

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 235 677

FL 013 968

AUTHOR Snow, David P.
 TITLE Typology of Teaching Events in Formal Language Instruction.
 INSTITUTION National Center for Bilingual Research, Los Alamitos, Calif.
 SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
 REPORT NO NCBR-TN-11
 PUB DATE Mar 83
 NOTE 6lp.
 AVAILABLE FROM National Center for Bilingual Research, 4665 Lampson Ave., Los Alamitos, CA 90720
 PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS *Classification; Classroom Communication; *Classroom Observation Techniques; Classroom Techniques; *Second Language Instruction; *Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

This system for describing teaching events is intended to facilitate the analysis of classroom observations for purposes of comparing, documenting, or evaluating different instructional techniques. The typology is designed to describe a wide range of settings and teaching styles. The descriptors are organized into two groups that simultaneously depict two levels of events. Higher order events, such as tasks and lessons, are characterized in terms of the language content targeted for instruction, the language skill involved, and several features of language tasks. These tasks include an analysis of question types, response modes, and the role of cues. Communication events, such as turn-taking, depict the communication of an integral segment of information in classroom exchanges. The typology describes these events by their source, medium, purpose, and by a special group of descriptors for communication strategies and affective aspects of classroom interactions. The system will be useful to teacher educators, evaluators, and researchers interested in observing and analyzing language instruction. (Author/RW)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED235677

TYPOLGY OF TEACHING EVENTS IN
FORMAL LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

David P. Snow

March, 1983

TN-11

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

NCBR

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it. Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

FL013968



national center for bilingual research, 4665 lampson avenue, los alamos, CA 90720, telephone (213) 598-0481

The material in this publication was prepared under Cooperative Agreement 00-CA-80-0001 from the National Institute of Education, Department of Education. Its contents do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Institute of Education or of any other agency of the United States government, and no official endorsement should be inferred



ABSTRACT

This paper introduces a descriptive typology of teaching events in formal language instruction. The descriptive system is intended to facilitate the analysis of classroom observations for purposes of comparing, documenting, or evaluating different instructional techniques. Consisting of distinctive features of instruction which are largely independent of one another, the typology is designed to describe a wide range of settings and teaching styles. The descriptors are organized into two groups in order to simultaneously depict two levels of events. Higher-order events, such as tasks and lessons, are characterized in terms of the language content targeted for instruction, the language skill involved, and several features of language tasks, including an analysis of question types, response modes, and the role of cues. Communication events, such as turn-takings, depict the communication of an integral segment of information in classroom exchanges. The typology describes these events by their source, medium, purpose and/or topic, and by a special group of descriptors for communication strategies and affective aspects of classroom interactions. The descriptive system will be useful to teacher educators, evaluators, and researchers interested in observing and analyzing language instruction.

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ABSTRACT	ii
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. DESCRIBING LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION	3
<u>Approach, Method, and Technique</u>	3
<u>Components of Language Instruction</u>	5
<u>Communicative-Based Versus Grammar-Based Approaches</u>	7
<u>Limitations of Analysis on the Level of Approach</u>	9
III. TYPOLOGIES OF LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION	12
<u>Analysis of Practice Activities</u>	18
<u>Cues and Response Types</u>	21
<u>Classroom Activities</u>	22
IV. THE ROLE OF MODELS AND CUES	26
<u>Classification of Pattern Drills</u>	26
<u>An Information Processing Approach to Questions and Answers</u>	28
<u>Semantic Processing</u>	29
<u>Form and Content</u>	31
V. COMMUNICATION EVENTS	34
<u>Purpose of Communications</u>	35
<u>Interaction Strategies and Nonverbal Behaviors</u>	39
<u>Affective and Social Aspects of the Classroom</u>	40
VI. SUMMARY	45

CONTENTS (continued)

REFERENCES

APPENDIX A: Example of Coded Transcript

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
Table 1: Characteristics of Five Major Language Teaching Approaches	6
Table 2: Categories and Descriptors for Tasks and Practice Activities (MacKey, 1965)	14
Table 3: Typology of Structural Pattern Drills (Paulston & Bruder, 1976)	19
Table 4: Description of Major Activities	20
Table 5: Question Types and Levels of Processing	31
Table 6: Nine Types of Questions Described by Form and Content	32
Table 7: Summary of Content Relationships in Language Tasks	33
Table 8: The FLint System for Analyzing Interactions in Language Classes (Moskowitz, 1976)	42
Table 9: Summary of the Typology of Language Teaching Events	47

I. INTRODUCTION

Formal language instruction designates an academic classroom setting in which students are learning a second or foreign language. Language learning in a formal classroom environment is an important facet of the cultural and educational experience of many children and adults in the United States, particularly those in ESL and bilingual education classes. In this key area of education, however, the problem of evaluating instructional effectiveness is a critical but unresolved issue which continues to provoke controversy among educators, linguists, and researchers (e.g., Diller, 1978). It is probably fair to say that methods of evaluation have not kept pace in recent years with the rapid development of language teaching materials, audiovisual aids, and instructional techniques. Research efforts aimed at evaluation have been hampered by the fact that most studies have been based on general descriptive labels which are too broadly defined to describe the realities and complexities of actual classroom practice.

In order to support studies of evaluation, descriptions of language instruction must use a detailed unit of analysis capable of depicting 1) what teachers do, 2) the activities and lessons presented, 3) the verbal interactions between students and teachers, and 4) the use of cues and instructional materials. Furthermore, descriptive devices must be sensitive to nonverbal behaviors as well as social and affective aspects of the interaction. A comprehensive model of teacher-student communications would permit researchers and educators to begin a more fruitful study of the instructional variables associated with student learning. In addition, explicit descriptions of classroom practices would permit teacher training programs to effectively communicate techniques and to convey the reality of the classroom.

This paper addresses some of these needs by sketching a typology of teaching events in the setting of formal language instruction. The goal of the paper is to review several typologies of language instruction that have been proposed in recent years, together with related research in language learning, and to identify the major instructional variables that are potentially important in classroom practice.

The description system (see Table 9 at the conclusion of the paper) has also been supported by observations of classroom practice in ESL instruction. Samples of instruction in several Southern California classrooms were observed and videotaped. The videotapes, representing instruction for children and adults at different stages of second language acquisition, provide an empirical basis for trying out the description system and making it consistent with actual classroom practice. A transcribed excerpt, illustrating the use of the typology, is given in Appendix A.

II. DESCRIBING LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

Language teaching is traditionally described in one of two global ways. One of these refers to the setting or context, for example, instruction in English as a Second Language (ESL) versus a Bilingual Education setting. Another type of descriptor characterizes the general instructional approach. As examples, two approaches which have been the subject of much controversy in recent years (Newton, 1974) are the Audiolingual Approach and the Cognitive Method. A recent and interesting extension of the latter approach is the Natural Language Acquisition Approach (Terrell, 1981).

Although these descriptors are useful, they are not sufficiently explicit to serve the needs of research and teacher training. This paper is motivated by the perception that large units of analysis, focusing on the setting or approach, are not adequate to describe individual differences among teachers and different styles of interacting with students (Fanselow, 1977; MacKey, 1965). Since this is a basic premise of this paper, it will be worthwhile to discuss the question of different units of analysis and their implications for classroom research. Three units that are typically used to describe different strategies of language teaching are Approach, Method, and Technique. We begin by giving Anthony's (1963) classic definitions of these analytic terms.

Approach, Method, and Technique

In Anthony's analysis, an approach is an axiomatic set of assumptions about the nature of language and language learning. As such, it is a theoretical framework which guides teaching behavior but does not define it. For example, one such assumption is that language is oral-aural and that it is learned through repeated exposure to specific forms. This assumption underlies the Audiolingual Approach. Method is a plan for presenting the target material based on a selected

approach, for example, the use of mimicry and memorization, pattern practice, or free conversation. Technique is what actually takes place in the classroom, for example, the use of taperecorders, asking questions, or using dictation exercises.

These definitions constitute three levels of description in language teaching analysis, and reflect a gradient towards increasing specificity. It is possible to extend this list of terms further and analyze classroom events on a more detailed level. For example, Stevick (1959) uses the term "techneme" to describe what may be interpreted as a parameter of a given technique. A technique may consist, say, of presenting dialogs and asking comprehension questions. Stevick points out that the question-asking activity has many variable characteristics. One of these characteristics has to do with the grammatical structure of the questions. They can be in the form of a Yes/No question, an Either/Or question, or a Wh- question. Another dimension is the content of the question and its relation to the cues provided in the model dialog. Questions can be answered by verbatim recall or inference, for example, as discussed in later sections of this paper.

The important point is that the technique of asking questions can be analyzed into a set of variable characteristics or parameters. If any of these parameters actually affects students' responses or the difficulty of the task, it is a "techneme" in Stevick's terms, that is, a unit of teaching behavior that has significance in interactions with students. Thus, there are at least four possible levels of description, going from a global characterization of approach to Stevick's "technemic" level of analysis.

Several approaches or methods in language teaching are described in Table 1. The characteristics ascribed to these teaching strategies (e.g., Prator & Celce-Murcia, 1979) show that in actual practice the terms "approach" and "method" are not used in a technical sense.

Rather, they tend to reflect an uneven mixture of the three levels of description proposed by Anthony (1963). How well do these characteristics describe teaching behavior? In order to answer this question, we need an independent frame of reference that defines what an adequate description of language instruction consists of. For this purpose, we will refer to the major descriptive categories in MacKey's (1965) comprehensive analysis of language teaching. His set of categories is a useful overview of the building blocks of language instruction, and will be used extensively in this paper.

Components of Language Instruction

In MacKey's analysis, language instruction is characterized by four parameters: Selection, gradation, presentation, and repetition. Selection refers to the choice of language content to be taught. Gradation is the order in which this content is taught. Presentation refers to the manner in which the linguistic relationship between form and meaning is conveyed. And finally, Repetition describes the types of classroom activities which the instructor employs to make language use unconscious. In order to clarify this last unit, the term Practice will be used in this paper.

These parameters outline what a description of language teaching must entail. That is, an adequate analysis of instruction must minimally describe the selection, gradation, presentation, and practice characteristics of classroom events. Using these categories of analysis, we can compare different approaches to language teaching and determine how well descriptors at this level of analysis depict classroom practice.

Table 1: Characteristics of Five Major Language Teaching Approaches.

Category of Analysis	TYPE OF APPROACH				
	Grammar/ Translation	Direct Method	Audiolingual	Cognitive Approach	Natural Approach
<u>Selection</u> <u>Emphasis</u>	vocabulary, grammar		pronunciation, form vs. content	listening comprehension, communicative competence, vocabulary	listening comprehension, communicative competence, interpersonal communication
<u>Gradation</u>		oral skills first, verbs first	structures are sequenced		topically sequenced
<u>Presentation</u> Use of LI	extensive use	not used	some use	OK	OK
Grammar	explained	taught inductively	taught by analogy	explanations OK	not taught directly
Content/Form Relationships	little attention to content	oral model + actions/pictures	tapes/labs/ visuals, dialog form	context is used: audiovisual materials, stories	extralinguistic cues, comprehensible input
Skill sequence			listening speaking reading writing	oral/written modalities may be combined	listening nonverbal responses speaking
<u>Practice</u> <u>Activities</u>	translation	questions based on anecdote or dialog	repetition drills, memorization, avoidance of errors	communication-centered repetition is little used	communication-centered activities, repetition not used, errors OK
<u>Affective goals</u>					low anxiety situations, positive accepting attitudes, no overt correction

Characteristics of several major approaches (Prator & Celce-Murcia, 1979; Terrell, 1981) are outlined in Table 1, using MacKey's categories as an organizing framework. The entries show, for example, that the Audiolingual Approach differs from the Cognitive Approach in terms of Selection (the latter focuses on listening comprehension and vocabulary), Presentation (the Audiolingual Approach uses dialogs with little or no grammar explanation), and in Practice exercises (rote repetition is little used in the Cognitive Approach, in contrast to its extensive use in the Audiolingual method). As a case study of particular interest, we will examine in more detail the Natural Approach in second language teaching.

Communicative-Based Versus Grammar-Based Approaches

In this paper, an important distinction is made between grammar-based and communicative-based approaches to ESL instruction. It will be helpful to explore this distinction for at least two reasons. First, this is probably one of the most fundamental distinctions between different approaches. Second, the videotaped classroom observations supporting this inquiry mostly reflect communicative-based approaches. And finally, the results of these teaching strategies appear to be especially promising. For these reasons, the present description system will attempt to be sensitive to the major principles of communicative-based instruction.

In communicative-based approaches, messages and communication (versus language forms) are the focus of teaching. The instructional goal is not to teach a specific set of linguistic skills, but rather to set up the conditions under which children acquire language in natural settings. Two examples of these approaches are the Natural Approach (Terrell, 1977, 1981; Krashen & Terrell, in press) and the Confluent Approach (Galyean, 1976, 1977). Some general characteristics of the Natural Approach are discussed below.

1. Communicative Competence. Behavioral objectives are defined in situational, functional, and social terms. Thus, the instructional material is topically sequenced rather than defined in linguistic or grammatical terms (see Table 1). Another implication of defining communicative competence as the overall goal is that classroom events may take the form of loosely structured activities (rather than drills) and that questions may not have a specific target response. The purpose of particular tasks may be mainly to enhance the verbal and affective qualities of the communication activity.

2. Comprehensible Input. Teaching strategies are based on the assumption that first or second language learners acquire language through exposure to "comprehensible input" in low-anxiety situations (e.g., Krashen, 1981). One instructional implication is that the Natural Approach uses a two-stage format of instruction, with an emphasis on comprehension preceding production. During the pre-production period, there is considerable emphasis on listening. Activities that are typically used at this stage are Total Physical Response (TPR) activities (Asher, 1969), TPR with naming activities, and questions requiring nonverbal responses (pointing, nodding) or simple oral responses such as Yes/No or a child's name.

Some factors contributing to comprehensible input are listed below.

- a. Here and Now. There is a focus on communicating real messages in the here and now. This is opposed to many exercises and drills which are out of context and contain no important or meaningful message.
- b. Nonverbal Cues. The meaning is supported by the extralinguistic context, using visual aids, acting out, and direct sensory experience.
- c. Linguistic Input. Teachers modify (simplify) their speech until the students understand the message. These modifications may include slower rate, increased stress on key words, slightly exaggerated prosody, and simple syntax.

The social and interpersonal aspects of instruction are also very important in the communicative-based approaches. Indeed, one of the most important contributions of these teaching methodologies is their emphasis on both cognitive and affective factors in language learning. An important principle underlying the Natural Approach, for example, is that learning takes place in low anxiety situations that lower students' "affective filter" (Dulay & Burt, 1977). The classroom should be a risk-taking environment where children feel free to participate in classroom experiences and to experiment with new language skills. Some factors contributing to a positive, caring, and relaxed environment are: 1) Teachers accept students' attempts at language production and avoid overt correction; 2) students are not forced to produce language until they are ready to do so; and 3) there is an emphasis on language use for interpersonal communication.

Limitations of Analysis on the Level of Approach

As implied by the above discussion of communicative-based approaches, there are distinct and important differences between approaches. Indeed, these differences implicitly define a wide range of issues giving coherence and shape to the analysis of language instruction. We note, however, that descriptors on this level are not sufficiently differentiated to describe the complex and infinitely varied nature of instructional interactions. The descriptors in Table 1, for example, show that approaches differ from one another only in certain respects but not in others. That is, each methodology tends to emphasize only one or two dimensions of instruction. Thus, characteristics are not uniformly contrastive across approaches. For example, all approaches described in Table 1 (except grammar-translation) specify the use of nonlinguistic cues in teaching form-content relationships.

Perhaps the most important observation about Table 1 is that each of the general characteristics of a given method can be translated into a number of different techniques, as discussed above in connection with questions. Description at the level of Approach (or Method) does not typically specify, for example, the actual types of classroom activities, the nature of feedback, the role of nonverbal behaviors, or the specific communication strategies used by teachers and students. Thus, when Approach is translated into Practice, individual differences between teachers may be even greater than differences between approaches.

The videotaped samples of instruction in the present study support this conclusion. Virtually all of the teachers participating in the study felt they were using the Natural Approach. And yet they differed in such respects as their emphasis on structured interactions versus naturalistic communication situations, their use of nonverbal and gestural cues, and the personal manner in which they interacted with students.

Empirical studies have also shown that descriptors at the level of Approach or Method do not adequately depict teaching behavior. For example, Duffy, Roehler and Reinsmoen (1981) observed the classroom instruction of two language arts teachers. Although both teachers were proponents of the same method of reading instruction ("Direct Instruction"), the observational study showed that the teachers differed markedly in the way they presented lessons and in the manner in which they carried out the same curriculum mandates or used the required texts. The teachers differed primarily in regard to their use of two different teaching styles, which the authors characterize as monitoring versus explicating.

For the reasons discussed above, an adequate description of classroom practice requires an analysis that captures teaching activities on a more detailed level than is possible through general

labels of approach or method. The intent of the present description system is to identify potential "technemes" of teaching, that is, units of teaching behavior which may be significant in language instruction. Parts III through V of this paper discuss three topics which appear to be essential features of such a descriptive system.

Part III presents several typologies of language instruction, with special emphasis on practice activities. The goal of Part III is to identify generalized features of language activities and to specify a list of their major types and formats. Part IV considers the content rather than the formal aspects of language tasks. The focus of analysis here is the information processing requirements of language tasks using comprehension questions or structural drills. And finally, Part V describes teaching events on the level of discrete turn-takings. In addition to examining the source, medium, and purpose of classroom communications, this section also explores the instructional significance of different communication strategies and considers the social and personal aspects of classroom interactions.

III. TYPOLOGIES OF LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

The following tables present typologies of higher order events in classroom practice, covering the selection and practice dimensions of language instruction. These are referred to as higher order activities because the categories refer to events entailing multiple communications or turn-takings. That is, they describe a series of interactions (or communication events) between teachers and students. In practice activities, for example, these interactions may include the following events: 1) Teacher explains task, 2) teacher gives stimulus materials and models, 3) teacher elicits response, 4) student responds, and 5) teacher provides feedback. Each one of these steps involves at least one discrete communication. We will distinguish, therefore, between descriptors for single communications and those for tasks and lessons which apply to a series of communication events. The present discussion focuses on this latter higher-level domain of description.

The Selection dimension of language instruction refers to the following categories (MacKey, 1965):

(1) Phonetics

- (a) Segmental
- (b) Suprasegmental

(2) Grammar

- (a) Structures
- (b) Inflections
- (c) Structure words

(3) Vocabulary

- (a) Concrete nouns
- (b) Abstract nouns
- (c) Modifiers
- (d) Verbs

(4) Semantic selection

- (a) Lexical meaning
- (b) Structural meaning

These categories describe the language content which is the focus of instruction. The major headings may be represented by the level of linguistic description associated with them. The most useful distinctions in levels of linguistic description seem to be the following: Segmental (phonetics and pronunciation); morpho-lexical (vocabulary and

morphophonemics); sentence level (grammar); suprasegmental (prosody); and language use beyond the sentence level (discourse).

These categories may be used to designate the focus of instruction over large segments of classroom activities. Of course, they presume that the intention of instruction is to address a particular topic, such as vocabulary, or a particular syntactic pattern. Some approaches, as described earlier, do not do this. Instead, the teacher's intent may be to engage students in a language learning activity without regard to a particular linguistic skill. In such cases, the description system uses the last and most general descriptor, "Discourse".

Practice entails activities in which students participate in some way. This is perhaps the most important and complex area of instruction. Practice activities imply an interactive role for the teacher and learner, even if the learner's role involves a nonverbal or covert response. Table 2 summarizes the typology of Practice activities presented by MacKey (1965). Many of these tasks are illustrated by examples rather than by descriptive terms. In the examples, T represents the teacher or model, L the learner.

Table 2: Categories and Descriptors for Tasks and Practice Activities (MacKey, 1965)

<u>LISTENING</u>	
Recognition Sound Identification	(1) Same/Different judgements. Select the linguistic unit corresponding to the model (choose a number, check, point, circle). (2) Select the picture corresponding to a spoken word or sentence.
Phonetic Transcription	Transcribe sounds or spoken sentences into phonetic notation.
Auditory Comprehension Look-And-Listen	Spoken or recorded discourse is accompanied by pictures.
Read-And-Listen	(1) The model is presented simultaneously in spoken and written forms. (2) The model is auditory in L2, visual (written) in L1.
Listening	Listening only, as in the first stage of practice with model dialogs.
<u>SPEAKING</u>	
Pronunciation Sound Bracketing	Shift from a base sound to a contrasting (target) sound, e.g., Fr. /i/ to /y/.
Minimal Pair Drills	Practice with minimal pairs like "sit:seat", "boat:boot".
Oral Reading	Text in standard orthography or phonetic notation.
Listen-And-Repeat	Repeat an auditorily modeled sequence (imitation).
Oral Expression Model Dialogs	(1) Dialog is presented (listening only). (2) Then repeated in segments for imitation. (3) Dialog is repeated with only one speaker. The other role is spoken by the learner. (4) A spoken or recorded model describes a situation. This is followed by a dialog in which one role is played by the learner.

Table 2 (continued)

Pattern Practice	These tasks involve expanding or changing modeled sentences.
Addition	T: He's working. L: He's working. T: Today. L: He's working today.
Inclusion	T: Jim is working at his car. Always. L: Jim is always working at his car.
Replacement	T: He lost his pen. She. L: She lost his pen.
Integration	T: I know the man. He owns the garage. L: I know the man who owns the garage.
Conversion	Convert the model to a given form, e.g., negative, question, etc.
Completion	T: He has all of them and I ... L: He has all of them and I have none.
Transformation	A sentence must be modified to accommodate a substitution cue, for example, T: Today we came to school at nine. Tomorrow. L: Tomorrow we'll come to school at nine.
Transposition	Transpose a sentence into a related one, for example, T: (Ask for some) I like ice-cream. L: Please give me some ice-cream.
Rejoinder	The learner responds to the cued sentence in a given way, for example, T: (answer affirmatively and politely) Did you enjoy the meal? L: Yes, indeed.
Contraction	Replace given constituents with pronominal forms. T: It's my pencil. L: It's mine.
Restatement	Students paraphrase the content of a cue as directed. T: Ask me how old she is. L: How old is she?
Oral Drill Tables	(1) A substitution table gives a sentence structure with a list of possible words or phrases under selected structural elements. (2) A matching table restricts choices to

Table 2 (continued)

	certain meaningful combinations, for example, "I'd make a shelf/dress/cake/belt/poster if I had some leather/paper/cloth/flour/wood."
Backward Buildup Drill	T: ball L: ball T: blue ball L: blue ball T: new blue ball L: new blue ball T: a new blue ball L: a new blue ball
Look-And-Say	The student names or describes a picture: (1) thematic: Scenes depicting a number of situations, characters, objects. (2) semantic: Only one possible meaning. (3) mnemonic: Cues the student to previously learned words or sentences.
Oral Composition	
Question and Answer	Questions about dialog or reading material.
Reproduction	Free recall of previously modeled material.
Free Conversation	
READING	
Basic skills	Focus on word attack skills.
Visual Recognition	Phonics or whole-word recognition. For example, students may be given a sequence of pictures to name (Look-And-Say), then the written words to pronounce.
Oral Reading	Relating pronunciation and spelling.
Comprehension	Understanding text units larger than single words.
Silent reading	May be accompanied by textual aids, such as explanations in L2, translations in L1, comprehension exercises such as questions, or recordings (see Look-And-Listen).

Table 2 (continued)

<u>WRITING</u>	
Handwriting Drills	Tracing, or copying exercises.
Spelling	
Word Modification	Fill-in blanks for missing letters or words.
Transliteration	Write a phonetically transcribed text into standard orthography.
Dictation	Write a spoken text in standard orthography.
Composition	
Sentence modification	(1) Complete sentence frames with cues given by multiple-choice word lists, or (2) pictures. (3) Convert modeled sentences to another form (Pattern Practice). (4) Construct sentences from scrambled word lists, or (5) from picture cues. (6) Match lists of words or phrases.
Sentence Composition	(1) Describe pictures (2) Translate from L1. (3) Construct sentences from substitution tables.
Paragraph Writing	
Precis/Paraphrase	Summarize or paraphrase a given passage.
Narration	Write a story based on a set of pictures, or narrate the events of a typical day.
Exposition	Describe a familiar action such as how to ride a bicycle.
Description	Describe pictures.
Translation	Translate passages from L1 to L2.
Free Composition	

Table 2 shows that tasks addressed to speaking skills comprise a substantial portion of language instruction activities. An additional analysis of speaking skills is given in Table 3 which summarizes a typology of structural pattern drills presented by Paulston and Bruder (1976). The table is simplified in areas where the categories are identical to some of those presented in Table 2 above.

Tables 2 and 3 show that tasks entail a bewildering variety of activities. In fact, more activities could be added by combining some of the features described in the typology. For example, any of the pattern practice exercises could also utilize a recognition format, nonlinguistic cues, or more than one modality. In the next section, we will attempt to identify the distinctive features that underlie this complexity of activities. By specifying independent units of instruction, we can obtain a smaller but more generally useful list of descriptive categories. We begin by examining the organization of each table.

Analysis of Practice Activities

The entries in Tables 2 and 3 are organized in terms of three types of categories: (a) Language skill, e.g., speaking or reading; (b) type of task, e.g., recognition or comprehension; and (c) the degree of independent contribution required from the learner, that is, how much students must "restructure" linguistic models in order to respond correctly.

Table 3: Typology of Structural Pattern Drills
(Paulston & Bruder, 1976)

<p><u>REPETITION DRILLS</u></p> <p>Verbatim</p> <p>Open-ended</p> <p>Dialogue</p>	<p>Listen-And-Repeat.</p> <p>Chain drills in which each student adds something new to the model.</p> <p>The model specifies a structural pattern. This is repeated by the students with variations in content.</p>
<p><u>DISCRIMINATION DRILLS</u></p> <p>Pattern Recognition</p> <p>Context Recognition</p> <p>Function Coding</p>	<p>Recognize structural patterns, similar to "Sound Identification"</p> <p>Recognize the function of an utterance, e.g., "could" = request, ability, or possibility.</p> <p>The inverse of Context Recognition.</p>
<p><u>ALTERNATION DRILLS</u></p> <p>Morpho-Lexical</p> <p>Single substitution</p> <p>Double substitution</p> <p>Multiple substitution</p> <p>Moving slot</p> <p>Correlative change</p> <p>Syntactic</p>	<p>One constituent is changed by substituting a cue.</p> <p>Two constituents are changed.</p> <p>Three or more substitution changes are made. The cue varies with respect to the target constituent.</p> <p>Analogous to Transformation. May be simple (single-slot) or complex (more adjustments required).</p> <p>Analogous to Addition, Completion, Contraction, etc.</p>
<p><u>REPLY</u></p> <p>Two Stage Drills</p> <p>Short Answer</p> <p>Comprehension Questions</p> <p>Rejoinder</p> <p>Guided Comment</p> <p>Free Response</p> <p>Three Stage Drills</p>	<p>A conversation-like exchange.</p> <p>Short answers in response to queries. Analogous to Questions and Answers. Equivalent to Table 2.</p> <p>A specified structure is used for responding to questions or tasks involving differing content.</p> <p>No structure or model is given.</p> <p>A cue sets up a conversational exchange.</p>

Language skill describes the basic activity as listening, reading, speaking, or writing. These can be represented as combinations of two variables: 1) Receptive or expressive language skills, and 2) communication via the aural or visual modality.

<u>Language Skill</u>	<u>Modality</u>	
	<u>Aural</u>	<u>Visual</u>
Receptive	Listening	Reading
Expressive	Speaking	Writing

The typology separates modality as an independent characteristic in order to capture the shared features of such activities as listening and reading. This helps to identify other general classes of activity types which are partly defined by modality, as shown in Table 4. Table 4, an extension of the above schema, describes several major activity types in terms of the modality of the linguistic model and response.

Table 4: Description of Major Activities

<u>Linguistic Cue</u>	<u>Response Modality</u>		
	<u>(a) Nonverbal</u>	<u>(b) Aural</u>	<u>(c) Visual</u>
(1) Aural	Listening	Listen-and-Repeat	Dictation
(2) Visual	Silent Reading	Oral Reading	Copying
(3) None (or nonlinguistic)		Look-and-Say	Composition

Table 4 shows that several activities share similarities except that they involve different modalities. For example, "Listen-and-Repeat" and "Copying" are both imitation tasks. Similarly, "Oral Reading" and "Dictation" both involve a transfer across modalities. Thus, underlying tasks there are similarities and common

features that can more easily be appreciated if we separate modality from descriptions of the task type. As a beginning step toward representing independent features of tasks, the typology classifies tasks by two general descriptors: Receptive/expressive, and aural/visual (see Table 9 for a summary of the typology).

Cues and Response Types

Two additional features differentiate general classes of activities as presented in Tables 2 and 3. One of these has to do with the cues embedded in various verbal tasks. At least three levels of cueing can be identified (Hedrick, Christman & Augustine, 1973). These levels correspond to different degrees of immediate response support provided by the verbal instructions. Total cueing involves the complete modeling of the target response in the eliciting stimulus, for example, What do you want? Tell me, I want an apple. In some approaches, this type of cueing occurs at the beginning stages of instruction in order to maximally facilitate the acquisition of new language responses.

Partial cueing occurs at an intermediate stage of instruction, when the learner shows an ability to use the target form but still requires the assistance of a structured stimulus. Examples of partial cueing include: 1) Recognition (Is this a ball or an orange?); 2) completion tasks (Every morning I read the _____.); or 3) nonverbal cueing, such as pointing to an item, using gestures, or providing other visual cues. Oral reading might be another example.

Minimal cueing sometimes characterizes later stages of instruction when students have learned the target behavior well enough that it can be elicited by general questions or requests like the following: What's this? What's he doing? Tell me the story. Of course, some approaches use minimal cueing at the outset of instruction.

Another task variable is the target response type, that is, whether activities elicit a nonverbal response, a verbal response, or no overt response. The examples discussed above are all tasks requiring a verbal response. In some approaches, however, nonverbal activities are very important, especially in early stages of instruction. Students may at first only listen and then respond nonverbally to simple commands or questions.

Classroom Activities

The following table gives examples of major types of Practice activities, based on levels of cueing and response types. Specific activities are derived from Tables 2 and 3 and from the videotaped survey of classroom practices.

<u>Task Type and Example</u>	<u>Materials and Cues</u>
<u>Comprehension</u>	
(1) "I'm putting the apple on the table."	Teacher models actions
<u>Total Physical Response (TPR)</u>	
(2) Point to the mittens.	Several pictures
(3) Write the number of the picture that shows the fruit.	Pictures (numbered)
(4) Touch your dress.	Models action
(5) Put the grapes in the puppet theater.	Objects, action not modeled
<u>Recognition</u>	
(6) Are these mittens?	Picture or object
(7) Do you use the fireplace when its cold or hot outside?	Picture only of fireplace
(8) Are these mittens or gloves?	Picture or object
(9) Point to "mittens".	Series of words printed
<u>Identification</u>	
(10) Dictation	Oral reading
(11) Oral reading	Text

Task Type and Example
(continued)

Materials and Cues
(continued)

Imitation

(12) Say "dress."

Question-And-Answer

- (13) Who has the apple?
 (14) Where is the grapefruit?
 (15) It's not blue, its?
 (16) What's this?
 (17) What do you think will happen?

Response using a name
 Here/There
 Picture or object
 Picture or object
 Picture.

Recall

- (18) Which one is missing?
 (19) Where is the grapefruit?

Pictures
 Objects not readily visible

Conversation/Composition

(20) Any of the above

In comprehension tasks, students are not asked to respond in any overt way. TPR activities are characterized by nonverbal responses, such as performing a simple action, pointing, or nodding. Some of these activities present several choices for students to select from (examples 2 and 3).

The class of recognition tasks is quite complex to analyze. Evidence from studies of information processing (Howe, 1970; Kintsch, 1970) suggests that recognition tasks are quite different from parallel tasks requiring recall, and may involve a different processing strategy. Moreover, these activities are not always strictly receptive ones, since they sometimes require complex verbal responses. For these reasons, we define recognition as a special type of activity which is distinguished by the fact that the target linguistic response is modeled in the question itself (e.g., see Norris, 1970). The modeled response may be present in the form of a Yes/No question (example 6),

an alternative Either/Or question (7 and 8), or multiple choice format (9). The distinguishing feature in this definition is that questions (or their multiple-choice cues) model the verbal information needed for a correct response.

The above activity descriptors give a general description of task structure. They implicitly summarize a bundle of features: The type of response required (verbal, nonverbal, or none); the nature of cues (recognition, imitation); and presence or absence of cues in the immediate environment (recall). However, some features of the response description are not yet explicitly identified in them. For example, TPR activities may involve a multiple-choice format (examples 2 and 3). Similarly, recognition tasks may elicit a yes/no response or a choice among two or more alternatives. We will refer to this dimension as the task format. Descriptors, which partially cross-classify with task type, include: Yes/No, Either/Or, Multiple Choice, Wh- question, or Open-ended.

These categories all imply that questions are intended to elicit a specific response from students. In communicative-based approaches, however, the purpose of questions may be to generate interest in a conversation and involvement in a language learning activity (In adult classes, interview or signature activities are examples.) The response doesn't matter, neither its form nor whether it is verbal or nonverbal. To account for this type of interaction, we add an additional category, "Not Applicable", to the class of format descriptors.

Summarizing, Practice activities were defined as higher order events which apply to a series of related communication events. These global descriptors refer to three orthogonal dimensions of interactive activities, describing 1) language skill, i.e., receptive/expressive,

aural/visual; 2) task type, e.g., comprehension; and 3) task format, e.g., multiple choice. The above activity descriptors all refer to the overt form and structure of tasks. The content of language tasks, which is not as directly observable, is discussed next in Part IV.

IV. THE ROLE OF MODELS AND CUES

Part III of this paper identified general classes of activities and provided descriptors of their formal characteristics. The following discussion focuses on within-class differences that have to do with the content of the task. This dimension of task analysis probes the relation between linguistic models or supporting cues and the target response. In contrast to the levels of cueing discussed previously, the types of cues relevant to this discussion are not contained directly in tasks. Rather, they are secondary linguistic cues such as model sentences and dialogs (used in Pattern Practice drills) or reading passages in activities devoted to reading comprehension. We begin this section by examining the analysis of pattern practice activities.

Classification of Pattern Drills

Researchers have classified pattern drills according to dimensions such as (1) the type of response, (2) the degree to which the model influences the response, (3) the target behavior, and (4) the type of learning involved (Paulston, 1970). Based on these characteristics, Paulston divides structural pattern drills into three essential types: Mechanical (complete control of the response); Meaningful (some control, but the students must understand what they are saying); and Communicative (no control over the response). Using somewhat related criteria, Dacanay (1963) identifies four major classes: Substitution, Transformation, Response, and Translation. In this classification, "Response" means that the task does not control the form and/or content of the response.

Similarly, Prator (1965) considers the entire range of activities in language instruction in terms of the control exerted by the linguistic model and the task. Prator's analysis is based on the degree of independent communication that classroom exercises permit.

Accordingly, he proposes classifying activities in terms of a four-point manipulation-communication scale. Tasks that are completely manipulative (scale = 1) provide a complete model for the interaction. This category includes immediate imitation, substitution drills involving a verbal cue, and silent reading. In the second category (predominantly manipulative), tasks allow for a small amount of student contribution. Examples are delayed imitation, substitution drills using a visual picture cue, oral reading, and questions tapping verbatim content in reading passages. By contrast, tasks that are completely communicative, such as free composition, do not provide a model at all.

The typology represented in Table 3 (Paulston & Bruder, 1976) is organized by a gradient of subheadings that is similar to that of Prator's (1965) analysis. Basing their typology on the relation between the model and the target response (the "restructuring range"), Paulston and Bruder classify pattern practice activities as 1) repetition, 2) discrimination, 3) alternation, and 4) reply. Discrimination refers to recognition-like activities. Alternation specifies tasks requiring some change in the linguistic model. Reply suggests an increasing degree of independence from the stimulus model.

The classifications discussed above are based on the role of models and cues and the degree of independent cognitive contribution required from the learner. This concept has long been recognized in education, language therapy, and other areas as an important facet of task analysis. In educational research, questions have received the most attention, since question-like activities play a large role in language arts instruction and most notably in reading comprehension lessons. The next section explores some of this research with the goal of identifying the process distinctions underlying the diverse classification systems reviewed above.

An Information Processing Approach to Questions and Answers

The above discussion of pattern practice implied different kinds of cognitive processes for different tasks of the same type and form. The information processing strategy required for instructional tasks has been studied extensively by Pearson and Johnson (1978), in regard to comprehension questions in reading instruction. Pearson and Johnson consider the three-way relationship existing between the wording of the question, the response, and the text. Their analysis incorporates the notion of cognitive processing because it describes the source of knowledge that the reader must use to establish a connection between questions, answers and the text. Three types of questions are defined, each having a different relationship to the text and target answer:

- Textually explicit: The answers are "right there" in the text, and there is a one-to-one (verbatim) relationship between the wording of the question and the text which answers it.
- Textually implicit: Answers are also in the text (or derivable from the text), but the reader must use a text-based inference in order to construct them.
- "Scriptally" implicit: Answers to these questions require further contributions from the reader in terms of his/her knowledge and personal experience. That is, the data base for answering these questions is the reader's own script (Schank, 1973) for the realm of experience involved in the text (not the text itself).

An example given by Pearson and Johnson illustrates these three levels, using the following short discourse:

Right after the Civil War, many distraught soldiers made their way West to find fame and fortune. Some could not go home because there were no homes to go to. The war had devastated them. One young man, Will Goodlad, made his fortune in the hills of Colorado. He found gold in a little river near Grand Junction. His fortune was short-lived, however. In 1875, he declared bankruptcy and returned to the land of his birth--the Piedmont of South Carolina.

Some questions and answers about the text are given below, illustrating each type of question in the taxonomy.

- (21) Where did Will discover gold?
- (21a) In a little river near Gran Junction.
- (21b) In the hills of Colorado.
- (22) Why couldn't some of the soldiers go home?
- (22a) There were no homes to go to.
- (22b) The war had devastated their homes.
- (23) For what side did Will fight during the war? (The South)

Question and answer pairs (21)-(21a) and (22)-(22a) exemplify textually explicit comprehension: The answers are right in the text. Answers (21b) and (22b), however, are quite different. Although they are based on the text, they require the reader to independently make a logical connection between literal statements. Thus, they are examples of textually implicit comprehension. The question-answer relation shown in (23) is an example of scriptally implicit comprehension: The answer is derivable from the reader's knowledge (script) of the situations described, but not from the text.

We next consider a further refinement of the notion of literal comprehension in order to describe the comprehension process associated with paraphrased questions.

Semantic Processing

A special case of literal level comprehension tasks are those in which questions paraphrase the original wording of the text. An example is taken from protocols used by Anderson (1971) in a cloze format:

- (24) Text: . . . The traveler appreciated the gift.
- (25) Question: The _____ was grateful for the present.

Paraphrased questions such as (25) are sentence-level tasks not requiring inferences in the sense discussed above. However, they also differ from verbatim questions which can be answered on the basis of a superficial processing of the text, that is, "phonological encoding" (Anderson, 1972) or a surface representation of the text (Kintsch, 1974). Paraphrased questions relate to the text only on the level of semantic (propositional) representation, but not on the surface level. Thus answers to these questions require reading for meaning.

Experimental studies using verbatim and paraphrased comprehension questions (Anderson, 1972; Bormuth, Carr, Manning & Pearson, 1973; Caccamise & Kintsch, 1978) support the conclusion that meaning--the goal of comprehension--is represented psychologically by the reader in a form that is independent from the surface form (the original wording) of the text. Verbatim questions relate directly to the surface form of the text and indirectly to the deep semantic representation. They can be answered either 1) on the basis of the meaning of the text, or 2) by rote matching lexical elements of the question with the text. Paraphrased questions, on the other hand, relate to the text only on the propositional level of representation. They can only be answered by processing the text on a semantic level, that is, via comprehension.

In order to suggest the process distinction between surface and propositional representations of passages, we divide the category of textually explicit comprehension skills into two sub-groups: (a) Tasks with a verbatim relationship between question, text, and response; and (b) paraphrased questions in which there is a one-to-one relationship between the question and the text only on the propositional level.

In the above discussion, we have made several distinctions between comprehension tasks on the basis of the comprehension process, or "level of processing" (Craik & Lockhart, 1972), that they minimally

require from the reader. These ordered relationships between tasks and processes are summarized below:

Table 5: Question Types and Levels of Processing

Task Category	Minimum Level of Processing
1. Textually explicit a. verbatim b. paraphrased	I. surface representation II. propositional representation
2. Textually implicit	III. logical (text-based) inferences
3. Scriptally implicit	IV. experience-based inferences

The above schema shows the most superficial level of processing which is necessary to respond to each type of task. Verbatim questions, for example, can be answered on the basis of information obtained from any one of the levels. Textually implicit questions can be answered via information inferred from levels III or IV but not from information at levels I and II.

Form and Content

The analysis of questions-and-answers can be extended to include the grammatical form of the task. Stevick's discussion of "technemes" (mentioned above) illustrates nicely how questions and answers can be viewed in terms of at least two independent parameters. One of these is the content of the question, using categories described by Gurrey (1955) which correspond to those of Pearson and Johnson (1978). The grammatical form of the question (Yes/No, Either/Or, Wh-) is an independent variable that cross-classifies with content. These descriptors produce a 3 x 3 matrix for analyzing questions, which is illustrated below in an example taken from Stevick (1959). Stages I through III are analogous to content categories 1 through 3 in Table 5.

Table 6: Nine Types of Questions Described by Form and Content

Text Excerpt: This little boy is holding a broom. . . He has cleaned his room. . . He has put the toys under the bed. . . He is showing his room to his mother. . .			
Types of questions about this story:			
Question Form	Stage I (a)	Stage II (b)	Stage III (c)
(1) Yes-no	Is the boy holding a broom?	Is the boy's mother angry?	Do you clean your own room?
(2) Alternative	Is the boy holding a broom, or a toy?	Is the boy's mother pleased, or angry?	Do you clean your room, or does your mother?
(3) Question Words	What is the boy holding?	How does the boy's mother feel?	Who cleans your room?

The above categories are also remarkably consistent with Norris' (1970) analysis of question types. Norris distinguishes five classes, listed below in order of difficulty.

1. Information for the answer is contained in the question. These are essentially recognition questions using yes/no or true/false responses. Equivalent to row 1 of Table 6.
2. The target information is quotable verbatim from the reading. Column (a) of Table 6.
3. The information is stated in the text, but is not contained in a single sentence. No equivalent in Table 6.
4. These questions are answerable by implication or inference from the wording of the text. Column (b).
5. These questions require an evaluation or judgement based on additional information not contained in the text, especially the reader's experience. Column (c).

Both analyses take into account the form and content of questions and answers. However, Stevick's analysis shows that these two dimensions are independent of one another. Thus, recognition questions (rows 1 and 2 of Table 6) can be either verbatim (Stage I), inferential (Stage II), or experience based (Stage III), depending on their content. Therefore, the description system assigns coding independently for the formal characteristics of tasks (Part III) and their semantic characteristics (Table 5).

Synthesizing the classifications discussed in this section, we can define 5 levels that describe the relation between content of the task, cues, and response. The summary in Table 7 is produced by expanding the schema in Table 5 to include the observations of Prator (1965), Paulston and Bruder (1976), and Norris (1970).

Table 7: Summary of Content Relationships in Language Tasks

Level and Description	Question-Text Relation	Task-Cue Relation
1 Complete		listen-and-repeat substitution drills (verbal)
2 Transformed	verbatim questions	oral reading, dictation, transformation drills
3 Paraphrased	literal/paraphrased	delayed imitation completion tasks
4 Indirect	inferential	visual cues reply drills
5 Little or no relation	experience-based inference	free composition/conversation

V. COMMUNICATION EVENTS

The categories described in Parts III and IV are useful for characterizing high-order events involving a series of interactions between teachers and students. Descriptive systems have also been proposed for depicting events on the microlevel of discrete communications (e.g., Fanselow, 1977).

Fanselow's analysis, like the present inquiry, is motivated by the perception that large units of analysis, such as method, are inadequate to describe teaching behavior. Accordingly, he proposes a fine-grained description of language instruction that is based on each communication in the classroom. In effect, each communication refers to a discrete turn-taking in classroom interactions or to a separate type of information provided by the participants or the instructional materials. Communication events are analogous to "message units" in descriptive systems such as presented by Green and Wallat (1981). Serving as the basic unit of analysis in the present paper, these events are defined by their source, medium, purpose, and by a number of additional communicative and social characteristics.

Source refers to the person speaking or the written source of communications--for example, the teacher, textbook, a student, a group of students, or the class.

Categories for describing the medium of communication are listed and annotated below. This first group of descriptors refers to the formal nature of the medium.

Linguistic	Expressed with words, including suprasegmental information.
Nonlinguistic	Pictures, drawings, objects, realia, symbolic representations, sounds, music.
Paralinguistic	Gestures, movement, pantomime, posture, expression.

Another dimension of the medium, which is independent of the form, is the modality: Aural or visual.

The medium of communication is defined here as a unit of description that applies to interactions of many different intents and purposes. Since it is independent of any particular type of activity, we will need additional descriptive units in order to specify the context or intent of interactions. This topic is discussed next, beginning with Fanselow's classification of the purpose of communications.

Purpose of Communications

Fanselow (1977) uses four categories to describe the purpose of a communication event. Based on the work of Bellack, Kleibard, Hyman and Smith (1966), these categories are relevant to classroom instruction generally.

Structure	Prepare for the setting of tasks or activities
Solicit	Set tasks or ask questions
Respond	Perform tasks or answer questions
React	Communications not requested

Some of these are similar to categories proposed by Cherry (in Griffin & Shuy, 1978), who used a description system largely based on the purpose of interactions and the role of the participants. High order events are described as exchanges, with general types as shown below.

Elicit	An exchange intended to elicit responses from students.
Check	For example, "Lynn, do you know what I mean?"
Reinstate	Re-establish an elicitation.

Clarification Requests for clarifying, extending, or repeating information. For example:

Teacher: What is the second thing in the third row, Cindy?

Student: The second . . . ?

Teacher: thing in the third row

Exchanges are further categorized in terms of three Frames: Initiation, Response, and Follow-up. And finally, the last level, Acts, describes the individual communications that occur. These are listed below with an example.

Elicitation	"How much is two and two?"
Clue	"I'll give you a hint, it rhymes with your name."
Invitation to bid	"Who knows the answer? Raise your hand."
Bid	"Me, me, I know."
Nomination	"John."
Comment	"Maybe we can look up that other word."
Marker	good, OK now, right, etc.
Reply	"Two and two is four."
No reply	
Feedback	Right. "That's a pattern, but I was thinking about sets."
Informative	"My dance teacher lives near me."

One way of simplifying these categories is to define five "frames": Structure, solicit, respond, react, and follow-up. Within these, the following subtypes seem most relevant for our purposes

("clue" has been changed to "cue" in order to suggest a larger role for this category, including nonlinguistic and/or nonverbal cues):

elicit	clarification
check	bid
cue	reply
invitation to bid	no reply
nomination	informative
comment	feedback

The categories shown above are mostly relevant to practice activities, especially those involving requests for information and responses. This suggests that other major headings should be defined in order to designate additional kinds of classroom activities. An analytic category that is sometimes used for this purpose is the topic of classroom interactions. For example, Allwright (1980) distinguishes four classes of topic in his discourse analysis of instructional communications: (1) instances of the target language, usually models; (2) information about the target language; (3) pedagogical or procedural concerns; and (4) other topics.

The first two topic categories refer to teacher behaviors in the context of what MacKey (1965) calls Presentation activities. In MacKey's analysis, Presentation describes the manner in which teachers convey form-content relationships to students. It involves two major components: Expression and Content. The first of these categories describes how language forms are presented; the second, how meaning is conveyed.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Expression | How language forms are presented. |
| a. Staging | Describes the type of skill taught: Recognition, comprehension, and expression, and spoken versus written forms. |
| b. Demonstration | Modality or medium of presentation. |
| 2. Content Procedures for conveying meaning. | |
| a. Differential | Use of the learners' native language. |
| 1. Explanation | Deductive explanations. |
| 2. Translation | |
| b. Ostensive | Association with a visual stimulus: Objects, actions, or situations. |
| c. Pictorial | Use of pictures: Static versus dynamic. |
| d. Contextual | Using a linguistic context in order to explain meaning. Subtypes involve definition, enumeration, substitution, metaphor, antonyms, or multiple contexts. |

Expression corresponds to Allwright's first category (giving models of the target language). Similarly, categories subsumed under the heading of Content apply to communications which give information about the target language such as usage and meaning. In regard to these latter communications, there seem to be four basic techniques for using language to convey semantic content--definition, translation, illustration by examples, or explanation--and two methods for conveying meaning nonverbally, through a) ostensive (experiential) or b) pictorial cues.

One way of merging categories relating to topic and/or purpose is to specify a typology with two levels of entries. The first level is indexed to topic and covers the range of instructional activities in the analyses of MacKey (1965) and Allwright (1980): Expression (presenting models of the target language in lessons); Content (presenting information about the meaning of linguistic forms); Practice (tasks involving an interaction between teachers and students); Pedagogical/Procedural matters; and other topics. A second level describes the purpose of specific communications within Content (for example, definition or explanation) and Practice activities (structure, solicit, etc.). This is the organization of entries listed under the heading of Purpose in Table 9.

Interaction Strategies and Nonverbal Behaviors

A number of studies of language teaching have focused on aspects of teachers' verbal and nonverbal behavior which are believed to affect instruction but which are outside of the considerations reviewed in previous sections of this paper. In regard to verbal behaviors, Gaies (1977) reported a study reflecting the growing research interest in the type of language addressed to learners (input) and its role in second language acquisition (e.g., Wagner-Gough & Hatch, 1975). Gaies reviewed the evidence from studies of first language acquisition (e.g., Landes, 1975; Snow, 1972) which shows that adults modify their speech substantially in addressing young children. These modifications result in a speech style that is simpler and more redundant than that used in other social registers, suggesting that such characteristics in the speech addressed to children may help them to learn language more easily.

The speech characteristics of interest include the use of grammatically complete and simple sentences, restricted vocabulary, reduced rate of speech, and an exaggeration of prosodic features. In addition, communication strategies observed in adult speech to children

include the use of repetition (repeating the input), prompting, modeling, and expanding the output.

Gaies observed similar features and interaction strategies in teachers' interactions with adult second language learners. His findings were also consistent with first language studies in showing that the frequency of simple and redundant language input varies with the perceived proficiency of the learner. Gaies concluded that these speech characteristics and interaction strategies are not artificial teaching behaviors, since they are found frequently in naturalistic communication settings when adults speak to first language learners. Moreover, they may equally facilitate language acquisition in second language settings (e.g., Terrell, 1981).

It should be emphasized, however, that teachers do not always need to use simple syntax and concrete vocabulary. In the Natural Approach, for example, the important goal is that the input be comprehensible. Since comprehensibility is partly a function of nonverbal cues, the language of instruction may be rather complex on occasion if there is a sufficiently rich extralinguistic context (such as direct sensory experience) to support it and make the meaning clear (Terrell, 1981). For this reason, the present descriptive system does not attempt to characterize the speech characteristics of messages, but focuses instead on communication strategies.

Affective and Social Aspects of the Classroom

Communication strategies such as expanding the output have a significance in the classroom that goes beyond their value as facilitative teaching techniques. Because they are a part of the teacher's response to students' language production efforts, these behaviors introduce the larger and more important topic of the affective and social qualities of the language classroom.

A major goal of communicative-based instruction is that the language classroom be a risk-taking environment, characterized by positive, caring interpersonal relationships. One of the clearest instructional implications is that teachers accept students' production attempts and avoid any overt error correction. Feedback behaviors are, therefore, an important aspect of both affective and instructional characteristics of the classroom.

Different strategies for responding to students are among a large set of instructional and interpersonal behaviors investigated by Moskowitz (1976). Her categories of classroom observation are especially sensitive to verbal and nonverbal characteristics of the interaction that affect the rapport, attitudes, and overall affective experience of the classroom.

Having identified outstanding foreign language teachers and "typical" teachers by a survey of former students, Moskowitz analyzed the classroom behaviors of both groups of teachers, using the FLint (Foreign Language Interaction) system for recording and describing the instruction. Table 8 shows an outline of the FLint system, and indicates some of the most important analytic categories that showed differences between the two groups of teachers.

Most categories of interest in the FLint system reflect (a) nonverbal communications, (b) use of L1 versus L2, (c) communication strategies, and (d) interpersonal characteristics of the classroom.

The use of nonverbal communications is currently coded in the typology as a dimension of medium (paralinguistic, aural/visual). The language of instruction may be represented within medium by adding the subcategories L1 or L2 to the class of linguistic communications. These descriptors classify verbal communications as being conducted in either the target language or the students' native language.

Table 8: The FLint System for Analyzing Interactions
In Language Classes (Moskowitz, 1976)*

A. Teacher Talk

1. Indirect influence
 - deals with feelings of students
 - + praises or encourages
 - + jokes
 - uses ideas of students
 - repeats student response verbatim
 - asks questions
 - asks cultural questions
 - + personalizes questions to students
2. Direct influence
 - gives information
 - + corrects without rejection
 - discusses culture and civilization
 - models examples for students
 - orients students about procedures to be used
 - personalizes about self
 - carries out routine tasks in the classroom
 - gives directions, as in requests or commands
 - directs pattern drills
 - criticizes student behavior
 - criticizes student response

B. Student Talk

- specific responses to questions and tasks: limited range of previously shaped answers
- choral
- reads orally
- open-ended or student initiated
- off task

C. Classroom

- periods of no verbal interaction
- silence during AV presentations
- confusion, work oriented
- confusion, nonwork oriented
- + laughter

D. Special Conventions

- uses the native language (L1)
- + nonverbal communications (gestures or facial expressions)
- silence--students doing tasks
- teacher writes on board
- + teacher smiles

*A plus sign (+) indicates behaviors that characterized outstanding teachers. A minus sign (-) indicates behaviors which outstanding teachers used less than "typical" teachers.

A number of nonverbal behaviors are of special interest because they convey attitudes and feelings that contribute to a cheerful and trusting classroom atmosphere. In addition to some of the categories studied by Moskowitz (laughter, teacher smiles), some behaviors that encourage risk-taking and convey positive attitudes are touch, mutual distance, eye contact, humor, tone of voice, and encouragement. These categories are represented in the typology by adding a special class of "affective communication" descriptors to the section dealing with the medium of communication events.

"Communication strategies" mostly describe the teacher's response to students' language production (feedback behaviors). They include: Praise, criticism, acceptance, correction, repeating the output, and expanding the output. Other communication strategies (e.g., Gaies, 1977) refer to more general aspects of communicating messages to language learners, such as repeating or expanding the input.

In communicative-based approaches, there is additionally an emphasis on the use of language for interpersonal communication (Galyean, 1977; Terrell, 1981). Indeed, this feature serves to summarize two basic concerns of these approaches. First, an emphasis on interpersonal communication fosters a positive, caring, and personally meaningful environment for learning. Second, it assures the communication of real messages in the "here and now." Two factors should be considered in describing the social situations set up in the classroom. One of these is the degree to which the classroom permits learning from peers. Does the interaction invite communications from students or does it implicitly set up boundaries to the interaction? A chain drill, for example, is an elementary form of interaction that does not allow for spontaneity and sharing. Classroom observations should note whether interactions are spontaneous or planned, whether teacher-initiated or student-initiated. These aspects of classroom interaction are currently handled in the description system by means of descriptors for the purpose of communications. For example, the

descriptor "respond" indicates a student communication that is teacher-initiated. Other categories such as "react" and "informative" reflect student-initiated exchanges.

Another facet of interpersonal communication has to do with the instructional content of teacher-initiated exchanges. What does the teacher do to personalize the instruction? Is the content adapted to each child personally? An important topic in this regard is the content of questions asked. Previous sections of this paper examined some formal and semantic dimensions of questions. Further descriptive categories should be added to focus on the interpersonal content. Do questions ask for a specific response, give children choices, or ask about opinions, feelings, and judgments? The typology addresses these issues by the following descriptors for the interpersonal content of questions: Pre-determined response, opinion/feeling, choice, and personalized content.

In summary, affective acquisition activities (Terrell, 1981) are described in four different sections of the typology. These four classes of descriptors depict 1) nonverbal teacher behaviors expressing feelings and attitudes; 2) verbal interaction strategies; 3) student-initiated versus teacher-initiated exchanges; and 4) interpersonal aspects of questions and language tasks.

VI. SUMMARY

The terms approach, method, technique, and techneme were defined in relation to formal language instruction. Descriptions of approach or even method were found to be inadequate for describing specific activities and interactions in classroom practice. Several typologies of language instruction were merged to create a set of descriptors for recording and analyzing classroom observations on the level of technique or teaching "techneme."

The typology recognizes two types classroom events, (a) higher-order events and (b) communication events. Higher-order events include descriptors for tasks which involve a series of cues and turn-takings, or otherwise refer to large segments of instruction. On this level of analysis, Selection refers to the language forms being taught. The descriptors specify the level of linguistic description associated with the instructional material: Segmental (Phonetics), morpho-lexical (Vocabulary), syntactic (Grammar), suprasegmental (Prosody), or beyond the sentence (Discourse).

The analysis of Practice activities is supported by an information processing approach and defines language tasks by five classes of descriptors: 1) Language skill (receptive/expressive, aural/visual); 2) type of task, e.g., recognition, recall; 3) the format of the task, e.g., Yes/No, Wh-, Multiple Choice; 4) the relationship between the content of models, cues, and target responses, e.g., paraphrased or indirect; and 5) the interpersonal content of questions, e.g., opinions/feelings.

An additional set of categories is used for depicting events on the microlevel of turn-takings or communication events. Representing the basic unit of analysis in the description system, these events are defined according to their source, medium, purpose, and by their communicative and social characteristics.

The medium specifies whether information is communicated in a linguistic, nonlinguistic, or paralinguistic form, and whether it is expressed in the aural or visual modality. An additional class of descriptors focuses on nonverbal, affective aspects of communication which contribute to a trusting and accepting classroom setting.

Descriptors for the purpose of interactions are given on two levels in order to identify the context, topic, and intent of communication events. The superordinate level specifies the topic or context, and reflects the major components of classroom activity in language instruction--Expression, Content, and Practice. A second set of entries describes the purpose of communications in the context of lessons or tasks, for example, giving explanations or eliciting responses.

And finally, the description of communication events is augmented by a set of communication strategies which depict some important instructional and social aspects of teacher-student conversations. Examples include the teacher's acceptance and/or expansion of the students' verbal communications in a second language.

A summary of the typological categories discussed in this review is presented in Table 9.

A summary of the typological categories discussed in this review is presented in Table 9.

Table 9: Summary of the Typology of Language Teaching Events

I. HIGH ORDER EVENTS		
1. <u>Selection</u> phonetics vocabulary grammar prosody discourse	TPR recognition imitation identification fill-in model dialog question/answer recall	non (or nonverbal) not applicable
2. <u>Language Skills</u> receptive expressive aural/visual not specified	conversation/ composition	5. <u>Relation of Model and Response</u> complete transformed paraphrased indirect little or no relation
3. <u>Task Type</u> comprehension	4. <u>Task Format</u> yes/no either/or multiple choice Wh- open ended	6. <u>Interpersonal Content</u> pre-determined opinion/feeling choice personalized content
II. COMMUNICATION EVENTS		
1. <u>Source</u> teacher student class (choral) text nonverbal	affective communications smile distant near eye contact encouragement humor	elicit check invitation nomination comment clarification bid reply feedback informative cue
2. <u>Medium</u> linguistic L1 L2 nonlinguistic pictures objects recordings paralinguistic gestures/expressions pantomime situations modality aural visual other	3. <u>Purpose</u> Expression Content definition translation example explanation ostensive pictorial Practice structure solicit respond react follow up	Pedagogical/ Procedural Other 4. <u>Communication Strategies</u> repeat input expand input correct accept criticize praise repeat output expand output

References

- Allen, H. B., & Campbell, R. N. Teaching English as a Second Language. Second Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.
- Allwright, R. L. Turns, topics, and tasks: Patterns of participation in language learning and teaching. In D. Larsen-Freeman (Ed.), Discourse analysis in second language research. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1980.
- Anderson, R. C. Encoding processes in the storage and retrieval of sentences. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 1971, 91, 338-340.
- Anderson, R. C. How to construct achievement tests to assess comprehension. Review of Educational Research, 1972, 42, 145-170.
- Anthony, E. M. Approach, method, and technique. English Language Teaching, 1963, 17, 63-67.
- Asher, J. H. The Total Physical Response to second language learning. Modern Language Journal, 1969, 53, 3-17.
- Bellack, A. A., Kleibard, H. M., Hyman, R. T., & Smith, F. L. The Language of the Classroom. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1966.
- Bormuth, J. R., Carr, J., Manning, J., & Pearson, D. Children's comprehension of between-and-within-sentence syntactic structures. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1970, 61, 349-357.
- Caccamise, D. J., & Kintsch, W. Recognition of important and unimportant statements from stories. American Journal of Psychology, 1978, 91, 651-657.
- Craik, F. I. M., & Lockhart, R. S. Levels of Processing: A framework for memory research. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 1972, 11, 671-684.
- Dacanay, F. R. Techniques and procedures in second language teaching. Dobbs Ferry, N.Y.: Oceana, 1963.
- Diller, K. C. The language teaching controversy. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1978.
- Duffy, G. G., Roehler, L. R., & Reinsmoen, D. Two styles of direct instruction in teaching second-grade reading and language arts: A descriptive study. Research Series No. 100. East Lansing, MI: The Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University,

- Dulay, H. C., & Burt, M. K. Remarks on creativity in language acquisition. In M. K. Burt, H. C. Dulay & M. Finnochiaro (Eds.), Viewpoints on English as a Second Language. New York: Regents, 1977.
- Fanselow, J. Beyond RASHOMON--Conceptualizing and describing the teaching act. TESOL Quarterly, 1977, 11, 17-39.
- Gaies, S. J. The nature of linguistic input in formal second language learning: Linguistic and communicative strategies in ESL teachers' classroom language. In D. Brown, C. A. Yorllo & R. H. Crymes (Eds.), Teaching and Learning English as a Second Language: Trends in research and practice. Washington, D.C.: TESOL, 1977.
- Galyean, B. A confluent design for language teaching. TESOL Quarterly, 1977, 11, 143-156.
- Galyean, B. Language from within. Santa Barbara, CA: Confluent Education Research Center, 1976.
- Green, J. L., & Wallat, C. Mapping instructional conversations -- A sociolinguistic ethnography. In J. Green & C. Wallat (Eds.), Ethnography and language in educational settings. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1981.
- Gurrey, P. Teaching English as a Foreign Language. London, 1955.
- Griffin, M., & Shuy, R. (Eds.). Children's functional language and education in the early years. Final report to the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Rosslyn, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1978.
- Hedrick, D. L., Christman, M. A., & Augustine, L. Programming for the antecedent event in therapy. Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders, 1973, 38, 339-344.
- Howe, M. J. A. Introduction to human memory: A psychological approach. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.
- Kintsch, W. Learning, memory and conceptual processes. New York: Wiley, 1970.
- Krashen, S. Second language acquisition and second language learning. London: Pergamon Press, 1981.
- Krashen, S. D., & Terrell, T. D. The Natural Approach: Language acquisition in the classroom. London: Pergamon Press, in press.
- Landes, J. Speech addressed to children: Issues and characteristics of parental input. Language Learning, 1975, 25, 355-379.

- Mackey, W. Language teaching analysis. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1965.
- Moskowitz, G. The classroom interaction of outstanding foreign language teachers. Foreign Language Annals, 1976, 9, 135-157.
- Newton, A. C. Current trends in language teaching. English Teaching Forum, 1974, 12. Reprinted in M. Celce-Murcia & L. McIntosh (Eds.), Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1979.
- Norris, W. Teaching second language reading at the advanced level: Goals, techniques, and procedures. TESOL Quarterly, 1970, 4, 28-29.
- Paulston, C. B. Structural pattern drills: A classification. Foreign Language Annals, 1970, 4, 187-193. Reprinted in Allen & Campbell (1972).
- Paulston, C. B., & Bruder, M. N. Teaching English as a Second Language: Techniques and procedures. Cambridge, MA: Winthrop Publishers, 1976.
- Pearson, P. D., & Johnson, D. D. Teaching reading comprehension. Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1978.
- Prator, C. H. Development of a manipulation-communication scale. NAFSA Studies and Papers, English Language Series, No. 10, 1965, 385-391. Reprinted in Allen & Campbell (1972).
- Prator, C. H., with Celce-Murcia, M. An outline of language teaching approaches. In M. Celce-Murcia & L. McIntosh (Eds.), Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1979.
- Schank, R. C. Identification of conceptualizations underlying natural language. In R. C. Schank & K. M. Colby (Eds.), Computer models of thought and language. San Francisco: Freeman, 1973.
- Snow, C. Mothers' speech to children learning language. Child Development, 1972, 43, 549-565.
- Stevick, E. M. "Technemes" and the rhythm of class activity. Language Learning, 1959, 9, 45-51. Reprinted in Allen & Campbell (1972).

- Terrell, T. D. The natural approach in bilingual education. In Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework. Los Angeles, CA: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, California State University, Los Angeles, 1981.
- Terrell, T. D. A natural approach to second language acquisition and learning. Modern Language Journal, 1977, 41, 325-337.
- Wagner-Gough, J., & Hatch, E. The importance of input data in second language acquisition studies. Language Learning, 1975, 25, 297-308.

Example of coded transcript

MESSAGE UNIT NUMBER	TAPE SERIAL NO. <u>04</u> , SESSION <u>2</u> <u>22:47</u> TO <u>23:12</u> PAGE <u>1</u> OF <u>2</u>	SELECTION	LANGUAGE SKILL	TASK	FORMAT	RELATION	SOURCE	MEDIUM	MODALITY	TOPIC	PURPOSE	STRATEGY	
	DESCRIPTION												
1	What is this?	V	expressive (A)	question/answer	Wh	4	T	L2	A	practice	solicit	elicit	
2	<displays picture>						T	PL	V	practice	solicit	elicit	
3	<picture of a candle>						NL	NL	V	practice	solicit	cue	
4	Candle.						S	L2	A	practice	respond	reply	
5	Good.						T	L2	A	practice	followup	feedback	praise
6	A candle.						T	L2	A	practice	followup	feedback	expand
7	<nods>						T	AC	V	practice	followup	feedback	
8	How do you light the candle?	V	expressive (A)	question/answer	open	3	T	L2	A	practice	solicit	elicit	
9	<picture displayed>						NL	NL	V	practice	solicit	cue	
10	<points to picture, gestures>						T	PL	V	practice	solicit	cue	
11	Uhm.						S	PL	V	practice	respond	reply	
12	With what?				Wh	3	T	L2	A	practice	solicit	clarify	expand
13	With what?						T	L2	A	practice	solicit	clarify	repeat
14	<hand gesture, pointing>						T	PL	V	practice	solicit	cue	
15	What, what do I use?						T	L2	A	practice	solicit	clarify	repeat
16	<student displays appropriate picture>						S	PL	V	practice	respond	reply	
17	<picture of matches>						NL	NL	V	practice	respond	cue	

DESCRIPTION: < > = nonverbal information

SELECTION: V = vocabulary

SOURCE: T = teacher, CL = class (choral), S = student, NL = nonlinguistic

MEDIUM: L2 = linguistic, target language, L = nonlinguistic, PL = paralinguistic, AC = affective communication

MODALITY: A = auditory, V = visual

MESSAGE UNIT
NUMBER

TAPE SERIAL NO. 04, SESSION 2
22:47 TO 23:45
PAGE 2 OF 2

DESCRIPTION	SELECTION	LANGUAGE SKILL	TASK	FORMAT	RELATION	SOURCE	MEDIUM	MODALITY	TOPIC	PURPOSE	STRATEGY	
18 Matches.						T	L2	A	practice	followup	feedback	expand
19 <points to picture>						T	PL	V	practice	followup	cue	
20 Matches.						CL	L2	A	practice	followup	reply	repeat
21 Matches.						T	L2	A	practice	followup	feedback	repeat
22 OK. And I light the candle.						T	L2	A	expression			
23 If it's my birthday and the candles are on the cake, what do I do?	V	expressive (A)	question/answer		Wh 3	T	L2	A	practice	solicit	elicit	
24 <points to picture, gestures>						T	PL	V	practice	solicit	cue	
25 <picture still displayed>						NL	NL	V	practice	solicit	cue	
26 <pantomime: taking a breath to blow out candles>						T	PL	V	practice	solicit	cue	
27 Blow.						CL	L2	A	practice	respond	reply	
28 <completes pantomimed gesture>						T	PL	V	practice	followup	cue	
29 Blow.						T	L2	A	practice	followup	feedback	repeat
30 Blow.						CL	L2	A	practice	followup	reply	repeat
31 Right.						T	L2	A	practice	followup	feedback	accept
32 <smiles, hands the picture to a student>						T	AC	V	procedure			
33 So, that's a candle. 23:12						T	L2	A	expression			

5.1

61