects of video to which access is provided by no other situation" (Altman, 1989, p. 67). Therefore, they assume the position of "active mediators" (p. 67) between the students and the screen, providing for the necessary pauses, rewinds, comprehension checks, and comments. Stops in the scenes, and
questions about aspects of the situation can make the viewing more challenging and exciting to the students.

Besides challenge and excitement, pauses and comprehension checks can change the flow of the activity providing for variety. Regardless of the subject areas or the age group, variety represents an important element to maintain students' involvement in the instructional act. Video lends itself very well to variety. Options such as with or without sound, with or without image are combinations teachers can use as viewing strategies to enhance student participation in class and interaction with the video.

Altman (1989) concludes that "with a little imagination and forethought, instructors can assure through video a lively class period without abandoning any of the traditional goals of language teaching" (p. 68).

**Methods of Evaluation of Educational Programming Research**

Inquiry in program effectiveness consists in analyzing the teaching process as it functions in the classroom. Such examination can be done through an analysis of teacher-student interaction and through the developmental processes of learning (Gallagher & Aschner, 1969). As Gallagher and Aschner point out, "in analyzing these interaction sequences, it is possible to identify - and to describe - fruitful and fruitless teaching procedures in a way that has not been possible under the conventional pre-post test type of study" (p. 159).

The interest in teacher-student interaction patterns is not new. Interestingly, educational literature on evaluation of educational programs is full of instances in which great emphasis is given to product rather than to patterns of classroom interaction. It implies that children's achievement standing at the end of a given period of instruction.
determines the success of the program. This measurement often influences educational administrators in their decision to retain or reject an examined program. It is unfortunate that these decisions are seldom based on a detailed examination of the circumstances and the variables which may potentially affect their final conclusions (Gallagher & Aschner, 1969).

The drawbacks of evaluations whose primary focus is upon the product have attracted increasing attention to the use of teacher-student interaction investigation as an alternative method of program evaluation. Rogers (1969) in his studies of psychotherapy through the classifications of client and counselor interactions concludes that "it is the quality of the interpersonal encounter with the client which is the most significant element in determining effectiveness" (p. 297). It is true then, that the quality of personal interaction between teachers and students is the one element able to determine the extent of the learners' development and growth.

More specifically in educational settings, findings on the dimensions of the teaching process through the investigation of classroom interaction are quite similar to that expressed by Rogers (Flanders, 1960; Aschner, 1961; and Smith, 1961). As a result, instruments for measuring classroom interaction have become an option for researchers interested in assessing the role of teaching on learning. The first instruments to measure teacher-student interaction were developed in the early forties by Anderson (1943) and by Withall (1949). These instruments served as the basis for further seminal work in interaction analysis done by Flanders (1965).
The Anderson system

The first great influence in the area of interaction analysis was made by Anderson (1943). Anderson's category systems focused on the measurement of the affective climate of the classroom. Observations obtained through the Anderson system revealed that student behavior is directly affected by teacher behavior (Anderson, 1943). In his system, Anderson classified teacher behaviors into dominative and integrative. Dominative behavior is defined as the behavior that confines children's activities and leads to distracted, aggressive, noncooperative conduct (Sandefur & Bressler, 1982). Integrative behavior, on the other hand, aims at providing children with opportunities for self-initiated and cooperative behavior.

Anderson's study of preschool and elementary school children using this category system led him to substantial conclusions. First, teachers who promoted integrative behavior in the classroom encouraged problem solving, self-initiative, and spontaneous behaviors among the students. A further finding was that the teacher's dominative behavior generated students' behavior distracted from schoolwork. The conceptualization of teacher behaviors developed by Anderson was very influential to further work developed by Withall (1949), and later by Flanders (1965), Hough and Duncan (1970) and others.
The Withall system

In the late forties, Withall (1949) developed a system of classroom observation in which the teacher verbal behavior represented the index of the social climate in the classroom (Nelson, 1969). Social climate is understood by Withall as the "emotional tone" (cited in Sandefur & Bressler, 1982, p. 15) that accompanies interpersonal interaction. The Withall System, also known as Social-Emotional Climate Index utilizes seven categories to classify teacher verbal behavior. With this index, Withall was able to identify teacher verbal statements in a similar way as Anderson with his integrative-dominative (I-D) ratio.

The seven categories Withall utilized to analyze teacher verbal behavior were:

1. Learner-supportive statements that have the intent of reassuring or commending the pupil.

2. Acceptant and clarifying statements having an intent to convey to the pupil the feeling that he was understood and help him elucidate his ideas and feelings.

3. Problem-structuring statements or questions which proffer information or raise questions about the problem in an objective manner with intent to facilitate the learner’s problem solving.

4. Neutral statements which comprise polite formalities, administrative comments, verbatim repetition of something that has already been said. No intent inferable.

5. Directive or hortative statements with intent to have pupil follow a recommended course of action.

6. Reproving or deprecating remarks intended to deter pupil from continued indulgence in present "unacceptable" behavior.

7. Teacher self-supporting remarks intended to sustain or justify the teacher’s position or course of action (cited in Sandefur & Bressler, 1982, pp. 15-16).
Categories 1, 2, and 3 are classified as learner-centered. Categories 5, 6, and 7 are teacher-centered, and category 4 is neutral, meaning that it has no influence on either the learner or the teacher-centered group.

Withall's final conclusion using this observational system was that teacher statements are valid measures of the social-emotional climate of the groups. The Withall system served as preparatory research for Flanders and others in their attempts to analyze teacher behavior and group social climate.

The Flanders system of interaction analysis

Major contribution in interaction analysis was done by Flanders (1965). Utilizing Withall's scale, Flanders correlated teacher verbal behavior with students' responses and achievement through the analysis of emotional and physiological reactions to teaching processes (Nelson, 1969).

This system is represented by ten categories. Seven of these categories measure teacher verbal behavior, two concentrate on pupil talk and one is for silence or noise. The teacher-talk categories are divided into indirect influence on classroom climate and direct influence. Indirect influence emphasizes student participation through teacher questioning. Teacher direct influence, on the other hand, is mostly represented by teacher leadership in the teaching process resulting in inhibition of student initiative and student compliance.

Teacher-talk categories are divided as follows:

Indirect Influence Categories
1. Accepts pupil's feelings
2. Praises or encourages pupil
3. Accepts or uses pupil's ideas
4. Asks questions
Direct Influence Categories
5. Lectures
6. Gives directions
7. Criticizes and justifies authority (Flanders, 1965, p. 7).

Through this observational system, Flanders concluded that directive teacher behavior resulted in student hostility, withdrawal, apathy, aggressiveness, and emotional disintegration (Flanders, 1965), whereas indirect behavior promoted student integration, emotional adjustment and decreased interpersonal anxiety.

The Flanders System of Interaction Analysis has been widely used in classroom observation. Several researchers (Moskowitz, 1966; Amidon, 1967; and Hough & Duncan, 1970) have utilized, expanded and adapted this system for their specific purposes.

The Observational System of Instructional Analysis (OSIA)

The Observational System of Instructional Analysis, also known as OSiA, was developed by Hough and Duncan (1970). The OSIA system was developed with the purpose of describing and classifying the verbal and the nonverbal behaviors that characterize instructional behaviors in the classroom. Conceptually, this system allows teachers to code and classify behaviors through audio or videotaped records of classroom situations (p. 116), thus, helping educators evaluate whether the objectives set out have been actually accomplished.

The OSIA system has two main characteristics. "(1) It makes possible the classification of all events that occur in the classroom that are encompassed by the category system. This is the characteristic of inclusiveness. (2) These events can be categorized as falling into one and only one of the several categories of the classification
system. This is the characteristic of *mutually exclusive categories*" (Hough & Duncan, 1970, p. 117).

This classification system includes eleven categories of behaviors used by teachers and students during substantive and managerial activities. Substantive activities are those aimed at meeting the goals of instruction; whereas, managerial activities involve the instructional conditions through which substantive goals can be attained. In addition to these eleven categories of behavior, there are two additional categories. One to record instructionally nonfunctional behavior, and the other to indicate the occurrence of student-student interaction during student discussions.

Instructional behaviors by the OSiA system are classified as listed below.

- Clarification
- Response to solicitation
- Initiation of information
- Solicitation of response
- Corrective feedback
- Confirmation
- Acceptance
- Positive personal judgment
- Negative personal judgment
- Overt silence
- Covert silence
The first four behaviors may be classified as substantive and managerial. Through this system, behaviors are recorded on a five-second interval, which allows for a detailed, descriptive and objective record of the classroom instructional strategies.

**OSIA studies on solicitations and responses in second language settings**

The frequency and types of teacher and student behaviors have been tabulated before. Some techniques have been developed to describe subject matter content, others to analyze the social-emotional climate of the classroom (Withall, 1949). The OSIA system, developed by Hough and Duncan (1970), is a relevant instrument in this study since its categories of behaviors are used to describe instructional strategies and tactics permitting the analysis and evaluation of the quality of teaching.

Shrum (1985) has conducted studies using Hough and Duncan's OSIA in her analyses. In her first study, Shrum described the length of wait-time, the pause teachers and students use to think after solicitations and responses, and student performance level in selected first-year high school Spanish and French classes. Findings relevant to the present study showed that teachers made most of the solicitations (94%) that required some form of response from students. Solicitations from students occurred most often when they requested clarification (53%). It was also noted that students made most of the responses (89%). Wait-time occurred after 94% of the solicitations. The mean post-solicitation wait-time was 1.91 seconds, and the mean post-response wait-time was 0.73 seconds. Her findings indicated that wait-time was longer in second language classes than it was in science classes reported by Rowe (1974). For the different levels of performance, Shrum found that wait-time following teacher solicitations was 2.69 seconds for high performers, 1.87 seconds for average performers, and 2.18 for low performers.
Her conclusions indicate that neither post-solicitation wait-time nor post-response wait-time were of sufficient length to allow for thoughtful cognitive processing in first-year high school language classes.

In her second study, Shrum (1985) examined wait-time and the use of target and native languages in first-year high school language classes. Her findings in length of wait-time after solicitations and responses were similar to the ones reported in her previous study. Another finding showed that students required longer periods of time after native language solicitations opposed to solicitations in the target language. A question posed by the researcher was whether teachers ask more thought provoking questions in the native language compared to those in the target language.

**Summary**

The literature reviewed in this chapter is divided into four main areas: patterns of interaction research, communicative language teaching research, video-based instruction research, and methods of evaluation of educational programming research.

The review puts greater emphasis on two areas: patterns of interaction research and communicative language teaching research. The primary reason is that patterns of language interaction represents the central theme of this study. Research on language interaction indicates that indirect teaching and increased instances of student-student interaction produce better results in students' performance and in second language acquisition. It is hypothesized that the more interaction and communication in the classroom, the more engagement in learning tasks and language development students are likely to experience. It is also shown that interaction is an important component in the communicative language teaching approach. This approach agrees with indirect teaching.
It emphasizes the role of the learner as a negotiator and an active agent in the communicative classroom. As a result, the teacher needs to adapt herself/himself to the new role of the students. In communicative language teaching settings, the teacher becomes a facilitator of the communicative process, a participant in the students' learning process, as well as an observer of the learner. The purpose of the reshaping of roles for students and teachers express the effort to highlight the students' needs in the learning process. In this new focus to language learning, communication and comprehension play a fundamental role. These are viewed as prerequisites for language learning in the new kind of literacy in a second language. As a result, national standards for foreign language education have been developed. These standards emphasize that efforts be made to enhance students' comprehension and communicative/interactive skills of the target language. From a linguistic perspective, these standards advocate that learners should be prepared so that they can participate successfully in the pluralistic American society and abroad.

In the area of video-based instruction, it is found that video in the language classroom is a resourceful device to facilitate the learners' comprehension process. The advantages to the use of this mode of instruction outnumber its disadvantages. Studies done in this area show that this resource constitutes a powerful medium for the authentic linguistic aspects of the target language and cultural interactions. Besides, it creates a contextually rich classroom environment upon which comprehension depends. There are still a number of questions related to the role of visual materials in language comprehension that remain unanswered. It seems then, that there is still need for research to examine the possible contributions of these instructional resources to second language acquisition.
Finally, research done on methods of evaluation of educational programming since
the early 40s show that systematic observation of classroom instructional behavior
provides descriptive information that helps educators analyze and evaluate instructional
strategies and instructional behaviors in the classroom. The methods of evaluation
presented in this review have been adopted in recent research for the analysis of classroom
verbal and nonverbal behavior (Moskowitz, 1976; Freeman & Richards, 1993; Ernst,
1994; Herron, 1994; Wintergerst, 1994; Johnston & Milne, 1995; Johnson, 1995; and
others). The use of the different techniques of instruction analysis aims at reshaping
instructional strategies and behavior to promote effective instruction.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Population

The population for the proposed study consisted of all language interaction behaviors of teachers and students in a video-based foreign language program and those in elementary language classes whose instruction resulted from the instructional video selections. The population of interaction behaviors described in the two sources of data served as data for the examination of patterns of communication (amount of teacher and student talk) in the language video program and in the elementary language classes.

Description of interaction behaviors in the video language program consisted of the examination of the verbal and nonverbal behaviors of the video teacher and her students as they interact in the video lessons. The language video program named Elementary Language Fundamentals (ELF) was developed in 1988 by a group of language teachers with the purpose of exposing elementary age students to the study of foreign languages and other cultures. ELF is exclusively an audiolingual language program designed to emphasize listening and speaking skills in the target language (Appendix C).

Interaction behaviors in the elementary language classes were captured by videotaping four samples of each grade level, K through five in two rural elementary schools. A total of 24 groups of language learners K through five were videotaped over a four-week period on one occasion each. A desensitizing videotaping session was administered for each group prior to the actual data collection videotapings. The schedule for the desensitizing videotaping sessions and data collection is presented in Appendix D.
The purpose of the desensitizing videotaping sessions was: 1) to ensure that proper procedures for data collection were used during the videotapings; 2) to allow the children to familiarize themselves with the presence of the researcher and the video camera in the classrooms; and 3) to reduce the likelihood of students' disruptive behavior as a result of the presence of the researcher and the video camera in the classroom. Placement of camera in the different classrooms, and manipulation of the equipment were important considerations to be made prior to the actual collection of data.

Language learners in the two targeted schools had been exposed to ELF at least two years prior to the present study. Language classes were offered to each group for 20 minutes a week during approximately 10 weeks. Classes were taught by student aides from a state-supported university in Southeastern United States majoring in Curriculum and Instruction with a specialization in foreign languages.

Sample Selection

The entire population of interaction behaviors of teachers and students in the language video program and in the elementary language classes constituted the sample of the study. The general approach to describe the interaction behaviors in the two sources of data was based on The Observational System for Instructional Analysis (OSIA) developed by Hough and Duncan (1970). The system allows for the description and analysis of instructional activities and tactics.

The 25 language episodes of the ELF video program were used for the study. Classroom talk in the 25 video lessons was coded using the OSIA system. In addition, classroom verbal and nonverbal interaction behaviors in the 24 elementary live language groups were examined. Classroom interaction behaviors were also coded using the OSIA
system. Amount of teacher and student talk was examined based on the occurrence of solicitation and response interaction behaviors found in the two sources of data.

**Research Design**

The study is a descriptive analysis of the verbal and nonverbal interaction behaviors of teachers and students in a video-based language program and in live elementary language classes. The analysis also includes examination of how these interaction patterns shaped patterns of communication, specifically amount of teacher and student talk, in the two sources of data.

In order to describe the predominant types of interaction behaviors in the two sources of data, a descriptive analysis of the overall features of instruction in the video program and in the live classrooms was necessary. This analysis constituted the first phase of the study. Instruction in the two sources was observed prior to the actual coding of behaviors. The observations focused on the examination of the structure of the classes, instructional strategies, lesson design and lesson content. After this phase was completed, the researcher initiated the coding of teacher and student behaviors in the video lessons and in the live classroom lessons. This phase involved coding the video-taped records of teachers and students' behaviors in the two data sources using the OSIA system. The OSIA is a classification system composed of eleven functional categories used to describe and analyze instructional strategies in native language (L1) classrooms. Behaviors were coded every five seconds permitting the researcher to observe major shifts of behavior during the instructional act in the video lessons and in the classroom settings.
Variables

The variable of interest in the present study was interaction behaviors of teacher and students in a video language program and in live elementary level Spanish classes that used the video-based instruction. The variable interaction behaviors of teachers and students was examined from two perspectives. The first perspective focused on the description of the most predominant types of interaction behaviors in the two sources of data. The second examined the effect of the amount of solicitations and responses on specific patterns of communication, amount of teacher and student talk, in the video program and in the elementary language classes. The variable was not manipulated. Interaction behaviors were described and analyzed as they occurred in the video program and in the classroom settings.

Interaction behaviors in the video program were examined focusing on interaction behaviors between the video teacher and video students, interaction behaviors among video students, and behaviors between video teacher and classroom students. Interaction behaviors in the live classroom settings were analyzed through interaction between video teacher and classroom students, interaction between language teachers and classroom students, and interaction among classroom students. Therefore, language interaction is represented by two variables: video interaction and classroom interaction.

The variable, video interaction, is represented by two elements, the video teacher and the video students. The variable, live classroom interaction, involves four elements: the classroom teacher, the classroom student, the language teacher or language consultant and the video teacher. Interaction behaviors between all these elements were analyzed using the behavior category system proposed by The Observational System for Instructional Analysis (Hough & Duncan, 1970). The categories include: clarification,
response, initiation, solicitation, corrective feedback, confirmation, acceptance, positive personal judgment, negative personal judgment, overt silence and covert silence from the teacher and the student perspective. Table 1 presents the classification of behaviors according to OSIA and the symbols pertinent to the identification of teacher and student behaviors.

Solicitations and responses of teachers and students in the form of manipulatives were also considered. Manipulatives involved the use of audio tapes, flashcards, puppets, the blackboard or any resource in connection with the video program. Student responses were examined in terms of individual and whole group responses to the teacher and/or another student solicitation.

In summary, the focus of the study was interaction behaviors of teacher and students in two sources of data: a language video program and live language classrooms. Interaction behaviors were described in terms of video program interaction and live classroom interaction. The variable, video interaction, was represented by two elements, the video teacher and the video students. The elements of the variable, live classroom interaction, were the classroom teacher, the classroom students, the language teachers, and the video teacher. Manipulatives in teacher and student solicitations and responses were the use of audio tapes, flashcards, puppets, the blackboard or other devices. Finally, individual and whole group behavior were described as they occurred in the video segments and in the live classroom settings.
Table 1. The OSIA categories and codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher-behavior symbols</th>
<th>Behaviors</th>
<th>Student-behavior symbols</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Substantive clarification</td>
<td>S1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>S2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>S3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>Solicitation</td>
<td>S4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>Corrective feedback</td>
<td>S5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>Confirmation</td>
<td>S6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>S7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>Positive judgment</td>
<td>S8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T9</td>
<td>Negative judgment</td>
<td>S9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T10</td>
<td>Managerial clarification</td>
<td>S10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T11</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>S11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T12</td>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>S12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T13</td>
<td>Solicitation</td>
<td>S13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T14</td>
<td>Silence Covert</td>
<td>S14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T15</td>
<td>Silence Overt</td>
<td>S15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Nonfunctional behavior</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Interaction separation designation</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Hough & Duncan, 1970, p. 130)
Instrumentation

The Observational System for Instructional Analysis (Hough & Duncan, 1970) was used as the method of analysis of instructional strategies and behaviors. The OSIA system was chosen because, unlike other techniques for the analysis of classroom instructional behavior, it involves categories that describe chains of interactions which are very typical in classrooms.

The system contains a total of thirteen categories of behavior. Eleven of these categories refer to instructional behaviors used by teachers and students during substantive and managerial activities. Substantive activities are those aimed at meeting the goals of instruction, and managerial activities relate to the conditions through which substantive goals are achieved. Two additional categories concernInstructionally nonfunctional behavior and student-student interaction during student discussions.

The Observational System of Instructional Analysis is a unique system in its characteristics. Due to its inclusiveness feature, it allows for the classification of all events that occur during the instructional act. In addition, because of its exclusive categories, events are categorized as only one of the various categories of the classification system.

This system allows for very sophisticated classification of instructional events. It makes it possible for the researcher to evaluate the level of thought processes being used by the teacher and students. For the purpose of the present study, behaviors related to level of thought processes are not classified. A description of interaction behaviors based on the OSIA basic system suffices. In addition, the study only takes into consideration substantive behaviors in the two sources of data.

A description of the basic behaviors that are classified by The Observational System of Instructional Analysis developed by Hough and Duncan (1970) is presented
below: The categories initiation of information and covert silent were modified to fit the context of the study. The original version of the OSIA system can be found in Appendix E.

*Categories of The Observational System of Instructional Analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Clarification</td>
<td>This is a responsive behavior aimed at clarifying the meaning of the behavior. It is used to help the person who emitted the behavior become more aware of his own behavior or understand the meaning or implication of his own behavior, or to help the person responding to the behavior, or some other person observing the behavior, understand the meaning or implication of the behavior (Hough and Duncan, 1970, p. 120)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Response to Solicitation</td>
<td>This category includes all behaviors of teachers and students that are a valid response to questions, directions, or commands. Responses can be verbal or nonverbal (p. 122).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Initiation of Information</td>
<td>It involves all behaviors of teachers and students that involve the initiation of knowledge of the language or the target culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Solicitation</td>
<td>This category includes all the verbal and nonverbal behaviors of teachers and students used with the purpose of inviting another person to say or do something, except for solicitations of clarification (p. 124).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Corrective Feedback</td>
<td>It is restricted to responses to statements considered incorrect or inappropriate by commonly accepted definition, custom, convention, or some form of empirical verification (p. 124).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Confirmation</td>
<td>It indicates that the behavior is correct or appropriate. Confirmation can be expressed verbally or nonverbally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>Whether emitted by the teacher or student, this category simply implies that one part accepts the other part to hold a different point of view. This behavior contains no explicit value judgment (p. 126).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Positive Personal Judgment</td>
<td>This category includes behaviors with a positive value connotation that praise, reward, or give encouragement (p.126).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Negative Personal Judgment</td>
<td>It involves negative value connotations which criticize or reject ideas, feelings, or behaviors of others. Jokes and sarcasm are included in this category (p. 127).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Silence Covert</td>
<td>Periods of silence in the classroom due to recognition or recalling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Silence Overt</td>
<td>This is an observable nonverbal behavior characterized by lasting longer than five seconds, such as student doing a reading assignment. It is also used to categorize situations when a number of people talk and no one is the center of focus (p. 128).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Instructionally Nonfunctional Behavior</td>
<td>Instances of teacher and student behavior that are not related to instruction or classroom management, such as when someone comes in the classroom (p. 129).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This is considered a notation (symbol) rather than a category. It is used to categorize student/student interaction or teacher/teacher interaction (p. 129).

In addition to the OSIA system, a descriptive analysis of instruction in the video program and in the classroom settings was done as supporting data for the description of language interaction between teachers and students in the two sources of data examined. The study included primarily, examination of the structure of the video program, and observation of the videotaped classes from the perspective of instructional strategies, lesson design and lesson content. These observations are documented and reported in Appendix F.

In order to conduct the study, the researcher used the Informed Consent Form (Appendix G) to assure that permission of teachers, parents and students was given for the collection of the data.

Data Collection

Data from the ELF program were collected through the observation and coding of the instructional events in the 25 video lessons. Observation of the video lessons served as background knowledge for the examination of patterns of interaction. Coding of interaction behaviors in ELF involved recording all teacher and student behaviors as they interacted in the video lessons in a five-second interval using the OSIA system. According to this system, within a one-minute period, at least 12 symbols can be recorded. Considering that each video lesson lasts approximately 15 minutes, a total of 3,269 behaviors were recorded.
Data from the language classroom settings were obtained through the videotaping, observation and coding of 24 Spanish classes taught in grades K through five in two rural elementary schools. The groups were videotaped for 20 minutes each on one occasion during a four-week period. All videotapings were observed. Classroom behaviors were coded using the OSIA system. A total population of 3,223 separate behaviors were recorded by the end of the four-week videotaping period. The videotapings for data collection followed a desensitizing videotaping session that was conducted in all groups in both schools.

A log was kept for all observations (Appendix H), both of the video program and the language classes, in order to provide anecdotal evidence that enabled the researcher to answer the following questions: What was the organizational structure of the developing lesson as reflected in the tasks, content and opportunities for language interaction?; How did the classroom teacher, language teacher and video teacher signal the requirements for language interaction to classroom students and video students?; and What did the actions of classroom students and video students indicate about their understanding of task, content and social requirements? Coding of the instructional behaviors helped in the examination of amount of teacher and student talk in the two sources of data.
Validity and Reliability

The categories of behavior represented in The Observational System for Instructional Analysis establish its face validity and its use in an elementary second language setting. In order to demonstrate construct validity, a typescript of 100 isolated unambiguous events (Appendix I) were selected and compared against the judgments of a criterion observer. The criterion observer in the present study was Professor Judith L. Shrum, who has utilized this instrument in three studies in second language classrooms. Scott's (1955) coefficient was used to determine inter-coder agreement. Agreement between the researcher's and the criterion observer's coded data reached a \( \pi \) value of 0.89.

To ensure observer reliability, the researcher utilized agreement on codings of unambiguous videotaped events done after the end of the training period on the use of the OSIA and upon termination of coding of all behaviors in the video program and in the classroom settings. An interobserver reliability coefficient of \( \pi = 0.88 \) was established between the two samples of coded data. Calculation on Scott's (1955) coefficients for inter-coder and intracoder agreement is found in Appendix J.

Observer drift represented an additional threat to reliability. Observer drift refers to the inclination of an observer/coder to change selections from one code to another when a large amount of data is coded over a period of time. A total of \( N = 6,492 \) interaction behaviors were coded in the video program and in the classroom settings over a four-week period. In order to prevent observer drift, a segment with 100 isolated unambiguous events was selected and coded on two occasions: at the beginning of the data coding process and at the end of the process, when all the data had been collected and coded. Agreement of 88% was found between the first and the second coding.
Finally, phenomenal validity constituted a validity concern in the present study. In the context of the study, phenomenal validity referred to the degree to which an event was perceived by the observer/coder. The general approach involved coding only the dominant behavior when two or more behaviors occurred simultaneously. Dominant behaviors were interpreted as the loudest behaviors occurring in a five-second interval.

**Data Analysis**

The data were analyzed according to the general research questions: 1) What are the predominant types of interaction behaviors in a language video program? 2) What are the types of teacher and student interaction features that result from using the instructional video selections in elementary language classrooms?; and 3) How do the identified interaction behaviors in the video program and in the classroom settings shape patterns of communication (amount of teacher and student talk) in the two sources of data?

Interaction behaviors in the video program and in the language classes were analyzed by qualitative analysis. The data consisted of notes from observations of the video lessons and videotaped language classes, and coded behaviors using the OSIA system. Observations of ELF included the analysis of: 1) students' level of cognitive functioning based on their responses; 2) video teacher's teaching style; 3) amount of wait-time between solicitations and responses; 4) types of video teacher's solicitations; 5) amount of teacher and student talk in the video lessons; and 6) incidence of teacher interaction towards group and individual students.

Observations of classroom settings included: 1) the analysis of the amount of teacher and student talk; 2) the lack of student individualization due to the scarce number of contact hours; and 3) the amount of time the video program was used in the language
classes. By coding all instructional behaviors using the OSIA system, it was possible to describe and analyze the types of behaviors (teacher and student solicitation, teacher and student response) that were predominant in the video program as well as in the classroom settings, and to examine how the identified patterns of interaction shaped patterns of communication (amount of teacher and student talk) in the two sources of data.

Data described include: 1) all teacher and student behaviors recorded from the two sources of data; 2) amount of teacher talk and amount of student talk in the video program and in the classroom settings; and 3) classroom strategies used by language consultants to stimulate interaction during video viewing.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Introduction

The present study was designed to consider the following questions: 1) What are the predominant types of interaction behaviors in a language video program?, 2) What are the types of teacher and student interaction features that result from using the instructional video selections in elementary language classrooms?, and 3) How do the identified interaction behaviors in the video program and in the classroom settings shape patterns of communication (amount of teacher and student talk) in the two sources of data? In order to describe the predominant types of interaction behaviors in the two sources of data examined, the researcher coded all the verbal and nonverbal behaviors of teachers and students during the instructional act. The Observational System for Instructional Analysis (OSIA) was used for the identification and description of these behaviors.

This chapter presents a detailed description of the types of interaction behaviors encountered in the language video program. Data on the amount of teacher and student talk in the video lessons are also presented. In addition, interaction features used by teachers and learners in live classroom settings are described. Strategies used by live classroom teachers to stimulate interaction during video viewing and amount of teacher and student talk in live classroom settings are discussed. The chapter closes with general conclusions on the two sources of data examined.
Interaction Behaviors in ELF

In this study, the description of interaction behaviors relied on two sources of data: the language video program and live elementary Spanish classes that used the video instruction. The analysis of interaction behaviors in the video program was done by examining the verbal and nonverbal behaviors of the teacher and her students in the 25 video lessons. The description of interaction behaviors in live elementary language classrooms was done through the analysis of videotapings of 24 live elementary level Spanish classes of grades K through five.

This section presents the findings obtained from the analysis of interaction behaviors in the ELF video program using The Observational System for Instructional Analysis (OSIA). An overview of the findings for all types of interaction behaviors found in the video program is presented. A description of the most predominant interaction behaviors from the perspective of teacher and student behaviors in ELF is then included. The amount of teacher and student talk in the ELF program is also discussed. This section closes with a summary of the findings on interaction behaviors in the ELF program.

Overview of findings in ELF

One of the concerns of the study was to describe the types of interaction behaviors in a language video program. The videotaped lessons of the ELF program contained a total of N=3,269 behaviors, including video teacher behaviors and video student behaviors, that were coded using the OSIA system. The types of behaviors that were most predominant in the video program were of particular interest in the study. Nevertheless, behaviors with low or no frequency were also reported.
Examination of the video teacher behaviors showed that the most common behavior in ELF was *initiation of information*. This behavior accounted for 39% (n=1,266) of the total number of behaviors in the video program. Initiation of information was followed by *solicitation of response*. Occurrences of soliciting behaviors counted for 33% (n=1,082) in the total number of behaviors observed. The third most predominant teacher behavior in ELF was *response to solicitation*. This behavior occurred in 9.3% (n=305) of the total classroom behavior. The fourth most common teacher behavior was *positive personal judgment* which counted for 3.3% (n=108) of the total occurrence of behaviors. *Confirmation* ranked fifth most predominant teacher behavior in ELF. It occurred in 1.2% (n=38) of the total occurrence of classroom events. Teacher behaviors such as: *clarification, corrective feedback, acceptance, and silent covert* took place in less than 1% of the total occurrence of behaviors. Finally, *negative personal judgment* and *silent overt* did not occur in any instances of the video teacher behaviors in the language video program. Table 2 presents a detailed summary of the types of interaction patterns, from most to least predominant, in ELF and their occurrences in the video lessons from the perspective of teacher behaviors.

Student behaviors were represented by only one category of OSIA in the ELF video lessons. *Response to solicitation* appeared 331 times in the video lessons, representing 9.8% of the total occurrence of behaviors in the video program. All the other categories had 0% of occurrence. Table 3 presents the data on interaction behaviors from the perspective of student behaviors in the ELF program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentages/Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Initiation of Information</td>
<td>39% - (n=1,266)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Solicitation of Response</td>
<td>33% - (n=1,082)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Response to Solicitation</td>
<td>9.3% - (n=305)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Positive Personal Judgment</td>
<td>3.3% - (n=108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Confirmation</td>
<td>1.2% - (n=38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Clarification</td>
<td>.4% - (n=13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Silent Covert</td>
<td>3% - (n=9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Corrective Feedback</td>
<td>.15% - (n=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Acceptance</td>
<td>.06% - (n=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Negative Personal Judgment</td>
<td>0% - (n=0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Silent Overt</td>
<td>0% - (n=0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Teacher Talk</strong></td>
<td><strong>86.71%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Percentages and occurrences of student behaviors in ELF using OSIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Percentages/Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Response to Solicitation</td>
<td>9.8% - (n=331)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Clarification</td>
<td>0% - (n=0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Initiation of Information</td>
<td>0% - (n=0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Solicitation of Response</td>
<td>0% - (n=0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Corrective Feedback</td>
<td>0% - (n=0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Confirmation</td>
<td>0% - (n=0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Acceptance</td>
<td>0% - (n=0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Positive Personal Judgment</td>
<td>0% - (n=0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Negative Personal Judgment</td>
<td>0% - (n=0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Silent Covert</td>
<td>0% - (n=0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Silent Overt</td>
<td>0% - (n=0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Student Talk</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.8%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the category of Other Behaviors, results show that there are no instances of instructionally nonfunctional behavior in the video lessons. Table 4 presents the data for Other Behaviors in the ELF program.

Table 4. Percentages and occurrences of other behaviors in ELF using OSIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentages/Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Instructionally Nonfunctional</td>
<td>0% - (n=0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Interaction Separation Designation</td>
<td>0% - (n=0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Other Behaviors</strong></td>
<td><strong>0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The percentages and occurrences of teacher and student behaviors through the analysis of each individual behavior permitted determination of the most predominant teacher and student behaviors encountered in the video program. From the perspective of teacher behaviors, the three most predominant behaviors analyzed in the following section are: 1) initiation of information, 2) solicitation of response, and 3) response to solicitation. The only student behavior observed in the video lessons was response to solicitation.

Teacher behaviors

Initiation of information

As reported in the preceding subsection, initiation of information was found to be the most prevalent type of teacher behavior in the video lessons of the ELF program. This category involved all instances of factual information provided by the teacher that was related to the goals of instruction. Information the video teacher initiated verbally or nonverbally, or by means of visual symbols were coded under initiation of information. For instance, instances related to the cultural aspects of the target culture in the video lessons were classified as initiation of information, because there was no tentative interaction between the video teacher and the students. The video teacher used that portion of the lesson to demonstrate peculiarities of the target culture without aiming at communication. In addition, demonstrations on the chalk board were also classified under this category.

One component in determining the high incidence of teacher-initiated information was because the content of ELF is primarily cultural. As a result of this culture-oriented fashion of language instruction, long intervals were devoted to the description of aspects
of the target culture, which in turn increased considerably the occurrence of teacher initiation of information. An analysis of the coded behaviors in the different video lessons showed that the greater incidence of initiation of information occurred towards the end of each video lesson. It coincided perfectly with the cultural segments which were systematically presented at the end of each video episode.

**Solicitation of response**

Teacher solicitation of response data reported showed that this category of behavior was the second most predominant type of teacher interaction behavior in the video lessons. Soliciting behaviors were represented by the video teacher’s questions, directions or commands. These were all behaviors that called for student response, or that invited learners to react either verbally or nonverbally to the solicitations of the teacher.

There was 33% occurrence of soliciting behaviors from the video teacher. Solicitations took varied forms in ELF. The highest incidence of soliciting behaviors was teacher’s questioning. The second form of solicitation was expressed through the use of gestures.

**Questioning.**

The video teacher made frequent use of questioning strategies to provoke students’ reaction or response. The majority of the questions were at the level of identification and comprehension of material. In other words, most of the solicitations in the form of questions required “Yes/No” answers, or single-word responses. For instance, solicitations such as: "¿Cómo están hoy?" or "¿Cómo se dice "no"?" typify these types of
solicitations. Solicitations appeared in the native language and in the target language as well. Approximately 60% (N= 325) of the solicitations in the form of questions appeared in the target language. The other forms of solicitations such as directions and commands were most commonly used in the native language. Table 5 provides some samples of the types of teacher solicitations found in the video program.

Table 5. Samples of Yes/No/One word and information questions in the native and target language in ELF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native Language</th>
<th>Target Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y/N/iW Questions</td>
<td>Information Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you know what a <em>lavandería</em> is?</td>
<td>¿Tienes sed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who can remember how you say I like?</td>
<td>¿Te gusta la falda blanca?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you want to come with me?</td>
<td>What am I doing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does this feel better?</td>
<td>How do I say that I like to go by plane?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key
Y = Yes
N = No
IW = Questions that required one word response
Another soliciting strategy the video teacher explored was the use of gestures. Hand gestures and head movements were some of the common types of nonverbal solicitation the video teacher used to encourage students' response or reaction. Instances of nonverbal solicitation were represented in games that emphasized Total Physical Response (TPR) (Asher, 1977) such as "Simon dice", as well as in activities that reinforced the use of choral repetition.

Response to solicitation

Response to solicitation was found to be the third most predominant type of interaction in the ELF language video program. There was a total of n=305 instances of teacher's response to solicitation in the video lessons. Therefore, this category of behavior represented 9.3% of the total discourse of the program. Response to solicitation encompassed all responses to solicitations done through verbal and nonverbal reaction of the responder. Information provided verbally or by means of demonstrations or gestures, such as pointing to objects or using physical demonstrations (mimicry), was coded as response to solicitation using the OSIA system.

Analysis of the data alone, 9.3% occurrence of teacher's response to solicitation, can lead to the conclusion that student solicitation of response (student questions to the teacher) accounted for roughly 10% of the total discourse in ELF. This, in fact, is a misleading inference to make. It was found that out of the 305 responses, 195 were provided by the video teacher as responses to her own solicitations. That is, the behavior teacher response to solicitation was followed by teacher solicitation of response in 195
instances out of 305 occurrences of response of solicitation. It suggested that 64% of the total occurrence of teacher response to solicitation was provided by the video teacher herself. The remaining 36% occurrence of teacher response to solicitation was actually repetition of teacher responses or repetition of student responses. For instance,

Video Teacher: ¿Cómo están hoy?
Video Teacher: ¿Bien?
Video Teacher: ¡Bien!

That led to the final conclusion that there were zero instances of teacher response to solicitation as a result of student solicitation of response. The graph in Figure 1 summarizes the data on teacher behaviors.

![Category of Teacher Behavior](image.png)

Figure 1. Bar graph of percentages of predominant types of teacher behaviors in ELF
Student behaviors

Response to solicitation

From the perspective of student behavior, results showed that response to solicitation was the only category from the OSIA system present in the video lessons. This category represented 9.8% of the total discourse in the program. Students responded to teacher solicitations in n=331 instances. All types of student responses manifested both verbally and nonverbally were coded under the category, response to solicitation. This type of behavior also applied to whole group response in the analysis of student behaviors. Whole group response was found to be the most prevalent type of student response in the overall video lessons.

The evaluation of student responses showed that in great part whole group responses (n= 289) predominated compared to individual responses. Indeed, the video lessons were structured in a way to put stronger emphasis on group response as a strategy to stimulate student behavior, rather than focusing on individual student responses. There were few instances of individual student responses (n=42). These behaviors commonly occurred when students were called on to formulate a response to a solicitation individually. Nevertheless, even in these cases there was clear attempt to promote groupism, and to encourage responses in unison. For instance,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Video Teacher:</th>
<th>Video Students:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>¡Qué clase más inteligente! Who can remember how to say &quot;I like&quot;? if I ask ¿Te gustan las fresas?</td>
<td>Si (several head nods)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si, me gustan las fresas. Angela will come up here and help me a little (turning to Angela). ¿Te gusta el melocotón? (teacher makes gestures to stimulate whole group to respond).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Students:</td>
<td>Si, me gusta.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Amount of teacher talk versus amount of student talk in ELF

The proportion of time during which the teacher controlled speech in the video lessons was approximately nine times higher than the amount of student talk time. Teacher talk accounted for 86.71% of the total classroom talk time, whereas student talk was represented by 9.8% of the same sum. Therefore, the total amount of talk in the video program was of 96.51%. The remaining 3.49% was used on instructional songs. Table 6 presents the percentages of the total classroom talk in ELF.

Table 6. Percentages of amount of talk in ELF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Teacher Talk</td>
<td>86.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Student Talk</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Classroom Talk</td>
<td>96.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Time on Instructional Songs</td>
<td>3.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Class Time</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to mention that the video teacher was frequently speaking during periods in which students were supposed to respond, or at the same time as her students. In the case of simultaneous speech (teacher and students), the louder speech source was coded at the end of the five second interval. Findings showed that teacher talk dominated the classroom verbal activity decreasing significantly students' attempts to respond to the teacher solicitations, or to interact with her.
Summary of findings in ELF

The study intended to describe the most predominant types of interaction behaviors in a language video program. The analysis of these behaviors showed that three categories from the perspective of teacher behaviors appeared most frequently in the video lessons. They were: initiation of information (39%), solicitation of response (33%), and response to solicitation (9.3%). From the student behavior standpoint however, only one category of behavior represented student classroom discourse. It was the category response to solicitation with a 9.8% occurrence rate.

The results of the study also showed that there was a great discrepancy between teacher talk and student talk in the video lessons. 86.71% of the total talk time in ELF was dominated by the video teacher, while 9.8% of the talk was done by the students. In 3.48% of the video instruction time, instructional songs were explored in the video program.

Interaction Behaviors in the Classroom Settings

This section presents the findings obtained from the analysis of interaction behaviors using the OSIA system in live elementary classrooms where Spanish was taught using the video program. An overview of the findings of the types of interaction that occurred most frequently in the live classroom settings using the language video instruction is presented. In addition, a description of the most common types of teacher student interaction features that resulted from the instructional video selections is given. The strategies classroom teachers commonly used to stimulate interaction during video viewing are described. Data obtained from the description of the predominant teacher and
student interaction behaviors allowed for the examination of amount of teacher and student talk in the classroom settings. Percentages of amount of teacher and student talk are discussed. A summary of the findings in the classroom settings is presented. This section closes with a comprehensive summary of the findings of the study obtained from examination of the two sources of data investigated.

**Overview of findings in the classroom settings**

In order to describe the types of interaction behaviors between teachers and students that resulted from the instructional video selections, 24 live Spanish classes grades K through five were videotaped. A total of N=3,223 behaviors, including teacher and student behaviors, were coded from the classroom videotapings using the OSIA system. This section presents the findings for all types of teacher and student behaviors that emerged from the video instruction in all language classroom settings.

Five teacher behaviors were found to be the most predominant in these elementary level language classrooms. They were: 1) solicitation of response, 2) initiation of information, 3) positive personal judgment, 4) confirmation, and 5) response to solicitation. Behaviors such as: clarification, corrective feedback, acceptance, silent covert and silent overt occurred less than 1% of the total occurrence of behaviors. Negative personal judgment did not occur in any instances of teacher behavior in the classroom settings.

*Teacher solicitation of response* was the category of behavior that appeared most frequently in all videotaped Spanish classes grades K through five. It occurred in 33% (n=1,055) of the total occurrence of classroom behaviors. *Teacher initiation of information* was the second most frequent behavior in these classes. The two language
consultants initiated information in 9.3% (n=301) of all classroom discourse time. The percentage of positive personal judgment was the third most frequent teacher behavior in the language settings. Positive personal judgment was found in 4.3% (n=139) of the interaction between language teachers and students in all grade levels. Confirmation was observed in 3.7% (n=120) of the teacher verbal behaviors. Finally, the category response to solicitation appeared in 2.2% (n=70) of the total classroom discourse. Table 7 presents the percentages and occurrences of all teacher behaviors in the classroom settings.

Table 7. Percentages and occurrences of teacher behaviors in the classroom settings using OSIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentages/Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Solicitation of Response</td>
<td>33% - (n=1,055)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Initiation of Information</td>
<td>9.3% - (n=301)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Positive Personal Judgment</td>
<td>4.3% - (n=139)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Confirmation</td>
<td>3.7% - (n=120)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Response to Solicitation</td>
<td>2.2% - (n=70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Silent Covert</td>
<td>.6% - (n=21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Silent Overt</td>
<td>.6% - (n=20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Clarification</td>
<td>.3% - (n=11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Corrective Feedback</td>
<td>.3% - (n=10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Acceptance</td>
<td>.03% - (n=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Negative Personal Judgment</td>
<td>0% - (n=0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Teacher Talk</td>
<td>54.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The predominant types of behavior displayed by the targeted population of language learners grades K through five were: 1) response to solicitation, 2) silent overt, 3) silent covert, and 4) solicitation of response. Except for clarification and initiation of information which occurred less than 1%, all the other categories of behavior had a 0% occurrence in the overall student behavior.

The first most frequent student behavior was response to solicitation. This behavior occurred in 28% (n=907) of the total classroom discourse. Student response to solicitation was followed by silent overt. The category, silent overt, represented the second most frequent student behavior in the videotaped classes. It accounted for 5.2% (n=167) of the total classroom discourse. The category silent covert was found to be the third most prevalent student behavior in the live classroom settings. Silent covert represented 2.1% (n=68) of the overall student classroom behavior. Finally, solicitation of response occurred in 2% (n=65) of the classes. Table 8 displays the findings on classroom behaviors from the student perspective.
Table 8. Percentages and occurrences of student behaviors in the classroom settings using OSIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Percentages/Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Response to Solicitation</td>
<td>28% - (n=907)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Silent Overt</td>
<td>5.2% - (n=167)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Silent Covert</td>
<td>2.1% - (n=68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Solicitation of Response</td>
<td>2% - (n=65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Initiation of Information</td>
<td>0.2% - (n=6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Clarification</td>
<td>0.03% - (n=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Corrective Feedback</td>
<td>0% - (n=0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Confirmation</td>
<td>0% - (n=0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Acceptance</td>
<td>0% - (n=0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Positive Personal Judgment</td>
<td>0% - (n=0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Negative Personal Judgment</td>
<td>0% - (n=0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Student Talk</strong></td>
<td><strong>37.53%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the category of Other Behaviors, results showed that the category instructionally nonfunctional behaviors occurred in 7.2% (n=233) of classroom instruction. These behaviors were identified as behaviors not clearly related to instruction. Examples of instructionally nonfunctional behavior were periods of extreme confusion, digression from instruction, interruption by someone who enters the room. These behaviors were prompted by announcements, money collection, or interruptions in general. Table 9 presents the data related to Other Behaviors.
Table 9. Percentages and occurrences of other behaviors in the classroom settings using OSIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Percentages/Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Instructionally Nonfunctional</td>
<td>7.2% - (n=233)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Interaction Separation Designation</td>
<td>0% - (n=0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Other Behaviors</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher behaviors

Solicitation of response

Language consultants made use of this category of behavior in 33% of their total classroom talk time. Teacher solicitations of response were coded in all instances of verbal and nonverbal invitation to student response. Questioning and elicitation strategies, gestures, head nods emanating from the language teachers were described as forms of solicitation of response. Several examples of solicitation also occurred when language teachers encouraged students to interact with the video teacher, by inviting them to repeat after her, or playing along in the different types of tasks proposed in the video lessons.

Solicitations also appeared in the form of visuals in the classroom settings. Language teachers used drawings, props, pictures to evoke students' reaction and response to a given situation. For example, flashcards and realia (authentic material) were some of the most common visuals language teachers used in the practice activities to solicit information from the learners. Teachers usually held visuals up, and students knew they were being solicited to respond by providing the Spanish word for the image displayed. The frequent use of these forms of solicitation in the classroom settings
suggested that the visual component of the solicitations was successful in promoting associative learning, and consequently better memorization and retention of material.

Teacher solicitation of response was commonly used in the classroom settings as a strategy to keep the students' attention focused on the important details of the lesson. In the overall instances of teacher talk, language consultants resorted to this strategy n=1,055 times in the videotaped classroom lessons as a way to verify the level of students' comprehension and recall of the material studied on that specific segment of the language lesson.

**Initiation of information**

The results showed that the category, initiation of information, appeared in 9.3% (n=301) of the total teacher talk time in the live classroom settings. Initiation of information involved information initiated verbally and nonverbally by the teacher. Information initiated by means of any sort of audiovisual aid was also included in this category.

Audiovisual aids were a frequently used strategy for initiation of information in the classroom settings. Flashcards, audio tapes, blackboard, or other audiovisual aids were widely explored in the observed language classes. These devices represented some of the most common initiation material resources the language teachers used in their language classes.

Roughly 95% of the information initiated in these elementary language classes focused on concrete demonstrations of the target language. In other words, vocabulary in the target language was routinely presented through visual demonstrations such as pictures or real objects which were then, associated with the phonetic characteristics of
the word. For example, in the presentation of the word *manzana*, the Spanish word for apple, language teachers would first show students the picture of the fruit, and then introduce the sound/pronunciation of the word in L2.

Analysis of this category of behavior also showed that most of the initiation of information done in the classroom settings was through the video program. This suggested that the greater amount of information initiated was provided by the ELF video teacher rather than by the classroom language teachers. The instructors were accountable for the practice of the material presented in the video lessons with the students. Despite the fact that the students were exposed to the video program during approximately one-fourth of the total amount of the language instruction time, language classes dealt mostly with material reinforcement and practice rather than with presentation of material or initiation of new information.

**Positive personal judgment**

The third type of behavior that helped describe the interaction features of language teachers and students in the live classroom settings was positive personal judgment. This category involved all behaviors with a positive value, such as praise, reward, or encouragement encountered in the language classes. Results showed that language teachers used positive personal judgment in 4.3 percent (n=139) of their total classroom discourse. Positive personal judgment represented all verbal behaviors that expressed the teacher agreement with the student behaviors that were related to the goals of the instruction. In addition, nonverbal symbols such as smiles, voice tone and gestures that carried implicit value of agreement were also coded as demonstrations of value-oriented encouragement from the teachers to the students.
An important consideration about this category of behavior was that it occurred mostly in the target language. Both language teachers expressed their personal approval in Spanish. Expressions such as: "¡Excelente!", "¡Muy Bien!" associated with a value-oriented teacher behavior were the most used forms of positive personal judgment used by the teachers in the language classrooms. Even learners in early levels of language instruction were able to recognize these expressions as a sign of the teachers' agreement or approval of what the other person did or said.

Other typical behavior of positive personal judgment encountered in the live classroom settings was the different ways language teachers rewarded students on their performance. Candies, bows, certificates were some of the rewards language teachers gave students to recognize their performance and accomplishment of instructional tasks. Rewards were found to be successful strategies in increasing students' involvement, participation, motivation and interaction in the language classes.

In sum, the two language teachers who participated in the study displayed a positive attitude towards a considerable portion of student behaviors related to L2 learning. An analysis of student behaviors as a result of positive personal judgment showed that learners were more willing and motivated to participate, judged by their body language, when such behavior was used by the language teachers.

Confirmation

Confirmation was found to be the fourth most predominant teacher behavior in the observed classroom lessons. This behavior accounted for 3.7% (n=120) of the total teacher talk. All verbal and nonverbal teacher behaviors that indicated the correctness or appropriateness of student responses were coded under this category of behavior.
In the analysis of confirmation, it was found that the most common form of confirmation the language teachers used to express correctness and appropriateness of response was through repetition of student response. For example,

Language Teacher: ¿Cómo se dice ship en español?
Student: Barco.
Language Teacher: Barco. ¡Muy bien!

This type of direct communication was very common in the observed language classes. The type of teacher response demonstrated in the example, characterized the typical cases of confirmation that occurred in the classroom settings.

Other types of teacher confirmation behaviors were expressed by head nodding, gestures, facial expressions that dealt with knowledge and skill performance. These nonverbal conventions were also frequently used in the language classes to indicate exactness. Students were generally given feedback on the appropriateness of their contribution. This feedback was understood easily by early and later level language learners. That is to say that all students understood from this feedback whether their responses were correct and appropriate in relation to the teacher solicitations.

Overall, language teachers confirmed student responses to a considerable extent. The results showed that language teachers sought to confirm the appropriateness and correctness of student responses as a way to secure comprehension of teacher solicitation from the majority of the population of language learners in the classroom settings.
Response to solicitation

Data for response to solicitation showed that this behavior was the fifth most frequent behavior displayed by the language teachers. Teachers responded to student solicitations in 2.2 percent (n=70) of the total classroom talk. This category involved all the teacher's answers to student solicitations. The answers took the form of verbal responses as well as physical demonstrations that somehow provided a response to a question, direction or command.

In great part, teacher responses were formulated in the foreign language. The reason for that was that the majority of the student solicitations in the observed language classes dealt with finding the equivalent Spanish word for English words and expressions. Student solicitations such as: "How do you say cow in Spanish?", and teacher responses such as: "Vacca" constitute a sample of the types of teacher responses commonly provided to similar types of student solicitations in the language classes.

Physical demonstrations were another type of teacher response that resulted from student solicitations. Finger-pointing was one common strategy language teachers used to indicate a response to a solicitation in the live classroom settings. Teachers made use of this nonverbal behavior when information necessary to provide a response had been previously written on the chalkboard, or was displayed somewhere in the classroom visible to the students.

Results from the description of the interaction features of language teachers and students in observed classroom settings showed that teachers provided responses to virtually all student solicitations done, either verbally or nonverbally. A percent-wise examination of the data for the categories response to solicitation (2.2%) and solicitation of response (2%) confirmed this finding.
Student behaviors

Response to solicitation

The evaluation of student responses showed that this category of behavior was the most predominant type of student behavior in the classroom settings. Students provided responses to teacher solicitations in 28% (n=907) instances of the total classroom discourse. This category of behavior appeared in the form of verbal responses or overt physical behavior. In conclusion, all student behaviors that were legitimate responses to the teacher solicitations were coded under the category, response to solicitation.

Whole group response was the most common type of verbal response in all observed classes. Students, for the most part, were encouraged to respond as a group to teacher solicitations. Presumably, the emphasis on whole group response was due to the language teachers' effort not to focus on individual students, and their unfamiliarity with students' names, considering they were in the school two times a week. In addition, it was noticed that students from both early and later levels of language instruction showed greater initiative to respond when solicitations were directed to the whole group rather than to individuals as a way to diminish risk level.

Among the various forms of nonverbal responses, hand-raising was the most widely used physical response the students displayed in their language classes. It was apparent, however, that this type of nonverbal behavior was highly emphasized by their regular teachers in classes other than the foreign language classes. As a result, students tended to make use of the same classroom rules they were expected to follow in other content area classes in the language classes as well.
In order to examine the occurrence of student responses in relation to teacher solicitations, data for both categories of behavior were compared. The results showed that students responded to most teacher solicitations in the observed language classes. An examination of the occurrence rate of student response to solicitation (n=907) in relation to teacher solicitation of response (n=1,055) showed that students understood most of the teacher solicitations, and as a result were able to respond to great part of these solicitations.

Silent overt

Observation of the language classes showed that silent overt was the second most frequent student behavior. This category encompassed all instances of nonverbal overt and observable behaviors on the part of the students. Instances of silent overt were found in 5.2% (n=167) of the total classroom time, in which instructional activities demanded students to work silently. Behaviors that resulted from instructional situations that promoted team effort, and therefore, did not emphasize one person behavior were also included in the category of silent overt.

Longer periods of silence were found more frequently during assessment practices. These activities represented the most common task language teachers used to observe the effects of instruction on the learners' performance. Assessment practices involved a variety of activities such as: crossword puzzles, flag coloring, shape identification, clothing identification practices. Samples of assessment worksheets can be found in Appendix K.

Other instances of silent overt were found in group activities. These activities involved essentially games which promoted a team situation. During instructional games, a number of students tended to talk simultaneously, not allowing for the observation of
individual behaviors. This student group behavior was interpreted as a silent overt behavior as well.

The number of instances of silent overt showed that assessment of student learning was a common practice in the classroom settings. Through the data obtained, there was indication that language classes aimed to promote student learning of the foreign language rather than simply exposing them to L2.

Silent covert

Silent covert was found to be the third most predominant student behavior in the language classroom settings. This category of behavior was used in 2.1% (n=68) of the total classroom time. Typical demonstrations of silent covert were periods of silence of five seconds or more in which students were trying to recall or recognize the input in order to formulate a response to a teacher solicitation. Commonly, these periods of silence were followed by the types of teachers’ directions or questions that required students to go through a cognitive process of identification before they could provide a response.

Direct or indirectly, all instances of silent covert followed a teacher solicitation in the observed classes. Examples of silent covert directly following a teacher solicitation were represented by periods of silence for recognition or recall of language after a solicitation was made. Occurrences of silent covert that indirectly followed a teacher solicitation involved cases such as: the teacher formulated a question, a student provided a response. The response was not satisfactory. The teacher then, signaled to the students that the answer was not appropriate, and allowed additional time for students to come up with the suitable response.
Overall, most periods of silence analyzed from the observed classroom settings were interrupted after a five-second interval. In other words, another behavior took place after five seconds that the silent covert behavior had occurred. Consequently, there were fewer instances of extended periods of silence in the observed classes.

In general, classroom students were allowed considerable time to formulate a response to a question. Despite the fact that language classes were short in duration, in average 20 minutes each, and that the structure of the language material used (video program) was essentially audiolingual, language consultants allowed sufficient wait time between solicitations and responses.

**Solicitation of response**

The last most frequently observed student behavior in the classroom settings was solicitation of response. Students from grades K through five questioned the teachers in 2% (n=65) of the total classroom talk. Behaviors coded as solicitation of response were questions, directions and commands related to the substantive goals of the lesson. Nonverbal solicitations were also considered in the description of the interaction behavior features of language teachers and students.

The greatest part of student soliciting behaviors were in the form of questions rather than in the form of directions or commands. Some typical examples of this type of behavior were: "How can I say pencil-case in Spanish?", "Does *perro* mean *dog*?", "*Azul* is blue, isn't it?" In general, questions were targeted to the students' need for confirmation of meaning, reassurance and recall.

Nonverbal solicitations were represented by a variety of gestures. Raising hands, standing up from the chair, jumping up and down were some of the most common physical
demonstrations of student soliciting behaviors. These behaviors were commonly resorted to as an effort to call the teacher's attention, and get her permission to solicit. Once again, it was clear that classroom rules came into play in these classroom settings. Students were disciplined to follow those rules, and wait for their turn to ask a question or provide a response.

The data obtained for this category of behavior reflected the students' virtual involvement in the language instruction. This suggested that the type of instruction delivered in these classes may have influenced students' willingness to take a more active role in the lessons. In addition, based on the results obtained from the comparison of the occurrence rates of student solicitation of response (2%) and teacher response to solicitation (2.2%), it can be said that this finding facilitated the identification of reliable patterns of interaction between the language teachers and the learners.

Other behaviors

Instructionally nonfunctional

This classroom behavior was found to be the most predominant in the category of other behaviors. Classroom observation allowed for the identification of \( n = 233 \) instances of instructionally nonfunctional behavior, which accounted for 7.2% of the total occurrence of behaviors in the classroom settings. Instructionally nonfunctional behavior included all situations in which teachers and students were not clearly engaged in instructional issues. For instance, periods of extreme confusion when a number of people spoke at the same time fell under this category. In addition, interruptions of instruction were also coded under instructionally nonfunctional behavior.
Frequent occurrences of instructionally nonfunctional behaviors were identified during periods in which the language consultants were setting up the language video program. In average, it took them two minutes to locate the video lessons to be shown to the students. Considering that each grade level viewed a different video selection, teachers had to locate the lessons in the classroom because, in general, time did not permit for them to find the video lessons between classes.

Other examples of this category of behavior occurred when the class was interrupted. Notes from the principal, money collection for lunch were some of the common events that diverted students and teachers from their normal instructional functions. These interruptions generated a break in the class flow, and required the language teachers to review previously studied points before instruction could be continued.

In sum, the data presented for this category of behavior was interpreted in the light of two main disadvantages to the foreign language instruction in the observed groups. The first related to the high amount of digression the set-up of the video program caused to the language instruction in the classroom settings. The second had to do with the reduction in the amount of classroom quality time as a result of digression from instruction.

*Classroom strategies used to stimulate interaction during video viewing*

Another main finding of this study was related to the use of strategies to promote classroom interaction during video viewing. These strategies were effective in stimulating interaction in the various instances when the video program was used in the live classroom settings. Differences were found in student interaction behaviors when interaction
stimulators were used compared to instances in which these strategies were not used during the video viewing periods. For example, classroom students would respond to the video teacher solicitations only if language teachers reinforced this behavior continuously. Instances in which language teachers failed to stimulate student response after video teacher solicitation generated no interaction behaviors between the classroom students and the video teacher.

Overall differences in the amount of video-student interaction stimulation provided by each language consultant were found. One teacher stimulated students to interact with the video program more persistently than the other did. That suggested that students in certain groups received greater encouragement to move from the observer role to a speaker participant role (Willis, 1983) when the video lessons were played. On the other hand, students who were less stimulated to interact with the video teacher assumed a rather passive viewer role in front of the television screen. Instances of video-student interaction stimulation accounted for 55% of the total amount of video instruction in the classroom settings. In these instances, language teacher 1 stimulated students to interact with the video program in 48% of the total video viewing, whereas language teacher 2 reinforced student interaction with the video program in 27% of the total video viewing.

The most common strategies the language consultants used to stimulate interaction between students and the video program were: 1) hand gestures, 2) stimulation for repetition after the video teacher, and 3) solicitation of material repetition prior to video viewing (stimulate to interact with the video teacher before playing the video lesson). Hand gestures were the most predominant classroom strategy language consultants used. These hand movements were essentially the teacher invitations for student responses to the video teacher solicitations. It was found that when these strategies were used during video viewing, students showed greater involvement in the video instruction.
The second most frequently used classroom strategy was teacher responses to the video teacher solicitations out loud. Presumably, language consultants used this technique as a modeling strategy to demonstrate what students were expected to do when watching the video lessons. This procedure involved determining the specific occasions in which students should interact with the video teacher by identifying the exact location for the responses.

Solicitations of response after the video teacher solicitations prior to video viewing were the third most common classroom strategy to stimulate interaction. Although less effective than the other two strategies previously described, solicitations prior to video viewing were also effective in reminding students that interaction with the video teacher was expected. When this classroom strategy was used, it was found that in average 20% of the students interacted with the video teacher. The majority of the students just sat passively and looked at the television screen, or engaged in activities other than the ones related to language instruction. In sum, more disruptive student behaviors were found during video viewing when students were not continuously encouraged to interact with the video teacher.

Results showed that to assure more frequent instances of interaction between students and the video program, classroom strategies designed to encourage participation must be sustained throughout the video viewing period. Failure to provide continuous stimuli for interaction resulted in diminished student involvement in the instruction, generated disruptive behaviors, and consequently, digressed students from the instructional functions. Furthermore, student interaction with the video program influenced the pacing of content and class activities, the students' readiness for dialogue-based performance tasks and the methods for assessment practices. Results from interaction stimulator strategies provided resourceful evidence for increasing student
participation and involvement in video language instruction, and furnished data for the
design of future communicative assignments and class interactions in language classes
using this type of instruction.

Amount of teacher talk versus amount of student talk in the classroom settings

Data on the amount of classroom talk in the classroom settings showed that
teacher talk was higher than student talk in the observed language classes. Teacher talk
accounted for 54.33% of the total classroom talk, whereas student talk comprised 37.53%
of the total class time talk. This generated a difference of 16.8% in the amount of teacher
talk in relation to student talk in these classes. Table 10 summarizes the amount of
teacher and student talk in the classroom settings observed.

Table 10. Percentages of amount of talk in the classroom settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Teacher Talk</td>
<td>54.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Student Talk</td>
<td>37.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Classroom Talk</td>
<td>91.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Time on Other Behaviors</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Class Time</td>
<td>99.06%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results reported in Table 10 suggested that the language consultants
attempted, in great part, to stimulate student talk in the classroom settings, and equate
receiving L2 information with reacting to the incoming message. Except in instances of
material clarification in which teacher talk time tended to be higher, students were
constantly expected to manifest their reactions to what was being taught. Whether or not students had prior knowledge of the foreign language, they were asked to react to the teacher solicitations immediately. This procedure resulted in considerable increase in the amount of student talk in the classroom settings.

Summary of findings in the classroom settings

One of the purposes of the study was to describe the types of teacher student interaction features that resulted from the instructional video selections in live elementary language classrooms. The data obtained from the analysis of the observation of classroom instruction revealed that five teacher behaviors appeared most predominantly in the classroom settings: 1) solicitation of response (33%), 2) initiation of information (9.3%), 3) positive personal judgment (4.3%), 4) confirmation (3.7%), and 5) response to solicitation (2.2%). From the perspective of student behavior, four categories of behavior were found to be most frequent in the observed classes: 1) response to solicitation (28%), 2) silent overt (5.2%), 3) silent covert (2.1%), and 4) solicitation of response (2%). In the category of Other Behaviors, instructionally nonfunctional behavior (7.2%) also had its share in the overall behavior of the classroom settings.

Results on amount of teacher and student talk revealed reliable evidence that classroom instruction reinforced student interaction and participation in the instructional activities. That suggested that classroom instruction tended to be more learner-centered than teacher-centered due to student class participation. As a result, students displayed greater involvement in the instruction and more positive feelings related to their language learning abilities.
In addition, data clearly showed that certain classroom strategies were more effective than others in stimulating student interaction with the video program. Among the most used strategies were: 1) hand gestures, 2) stimulation for repetition after the video teacher, and 3) solicitation of material repetition prior to video viewing. Constant teacher-initiated stimulation during video viewing was found to be the most effective strategy in promoting interaction between classroom students and the video teacher.

The findings also indicated that the way classroom talk was managed in the language classes helped generate more frequent interaction sequences between the language consultants and the students. In looking more closely at the relationship across the pairs, teacher solicitations of response/student response to solicitation, and student solicitation of response/teacher response to solicitation, it can be said that these relationships were ideally complementary. Percent-wise, soliciting and responding behaviors complemented each other in the overall observed language classes.

Comprehensive Summary of the Findings in ELF and in the Classroom Settings

Using the OSIA system, the researcher was able to identify and describe the most predominant interaction behaviors in ELF and in the language classroom settings. The kinds of information obtained from these two sources included: 1) the types of behaviors and occurrence of the most frequent categories of behavior, and 2) the differences in classroom talk in the two sources of data. Table 11 presents all percentages and occurrences of interaction patterns in the ELF program and in the classroom settings.

From the analysis of the types of behaviors that were most frequent in each source of data, it can be concluded that instruction in ELF and in the live classroom settings was intended to involve students, and stimulate them to interact in the foreign language. From
the perspective of teacher behaviors, *solicitation of response* was found to be one of the most predominant types of behavior in the video program and in the classroom settings. This category had an occurrence rate of 33% in ELF, ranking as the second most frequent behavior in the program, and of 33% in the classroom settings, identifying it as the first most predominant behavior in the observed language classes.

Presumably, the video instruction and the classroom instruction were meant to stimulate student interaction through questioning and elicitation strategies. From the student behavior perspective, *response to solicitation* was the most prevalent behavior in ELF and in the classroom settings. Nevertheless, an analysis of the occurrence rate of this behavior in these two sources of data showed a big discrepancy in the amount of student interaction. In ELF this behavior accounted for 9.8% of the total classroom talk, whereas in the live classroom settings, students responded to the teacher solicitations in 28% of the overall occurrence of classroom behaviors. This suggested that classroom students interacted with the teachers approximately three times more than video students interacted with the video teacher. Figure 2 (p.106) demonstrates graphically the differences of occurrence of all behaviors in ELF and in the classroom settings.

**Chains of interaction/direct communication in ELF and in the classroom settings**

The interaction behaviors identified in the ELF video program and in the live classroom settings, in part defined the nature of the interactive process of reciprocal communication in these two sources of data. Patterns of interactive behaviors encountered in the video program and in the language classes were analyzed through the sequences of instructional moves. Instructional moves are behaviors that start with the initiation of that behavior and end with the transition to the next behavior (Hough &
Duncan, 1970, p. 164). Chains of interaction were considered periods longer than 30 seconds of direct communication between teachers and students.

The key behaviors that characterized typical patterns of interactive behaviors in the video lessons were: solicitation; response; confirmation, positive personal judgment, and initiation of information. Chains of interaction were found in 47 occasions in the video lessons. These chains followed three distinct patterns of interaction in the video lessons: 1) solicitation/response/confirmation; 2) solicitation/response/positive personal judgment; and 3) solicitation/response/initiation of information. The moves of solicitation and response, (T4)→(S2), followed by an appraisal move such as confirmation or positive personal judgment constitute a pure interactive strategy (Hough & Duncan, 1970).

Observation of chains of direct communication between the teacher and the students in the video program showed that the pattern solicitation/response/initiation of information was the most common pattern in the overall video lessons. This pattern occurred in approximately 45% (n=21) of the total occurrence of direct communication between the video teacher and her students. The pattern solicitation/response/positive personal judgment occurred in 42% (n=20) during teacher-student interaction. Finally, the pattern solicitation/response/confirmation was the third most used pattern of interaction in the video lessons, 11% (n=5).

Chains of direct interaction between language teachers and students in live language classes were found in 69 instances. Patterns of interaction that characterized the chains of direct communication in the classroom settings were very similar to those found in the video lessons: 1) solicitation/response/positive personal judgment; 2) solicitation/response/confirmation, and 3) solicitation/response/initiation of information.

Solicitation/response positive personal judgment occurred in 39% (n=27) of the total patterns of interaction between language teachers and students. The pattern
solicitation/response/confirmation appeared in 26% (n=18); and the pattern solicitation/response/initiation of information counted for 21% (n=15) of all instances of direct communication between teachers and students in the live language settings.

In reviewing the chains of interaction in the video lessons and in the language classes, it was concluded that in both instruction settings teachers incorporated interactive strategies through various patterns of behaviors. Variations on the types of patterns of behaviors were employed to satisfy specific purposes of instruction.
Table 11. Summary of the percentages and occurrences of interaction patterns in the ELF program and in the classroom settings using the OSIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>% - Occ. ELF</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>% - Occ. Classroom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Behaviors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Teacher Behaviors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiation of Inf.</td>
<td>39% - n=1,266</td>
<td>Solicitation of Resp.</td>
<td>33% - n=1,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicitation of Resp.</td>
<td>33% - n=1,082</td>
<td>Initiation of Inf.</td>
<td>9.3% - n=301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resp. to Solicitation</td>
<td>9.3% - n=305</td>
<td>Pos. Pers. Judgment</td>
<td>4.3% - n=139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pos. Pers. Judgment</td>
<td>3.3% - n=108</td>
<td>Confirmation</td>
<td>3.7% - n=120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation</td>
<td>1.2% - n=38</td>
<td>Resp. to Solicitation</td>
<td>2.2% - n=70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification</td>
<td>.4% - n=13</td>
<td>Silent Covert</td>
<td>.6% - n=21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silent Covert</td>
<td>.3% - n=9</td>
<td>Silent Overt</td>
<td>.6% - n=20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrective Feedback</td>
<td>.15% - n=5</td>
<td>Clarification</td>
<td>.3% - n=11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>.06% - n=2</td>
<td>Corrective Feedback</td>
<td>.3% - n=10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg. Pers. Judgment</td>
<td>0% - n=0</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>.03% - n=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silent Overt</td>
<td>0% - n=0</td>
<td>Neg. Pers. Judgment</td>
<td>0% - n=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Teacher Talk</strong></td>
<td>86.71%</td>
<td><strong>Subtotal Teacher Talk</strong></td>
<td>54.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Behaviors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Student Behaviors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resp. to Solicitation</td>
<td>9.8% - n=331</td>
<td>Resp. to Solicitation</td>
<td>28% - n=907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification</td>
<td>0% - n=0</td>
<td>Silent Overt</td>
<td>5.2% - n=167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiation of Inf.</td>
<td>0% - n=0</td>
<td>Silent Covert</td>
<td>2.1% - n=68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicitation of Resp.</td>
<td>0% - n=0</td>
<td>Solicitation of Resp.</td>
<td>2% - n=65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrective Feedback</td>
<td>0% - n=0</td>
<td>Initiation of Inf.</td>
<td>.2% - n=6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation</td>
<td>0% - n=0</td>
<td>Clarification</td>
<td>.03% - n=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>0% - n=0</td>
<td>Corrective Feedback</td>
<td>0% - n=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pos. Pers. Judgment</td>
<td>0% - n=0</td>
<td>Confirmation</td>
<td>0% - n=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg. Pers. Judgment</td>
<td>0% - n=0</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>0% - n=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silent Covert</td>
<td>0% - n=0</td>
<td>Pos. Pers. Judgment</td>
<td>0% - n=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silent Overt</td>
<td>0% - n=0</td>
<td>Neg. Pers. Judgment</td>
<td>0% - n=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Student Talk</strong></td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td><strong>Subtotal Student Talk</strong></td>
<td>37.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Class Talk</strong></td>
<td>96.51%</td>
<td><strong>Subtotal Class Talk</strong></td>
<td>91.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Behaviors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Other Behaviors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruct. Nonfunc.</td>
<td>0% - n=0</td>
<td>Instruct. Nonfunc.</td>
<td>7.2% - n=233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interact. Sep. Design.</td>
<td>0% - n=0</td>
<td>Interact. Sep. Design.</td>
<td>0% - n=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Other Behaviors</strong></td>
<td>0% - n=0</td>
<td><strong>Subtotal Other Behaviors</strong></td>
<td>7.2% - n=233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Classroom Talk</strong></td>
<td>*96.51% - N=3,269</td>
<td><strong>Total Classroom Talk</strong></td>
<td>**99.06% - N=3,223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% = percentage
Occ. = occurrence
* the remaining 3.49% was time spent on instructional songs
** the remaining .94% was time spent on managerial behaviors (= control of student discipline)
Figure 2. Bar graph of the most predominant teacher and student behaviors in ELF and in the classroom settings.
A large percentage of classroom talk in the ELF program was exclusively done by the video teacher, 86.71%. This amount of teacher talk contrasted with 54.33% of talk done by the language consultants in the live classroom settings. The difference in the two sources of data related to teacher talk was of 31.38%. The discrepancy was also large in terms of student talk in the two sources of data. Video students participated in the video lessons in 9.8% of the video total classroom talk. Classroom students, however, had an interaction rate of 37.53%. Therefore, the difference in student talk in the video program and in the language classes was of 27.73%. Analysis of overall student participation in the two settings of instruction led to the conclusion that instruction in the video program is essentially teacher-centered, contrasted with a more learner-oriented type of instruction in the classroom settings. Table 12 summarizes the amount of classroom talk in the ELF program and in the classroom settings.

Table 12. Percentages of amount of talk in ELF and in the classroom settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events</th>
<th>ELF</th>
<th>Classroom Settings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Teacher Talk</td>
<td>86.71%</td>
<td>54.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Student Talk</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>37.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Behaviors</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Songs</td>
<td>3.49%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Classroom Talk</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>*99.06%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .94% of classroom time was spent on managerial matters
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

In this study predominant types of interaction behaviors were described in two sources of data: a language video program, and live elementary language classrooms in which the instructional video program was used. Percentages and occurrences of categories of behaviors using The Observational System for Instructional Analysis (OSIA) were reported for the two sources.

The results, presented in Chapter Four, are discussed in this chapter. This chapter discusses: 1) the types of teacher and student interaction behaviors in ELF and in the classroom settings, 2) the amount of teacher and student talk in the two sources of language instruction, and 3) the strategies most frequently used by language consultants to stimulate interaction in the classroom settings during video viewing. A summary and discussions of the findings in ELF and in the classroom settings are presented in the first part of this chapter. In addition, the amount of teacher and student talk and the peculiarities of the video program are also analyzed in this section. Findings related to interaction behaviors in the classroom settings are then, examined. Conclusions related to the findings in the two sources of data follow this section. Recommendations for further research constitute the final part of this chapter.
Summary of Findings

The ELF language video program

Interaction behaviors and patterns

The first purpose of this study was to describe the predominant types of interaction behaviors in the ELF language video program. In identifying the key behaviors in the video program, it was possible to examine the interactive process of reciprocal communication that the program emphasized. In order to identify the key behaviors in ELF, The Observational System for Instructional Analysis (OSIA) was used. This system allowed for the description of the categories of verbal and nonverbal behaviors of the video teacher and her students in the 25 video lessons of ELF. Analysis of interaction behaviors in the video program showed that three teacher behaviors were predominant in these lessons: 1) initiation of information (39%); 2) solicitation of response (33%); and 3) response to solicitation (9.3%). Student interaction behaviors were represented by a single category, response to solicitation (9.8%).

Close examination of the predominant interaction behaviors in ELF allowed for the identification of the types of patterns of behavior emphasized in the program. Results showed that more than one pattern characterized direct communication between the video teacher and her students. Direct communication is defined as one-way communication in which the speaker initiates information, with little or no opportunity for audience interaction (Hough & Duncan, 1970, p. 197). The interaction strategies in the video program followed three distinct patterns of interaction behaviors.
1) solicitation/response/initiation of information (45%),
2) solicitation/response/positive personal judgment (42%), and
3) solicitation/response/confirmation (11%).

Direct communication strategies lasted a minimum of 30 seconds. In general, instances of direct communication were predominantly directed at the attainment of substantive objectives of the lesson in the video program.

Considering that the focus of the study was interaction, key behaviors that stimulated student participation were considered. An examination of the video teacher's key behaviors showed that she used great amounts of solicitation to involve students. This result confirmed Hough and Duncan's (1970) statement that, "solicitation is one of the key behaviors used in getting students to engage in various thought processes" (p. 162). The types of solicitations most frequently used in the video lessons were the ones that called for expression of knowledge, recognition, or recall. Questions requiring some sort of convergent application of the target language were also used by the video teacher. As a result, student responses operated on the levels of cognitive engagement suggested by the solicitations.

Furthermore, by examining the video teacher's key behaviors, it was possible to conclude that the video teacher used predominantly direct communication as an instructional strategy. Potential weaknesses of the use of direct communication strategies in the video lessons were that students, both video students and classroom students, did not have the opportunity to practice behaviors other than responsive behaviors, and did not have many opportunities to interact with the video teacher.
Amount of teacher and student talk

Based on the interaction behaviors found most predominantly in the video lessons, it was possible to examine the amount of teacher and student talk in the program. Results showed that the total amount of teacher talk was 86.71%, in contrast with student talk which accounted for 9.8% of the total classroom talk time in the video lessons. Teacher's speech outnumbered students' speech by approximately nine times. That means that the video teacher dominated speech nine times more than students did during instruction in the video lessons.

The major implication of the discrepancy between amount of teacher and student talk, in this particular medium of instruction, was that students did not get much opportunity to use the language, or to become independent learners. The rules of the game were for students to become passive learners, and to rely entirely on the teacher's input and guidance. In this case, teacher instructional behaviors were congruent with the substantive instructional objectives of ELF which were to reinforce the oral (listening) feature of L2.

Peculiarities of the video program

Besides the description of the interaction behaviors in ELF, the study also examined aspects of the video program that directly or indirectly influenced interaction behaviors between the video teacher and her students, and among students as well. The use of visuals constituted one aspect of the video program that addressed the role of interaction in language learning. On a number of occasions, the video teacher established conversations with props. The communication that resulted from these interaction
practices emphasized the use of language for negotiation. For instance, in lesson 24 the video teacher tries to help Leo (a puppet) solve a problem. Leo's problem was that his family would arrive in his house, and the house was dirty. The teacher converses with the puppet as if he were real, and tries to present solutions to make him feel better. The purpose of this interaction practice between the teacher and the puppet was to introduce the words for family members in Spanish. At the same time, it created a context that allowed for negotiation of ideas and opinions. Based on research findings (Wintergerst, 1994; Johnson, 1995; and Bouwhuis, 1995), interaction practices of this sort facilitate comprehension and stimulate production of L2.

Another peculiarity of ELF that had an impact on interaction was the scenario the program used for its lessons. By recreating a typical classroom scenario, the program attempted to focus on the communicative and interactive exchanges of teacher and students as language instruction was delivered. From this perspective, it was possible to note how students' verbal and nonverbal behaviors were shaped by the verbal behaviors of the video teacher.

Classroom settings

*Interaction behaviors and patterns*

The second purpose of this study was to describe the types of teacher and student interaction features that resulted from the instructional video selections in live elementary language classrooms. Classroom behaviors in 24 elementary language classes were captured through videotapings. Language consultants and classroom students' behaviors were described and analyzed using The Observational System for Instructional Analysis.
(OSIA). The results of this analysis showed that five teacher behaviors were prevalent in the classroom settings: 1) solicitation of response (33%); 2) initiation of information (9.3%); 3) positive personal judgment (4.3%); 4) confirmation (3.7%); and 5) response to solicitation (2.2%). Four student behaviors were found to be predominant in the language classes: 1) response to solicitation (28%); 2) silent overt (4.4%); 3) silent covert (2.1%); and 4) solicitation of response (2%).

Patterns of interaction in the classroom settings were represented by the following interactive strategies:

1) solicitation/response/positive personal judgment (39%);
2) solicitation/response/confirmation (26%); and
3) solicitation/response/initiation of information (21%).

The analysis of the instructional moves of language consultants showed that the most persistent behavior used was solicitation. Teachers predominantly used this behavior as a substantive direct communication strategy. That means that teachers used this resource (questioning) in order to meet the instructional objectives of the lesson.

In addition, language teachers organized direct communication around a context that was part of the students' experiences. Teachers used the learner's interests and needs to identify the context for the communication. The advantages to utilizing direct communication of this sort were: 1) students were able to use their prior knowledge to communicate; and 2) students were able to derive meaning from the communication. According to Hough and Duncan (1970), "direct communications planned in terms of the experience and frame of reference of the audience (learner) will be far more effective than direct communications planned in terms of the teacher and his frame of reference and experience" (p. 221).
Amount of teacher and student talk

The examination of the amount of teacher and student talk in the classroom settings showed that language consultants talked 54.33% of the total classroom talk time when they were not using the ELF language video program. Student talk accounted for 37.53% of the total classroom talk. The difference between teacher talk and student talk was of 16.8% in the language classes observed.

In great part, teachers attempted to encourage students to engage in communicative exchanges through questions that called for both convergent applications or divergent responses. The nature of the questions varied along the various grade levels. In general, questions required students to respond at different levels of cognitive processing. For instance, at early levels of language instruction, grades K, one and two, students were engaged in mental processes that required primarily recall and recognition of information. In grade three, teachers' solicitations were still at the level of recall and recognition but aiming at expression of knowledge (e.g., teachers attempted to make connections between the content studied in the classroom and students' real experiences - "tell me the pets you have at home in Spanish"). In later levels of language instruction, grades four and five, questions required some sort of judgmental applications (e.g., how long do you think it takes to go from X to Y?). These interactive strategies helped increase student talk.

Another strategy used by language consultants to incite students' talk was verbal and nonverbal reinforcement of student given responses. Praising strategies helped engage learners in reacting to the teachers' solicitations which, consequently, increased the number of student communicative verbal and nonverbal behaviors in the language classroom settings.
Strategies that promoted interaction in the classroom settings

The findings of this study clearly demonstrated that stimulators played an important role in producing interaction during video viewing. Video instruction may suggest passive learning. In order to engage students actively into their learning process, language teachers provoked interaction through a number of strategies. These strategies: 1) helped students not to distract attention from the main ideas presented in the video lessons; 2) helped reinforce relevant aspects of the language; 3) helped students see and understand the main concept of what was being presented; and 4) helped students understand the relationship between concepts.

Conclusions

A number of researchers have found that a greater amount of interaction in the language classroom increases the availability of comprehensible input. This input in turn facilitates the learners' comprehension of the language because there is more negotiation of ideas. In addition, the availability of comprehensive input leads to more successful language acquisition (Long, 1981; Ellis, 1984; and Lee & VanPatten, 1995).

In this study, analysis of discourse in the video program showed that input did not originate from interaction. Findings on the predominant interaction behaviors in ELF as well as the amount of teacher and student talk in the video lessons showed that the type of input directed to video students and to the classroom audience was in most part not derived from interaction. That means that the speaker, in this case the video teacher, had complete control of what was said in the video lessons. As a result of the high amount of teacher talk, video students as well as classroom students had very little or no
opportunities to interact with the video teacher or with each other, and consequently to negotiate meaning.

Findings of the interaction sequences between language consultants and students in the live language classes showed that comprehensible input was derived from interaction in these instructional settings. Teachers generally modified their utterances whenever learners presented some indication of lack of comprehension (students did not understand what teachers said). As was expected, classroom instruction utilized interactive strategies that resulted in more frequent instances of student participation and interaction compared to the tactics used in the video program.

The conclusion that input in ELF did not originate from interaction, contrary to input in the classroom settings, is supported by the findings related to the predominant types of interaction behaviors found in both sources. The types of teacher's discourse in ELF and in the classroom settings sustain this conclusion. Furthermore, the amount of teacher and student talk in these two language instruction situations represents another indication that the emphasis on interaction was stronger in the language classes compared to interaction promoted in and by the video lessons.

**Teacher discourse and student behavior in ELF**

To explain the discrepancy between teacher discourse and student verbal behavior in the video program, the researcher hypothesized that there was a correlation between post-solicitation wait-time (time between a teacher's solicitation and student response) and the two variables below:

1) video teacher's solicitations and students' responses, (T4-S2), and
2) amount of students' response to solicitations (S2).
It was found that on average, the length of wait-time between the video teacher's solicitations and her students' responses was less than five seconds. According to research on memory and on wait-time intervals (Shrum, 1982), durations of wait-time from five to twenty seconds are needed for cognitive processing. This interval applies to lower stages of language learning. Although in these stages the degree of complexity of interaction is based on stimulus-response or on cognitively mediated responses, the time allocated in post-solicitation was insufficient to generate response from the students.

It was hypothesized that the lack of students' response to the teacher's solicitations was a result of insufficient wait-time between post-solicitations and responses. A comparison in the percentages of video teacher's solicitation of information (33%) and students' response to solicitation (9.8%) led to the following conclusions: 1) students did not have time to react to the solicitation; 2) mastery of content was insufficient to generate more frequent instances of student response to solicitations.

**Goals of the video program**

Data pertaining to the goals of the video program were somewhat contradictory. It was suggested by the developers of ELF that one of the goals of the program was that proficiency objectives should be accomplished for each lesson. Based on the examination of student talk in the video lessons, it was noticed that students' attempts to become proficient and independent speakers were not a visible concern of the video program. Instead, it was found that teacher talk dominated the classroom verbal activities which reserved very little room for students', studio students and classroom audience, verbal production.
Although classroom talk was also dominated by teacher talk in the language settings, students were provided with greater opportunities for communicative exchanges in the classroom settings than video students and classroom students using the ELF video program.

Another contribution to this finding was that learners using the video lessons were restricted to the role of responders. Most of the display questions posed by the video teacher did not invite students to respond at length or initiate new topics (Long & Sato, 1983; and Ellis, 1984). Ellis (1984) states that if the learner is merely asked to respond to the teacher's pre-determined set of solicitations, he will not be given the opportunity to use what he knows in a flexible manner. Ellis maintains that this flexibility may be essential to shape the learner's interlanguage system (p. 129). Based on this statement, it may be concluded that the lack of practice on the part of the students using this program may result in low retention of the material studied, and lead to poor learning.

Mode of instruction in the two sources of data

An analysis of the amount of teacher talk in the two sources of data examined supported the conclusion that instruction in the video program is essentially teacher-centered, in contrast with instruction in the classroom settings that proved to be more student-oriented.

One aspect in the ELF video program that suggested a teacher-centered classroom discourse was the seating arrangement. Video students are placed in rows of chairs, one in front of the other. Students in both rows face the teacher. This type of seating arrangement suggests a typically teacher-centered environment allowing for greater
teacher control of the classroom speech, reducing thus, opportunities for student-student
dialogue, interaction and cooperative learning among the learners.

Although seating arrangement in most of the classroom settings observed was very
similar to the arrangement used in the video program, language consultants in several
occasions positioned themselves in places other than the front of the classroom and moved
around the room more freely. The video teacher, on the other hand, was positioned in the
front of the room throughout the video lessons which may have been an artifact of the
videotaping conventions adopted. For videotaping purposes, the teacher in the video
program did not have the same mobility as language consultants did. In addition,
considering that it is an instructional video program, it was hypothesized that the teacher
would take greater control of instruction compared to daily classroom instruction.
Despite these facts, instruction in ELF revealed strong tendencies of traditional methods
of language teaching portraying the teacher as the dominant figure in the classroom
scenario.

Focusing on teacher-centeredness, it is important to note that the video program
was created in the late 80s. During this period, the emphasis on the teacher as the
controller of speech in the classroom was much stronger (Nunan, 1992). The language
consultants that took part in the study, on the other hand, were trained under the most
contemporary communicative theories of language teaching. Based on this, differences
between the type of instruction in ELF and in the classroom settings were expected.

The switch from a teacher-centered perspective to a student-centered focus is by
no means an easy task. It entails that the design of the lesson would purposefully promote
the learners' greater acquisition and mastery of different vocabulary items, as well as the
phonological rules of the language, which is different from simple language exposure.
Nevertheless, what seems to be important in lessons designed from an interactive
perspective is that they need to constantly and continually engage learners in the instructional tasks, and to provide learners with increasing opportunities to use and practice the language in a meaningful and communicative way. Opportunities for participation and involvement have been recognized as an important condition in language classes by a number of researchers (Ommaggio, 1986; Dubin & Olshtain, 1986; Nunan, 1992). These researchers maintain that student participation is a possible contributor to student success in foreign language acquisition.

Nevertheless, to achieve a situation of real interaction, it is necessary that the nature of instruction be less teacher-directed and dominated, which is not the case in the majority of the ELF lessons. The type of classroom discourse that shapes instruction in the program is characterized by one-way communication. It suggests that information most often travels in one direction, from teacher to students. According to Rivers (1990), "interaction can be two-way, three-way, or four-way, but never one-way" (p. 9).

**Recommendations**

This study presented the description of the predominant interaction behaviors in a language video program and in live elementary language classroom settings. A question raised after considering the important facts tied to the issue of interaction in the video program is how much interaction is promoted between the video instruction and the viewers in language video programs similar to the ELF program. A number of researchers (Willis, 1983; Arieux, 1987; and Altman, 1989) maintain that, it is the classroom teacher's responsibility to assure more lively interaction between students and the video program. Nevertheless, for a program like ELF which was designed to provide elementary level teachers who do not necessarily know a foreign language the tools they need to expose
their students to a foreign language, the question of how much interaction there should be between the video lessons and the learners still remains. For this reason, an analysis of the types of interaction in different video materials for teaching Spanish as a foreign language to elementary level learners would be recommended.

The study also considered the amount of teacher and student talk in the two sources of data. This leaves open the question of how much a teacher should control speech in a language video program. An interesting future project would be to compare the amount of teacher talk in several types of videotaped language lessons designed specifically for elementary language learners. Based on the results obtained, changes related to reducing the amount of teacher talk in the ELF program could be recommended.

A weakness of the study was that the language consultants who used the instructional video selections in the elementary language settings were not experienced language teachers. They were student aides who were still at the developmental stages of their teaching ability. These language consultants were experimenting in their role as language teachers in a real classroom environment. For this reason, they were unaware of a number of strategies move the student from an observer to a speaker participant role during viewing of the video program. In addition, the language consultants had not used ELF prior to the study. Their ability to integrate the video materials into their classes had not been fully developed. As a result, they were reluctant to introduce this medium of instruction into their classes. By duplicating the study with teachers who have more extensive experience in language teaching, and who are familiar with the video-based instruction, it would be possible to examine whether there would be differences in interaction patterns between the classroom students and the video program in elementary language learning settings.
Another weakness of the study, for the examination of teacher-student interaction sequences that resulted from the instructional video selections, was that language classes were reasonably short. Language classes lasted on average 20 minutes. There were a number of occasions that language consultants had to postpone or eliminate the use of the video material due to time constraints. Longer periods of language instruction would probably give teachers greater opportunities to explore the video program, and produce increased instances of interaction between the program and the students.

In sum, the interactions between teachers and students in and through instructional video selections need further investigation, particularly from the perspective of video language instruction. Some intriguing possibilities follow:

1. How much interaction is promoted in instructional language video programs designed for elementary level language learners?

2. How much should a teacher in a video language program control speech?

In the light of such questions, revision of the ELF program could be justified paying more careful attention to the question of interactive strategies in a language video situation.

Based on the findings generated by this study, a few recommendations were made to school principals and administrators who consider adopting the ELF video program for language instruction in their institutions:

1) considering that the video lessons are not organized sequentially in terms of the developmental stages of children, it is recommended that video lessons are sequenced in a way to be developmentally appropriate to different age groups;
2) because the video lessons rely on audiolingual methods of language teaching, instructional activities in ELF need to be complemented with communicative strategies to allow for student greater practice on L2; and

3) because ELF is a program that aims to simply expose students to the foreign language, it is recommended that language teachers devise strategies that stimulate interaction between the video program and the students. This way learners can develop an active, negotiative role in their learning process.

In order to help foreign language teachers incorporate the video program into their classroom instruction, a few recommendations are:

1) to use the video program as an additional resource to enhance instruction. Not to rely entirely on this mode of instruction in language classes;

2) to avoid adopting the teacher dependent method used in the video program in real classroom settings. The teacher's role should be of a facilitator or a guide, not of a manager of material (Nunan, 1992, p. 84);

3) to provide greater opportunities for student-initiated behaviors during practice activities since the video program does not give many opportunities for learners to develop these behaviors;

4) to select portions of the video program in which oral interaction can be explored; and

5) from time to time, to record and analyze interactions in the classroom despite the instructional material in use.
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Appendix A: Organization of the Video Lessons for Each Grade Level

Schools A and B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Levels and Video Lessons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2/21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2/23</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2/28</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3/2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3/7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3/9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3/21</td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3/23</td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3/28</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3/30</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4/6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4/11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4/13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4/18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4/20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4/25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4/27</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5/2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5/4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix B: Description of Researcher's Experiences During Data Collection

Prior to the actual collection of data, I met with the two language teachers (student aides in a methods class for foreign language and ESL teaching) who would be involved in the study. The purpose of our meetings was to get them familiarized with the language video program, and to help them develop lesson plans as well as instructional activities incorporating the ELF video lessons.

The attitude of these instructors was, from the very beginning, not very positive towards the video program. They did not particularly like it, and thought it was rather uninteresting. Both agreed that the content of the video lessons was good, and interesting activities could be created focusing on those themes. Nevertheless, they were very reluctant to use it in front of the students. The ELF program was being used in those schools for at least two consecutive years prior to the study, therefore, most of the students had already been exposed to it. From the reaction of the majority of the students in previous observations, they seemed to really enjoyed it.

During two weeks prior to the data collection, I went to both schools to do the desensitizing videotapings. In these two weeks I noticed that none of the language consultants attempted to use the video program in their classes. I then, reinforced that the material should be used for at least 5 minutes during instruction of each unit (approximately 4 classes of 20 minutes each). They agreed, but not very happily.

When the actual data collection started, both language teachers made plans to use the video. The biggest problem that we encountered was to locate on the tape the video lessons specific to the different grade levels. The language teachers actually did not have time to locate the lessons between classes. I offered to help them on that, and was often responsible for this task. I would set up the video while they did their warm-up
activity. This method was not very effective, tough. A lot of students were distracted by me and ended up not paying attention to the class. That got me frustrated a lot of times. In fact, there were several reasons that frustrated me in this study: 1) the schools did not have the video tapes (they had bought all the material when the program was introduced in the schools, but materials had been misplaced); 2) language consultants were not pleased about having to use that material in their classes, 3) even when language teachers attempted to use it, they were not enthusiastic and that affected student performance; 4) whenever video lessons were played in the classrooms, they were often played just once and without being explored in depth. I should recognize, though, that after a short period of time one of the language consultants became very willing to help. The other one, until the very end of the data collection period, kept a rather sour attitude about the use of the video program in her classes. Despite all the grudging feelings we had at that time, I am very thankful to these two teachers and happy to be able to complete this work.
Appendix C: Description of the Elementary Language Fundamentals (ELF)

The Elementary Language Fundamentals program, herein called the ELF program, is designed to offer to elementary age students the aforementioned opportunities through the study of foreign languages and other cultures. The sequence of skills promoted in the ELF program, parallels the students' own native language learning. Level one of the ELF program, being exclusively audiolingual, serves to establish a basic foundation in listening skills, understanding the spoken word, and speaking skills. The student listens and repeats, moving from words and phrases to simple sentence patterns in the target language. In addition, each lesson promotes some cultural awareness of the people and countries in which the target language is spoken, and, with that awareness, a better understanding of those people.

In order to attain these goals the ELF program was designed to provide to elementary level teachers who do not know a foreign language, or who are not foreign language specialists, the tools they need so that their students may have the opportunity to study French, German or Spanish. The program's components include three videotapes, three audiotapes and a teacher's guide and resource book.

The videotaped material consists of twenty-five lessons in which all the new material is presented: five to eight new vocabulary words per lesson, songs in which the new vocabulary is used, and a cultural component. While observing these tapes, active participation by the classroom students is elicited. The audiotapes include a tape of the new songs in the target language and two vocabulary tapes with pauses for repetition. One vocabulary tape includes an English translation, while the other one is entirely in the foreign language. The teacher's guide and resource book serve to support the other
Appendix C (continued)

components, act as a source book for additional information, and provide activities and games for drill, review and reinforcement of the material.
### Appendix D: Schedule for Desensitizing Videotaping and Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/28/95</td>
<td>Desensitizing videotaping at School I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/30/95</td>
<td>Desensitizing videotaping at School II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/4/95</td>
<td>Desensitizing videotaping at School I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/6/95</td>
<td>Desensitizing videotaping at School II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/11/95</td>
<td>Data Collection at School II/2 groups of grades K-1-2 (total=6 groups)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/13/95</td>
<td>Data Collection at School I/2 groups of grades K-1-2 (total=6 groups)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/20/95</td>
<td>Data Collection at School II/2 groups of grades 3-4-5 (total=6 groups)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/25/95</td>
<td>Data Collection at School I/2 groups of grades 3-4-5 (total=6 groups)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix E: Categories of The Observational System of Instructional Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Clarification</td>
<td>This is a responsive behavior aimed at clarifying the meaning of the behavior. It is used to help the person who emitted the behavior become more aware of his own behavior or understand the meaning or implication of his own behavior, or to help the person responding to the behavior, or some other person observing the behavior, understand the meaning or implication of the behavior (Hough and Duncan, 1970, p. 120)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Response to Solicitation</td>
<td>This category includes all behaviors of teachers and students that are a valid response to questions, directions, or commands. Responses can be verbal or nonverbal (p. 122).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Initiation of Information</td>
<td>It involves all behaviors of teachers and students that involve the initiation of knowledge, skills, or feeling states relating to substantive or managerial objectives. Initiation can be done verbally or nonverbally (p. 123).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Solicitation</td>
<td>This category includes all the verbal and nonverbal behaviors of teachers and students used with the purpose of inviting another person to say or do something, except for solicitations of clarification (p. 124).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Corrective Feedback</td>
<td>It is restricted to responses to statements considered incorrect or inappropriate by commonly accepted definition, custom, convention, or some form of empirical verification (p. 124).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Description and Definition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Confirmation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It indicates that the behavior is correct or appropriate. Confirmation can be expressed verbally or nonverbally.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whether emitted by the teacher or student, this category simply implies that one part accepts the other part to hold a different point of view. This behavior contains no explicit value judgment (p. 126).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Positive Personal Judgment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This category includes behaviors with a positive value connotation that praise, reward, or give encouragement (p. 126).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Negative Personal Judgment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It involves negative value connotations which criticize or reject ideas, feelings, or behaviors of others. Jokes and sarcasm are included in this category (p. 127).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Covert Silence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Periods of silence in the classroom due to thinking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Overt Silence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is an observable nonverbal behavior characterized by lasting longer than five seconds, such as student doing a reading assignment. It is also used to categorize situations when a number of people talk and no one is the center of focus (p. 128).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Instructionally Nonfunctional Behavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instances of teacher and student behavior that are not related to instruction or classroom management, such as when someone comes in the classroom (p. 129).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Interaction Separation Designation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is considered a notation (symbol) rather than a category. It is used to categorize student/student interaction or teacher/teacher interaction (p. 129).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F: Descriptive Analysis of the ELF Video Program and Conclusions

Introduction

To examine the ELF program from a perspective of interaction behaviors, it was first necessary to understand the theoretical orientation adopted in the development of the video program, and to observe the way the program was structured as a result of this orientation. The researcher's analysis of the structure of the video program concentrated on three elements: 1) instructional strategies, 2) video lesson design, and 3) lesson content. These elements helped identify and describe the types of interaction that were most predominant in ELF.

This section presents a brief overview of the ELF language video program. It concentrates on aspects of the program such as: 1) program goals, 2) video setting and physical organization, 3) materials, and 4) video lesson organization. This section also includes an analysis of the structure of the program from an interactive perspective concentrating on elements such as instructional strategies, lesson design and lesson content. General conclusions in terms of the most predominant teacher behaviors in the video lessons, and the amount of teacher and student talk close the present appendix.
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Theoretical Framework

The ELF video lesson program was created in 1988. During this period, the awareness among researchers of the contribution of communication and interaction in language acquisition started rising. This new consciousness challenged the existing language teaching practices, which for a long time had relied on strongly grammar-oriented instruction followed by the use of great amounts of translation and mechanical repetition. Instead, the focus shifted to a method that reinforced the learner’s receptive skills, leading to comprehension as well as production of the foreign language (Ellis, 1990).

The advent of an approach that put emphasis on language production challenged language programs to redefine their goals, to adjust their curricula to meet the requirements of the new approach, and to help students achieve rapid and successful language learning. Despite the resistance of deeply rooted grammar-translation followers, the wave towards a more naturalistic, interactive, and communicative mode of language education was becoming increasingly stronger. The intention of this approach was translated in terms of facilitating student language learning, and providing them with a more realistic and meaningful experience in foreign language learning.

ELF belongs to this period of changes in language education. The program attempts to undermine the theories of habit formation which were still in vogue at that time, in order to promote the type of language instruction that focuses on communicative language ability. Communicative language ability is defined as the ability to understand others and to express oneself (Lee & VanPatten, 1995). Although ELF uses some
features of traditional methods of language teaching, there is visible effort in each video
lesson in presenting the target language through a communicative and contextualized
perspective.

An Overview of the Video Program

Video program goals and production

The Elementary Language Fundamentals (ELF) is a video lesson program designed
for elementary level students in grades K through five. Its intent is threefold. 1) to expose
elementary school children to foreign languages; 2) to help them create a positive attitude
toward foreign language study; and 3) to heighten students' appreciation for world
cultures. ELF is a language-experience program based essentially on the oral and the
visual exposure of the target language. The program has three versions: Spanish, German
and French. Patterns of interaction were described only in the Spanish version of the
language video program in this study.

The production of the ELF program was funded by the Education for Economic
Security Act under the Cooperative Grant Program in a Southeastern state. The
accomplishment of the project was possible with the participation of foreign language
teachers and students in the area.
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Video setting and physical organization

ELF recreates a real classroom environment in its video lessons. The classroom environment is composed of a teacher and a group of students. The classroom scenario is represented by a conventional classroom. It has a chalkboard used as the background scene for the setting, and two rows of chairs facing the board where video students are placed. Figure 3 provides a visual representation of the physical organization of the video setting.

![Diagram of video setting]

Figure 3. Physical organization of the setting in the ELF video program

Chairs are used instead of the standard-classroom desks as a way to emphasize the oral and active feature of the video program. As a result, children who learn the foreign language through the ELF program are not expected to write or take notes during the
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lessons. Instead, learners are encouraged to concentrate on the sounds of the language, and to work on pronunciation rather than on spelling, which is a developmentally appropriate approach for children age eight and below. The aspect of the physical organization in the video program reflects its philosophy to help learners build language competence through listening (Ellis, 1990).

The class group used in ELF is of approximately eight students. Students are placed in two rows of chairs in the classroom setting. Four students sit in the front row and four in the back row. All of them face the teacher. The teacher typically stands in front of the children in the video lessons. This type of seating arrangement reinforces the teacher-student interaction pattern, which, in turn, does not facilitate language learners to interact among themselves since they all face the teacher. On the other hand, the number of students used for the video lessons is ideal for communication and interaction purposes. It can be said that the setting created in ELF lends itself exceptionally well to the use of communicative language.

The group of students selected to participate in the production of the video program consists essentially of second and third graders. Their ages range from eight to nine years old. It is assumed that by selecting a group of students who belong to an intermediary age group, the program lessons can be easily adapted to younger and older language learners. It is to say that the ELF program uses this strategy to appeal to the different age groups it is designed for.
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Materials

The program is composed of twenty-five video lessons. The video lessons are transcribed and organized in a notebook. Besides the typescripts of the lessons, the notebook includes activity sections which feature drawings of the active vocabulary of each lesson. These drawings serve as visual representations of the foreign words studied in the lessons to help learners memorize and retain material. Coloring and cutting out drawings are some of the ways classroom teachers can explore these activity sections. Another strategy found in the video lessons is the use of finger puppets. These can help students engage in communicative activities and interact with one another.

The purpose of the notebook is to help classroom teachers familiarize themselves with the content of the lessons, and to help them make decisions on the portions of the video lessons to be selected for their classes. In addition to the notebook with the typescripts and activity sections, the program has two audio tapes. One tape contains a number of instructional songs. Although all songs appear in the video lessons, classroom teachers can opt to use the tapes separately from the video lessons. The other tape is a pronunciation/repetition tape for teachers.

The ELF songs were created exclusively for the program. Each lesson features a song which reinforces specific aspects of the language studied in that particular lesson. The songs generally focus on vocabulary or expressions learned in the lesson. The purpose of using songs is to allow for additional practice on the material studied through an alternative modality.
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In addition to the songs, the ELF program uses a variety of strategies to enhance and to facilitate students' comprehension of the target language. Props, flashcards, slides, pictures are some of the resources the video lessons use to present vocabulary words, or to help represent the context of the lessons.

Video lesson organization

Video lessons last an average of fifteen minutes each. Each video episode is divided into three parts: review, presentation, and cultural segment. At the beginning of each video lesson the video teacher presents the objectives of the lesson, provides a brief review of previously studied material, introduces new material, and presents cultural information about Spanish-speaking countries at the end of each lesson.

The organization of the lessons is fairly consistent throughout the program. After the review and the presentation segments, there is a pause period. Prior to each pause period, the video teacher recommends that classroom teachers stop the tape at that point and allow for additional practice of the material with classroom students. There is an average of two pause periods per lesson. In addition to the pause periods, a summary of the main points studied in the day's lesson is presented at the end of each video lesson. Summaries appear either before or after the cultural segment as a way to provide closure to the lesson.

ELF is a program with several communicative tendencies. Its goal is to expose students to the target language, and it does so by means of great amounts of whole group
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(choral) repetition. Nevertheless, it lacks some of the communicative features such as engaging video students more frequently in some kind of conversational interaction with each other, which is intended to help learners achieve automaticity by means of practice.

The Structure of ELF from an Interactive Perspective

An analysis of the predominant types of interaction patterns in ELF showed that the structure of the program relies substantially on three types of interaction patterns, according to the OSIA system. The categories of behavior found to be the most prevalent in the video program were: 1) initiation of information, 2) solicitation of response, and 3) response to solicitation. The program tends to produce more frequent instances of the teacher-student discourse pattern, ranging from teacher questioning strategies to solicitation of whole group (choral) repetition. Instances of student-student interaction appear sparingly in the video lessons.

A second aspect to emerge is the amount of teacher solicitations compared to the total number of student responses to the teacher solicitations. Based on the data obtained through the investigation of patterns of interaction in the ELF video lessons, it was found that there were 1,082 teacher solicitations of response compared to 331 instances of student response to teacher solicitations. The results showed that instances of teacher solicitation of response are approximately three times more frequent than student response to solicitation.
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The amount of teacher talk in ELF also made differences in the patterns of interaction among the players of the video program scene. 86.71% of the total speech in ELF is done by the video teacher. Video students interact with the video teacher or with each other in approximately 10% of the total classroom talk. It is hypothesized then, that short durations of wait-time between the video teacher solicitations and the students responses may have contributed to the increment of teacher talk time.

Another aspect related to the structure of the program is the way the video teacher and the students are positioned in the classroom. For recording purposes, the video teacher stands in the front of the class. This artifact portrays the video teacher as the dominant figure in the video classroom setting. Students, on the other hand, are typically pictured on their seats. There are instances in the video lessons in which students move around the room or are asked to engage in some type of Total Physical Response (TPR) (Asher, 1986) activities. Nevertheless, even in these instances, the video teacher takes control over the ongoing task.

In sum, there is reliable evidence from the examination of the structure of ELF from the viewpoint of interaction patterns that the program is designed from a teacher-centered perspective. There are rare instances of student-student interaction in the program lessons. Examples of teacher-centeredness in ELF may be represented by features such as amount of teacher talk and the positioning of the players in the video scene.
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Instructional strategies

The ELF video program makes use of a wide variety of instructional strategies. Some more communicative and interactive than others. From props to realia, the program explores diversified strategies to make language meaningful and easy to understand. As a way to enhance student's comprehension of the material, the program utilizes situations that provide a context to the lessons. Besides the use of contextualized scenes, puppets are used as characters who play their parts in different portions of the video lessons. This resource allows learners to easily recall situations from previous portions, and to establish connections between linguistic structures and functions which help build a readiness for foreign language study.

Scenario

In its attempts to incorporate communicative features into the program, ELF presents a scenario in its video lessons that illustrates the continuous interactions between the speaker and the listeners. That is, the program relies entirely on the interaction between the video teacher and her students. This interaction is at times extended to classroom viewers. Instances of interaction between the video teacher and the classroom students are represented by whole group (choral) repetition of material or participation in a TPR (Asher, 1986) activity such as "Simon says."

The interactive feature of the video lessons establishes the communicative attempt of the program, despite the fact that interaction per se is not part of the program goals.
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The rationale for portraying a typical language classroom atmosphere is to suggest the types of strategies to be promoted in real language classroom situations for faster and more successful language learning.

_Body language_

A common instructional strategy performed by the video teacher is the use of hand gestures. These gestures aim to encourage video students as well as classroom students to interact with the video teacher. For example, in several instances of the program the video teacher uses hand movements to invite video students and viewers to repeat after her. Through this body language strategy, the video teacher solicits the audience reaction to what is being done in the video lesson. The video teacher frequently invites both audiences - video students and classroom students - to engage in games, to sing songs, and to participate in activities all together. The attempts the video program makes to generate interaction in the classroom environment via its lessons represent opportunities the program provides to increase situations for language practice, thus guaranteeing better language results.

_Pause periods_

In addition to inviting audiences to participate in the lessons, the program also allows for additional practice of the material studied. After the review and the presentation segments, classroom teachers are instructed to stop the tape so that
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additional practice on the vocabulary and structures presented on that portion of the video lesson can be done with classroom students. These pause periods appear in average twice in each video lesson. Before each pause period, the video teacher gives suggestions to classroom teachers on the types of activities they can use with their students to provide for additional reinforcement of the language studied in that segment. The pause periods represent periods in which language is expected to be practiced in the language classroom in a communicative fashion.

Strategies

Not all instructional strategies used in the video program can be viewed as communicative. The program emphasizes the use of stimulus and response throughout its video lessons. This behaviorist approach is used as a way to help learners practice specific phonetic features of L2, and produce utterances in the target language. Through imitation and mechanical repetition, the video teacher drills the vocabulary and the structures presented in the lessons.

Although the use of stimulus and response are popular tactics in ELF, the program also makes use of 1,082 instances of soliciting behaviors. These are effective strategies in the foreign language classroom environment because they help induce student communicative verbal behavior. Nevertheless, the time interval allocated for the occurrence of the second behavior after the first behavior occurs is often not sufficient to generate an observable response from the solicited part. The overall occurrence of solicitations and responses shows that wait-time between the video teacher solicitations
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and the video students' responses is in average less than five seconds. The fact that wait-
time between these two behaviors is generally insufficient to generate the second behavior,
it was found that in general teacher solicitations are not accompanied by student
responses. In addition, the video teacher does not provide opportunities for video
students to repeat the material on their own. The video teacher commonly does the
repetition drills aloud which results in decreased instances of repetition of the material by
video students, reducing instances of student interaction with the video teacher.

In terms of comprehension-facilitating devices, the program presents a number of
effective strategies to ensure material comprehension. Hands-on activities and
manipulatives are some of the commonly-used devices to enhance comprehension and
material retention. Props, realia and flashcards constitute some of the examples of the
resources explored in the video lessons to ease student comprehension of material. It was
found that these devices help learners grasp the meaning of unfamiliar words or
expressions more easily through visual strategies than through oral exposure. Research on
the effectiveness of visual strategies (Price, 1990) maintains that this type of strategy is
powerful in promoting better retention of incoming information.

Another strategy ELF uses to provoke interactive instruction is represented by
conversations established between the video teacher and props. This instructional strategy
attempts to make the lesson communicative and interactive as well as to create a
meaningful context to teach the language. A common situation, however, is that video
students are not encouraged to engage in these conversational tasks and practice the
language communicatively with the props as well. Instead, their role is to observe the
communicative demonstrations done by the video teacher. Students do not establish
direct interaction with the props or with each other. Their participation is restricted to mechanical interaction which is expressed through whole class repetition of indicated vocabulary or expressions.

The ELF program utilizes an effective strategy of recycling previously studied material and incorporating it into new contexts. This strategy allows for supplementary reinforcement, at the same time it reveals the multiplicity of contexts in which an item can be incorporated. For example, numbers and colors are reinforced in a number of different portions of the video lessons through a variety of contexts. Some contexts are more effective than others in promoting learning.

The effectiveness of the contexts is dictated by two prerequisites. One of them is the level of cognitive engagement the students need to accomplish the instructional task. A cognitively demanding activity can be exemplified by activities that require critical thinking and/or decision making. For instance, in lesson 21 of the video program the teacher presents a situation in which one of the characters is thirsty. She uses the word "thirsty" in Spanish, and asks the students how they can help this character. Through this type of solicitation, the video teacher allowed students to make their own decisions on what they should give this thirsty person. The second prerequisite to determine context effectiveness is how much instructional strategies emphasize the use of language that is natural in L2 situations. This relates to the authenticity of the language used in everyday second language situations.

It can be said that the use of communicative and interactive instructional strategies
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is one of the hidden goals of the video program. Although ELF attempts to approach language learning in a communicative and interactive fashion, it fails in furthering student's communicative and interactive skills. Configurations of student-student interchanges are rare because of the limited interaction opportunities available to the learners. In addition, in the great majority of the instructional strategies presented in the video lessons, the proportion of time the video teacher controls speech is substantially high to generate an increase in communicative talk among the learners.

Lesson design

In order to analyze the design of the ELF video lessons, components of instruction that are consistent in the lessons are identified. The components described in this section are: the goals of the program, lesson objectives, students knowledge of objectives, video teacher communication skills, student mastery of material, lesson activities and content sequence (Seels & Glasgow, 1990). In addition, findings from the analysis of lesson design in the program are correlated with the types of interaction that were found to be most prevalent in the video lessons.

Goals of the program

Two of the most visible goals of the ELF language video program are: expose elementary level learners to a foreign language, and help them gain appreciation for the target culture. In its attempt to introduce young learners to the study of foreign
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languages, the program aims at helping students become familiar with the sounds of L2, and encouraging them to imitate the unfamiliar sounds as closely as possible. Focusing on the second explicit goal of the program, which is the appreciation for the target culture, it is noticed that the lessons have a strong emphasis on cultural concepts, global awareness, and peculiarities of the target culture. Based on these two perceived goals, the ELF video lessons are designed to reinforce listening over speaking; to provide abundant opportunities for choral repetition; and to present aspects of the target culture in a multiplicity of contexts.

Lesson objectives and student knowledge of objectives

The lesson objectives are stated at the beginning of each video lesson. Conceptually these lesson objectives address student performance in terms of linguistic functions. These linguistic functions are stated in terms of general outcomes, with little reference to student performance. For instance, the majority of the lesson objectives are phrased in terms of the topics to be covered in the lesson (e.g., to talk about likes and dislikes, to tell time on the hour), rather than in terms of what students will be able to do with the language at the end of the instructional act. An analysis of the lesson objectives stated in the ELF notebook showed that three out of twenty-five lessons state their objectives using the actual words Students will be able to ... This is the case of lessons twelve, thirteen and fourteen. All the other lesson objectives present statements in terms of topics to be covered. Although, these are also related to student performance, these objectives do not specifically state that students will be able to produce those functions

163
stated in that particular lesson. The linguistic functions are listed so as to indicate that students will simply be exposed to them.

The distinction between traditional instruction and systematic instruction is that traditional instruction travels in a straight line. That means, that material is hardly recycled. Whereas, in systematic instruction material is often revisited allowing for better memorization. The approach used for the presentation of lesson objectives in ELF suggests that the program design fluctuates between the parameters of traditional instruction and the guidelines of systematic instruction. In other words, the design of the program is systematic. The delivery, on the other hand, is traditional. With relation to student knowledge of objectives, it can be said that students are explicitly informed of the lesson objectives prior to the learning act. This in turn is a feature of systematic instruction which contrasts with the way the majority of the video lesson objectives are phrased in the ELF notebook.

*Video teacher communication skills*

Examination of the video teacher verbal behavior shows that, within the category solicitation of information, there are two strategies frequently used in the video lessons. Questioning and cueing are the forms of solicitations of information most frequently found in the video teacher verbal behavior. Praising was also another communication skill frequently used by the video teacher. Praising is classified under Positive Personal Judgment according to the OS1A system. The high frequency of teacher solicitation reveals the program effort in helping learners play a more active and participatory role in
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their language learning process. Table 13 presents the frequencies and occurrences of these two teacher behaviors.

Table 13. Frequencies and occurrences of video teacher’s most used communicative skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solicitation of Response (questioning and cueing)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>1,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Personal Judgment (praising)</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student mastery of material

In the analysis of student mastery of material, it was found that much of the information the video teacher solicits is not provided by the students. For example, the video teacher asks "¿Cómo se dice cup?, students do not respond; the video teacher then says, "Taza." Only 9.8% of the teacher solicitations are responded by the students. Some instances of student responses are represented by unsuitable responses. For instance, the video teacher says, "Muy bien, I’m going to ask who these people are and where they are. ¿Quién es?, the students respond, "El hermano"; the video teacher reacts, "Pay attention. It is la hermana. It is a girl!". Due to the types of student verbal behavior observed in the video lessons, it can be concluded that only a small percentage of the video students mastered the majority of the linguistic functions presented in the lesson objectives.
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Lesson activities

In accordance with the goals of ELF, the video lesson activities are designed to engage language learners in the most basic levels of cognitive processing in the target language. Instructional activities operate predominantly at the levels of identification and comprehension of message according to Bloom’s taxonomy (Appendix L). These levels of cognitive processing are the simplest levels of learning based on this taxonomy, respectively first and second levels. At these levels it is expected that learners require longer periods of silence after a message is sent, considering they are working the incoming information in their heads, and trying to assimilate it. As a way to assist students in this information processing phase, the video teacher resorts frequently to L1 in order to ensure student's understanding of the activity. The resulting figures of the use of L1 in the lessons of ELF are of approximately 65 to 70%. As a result, 30 to 35% of the language used in the program is in the target language.

Content sequence

In terms of content sequence, the video lessons progress gradually from simple to more complex aspects of L2. Content in the lessons is organized in a sequential progression that ranges from concrete to abstract concepts. Concrete concepts are represented by language that can be easily demonstrated or experienced. For example, clothing, fruits, colors, are some of the concrete concepts explored in ELF. Conversely, abstract concepts refer to language that presents shades of meaning, or that deals with the
learners' feelings, emotions or opinions. For instance, expressions related to their likes or dislikes of a specific situation require learners to present their personal point of view about that particular situation. Another guiding principle used in the content organization of ELF is a progression from the self to other families, other schools and other communities. Considering these organizational principles, it is predictable that the level of difficulty in the ELF lessons increases as learners progress in the study of the foreign language.

As for interaction implications, the design of the lessons in ELF reveals features of traditional instruction, but also presents instructional activities that focus on interaction interchanges which, in turn, stimulate the use of the target language. The fact that the video teacher solicitation of student response was found to be the most prevalent pattern of interaction in the video lessons unveils the two instructional positions the program adopts, the traditional and the communicative. To elucidate this conclusion, it can be said that at the same time the video teacher controls entirely the discourse interchange in the classroom by maintaining a permanent teacher-student interaction pattern, she also encourages student participation through questioning strategies as an effort to promote more frequent communicative instances between the students and herself.

In order to increase interaction between the teacher and the students, and among students as well, the design of the video lessons should concentrate on tasks involving students actively, and reserving the instructor the role of a facilitator or monitor. Circumstances like these in the lesson design would have an impact on the types of interaction patterns explored in the program to allow for more regular occurrence of student verbal behavior.
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Lesson content

The content of ELF is approached in this study from the perspective of interaction. In the light of this perspective, the content of the video lessons is evaluated in terms of context, vocabulary content, vocabulary and linguistic functions that are potentially tied to the learner communicative and interactive purposes. The sequence through which the content is organized in ELF is also examined. The intention is to investigate how the sequence in the video lessons may help learners build up knowledge in L2, and prepare them to interact in the foreign language.

Context

The use of contextualization represents one of the features of ELF. The program makes use of a repertoire of contexts in its video lessons focusing primarily on everyday and familiar situations to the viewers. The context progresses in a fairly sequential format establishing some extent of connection from one lesson to the other. The variety of contexts represented in the lessons brings the types of situations in which interaction may occur naturally.

Choosing a context that is familiar to the students is undoubtedly an effective strategy for interaction exchanges (Clifford, 1995). Familiar contexts help learners understand the language, make learning more meaningful to students, and create situations that actually induce communication. ELF resorts to this strategy quite often in its attempt
to expose learners to the language. To illustrate the types of situations used in the video lessons, a brief description of the context portrayed in lesson nine of ELF is presented.

In lesson nine the context used is *Going on a Trip*. The video teacher pretends she is traveling some place. She has her suitcase with all her belongings in it. She is not sure what she should take, though. As she packs, she solicits the students' opinions on the things she should bring with her. The video teacher solicitations encourage students to use their common sense to help her decide on things such as: how many pairs of shoes, how many blouses and skirts.

The nature of the situation created in this lesson enables students to present their opinion which helps them engage in an interactive communication practice (Clifford, 1995). In this particular episode, it was found that students respond to 100% of the teacher solicitations [teacher solicitations (n=7), students' responses (n=7)]. It can be said that the context used in lesson nine was able to promote a desire in the students for interaction due to its familiarity.

The analysis of the information-exchange tasks in the video lessons shows that the majority of the video instructional tasks are not structured to allow for frequent interaction between the teacher and the students, and/or among the learners. Lesson ten represents one example in which information exchange is not the means to some other end or purpose. In other words, learners are not given a purpose for obtaining and exchanging information since the video teacher controls the task entirely. The situation in this lesson is a birthday party. The following quote illustrates the learner's lack of purpose in obtaining and exchanging information.
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T: "Let's see, Sara. You wanted to invite Alicia to your birthday party, didn't you? Would you go over there to the phone and call her if I tell you the number? 55-42-10. Is she answering?"
S: "No".
T: "No? Well, hang up and let's call her at her father's work number. 77-36-12. No answer there either? Well, let's hang up and we'll try later. Well, to make you feel a little bit better, I'll sing you a song. It's a birthday song, and it's titled Feliz Cumpleaños".

In this particular instance, interaction between the video teacher and the video student is not justified, despite the fact it is a dialogue between the two parts. In fact, this communication exchange could be classified as a dialogue with features of a monologue. According to Clifford (1995) "language teaching is not presenting or lecturing; language learning is not receiving and memorizing" (p. 154).

Vocabulary content

Focusing specifically on vocabulary content, ELF presents vocabulary words in a thematic way. The vocabulary is taught within the context of a specific communicative setting. For example, food, clothing, family structure, housing, transportation, numbers, sports constitute some of the vocabulary content the program explores. In general, the communicative settings in the video lessons have strong emphasis on the cultural aspects of the target culture. The customs and traditions of the target culture are explored in the majority of the lessons in the video program which to a certain extent determine the vocabulary presented.

Proficiency-based lessons are characterized by the presentation of vocabulary that is pertinent to ordinary second-language situations. Despite the fact that vocabulary
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content in ELF is fairly similar to the type of vocabulary selected in proficiency-based lessons, ELF can not be classified as a proficiency-based program. A proficiency-based program aims at language production from the very early stages of language instruction. ELF, on the other hand, is a program of language instruction developed to help students gain exposure to the target language and the target culture through listening rather than through speaking. Based on this evidence, it can be concluded that the goals of the program are restricted to providing students with simple exposure of L2 and limited mastery of language skills, primarily listening and speaking. It is apparent then, based on the type of delivery the video program adopts, that there is no emphasis on the use of vocabulary in connected discourse or for communicative or interactive purposes.

Vocabulary

The vocabulary used in each video lesson is classified as active and passive. Active vocabulary is comprised of words and phrases students are expected to recognize and recall by the end of instruction. Whereas passive vocabulary includes expressions used during instruction that require no assimilation or memorization from the part of the students. The average number of active vocabulary words per video episode is eight. Passive vocabulary accounts for approximately seven expressions per video lesson. The number of unfamiliar expressions presented in each video lesson is ideal for learners at later levels of language instruction, that is, learners in grades three, four and five. The number of new words may be too extensive for students grades K, one and two for purposes of word identification and recall.
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Linguistic functions

The linguistic functions are organized from personal information to global information, or from self to community. Proficiency objectives progress from an individual perspective such as encouraging students to give information about themselves (e.g., to identify themselves, to state and justify preferences), to a more global perspective which involves the environment the students are in or the people that surround them (e.g., to describe family members, to name objects in a familiar environment).

Most of the linguistic functions taught in ELF are based on survival skills (e.g., to express likes and dislikes for something, to ask people's names, to ask for the time). These functions are commonly found in situations of authentic language use. In other words, a number of real-life situations can be carried out with these structures. In addition, linguistic functions are organized in a spiraling and recursive format. Language functions recur in different segments of the program reappearing in other contexts to allow for a higher degree of identification and recall.

For interaction purposes, the types of linguistic functions adopted by ELF are meant to inspire learners towards a genuine interaction language learning experience. In general, these functions introduce the target language in a casual and familiar setting addressing topics that are of interest to the learners. By relating language learning to the learners' interests, it becomes easier to elicit willing student participation and interaction in L2.

The lesson content in ELF is sequenced in a way to parallel the students' own native language learning. Students are exposed to an extensive amount of listening and
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repetition, moving from words and phrases to simple sentence patterns in the target language. Although the content follows a progressive sequence of language learning, the lessons are not devised sequentially for different grade levels and different language abilities. The implication is that elementary level teachers, who are not necessarily language specialists, can make their own decisions on the sequence of the lessons to be viewed. Teachers can resort to the ELF notebook to identify the linguistic functions that eventually establish a relationship to the content being studied in that particular grade level, and from that decide the sequence that is more relevant to their classroom situation.

In sum, it can be concluded that based on the design of the program in terms of lesson content, ELF can be said to present elements in its context, vocabulary content, vocabulary, linguistic functions and sequence essential to initiate and sustain a conversational exchange, and provoke an interactive episode. Nevertheless, the nature of the delivery of the program does not carry out interaction. It suggests that it is often necessary that teachers draw attention to the fact that real interaction in the classroom requires the occurrence of more frequent student-initiated contribution. For this to happen, the teacher needs "to step out of the limelight" (Rivers, 1990, p. 9), and give more opportunities for learners to attempt to communicate and interact in the target language.

General Conclusions

Data from the predominant types of interaction patterns encountered in the ELF language program helped elicit reflections on the nature of the video program. In addition, findings on the structure of ELF served as additional evidence that allowed the
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researcher to formulate specific conclusions. General conclusions are presented below with regard to the most frequent video teacher verbal behaviors. Comments on the amount of teacher and student talk in the video lessons are also included.

Initiation of information

The data presented for the teacher behavior initiation of information can be analyzed in the light of amount of information delivered. Because initiation of information accounted for 39% of the total occurrence of behaviors in ELF, it can be assumed that the program presents an extensive amount of information about the target language and culture. This finding may indicate that the program provides sufficient background information about L2 which could have a potential impact on student language preparedness for subsequent language learning experience.

This finding also suggested that the video teacher dominates the classroom discourse in the video lessons. In other words, she is accountable for the overall classroom talk in the lessons, confirming the formulated hypothesis that instruction in ELF is essentially teacher-centered. The high frequency of occurrences of the teacher initiation of information behavior contributed to the reduction of student-initiated utterances.

There are many implications about classroom interaction that can be drawn from this finding. First of all, the fact that initiation of information was the most predominant type of teacher behavior in ELF showed that interaction, between teacher-student and student-student, was not strongly emphasized in the instructional video lessons. Results showed that the type of instruction adopted in ELF does not emphasize the interactive
Appendix F (continued)

aspect of language teaching and learning. Second, the amount of essentially cultural information provided in the video lessons, confirmed by the coding done through the OSIA system, indicated that students are more exposed to the culture of the target language than to the language per se. Content standards, what students should know and be able to do in the foreign language, are not clearly defined. This, in a way, is in accordance with one of the goals of ELF: to expose learners to the foreign language and to the target culture.

Solicitation of response

Overall, there was 33% occurrence of teacher solicitations in the video lessons. That revealed the program attempts to encourage interaction between teacher and student, and to increase student participation in the lessons. Despite the fact that the pattern teacher-student constitutes a constant pattern of classroom discourse in the video lessons, ELF proposes the idea of language teaching as an interactive act, in which teachers and students negotiate meaning in order to reach higher levels of comprehension of L2, and consequently better conditions for communication in the target language.

The fact that questioning and the use of gestures were found to be the most used types of soliciting behaviors displayed by the video teacher showed that theories of communicative and interactive language acquisition and instruction motivated the developers of ELF in designing a program with emphasis on communication skills. The classroom discourse designed for the video lessons was structured to stimulate oral communication between the video teacher and the students. The deliver of the program,
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however, fails to reveal the program attempts to promote interactional patterns and communication in the language classroom.

Response to solicitation

The findings presented for this category of behavior have implications to interaction patterns in the video program in two major areas: the teaching and the learning. As for teaching implications, it can be concluded that ELF portrays the teacher as the exclusive provider of information which is typical of traditional instruction. Regarding learning implications, it can be said that the program does not treat interaction as a necessary component of language learning, and as a consequence, does not encourage the use of the target language interactively.

In the analysis of student response to solicitation, much discrepancy on the amount of teacher solicitation of response (33%) was found, in comparison to the amount of student response to solicitation (9.8%). According to these figures, it can be concluded that students responded to roughly 30% of the teacher's solicitations. The remaining 70% of teacher solicitations are at large cases of teacher responses to her own solicitations.

This finding is consistent with previous findings in this subsection. There is little indication from the observation of the types of interaction behaviors that appear recurrently in ELF that the program promotes interaction between the video teacher and students and among learners. Instruction in the video lessons tend to center on the teacher reinforcing her role of initiator of information, despite the program attempt to create a communicative and interactive atmosphere for the video lessons.
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Amount of teacher talk versus amount of student talk in ELF

The fact that the amount of student talk is considerably smaller than teacher talk in the video lessons suggested that ELF promotes the role of students as passive learners. Students are not encouraged to react to the content with specific comments, or by giving examples of what is particularly interesting to them. Instead, they are given very few opportunities to interact, to negotiate meaning, and to contribute to their own learning success (Wintergerst, 1994). This in turn does not concur with what recent research in second language acquisition has emphasized. Research has stressed the importance of adopting a learner-centered approach (Nunan, 1992) for purposes of success in language learning.

It appears, then, that there is need for regular communication and interaction between the video teacher and the students so that the learning of a foreign language can be more successful. Furthermore, video instructional tasks should be designed in a way to involve learners, and to give them choices on how to perform them. This obviously implies a major change in the roles of the video teacher and her students in ELF.

Conclusions

The findings on the predominant types of interaction behaviors in the language video program revealed that the video teacher dominates the classroom discourse in the video lessons. Therefore, possible instances of teacher-student and student-student interaction are considerably reduced as a result of the teacher-centered approach adopted
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in ELF. Another aspect of the video program that may have reduced the possibility of classroom interaction was the insufficient wait-time between teacher solicitations and student responses. The insufficiency in wait-time may have prevented students' initiative to contribute to the lessons. In addition, teacher solicitations in great part emphasize whole group (choral) response. This, in turn, may have decreased students' motivation to interact once they knew the response would be provided somehow. This helps confirm the formulated hypothesis that instruction in ELF is essentially teacher-centered, and therefore less desirable as an instructional methodology for the acquisition of speaking and writing in L2.
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VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Informed Consent for Teachers

Title of Project: A Descriptive Study of the Interaction Behaviors in a Language Video program and in Live Elementary Language Classes using that Video Program

Principal Investigator: Solange A. Lopes

I. The Purpose of this Research

Your students are invited to participate in a study about the Spanish program being used at your school. This study involves experimentation for the purpose of identifying the types of interactions the program promotes in your classroom. This study involves all grades K through 5 in your school in addition to your group.

II. Procedures

The procedure to be used in this research is the utilization of videotapes of the Spanish classes done in the Spring of '95. A code will be used to describe your students' actions or speech in the videotaped segments, and in no instances will their names appear in the results of the analysis or in any written reports of the research.

III. Risks

Your students' participation in the project will help provide valuable information about how the Spanish program helps the students interact in the foreign language. There are no possible risks or discomforts to your students as a result of the analysis of the videotapes.

IV. Benefits of this Research

There will be no benefits or monetary compensation to your students' participation in the project.

V. Extent of Anonymity and Confidentiality

The results of this study will be kept strictly confidential. At no time will the researchers release the results of the study to anyone other than the individuals working on the project without your written consent.

The videotapes will be reviewed by Solange A. Lopes and by Dr. Judith L. Shrum, and will be erased immediately after being analyzed.
VI. Freedom to Withdraw

Your students are free to withdraw from the analysis of the videotapes without penalty. If any of your students chooses to withdraw, they will not be penalized by reduction in points or grades.

VII. Approval of Research

This research project has been approved, as required, by the Institutional Review Board for Research Involving Human Subjects at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, by the Department of Curriculum and Instruction and the Carroll County Public School System.

VIII. Subject's Responsibilities

I voluntarily agree to have my students participate in this study.

IX. Subject's Permission

I have read and understand the Informed Consent and conditions of this research. I have had all my questions answered. I hereby acknowledge the above and give my voluntary consent for my students' participation in this research.

If my students participate, they may withdraw from the analysis without penalty. I agree to abide by the rules of this research.

__________________________________________  ________________
Teacher                                      Date

Should you have any questions about this research, please contact:

__________________________________________
Solange A. Lopes
Investigator

__________________________________________
Dr. Judith L. Shrum
Faculty Advisor

__________________________________________  ________________
Dr. Ernest R. Stout
Chair, IRB
Research Division
Phone

Phone
Phone
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VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Informed Consent for Parents

Title of Project: A Descriptive Study of the Interaction Behaviors in a Language Video program and in Live Elementary Language Classes using that Video Program
Principal Investigator: Solange A. Lopes

I. The Purpose of this Research

Your child is invited to participate in a study about the Spanish program being used at your child's school. This study involves experimentation for the purpose of identifying the types of interaction the language program promotes. This study involves 299 children in addition to your child.

II. Procedures

The procedure to be used in this research is the utilization of videotapings of the Spanish classes done in the Spring of '95. A code will be used to describe your child's actions or speech in the videotaped segments, and in no instances will the name of your child appear in the results of the analysis or in any written reports of the research.

III. Risks

Your child's participation in the project will help provide valuable information about how the Spanish program helps the students interact in the foreign language. There are no possible risks or discomforts to your child as a result of the analysis of the videotapes.

IV. Benefits of this Research

There will be no benefits or monetary compensation to your child's participation in the research.

V. Extent of Anonymity and Confidentiality

The results of this study will be kept strictly confidential. At no time will the researchers release the results of the study to anyone other than the individuals working in the project without your written consent. The videotapes will be reviewed by Solange A. Lopes and by Dr. Judith L. Shrum, and will be erased immediately after being analyzed.
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VI. Freedom to Withdraw

Your child is free to withdraw from the analysis of the videotapes without penalty. If your child chooses to withdraw or if you choose not to have your child participate, he or she will not be penalized by reduction in points or grades.

VII. Approval of Research

This research project has been approved, as required, by the Institutional Review Board for Research Involving Human Subjects at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, by the Department of Curriculum and Instruction and the Carroll County Public School System.

VIII. Subject's Responsibilities

I voluntarily agree to allow my child to participate in this study.

IX. Subject's Permission

I have read and understand the Informed Consent and conditions of this research. I have had all my questions answered. I hereby acknowledge the above and give my voluntary consent for my child's participation in this research.

If my child participates, he or she may withdraw from the analysis without penalty. I agree to abide by the rules of this research.

_________________________                       _________________________
                Parent                                           Date

Should you have any questions about this research, please contact:

_________________________                       _________________________
    Solange A. Lopes                                           Phone
    Investigator

_________________________                       _________________________
    Dr. Judith L. Shrum                                         Phone
    Faculty Advisor

_________________________                       _________________________
    Dr. Ernest R. Stout                                       Phone
    Chair, IRB
    Research Division
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VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Assent for Students

Title of Project: A Descriptive Study of the Interaction Behaviors in a Language Video program and in Live Elementary Language Classes using that Video Program

Principal Investigator: Solange A. Lopes

I. The Purpose of this Research

You are invited to participate in a study about your Spanish classes. The purpose of the study is to find out how much and how you have learned through this program.

II. Procedures

I am going to use the videotapings of the Spanish classes that we did in the Spring of '95. I will not use your names, just a code that will identify your actions or speech in the videotaped segments.

III. Risks

Your participation is very important. There are no risks or discomforts to you as a result of the analysis of the videotapes.

IV. Benefits of this Research

You will not receive any money if you decide to participate.

V. Extent of Anonymity and Confidentiality

The results of this study will be kept strictly confidential. Only Dr. Shrum and myself will look at the videotapes, and we will erase them immediately after all the videotapes are analyzed.

VI. Freedom to Withdraw

You are free to withdraw from the analysis of the videotapes. If you choose not to participate, your grades will not be reduced.
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VII. Approval of Research

This research project has been approved, as required, by the Institutional Review Board for Research Involving Human Subjects at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, by the Department of Curriculum and Instruction and the Carroll County Public School System.

VIII. Subject's Responsibilities

I voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

IX. Subject's Permission

I have read and understand the Informed Consent and conditions of this research. I have had all my questions answered. I hereby acknowledge the above and give my voluntary consent for participation in this research.

If I participate, I may withdraw from the analysis without penalty. I agree to abide by the rules of this research.

_________________________________________  ________________________________
Student                                      Date

Should you have any questions about this research, please contact:

__________________________  ___________________________
Solang A. Lopes              Phone
Investigator

__________________________  ___________________________
Dr. Judith L. Shrum          Phone
Faculty Advisor

__________________________  ___________________________
Dr. Ernest R. Stout          Phone
Chair, IRB
Research Division
Appendix H: Observation Log of the Video Program and the Classroom Settings

Video Program

Overall features

1. There is an attempt to make the program interactive by the setting up of the video environment - real classroom with real classroom students.
2. Objective of each lesson is spelled out by the video teacher at the beginning of each episode.
3. Video teacher makes use of hand gestures to encourage classroom students and video students to interact with her.
4. Program is designed in a way to allow classroom students to practice a section of the lesson by pausing the video (average of two pauses per episode).
5. Approximately 30% - 35% of the video teacher talk time is done in the target language.
6. The video teacher reinforces vocabulary and sentence structure through whole group repetition.
7. Each video episode has a cultural section delivered entirely in English.
8. Wait time between video teacher solicitations and student response is in average less than 5 seconds. In general, not sufficient to allow for response.
9. Amount of vocabulary words presented in each video episode is too extensive for early levels of language instruction.
10. Use of hands-on and manipulatives to ease material comprehension and retention.
11. Teacher talk time is high. She speaks at least 90% of the total class time.
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12. The video teacher tends to refer to specific students during class session. This does not give all students the same opportunities for participation.

13. Not much use of body language by the video teacher.

14. Video lessons present songs that reinforce the structures and the vocabulary studied.

15. The beginning of each episode is a review of the previous episode. The review segments are done in the format of choral repetition.

16. The video teacher tends to use commands and expressions such as: "Repitan", "¡Excelente!", "¡Estupendo!", "¡Muy bien!" in the target language. However, commands such as "Listen" or "Everybody" are commonly given in English.

17. The video teacher attempts to establish conversations with props to make the lesson communicative. Nevertheless, opportunities are not given for video students to interact with the props as well.

18. The program reinforces listening. Students play a rather passive learning role.

19. The content of each video lesson is built upon previously studied material - good strategy.

20. Not many opportunities are given to students to explore the language. Lessons are teacher-centered and very controlled.

21. The video teacher uses a lot of positive reinforcement to recognize student performance.

22. Although the program was created to be used in the absence of a language teacher, the classroom teacher plays an important role in providing additional practice of
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L2. Also, the pause periods are devised so that classroom teachers can add to the program.

23. The video lessons make use of contextualized language. For instance, "Today we'll take a trip to the mercado" or "Hoy, vamos a una lavandería."

24. The video teacher makes use of realia, visuals, objects such as: fruits, grocery goods, props, drawings, pictures, etc.

25. The content is well sequenced in the video lessons. Some lessons establish good transitions among themselves.

26. At times, the video teacher uses questions in the target language; e.g., "¿De que color es?"

27. As episodes progress, students get more involved and get more chances to interact. However, the pattern teacher-student is never broken which results in scarce instances of student-student dialogue.

28. The video teacher usually resorts to translation while showing students objects or visuals with the vocabulary to be studied in that particular video lesson. For instance, holds a pair of socks and instead of reinforce the word in the target language, presents the translation. Not an effective strategy.

29. The video teacher uses some effective strategies to have students drill "si" and "no" (episode #5). She uses lots of questioning to do the drill; e.g., "¿Podemos lavarlo(s)?" showing different pieces of clothing.

30. The video program set up is done as brief demonstrations of how classroom teachers can organize their language classes.
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31. The video lessons present a great number of objects typical to the target culture. These are effective resources to bring reality about the foreign culture into the classroom.

32. The video teacher usually repeats questions at least twice. Vocabulary words are in average repeated 2 or 3 times before she asks for group repetition.

33. The video teacher uses a number of scaffolding devices to help students identify vocabulary items. For instance, refers to an object using the target language, and points at it.

34. Activities are designed at the level of comprehension, identification and repetition according to Bloom's taxonomy.

35. Lesson is divided into: objective, review, presentation of new material built on previous knowledge, co-construction of the rule, practice section, closure by reviewing the items focused, song, culture section.

36. In the few instances of student-student interaction, the video teacher plays the role of intermediary by eliciting all the answers and responses (episode #7 - practice on "El lleva"/"Ella lleva.")

37. Insufficient repetition is provided to video students. The video teacher does virtually all the repetitions herself.

38. In the cultural segments, video students participate very little in experimenting the target culture; e.g., dressing typical clothing, or eating a traditional breakfast in a Spanish-speaking country, etc.

39. The organization of the video lessons is consistent throughout the program (e.g., objectives, review, presentation, culture).
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40. There are some instructional activities in the video lessons that can be considered cognitively demanding. An example is episode #7 in which students have to tell the quantity and color of the "globos" in the flash cards. In this instance, the video teacher avoided using number recitation, and picked numbers at random.

41. The program makes use of a variety of instructional strategies to present the new material.

42. Among the various cultural information the program presents, body language and gestures commonly used in Spanish-speaking countries are explored.

43. Some video lessons have a story line (episode #9 - Going on a trip). In this specific video episode, the video teacher stimulates students to use their common sense to respond to her solicitations. Effective strategy.

44. Although the program is essentially oral, there are few instances in which word spelling is explored. Episode #10 is an example. Video students are asked to spell the teacher's name and telephone number.

45. The program attempts to reinforce the use of material in context. During one pause periods, the video teacher instructs classroom teachers to do some additional practice on numbers using telephone numbers as context.

46. Some instructional strategies are purposeless and uninteresting for kids. For instance, the video teacher makes use of various ways to have students recite the numbers: as opera singers, as soldiers, as snobbish people.

47. The video teacher uses assessment strategies to evaluate student knowledge. In episode #10, students are asked to call another student on the phone, and invite
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him or her for their birthday party. For this activity, the video teacher would say the telephone number, and students would dial it in a fake telephone set.

48. At times, the video teacher focuses on individual students. Very few are able to respond to the teacher's questions. There is lack of modeling out and demonstrations.

49. Some of the situations presented in the video lessons are not very clear. Interactions are set up in a confused way. As a consequence, students do not know exactly what they are expected to do (episode #10 - birthday party).

50. The program does not stimulate much guessing and inferring. The video teacher translates most all speech she does in the target language into English.

51. The game "Simon dice" is the only Total Physical Response (TPR) activity the program explores. There are no other kinesthetic strategies the program uses to get students to get up of their seats and move around.

52. When presenting new vocabulary, the video teacher says the words considerably fast, especially for early level learners.

53. In general, video students do not look enthusiastic or motivated to learn. Their role is fairly passive in the video lessons, and their participation is in most part limited to choral repetition or group response.

54. Despite the fact that ELF was developed for elementary learners grades K through five, the video students are the same all along the 25 video lessons. The group of students that participate in the language video program is composed of 2nd and 3rd graders.
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55. Lessons are not devised specifically for the various grade levels, and for the different language abilities. Classroom teachers can choose to show the video selections in sequence, from lesson 1 to 25, or randomly.

56. Roughly 60% of student responses is not correct. Reasons seem to vary. In episode #12, for instance, it was felt that the video teacher does not prepare students sufficiently so that them provide the answers to her solicitations.

57. At times, the video teacher makes errors in Spanish related to gender. For instance, she uses a feminine noun with a masculine adjective. Incidents of this nature were found in episodes #15, 16, 24 25. Pronunciation errors were also found in the video lessons.

58. The video teacher uses positive reinforcement even when video students do not repeat or respond to her solicitations.

59. The video teacher makes use of a great deal of solicitations, but does not give sufficient time for student response.

60. The video teacher, at times, does not provide clear directions (episode #13 - song).

61. The video teacher smiles in very few occasions. Specially with elementary level children, keeping a warm, cheerful and friendly attitude towards the kids is important. Facial expressions are not very effective and appealing in the video lessons.

62. The video teacher makes a number of unnecessary translations.

63. An interesting contrast of gestures used in the US and in Spanish-speaking countries is made in some of the cultural segments.
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64. Introductory greetings in all the 25 video lessons are translated by the video teacher.

65. The program utilizes substitution drills in a few instances (episode #15).

66. In episode #16, mimicry and kinesthetic strategies were used to teach action verbs such as: correr, parar and andar. Besides these strategies, the video teacher also utilizes a TPR activity and a guessing game to get students learn the verbs. Effective.

67. Most video lesson present suggestions of activities classroom teachers can use to provide additional practice on the expressions studied with the classroom students.

68. The most frequently used strategy in the video lessons is repetition of material. Based on the types student behaviors, this strategy does not seem to help students in material recall and retention.

69. At times, transitions between the review portion and the presentation of new material are not smooth. In episode #17, for instance, the review is on action verbs (e.g., parar, dar vueltas, pular) and the presentation is on means of transportation.

70. The use of praising is so repetitive that it loses its motivating meaning.

71. The instructional songs are not generally easy to sing. The melodies are not very appealing for children, and sometimes the sentences are too long for production.

72. There are instances in the video lessons in which slide projection is incorporated. These slides portray various typical things of the target culture, such as: people, means of transportation, houses.
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73. Some of the review segments look as if reteaching is taking place. Even in these circumstances, video students do not seem to recall the material.

74. Very often the video teacher responds to her own solicitations.

75. The program makes some good connections of material. For instance, the connection between fruits and colors.

76. In certain instances, video students are involved in situations that require no participation from them. For example, in episode #18, the video teacher keeps Angela standing in front of the class during the whole practice, but Angela just participates nonverbally once in the activity.

77. In the beginning of each video episode, the video teacher greets the students. In the majority of the instances, the video students do not seem to be able to answer the question "¿Cómo están?". In general, it is very common to observe the video teacher suggesting or inducing student answers.

78. The video teacher tends to call girls to the front of the class more frequently than boys.

79. The video teacher does not encourage guessing, and does not allow time for this behavior to occur.

80. The video teacher is always very polite with the students. She often says "por favor" and "gracias".

81. At times, the video teacher touches students on the shoulders when they come to the front of the class to help her with an activity. Nevertheless, she does not smile at them.

82. The program explores interesting realia to teach vocabulary (e.g., episode #20).
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83. There are video lessons that have too many new items to be taught, especially if taught to grades K through three.

84. The program is not very creative in terms of instructional games. The only one explored in the video lessons is Simon says which is played 3 times. During the 3 times, the commands used are the same which, in turn, makes it repetitive and uninteresting.

85. Group work and pair work activities are never presented in the program without the interference of the video teacher. The teacher has total control over the activities. As a result, student participation becomes considerably low.

86. Student oral production is not often encouraged in the video program. Students essentially produce the language when they are engaged in group repetition or whole group response.

87. Before each pause period, the video teacher usually points out the structures and vocabulary words to be reinforced before the lesson can proceed.

88. Storytelling is used twice along the lessons (episodes #22 and 24).

89. The microphone placed on the video teacher's blouse is very sensitive to any movement or touch, which creates disturbing noises that can be rather distracting.

90. Video students are not encouraged to make decisions about situations in the lessons. The video teacher often makes all the decisions herself.

91. The video teacher often modifies her voice tone to add dramatization to her presentations. Good strategy.

92. Each video lesson lasts approximately 15 minutes.
Appendix H (continued)

93. The video teacher establishes direct communication with classroom students at the beginning and end of each video selection, and at the end of each pause period.

Classroom Settings

Overall observations

1. Both language consultants were novice. They were doing their student aiding experience when the language lessons were videotaped.

2. Both language consultants were unfamiliar with the video program, and it was their first time using it in real classroom settings.

3. The researcher helped the language consultants develop lesson plans, and choose specific video episodes to be shown in the various grade levels.

4. The two elementary schools that took part in the study had video cassettes and television sets available to the language consultants.

5. Each language lesson was structure in the following way: review of studied material, presentation of new material and practice.

6. The researcher helped language consultants develop assessment worksheets to verify student performance.

7. The researcher instructed the language consultants on the amount of video instruction to be incorporated into the language classes. The video program should be used at least ¼ of the total number of classes for each episode presented.
Appendix H (continued)

8. The average use of the target language in the early levels of language instruction (grades K through 3) was in average 30%.

9. Both language consultants used a great deal of solicitations.

10. Both reinforced memorization of material.

11. One language consultant was extremely reluctant to use the video in her classes. She completely disliked the program.

12. Both language teachers made use of hands-on activities. Some of the most explored activities were drawing and coloring.

13. Cooperating teachers assisted language teachers in keeping managerial objectives. They helped language teachers monitor and control student discipline.
Appendix I: 100 Isolated Unambiguous Events

50 Unambiguous Events in ELF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Number</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>S: ¡Hola! / Hi!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>T: ¡Hola! Bienvenidos a nuestra cuarta lección de español. / Hi! Welcome to our fourth Spanish lesson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>T: Buenos días. ¿Cómo estás? / Good morning. How are you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>T: Estoy bien, gracias. ¿Y tu rojo? ¿Cómo estás? / I'm fine, thank you. And you red? How are you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>T: Now, in this lesson, in our fourth lesson of Spanish, we're going to learn three more colors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>T: He can't even talk if he doesn't have a boca. / mouth / Let's give him one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>S: La cabeza. La cabeza. / The head. The head.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>T: OK. ¿Y esto? / What about this?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>T: Muy bien. / Very good. / Angela remembers because she had that funny pelo / hair / on last time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>T: Y estos son orejas, ¿no? Las orejas. ¿Y cuántas hay? / And these are ears, aren't they? The ears. And how many are there?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>T: Bueno clase. / Well class. / To help us now practice this vocabulary that we've learned, we have la canción. / a song.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Number</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>T: Dame un poco de leche. Por favor. Por favor. / Give me some milk. Please. Please. / OK. Let's sing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>T: El ojo. ¿Y cuántos hay? / The eye. And how many are there?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>S: Dos. / Two.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>T: ¡Muy bien, clase!, ¡Excelente! / Very good, class!, Excellent!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>T: OK. That's our lesson for today with the exception of the cultura. / culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>T: The song that we learned yesterday. Today we are going to sing it in two verses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>T: First, let's do a little repaso / review / with our friend the elf. ¿Cómo se llama the head? / What's the word for head?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>S: Sí. / Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>T: Now to help us review we have a new song. I'll sing it first.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>T: If you hear the name of a sport clap your hands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>T: You know that in the US football is a popular sport. In Spanish-speaking countries fútbol / soccer / is what they play.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>T: Bien. / Well. / And I don't like to play.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix I: (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Number</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>No me gusta jugar. / I don't like to play.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>¡Muy bien, clase! / Very good, class! / Let's now review the rest of los deportes. / the sports. / ¿Qué es esto? / What's this?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Sí, esto es un barco y esto es un avión / Yes, this is a boat and this is a plane / and on land esto es un tren. / and this is a train.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>¡Muy bien, clase! / Very good, class! / and what goes on in the ocean, en el mar? / in the ocean?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>In hispanic-speaking countries all these are used, especially the tren. / train.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>¡Muy bien, clase! / Very good, class! / You know, I think I need to go shopping, do you want to come with me?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Tell me one more time, Alicia, ¿qué lleva José? / what is José wearing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Lleva un sombrero. / He is wearing a hat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>And here we have some animal friends. Esto es el gato. El gato dice &quot;miao, miao&quot;. Repitan &quot;miao, miao&quot; el gato. / And this is the cat. The cat says &quot;meow, meow&quot; Repeat &quot;meow, meow&quot;.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I: (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Number</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>T: &quot;Miao, miao&quot;, el gato. / &quot;Meow, meow&quot;, the cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>T: Well, Sr. Robot / Mr. Robot / how are you feeling today?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>T: ¡Excelente, clase! / Excellent, class!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>T: Today we are going to talk about Miga's furniture. Her muebles / furniture / and how she got her muebles. / furniture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>T: Simon dice, andar. / Simon says, walk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>S: Taza. / Cup.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>T: Gracias Alicia y Sara. / Thanks Alicia and Sara. / Now it's time to practice for a few minutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>T: Here we are at our excursión / excursion / and we need to unpack. ¿Qué es esto? / What's this?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>T: Today we're going to talk about ropa típica / typical clothing / again, and you can see that I'm dressed up in ropa típica. / typical clothing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>S: Sí, me gusta. / Yes, I like it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>T: OK. Let's go over one more time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>T: ¡Muy bien, Rosa! / Very good, Rosa!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>T: Perfecto, ¡que clase más inteligente! / Perfect, what an intelligent class!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I: (continued)

50 Unambiguous Events in the Classroom Settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Number</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. T:</td>
<td>Since we've had a long break, who can tell me what we have been studying?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. S:</td>
<td>Numbers and colors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. T:</td>
<td>How have we been studying numbers and colors?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. S:</td>
<td>In Spanish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. T:</td>
<td>What did that song teach us to say?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. T:</td>
<td>Exactly!, ¡Excelente! / Excellent! / (Clapping) Very good!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. T:</td>
<td>Raise your hand if you remember how to sing the song still.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. S:</td>
<td>Me llamo (all together). / My name is...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. T:</td>
<td>And, what does me llamo / my name / mean?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. T:</td>
<td>¿Hermano o hermana? / Brother or sister?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. T:</td>
<td>Well, today what we are going to do is revise these family members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. T:</td>
<td>That's right. And how do we say sister in Spanish?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. S:</td>
<td>Estoy bien. / I'm fine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. T:</td>
<td>When I say &quot;yo también&quot;, I mean &quot;I'm too.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. T:</td>
<td>We are going to add in dog, cat, boy and girl.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I: (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Number</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>S: ¡Hola! / Hi!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>T: How about I give you a little hint. Abuel... / Grandfa...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>T: Who is this man? (showing a flash card).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>S: Played games (other various answers).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>T: Didn't we sing a song in here?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>T: ¡Excelente! / Excellent!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>T: For those of you with your hands up, why don't you sing if for me and your classmates who don't remember?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>T: My name is. Very good! My name is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>T: How about in Spanish? Do you guys remember the words in Spanish?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>S: (Various answers, many in English).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>T: (She draws a picture of a spoon). Cuchara. / Spoon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>T: Everybody say, cuchara. / spoon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>S: Cuchara. / Spoon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>T: Good!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>T: What about this? (drawing a plate).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>T: Plátano is banana.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>T: What about plato? / plate?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I: (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Number</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39. T:</td>
<td>We are going to watch a video, OK?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. T:</td>
<td>Well, they can be members of the family, but umm...they are not like mom and dad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. S:</td>
<td>Grandpa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. T:</td>
<td>How do you say grandpa in Spanish?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. T:</td>
<td>¿Cómo estás? / How are you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. S:</td>
<td>Mother, father, brother, sister, grandma and grandpa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. S:</td>
<td>My name is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. T:</td>
<td>Can anyone tell me what the second part says?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. S:</td>
<td>What is your name? What is your name?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. T:</td>
<td>And what did that song teach us to say?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. S:</td>
<td>Who I am and who you are.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix J: Validity and Reliability Worksheet
### Interobserver Agreement Worksheet: Researcher to Criterion Observer

**Observations: One Hundred Isolated Unambiguous Events**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Percentages for Criterion Observer</th>
<th>Percentages for Researcher</th>
<th>Differences of Percentages/ Criterion and Researcher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Clarification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Response to solicitation</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Initiation of information</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Solicitation of response</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Corrective feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Confirmation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Acceptance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Positive personal judgment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Negative personal judgment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Silent covert</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Silent overt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Instructionally nonfunctional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Percentages</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Tallies for Both Observers = 100

\[
\pi = \frac{P_o - P_e}{100 - P_e}
\]

\[
= \frac{92 - 29}{100 - 29} = \frac{63}{71} = 0.89
\]

\(P_o = 92\)

\(P_e = 29\)

where: \(\pi\) is the index of inter-coder agreement,

- \(P_0\) is the observed per cent agreement, and
- \(P_e\) is the expected per cent agreement on the basis of chance.
Interobserver Agreement Worksheet: First and Final Observations

One Hundred Isolated Unambiguous Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Percentages of Observation I</th>
<th>Percentages of Observation II</th>
<th>Differences of Percentages/ Observation I and II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Clarification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Response to solicitation</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Initiation of information</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Solicitation of response</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Corrective feedback</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Confirmation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Acceptance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Positive personal judgment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Negative personal judgment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Silent covert</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Silent overt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Instructionally nonfunctional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Percentages</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Tallies = 100

\[
\pi = \frac{P_o - P_e}{100 - P_e}
\]

\[
= \frac{91 - 25}{100 - 25}
\]

\[
P_o = 91
\]

\[
P_e = 25
\]

\[
= .88
\]

where: \(\pi\) is the index of inter-coder agreement,

Po is the observed per cent agreement, and

Pe is the expected per cent agreement on the basis of chance.
Write the Spanish words for the objects to complete the puzzle.
Appendix L: Bloom’s Taxonomy

The Cognitive Domain Taxonomy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Learning</th>
<th>Definitions and Examples of Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Evaluation</td>
<td>Making judgments about the value of ideas, works, solutions, methods, materials, etc. Judgments may be either quantitative or qualitative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examples: to argue, to decide, to compare, to consider, to contrast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Synthesis</td>
<td>Putting together elements and parts to form a new whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examples: to write, to produce, to plan, to design, to derive, to combine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Analysis</td>
<td>Breaking down material or ideas into their constituent parts and detecting the relationship of the parts and the way they are arranged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examples: to distinguish, to detect, to employ, to restructure, to classify.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Application</td>
<td>Knowing an abstraction well enough to apply it without being prompted or without having been shown how to use it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examples: to generalize, to develop, to employ, to transfer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Comprehension</td>
<td>Understanding the literal message contained in a communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examples: to transform, to paraphrase, to interpret, to reorder, to infer, to conclude.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Knowledge</td>
<td>Remembering an idea, material, or phenomenon in a form very close to that in which it was originally encountered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examples: to recall, to recognize, to acquire, to identify.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Seels & Glasgow, 1990, p. 27)
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