DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 236 945   FL 014 111

AUTHOR   Guthrie, Larry F.
TITLE   Learning to Use a New Language: Language Functions
              and Use By First Grade Chinese-Americans. Final
              Report.
INSTITUTION   ARC Associates, Inc. Oakland, CA.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE   [83]
GRANT   NIE-G-81-0120
NOTE   100p.; Appendices marginally legible.
PUB TYPE   Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   Bilingual Teachers; *Chinese Americans; *Classroom
              Communication; Grade 1; Grade 2; Language Usage;
              *Limited English Speaking; Primary Education; Teacher
              Behavior

ABSTRACT
         The language use and interactions of limited English
proficient Chinese American first graders and their two teachers were
analyzed. One teacher was bilingual; the other was not. The study
consisted of three phases: identification of speech events, recording
and analysis of speech acts during teacher-directed lessons, and
followup of target students in second grade. The monolingual English
teacher was found to differentially treat the students who were less
English proficient, using less effective questioning strategies and
less clear instructions. The bilingual teacher was consistent and
used Chinese during English reading instruction for a variety of
carefully chosen purposes. In regard to student language use, it was
found that student language varied less when comparing their
communication with the two teachers, as English proficiency
increased. The students targeted for followup appeared to have no
problem making the transition to second grade. (Author/RW)

LEARNING TO USE A NEW LANGUAGE:
LANGUAGE FUNCTIONS AND USE BY FIRST GRADE CHINESE-AMERICANS

FINAL REPORT

Larry F. Guthrie
Principal Investigator

With assistance from
Nai-Chu Ding Lai

2

ABSTRACT

This study considered in detail the interaction and language
use of a group of limited-English-proficient first-grade
Chinese-American students and their two teachers, one bilingual
and one not. The goals were (1) to investigate patterns of
teacher and student language use across the two contexts, and (2)
to determine how teachers' proficiency in the students' first
language contributed to successful instruction.

The study was conducted in three phases. In the first,
teachers, students and speech events were identified. In Phase
Two, audiorecordings of teacher-directed lessons were made in the
two classrooms with the same groups of students. Recorded data
were transcribed, coded according to speech-acts, and analyzed
both quantitatively and qualitatively. In Phase Three, target
students were followed into their second grade classroom, where
comparable procedures were followed.

The monololingual English teacher was found to provide
differential treatment to those students least proficient in
English. He employed less effective questioning strategies and
was less clear about tasks, instructions, and rules. Both
bilingual teachers were consistent across groups. The bilingual
first grade teacher carefully selected the occasions when she used
Chinese in teaching English reading, and she used it for a variety
of purposes. Target students appeared to have no problem crossing
the border from first to second grade.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Recent research has shown that the ways children and teachers use language in classrooms can contribute to children's acquisition of both social and academic skills (Cazden, John & Hymes, 1972; Cherry, 1981; Green, 1982; Green & Wallat, 1981; Trueba, G. Guthrie & Au, 1981; Wilkinson, 1982). When students and teachers meet together in a classroom, their communication is done primarily through the medium of language; how their interaction is organized in part determines whether learning takes place. In this chapter, an overview of research from this perspective is presented, with special attention to the approach taken in the present study.

Language Use in Classrooms

In instructional contexts, teachers are responsible for orchestrating their interactions with students, including not only the presentation of academic content, but also the ways in which student turns are distributed and order maintained (Green, 1983). They determine, for example, whether students bid for turns, how correct responses are rewarded, what sorts of questions are asked, and what behaviors are sanctioned. Previous research in this area has looked at several aspects of classroom interaction such as the rules for questioning and answering, rules for turn-taking, the types of questions asked and the reponses elicited, and interruptions during small group instruction. Research has examined the possible effects of teacher differences, variation in students' communicative competence, student group status, and so on.

In general, the focus of this research has been less on the strictly linguistic aspects of language than on the uses to which language is put and the functions it serves. The traditional notion of second language proficiency held that knowledge of a language involves the mastery of particular phonological and grammatical features. More recently, however, Hymes (1974) and others have pointed out that the ability to manipulate linguistic rules or mimic native speaker phonology does not insure effective communication in the second language. Thus, how teachers and students use language, rather than particular linguistic aspects of their speech, may have more to do with the way children learn, and by the same token, the miscommunication, misunderstanding, and educational difficulty students encounter (Guthrie & Hall, 1983; Hymes, 1972; Gumperz, 1981).

A major focus of research from this perspective has been on the possible mismatch between how language is used at home and at school. If there is a discontinuity between the students' home

language use and that required for success at school, then the opportunities for success for those students are reduced (Guthrie & Hall, 1983; Hall & Guthrie, 1982). Students of different cultural and linguistic backgrounds, for example, act and use language according to the rules of their community and culture while at home; in the school, a different set of rules is operative.

Even learning to read in school is in many respects an interactional process. Whereas reading for adults is usually a solitary endeavor -- they read silently to themselves -- reading for children most often takes place in a group (Cazden, 1979; Guthrie and Hall, in press). The degree to which interactions within that group are compatible with the students' native ways of communicating and organizing interactions should facilitate learning; the degree to which miscommunication is minimized should also contribute to student success.

Theoretical and Methodological Issues

The study of language use in classrooms has in recent years become an interdisciplinary endeavor engaging scholars from a variety of fields: anthropology, education, linguistics, psychology, and sociology. Cross-fertilization of ideas and approaches has become so pervasive that most researchers actually span several disciplines in their work. While they may differ somewhat in scholarly background, perspective, and method, certain themes run through most of their work.

A common assumption of research from this perspective is that the functions and uses of language and other communicative means are relative to particular cultures, and even subcultures. Languages vary, for example, in the amount and way in which they are integrated into a culture (Hymes, 1974), and ways of speaking, gestures, songs, touching, and other means of communication may occupy different positions in one culture or another so that the nature of communicative competence varies. What we use speech to communicate, another culture may communicate with gesture, or what is an appropriate way of speaking in a given context for one culture may be unacceptable in another. Although sentences may be translated exactly on a grammatical level, because of intervening cultural factors, they may be non-equivalent semantically. A particular speech act may have multiple functions in context, and the particular function(s) which the speaker intends will depend on a number of possible factors relating to the context, topic and purpose of the interaction.

This theoretical perspective naturally has implications for the methodological approach of the research. Ervin-Tripp and Mitchell-Kernan (1977) have identified five common notions affecting method. The majority of classroom language studies currently take these into account. First, the data source for studies of conversation or children's language should be natural language in context. Traditional methods of language study, such as

interviews and introspection have proved inadequate. Research has shown that for children (and adults), the interview situation tends to cause the subject's speech to shift toward a more formal register (Labov, 1972; Ervin-Tripp & Mitchell-Kernan, 1977). Self report is also suspect. In a recent example cited by Legarretta (1981), for instance, teachers were asked to estimate the relative amounts of English and Spanish they used in the classroom. They reported using each language to an equal degree, but subsequent observations showed English was actually used nearly 75 percent of the time.

Researchers, then, have two alternatives. The first is to observe language in use and make use of on-the-spot coding or note-taking. The most popular observational system for classrooms is that of Flanders (1970); but there is a wide variety of observational schemes used in educational research and evaluation. Most of these, however, do not focus on language and language use per se. The Flanders system has been used in modified form for bilingual classrooms (Legarretta, 1979). More recently, struc- tured observation instruments for the specific purpose of examin- ing language use have been developed, such as those used in the Significant Bilingual Instructional Features Study (Tikunoff, 1983). In the Time Allocation Procedure (TAP), for example, the observer codes instances of language change, recording the addressee (individual, small group, or whole group) and the ostensible function of the first statement (discipline, procedures, or instruction). While such a system may be useful for estimates of language use at a somewhat gross level, it has serious limitations when it comes to describing discourse. Chief among them is the basic fact that all information-gathering is done on-the-spot, and restricted to a fixed set of categories. These schemes are thus inadequate for capturing the more subtle aspects of language-in-use and multiple functions of language. The complexities of social interaction are so great that no observers, no matter how astute, can see everything. They can take note of even less, so that actually very little of what goes on is captured. For these reasons and others, the use of structured observations as a means for describing discourse has been widely criticized (Labov & Fanshel, 1977; Mehan, 1979).

A second alternative is to utilize some sort of recording device, either audiotape, videotape, or film (see Erickson & Wilson, 1982). In this way, a permanent record of an interaction is produced which will allow repeated viewing or listening. In Erickson and Schultz's method (1981), for instance, researchers may view videotapes scores of times in the course of the analysis. In addition, by using more than one microphone or camera, differ- ent perspectives on the same interaction can be made available. This is not to say, of course, that the use of mechanical devices represents a perfect method; the process is time-consuming and the data sample is thereby necessarily limited. For the study of discourse, however, it appears that the use of recordings to some degree is required.

In the present study, a combination of these techniques was employed. First, descriptive fieldnotes were taken in the first phase of the study in order that appropriate target students and speech events for later recording could be identified. During the second and third phases, audio-tape recordings of the natural speech of target children and teachers were made and supplmented by fieldnotes. While one researcher operated the recording equipment and noted speakers, another described the contexts of actions and activities.

The second theme identified by Ervin-Tripp and Mitchell-Kernan (1977) was that the study of discourse includes elements of language beyond the sentence level. Traditional linguistic studies saw no paritcular reason to look at stretches of language longer that the sentence; neither did the early transformational grammarians (Chomsky, 1965). More recently, however, it has become apparent that multiple constraints beyond the sentence level operate on the production of speech. Sociolinguistic study, for example, has moved to a focus on the speech event or speech act. As Hymes (1974) put it, "in seeking structures, Saussure is concerned with the word, Chomsky with the sentence, the ethnography of speaking with the act of speech" (p.90).

In this study, the focus was on both the speech event and the speech act. First, through naturalistic observation, typical speech situation in the two classes were identified. Then, through more structured observations, the participant structures of various speech events (lessons) were determined and selected for study. Finally, by using the Conversational-act system, we were able to consider elements of discourse beyond the sentence or utterance level. While this system (to be described in more detail later) codes individual utterances, the coding is done in context, both linguistic and situational.

This brings us to the third theme in the study of children's discourse (Ervin-Tripp & Mitchell-Kernan, 1977). Most research on language use today recognizes that features of the social and situational context affect linguistic rules and output (for a discussion, see Guthrie & Hall, 1983).

In the mutual construction of their discourse, actors make selections about what they want to say next (semantic options), about how to say it (social options), and about the form it will take (linguistic options). At the basis of all these choices, and impinging upon them, is a series of factors which can act as constraints. At the most general level, these include social and cultural facts such as social status and cultural norms. At the most narrow level are facts within the interaction itself, such as particualr prosodic or phonological variations.

The various constraints do not operate in isolation, however; all are interdependent and mutually interacting. The influence of broader constraints like culture, in a sense, filters through every other level and is simultaneously experienced in terms of

4

9

the situation, social context, and task. Similarly, more local constraints such as the task always operate in a context of society, culture, and situation, for one cannot be engaged in a task outside of his or her culture, society, or some situation.

In the process of interaction, the actor makes lexical, grammatical, phonological and prosodic selections for each instance of a speech act. All these together are made within the confines of the interaction as established by the actor's own interpretations and definitions of the ongoing environment, and in accordance with his knowledge of interactional facts and rules. As suggested earlier, actors also have at their disposal a wide variety of ways in which to say what they mean, and thereby carry out their purposes.

It is at the discourse level, then, that the effects of these selections, and in fact, of constraints, interpretations, knowledge, and definitions as well, are realized. It is also at this level that meaning is conveyed. Once again, in the present study, by coding utterances in context, the influence of these various constraints is captured.

The forth theme concerns the fact that linguistic rules are variable. For example, as shown definitively by Labov (1966), phonological rules vary according to the situation. It should not, however be assumed that there is any regular one-to-one correspondence between particular constraints or rules and particular discourse features. Constraints may operate singly or in combination and across the various discourse and linguistic levels. Factors of social status, for example, can just as well influence code choice as phonological variation; a contextualization cue as subtle as a rise in intonation can result in a change in code, definition of the situation, or phonological choice. It is not possible to specify exactly how these factors constrain interaction, primarily because they are all filtered through the perception and interpretation of interactants and are, in addition, out-of-awareness. As mentioned earlier, one can never be absolutely certain which factor constrained a particular interaction in a particular way, though an educated guess or approximation is possible. The degree to which certain facts influence interaction will naturally vary from one occassion to another. Even in the most ritualized or controlled of cases such as a marriage, a religious ceremony, or an experiment, there will be room for flexibility and variation at one level or another. How then is the researcher to account for them and on what basis?

The fifth theme suggested by Ervin-Tripp and Mitchell-Kernan is that conversational utterances can serve multiple functions in context, and that particular functions do not map on to structural features. For example, philosophers recognize two types of meaning, literal (sentence) meaning and non-literal (utterer's) meaning (Grice, 1975). The first is the meaning which an utterance has regardless of context; the second is the meaning a speaker imputes in a certain situation. Indirect speech acts are

examples of non-literal language use that occur in everyday conversations. In the right context, for example, when someone says "it's hot in here," he is not just commenting on the room temperature, but is indirectly telling someone to open a window. Teachers make frequent use of such devices as when they say, "I like the way Johnny is sitting:" This comment not only serves to compliment Johnny, but at the same time reminds all the other students that they had better be quiet.

In the present study, we have tried to account for the multiple functions of language in two ways. First, as in the previous case, we have coded utterances in context -- with reference to tapes, transcripts and the memory of the coder, since data collectors conducted the coding as well. Second, the Conversational-act coding system allows for double coding so that two functions may be represented.

Research on Cultural and Linguistic Minorities

Previous research on language use in the classroom has been done with children from several different cultural and ethno-linguistic groups. These have included Blacks (Cook-Gumperz, Gumperz & Simons, 1981; Michaels & Cook-Gumperz, 1979; Guthrie, 1981; McDermott, 1978); Hawaiians (Au, 1980; Boggs, 1972); Hebrew-speakers (Enright, Ramirez, & Jacobs, 1981-82); Hispanics (Carrasco, Vera & Cazden, 1981; Mehan, 1979; Moll, Diaz, Estrada, & Lopes, in press; Duran, 1981; Erickson, Cazden, Carrasco, & Guzman, 1979); and Native Americans (Mohatt & Erickson, 1981; Philips, 1972).

. Effective use of language by teachers with limited-English-speaking children (LES) has been the subject of considerable debate. Much of the discussion has focused on the relative amounts of English and the students' first language a teacher should use. Some have attempted to prescribe the relative amounts of each language.

Legarretta-Marcaida (1981), for example, has suggested that for limited-and non-English-speaking children in grades K-2, teachers should use the students' primary language approximately 70 percent of the time. The English proportion can then gradually increased to about 50 percent in later grades.

Milk (1981) explored the "functional imbalance" in the use of English and Spanish. His thesis was that

If a particular classroom is aiming toward truly equal development of both languages, then each language must be used by both teachers and students more or less, equally for the full range of classroom functions. It is not sufficient, therefore, for the languages to be used an equal amount of time -- they must also be used to an equal extent to accomplish the principal pedagog-ical functions of the class. (Milk, 1981, p.13)

Some have suggested, further, that the use of students' first language and English should be separated in the classroom. Still others have recommended the almost exclusive use of English (Baker & deKanter, 1982).

Attention has also been given to comparison of teachers' instruction and language use across different student groups. Much of this work has concentrated on the differential treatment of students in lower groups (Good & Brophy, 1974; McDermott, 1976; Rist, 1973). Cherry (1978) conducted a comparative study of teachers' expectations across student communicative competence levels. Her finding was that while teachers' language use varied with student groups, between teacher effects were greater. This finding has been supported in the work of Enright, et al. (1981-82), who compared the language use of two teachers with the same group of students in a Hebrew-English bilingual situation.

In a study of Hispanic Americans, Moll, et al. (in press) examined the language use of two teachers, only one of whom spoke Spanish, with the same group of children. He found that the teacher who did not speak the students' first language provided lessons at a lower level of difficulty than did the Spanish-speaking teacher. Apparently, the Anglo teacher underestimated the Spanish-speaking students' abilities because he himself did not speak Spanish.

Mohatt and Erickson (1981) compared the cultural congruence of two teachers with their Native-American students. Only one teacher was of the same culture as the students, and the other had had little prior experience in teaching children from that culture. Both, however, were regarded as experienced and competent teachers. Using a microethnographic technique (Erickson & Schultz, 1981), Mohatt and Erickson videotaped a number of school lessons in each class. One focus of their analysis was upon the pacing, "doing the right things at the right time' (p. 112). Their conclusion was that the Native-American teacher and her students revealed a "shared sense of pacing" in their behavior that was at first absent in the other teacher's class (p. 112).

With the exception of the work by Fillmore (1981, 1982) and Pung Guthrie (1982, in press), language use of Chinese students and their teachers has been largely ignored. Further, the work that has been don has been at a more general, descriptive level. It is often assumed tha because Asian-Americans have a reputation for high achievement, their children experience little educational difficulty. This attitude obscures the fact that large numbers of recent immigrants from Asian face serious problems in communicating and learning to speak and read English.

At present, very little is known about how Chinese-speaking children and their teachers mutually construct interactions. In this study we examined the communicative acts of a group of such children and the teachers so that we might be able to describe what happens in their lessons and perhaps identify instructional and interactional approache: which are particularly effective.

CHAPTER TWO

OVERVIEW AND METHODS

Overview

This study involved a detailed examination of the language use of a group of Chinese-American first-graders and their two teachers. While considerable information is available on language use in monolingual classrooms, and to a lesser extent, on that in Hispanic bilingual situations, very little is known about how Chinese children and their teachers construct interactions.

The focus of the research was a bilingual class of students which alternated each half-day between a Chinese bilingual teacher and a non-Chinese-speaking teacher. This provided the unique opportunity to examine the language of the same LES children with two different teachers. The first of these teachers not only spoke the students' first language, Cantonese, but was also of the same cultural background. A woman in her early twenties, she and immigrated to the U.S. at the age of nine. Both her Cantonese and English were native-like. The other teacher was an anglo male who had taught in Spanish-English bilingual programs, but had little prior experience with Chinese students.

Research Questions

Three basic questions directed the research. The first of these sought an indepth description of the classroom interaction between Chinese-American children and their teachers. How do teachers orchestrate lessons and how, in turn, do students respond? What variation, in both teacher and student language, is found across student-English language proficiency groups?

Second, we compared the interaction in the two classrooms. What differences occur between the ways in which the two teachers orchestrate lessons? What differences emerge in student language use? How do these differences compare across linguistic proficiency groups?

Third, we asked what variations in teacher and student language might be found when this group of children moved on to second grade. Did these students experience difficulty in crossing the "border" between first and second grade, or in adjusting to the rule system of the new teacher?

Method

Sociolinguistic methods were used to seek answers to these questions and to uncover the ways in which Cantonese-speaking children and their teachers constructed their interactions and used language. The study was conducted in three phases. In the first phase, target

students and speech events (lessons) were identified. In the second phase recordings of sample lessons were collected, transcribed, and analyzed. The third phase involved additional recording in reading lessons after target students had progressed to second grade. The procedures employed within each phase are described in more detail below. First, however, is a description of the setting in which the study was conducted.

Setting

The setting for the study was an elementary school with a predominantly Chinese population. The school was located near a large Chinatown community on the west coast.

The school is located in the heart of Chinatown situated between these two streets, in the middle of the block, on an incline of about 20 degrees. A half block below is one of the busiest streets in Chinatown. This street is so busy, in fact, that there was a controversy in the newspapers recently concerning the dense traffic and how to deal with it. The traffic consists mainly of delivery trucks, buses, and shoppers; and the situation gets so bad sometimes that a bus may sit for half an hour without moving. Most of the shops on this street are groceries, with a few restaurants, coffee shops, banks, and jewelry stores. It is generally believed that things are somewhat cheaper on this street than on the other streets of Chinatown. Above the school is another major street. It is less congested, and the shops there are supposed to be still cheaper. There are also a few parking garages and apartment houses, as well as a Chinatown Branch of the Public Library on this street.

There are two buildings at the Chinatown Elementary School, the main building and the new building. The main building was constructed in the 1920's; the new building was completed about 15 years ago. Each is four stories tall. That area not occupied by the school buildings is comprised of two asphalt playgrounds, neither very large.

There were approximately 644 students enrolled in Chinatown Elementary at the time of this study. The school population is relatively stable, but there are periodic influxes of new immigrant and refugee students from the Oriental Education Center where most new immigrants go first. Almost half the school population was Chinese; the remainder of the students were largely Spanish surname, other Oriental (primarily Vietnamese), and Black. Table 1 presents the figures for the ethnic breakdown of the school population. Because of the ethnic quota system operative within the district, the school is not officially "closed" to new Chinese students, except those who live within the most immediate neighborhood.

Table 1

Ethnic Summary of Chinatown Elementary School Population

Ethnicity	Spanish Surname	Other White	Black	Chinese	Amer. Indian	Filipino	Other non-White	Tot
Total	128	17	75	287	1	4	132	644
%	19.9	2.6	11.6	44.6	.2	.6	20.5	100

Within the Chinese community, the school has a good reputation. Most Chinese parents seem to feel more secure if their children are attending a school that is predominantly Chinese and has Chinese teachers. There have been reports of parents who submitted a falsified address, or used that of a relative, in order that their child might be allowed to attend the school.

Most of the Chinese students at Chinese Elementary are classified as either Limited-English-Speaking (LES) or Non-English-speaking (NES). These students, in turn, are placed in either a Bilingual or Regular Class. Table 2 presents the numbers of Cantonese speakers, their classification as either NES, LES, Bilingual (balanced) or English-Dominant and their class assignments.

Table 2

Classification and Assignment of Chinese Students

	Assignment		
Classification	Bilingual	Regular	Total
NES	166	10	176
LES	76	1	77
Bilingual	8	0	8
English-Dominant	19	50	69

Phase One

During Phase One, the site participating teachers, target students, and speech events were identified. Details on each of these tasks are given below.

Subjects

Subjects were eleven first-grade Chinese-American students, selected on the basis of English language proficiency. Prior to data collection, each teacher was asked to rank all students in the class on a four-point scale of oral English language proficiency (Fuentes & Wisenbaker, 1979). The bilingual teacher also provided similar inform- ation on students' Chinese proficiency. These judgements were then

verified through observations of potential target students. In this way, five students ranked at the low end of the scale (1-2), four ranked at the middle of the scale (3), and two fluent English speakers were selected.

Lessons

As mentioned above, the two participating teachers in the study taught in a half-day alternation bilingual program. Each teacher met with the students in the target class for half of each school day, and alternated between mornings and afternoons. One teacher was bilingual and biliterate in Chinese and English, and while the other spoke no Chinese, he did speak Spanish and had taught a self-contained Spanish bilingual class the year before. Both teachers had several years of experience.

Two types of lessons were selected for analysis in this report, Reading with the bilingual teacher and Oral Language in the Anglo teacher's class. Although the lesson content and focus differed somewhat across the teachers' lessons, they were in many respects comparable. For two weeks prior to taping, classroom observers took descriptive fieldnotes and coded for activity structures (Bossert, 1978). These two lessons were found to be compatible in that they were both teacher-directed, student membership was approximately the same, and both teachers organized lessons around a basic question/answer format. Descriptions of the typical organization of each teacher's lesson follow.

Reading. The bilingual teacher divided students into four instructional groups for Reading: Flintstones, Roadrunners, Bugs Bunnies, and Snoopies. Each group met with the teacher for 15 to 20 minutes during each reading period, rotating according to the schedule set up by the teacher.

Reading lessons are conducted in much the same way with each group. The teacher usually began by writing a list of vocabulary words on the board near the reading table. She then would introduce each word and ask students to read and say the words as a group. Individual students were then called on to read all the vocabulary words aloud. The next task for the reading lesson would involve using the student text or the accompanying story posters. Each poster contained a picture on the top and a story below. When she used the poster, the teacher would ask the students to look at the picture first, then ask them to describe the picture. Together, they would then read the story on the poster. When she used the book, she adopted the same approach as with the poster, beginning with a description of the picture, followed by reading. The final step in the typical reading lesson would be to ask the children to read the text silently, after which she asked them comprehension questions. To answer these, students were allowed to read an appropriate phrase or sentence from the text. Throughout the reading lesson, if students stumbled over a word, the teacher read it out and asked the student to repeat it.

Oral Language. The Anglo teacher divided his class for Oral Language into two instructional groups on the basis of oral English.

proficiency, Low and a combination of Middle and High. However, during the Oral Language period, only that group being taught by the teacher remained in the classroom; the other group met with another instructor in a different room. The overall procedures employed with each group were much the same.

The Low group consisted of six students who sat in their assigned seats. For Oral Langauge, the teacher would join the group by pulling up an additional chair. Very often the lesson began with picture flash cards, which students were required to identify and describe.

The Middle/High group was composed of nine students. They all sat at a table in the center of the room, where only the Middle group students normally sat. The teacher brought his own chair when he joined the group. Once again, the teacher usually began with picture flash-cards, which the students were to identify. Chinese lessons taught by the bilingual teacher as well as seatwork in the other teacher's class were recorded as well.

Phase Two

In Phase Two, teachers and target students were recorded in differ-ent lessons: Oral Language and Seatwork in Teacher B's class and Reading and Chinese in Teacher A's. There were transcribed, coded, and analyzed. Following is an overall description of the activities within this phase of the study.

Data Collection

Audiotape recordings were made through the use of a Marantz recorder, with two lavaliere microphones placed in the middle of each group's table. All data collection for Phase Two was conducted over a two-month period in the spring of 1982.

Two data collectors were present during each taping session, both fluent speakers of Cantonese, Mandarin, and English. One data collector took fieldnotes on the activities of the focal group, recording inform-ation on the physical arrangement of the group, important nonverbal behaviors, the text and/or materials used, and other contextual inform-ation. The other data collector, meanwhile, monitored the audiotape through earphones. Because of incidental noise in the class and the voices of students in other groups, the earphones enabled the data collector to hear much better the speech of the teacher and target students. This data collector wrote down names and utterance fragments of speakers throughout the interaction to aid in subsequent transcrip-tion.

Transcription

The audiotape recording of each lesson was transcribed by the data collector who monitored that taping session. The handwritten transcript was then entered into an IBM Personal Computer used for the analysis. Those utterances in Chinese were transcribed in Chinese, and an English

17

translation was provided in brackets. Descriptions of nonverbal behavior were included in parentheses.

Coding

Utterances were coded using a system of Conversational-acts (C-acts) developed by Dore (1977) and employed in several studies of children's language use (Cole, Dore, Hall & Dowley, 1978; Dore, Gearhart & Newman, 1978; Guthrie, 1981; Hall & Cole, 1978). C-acts represent a taxonomy of speech act types which code utterances according to (1) the grammatical structure of the utterance, (2) its illocutionary properties, and (3) its general semantic or propositional content.

Because of the different nature and focus of the present research, some modifications were made in the system as used in previous studies. These included both the addition and deletion of certain codes. The revised list of codes, definitions, and examples is presented in Appendix A.

Forty-nine separate speech acts, each assigned a three-letter code, comprise the Conversational-act system. These are grouped into six broad function types: (1) Assertions, which solicit information or actions; (2) Organizational Devices, which control personal contact and conversational flow; (3) Performatives, which accomplish acts by being said; (4) Requests, which solicit information or actions; and (6) Responses, which supply solicited information or acknowledge remarks (Dore et al., 1978, pp. 372-3). An additional category of special speech acts which codes microphone talk, laughing, singing, etc. is also included. Conversational-acts serving the Request function, for example, include Requests for Action (QAC), Product Requests (QPR), and Requests for Permission (QPM).

Coding proceeded as follows. First, the grammatical form and its literal semantic meaning were determined. Then a judgement was made as to the conventional force, or purpose, of the utterance. In this step, sequencing, reference, and other conversational cues, such as marked illocutionary devices and intonation, were taken into consideration. Utterances were thus placed first within the six broad function types, and then categorized as an individual Conversational-act. Throughout the coding, the contextual information contained in fieldnotes provided an addition check for the validity.

Initial coding was conducted by the data collector who observed a particular lesson. To ensure inter-coder agreement, each taped session was then coded a second time by another member of the research team, all of whom had engaged in two weeks of training and practice. Discrepancies were resolved through discussion. Throughout the coding process, inter-coder agreement for individual lessons ranged from .90 to .96. It should be noted that Conversational-act coding has been shown to he highly reliable in other studies as well. In both the Cole et al. (1978) and Hall and Cole (1978) studies, inter-rater reliability approached .90.

Although utterances in Chinese were translated into English and entered as data, all coding was done on the original Chinese. In several instances, this procedure proved to be crucial since the English translation would have received a different code.

In a recent paper, Cicourel (1980) compared three prevalent models of discourse: the speech act model, the expansion model, and the problem-solving model. His conclusion was that any one of these models in isolation is inadequate; some sort of integration is required. The method used in the present study represents an attempt at such an integration. By including both quantitative and qualitative analyses, the speech act and expansion models were-to some extent combined.

This integration also helped to meet some of the criticisms leveled by Cicourel against the speech act approach. Cicourel faulted the speech act model because it cannot easily account for 1) organizational features of interaction; 2) participant's strategies, e.g. plans for elaboration; 3) the situated nature of discourse, such as situated meaning and context; and 4) the multiple functions of utterances. The present study overcomes these weaknesses by incorporating the following methodologies:

First, organizational features of interaction, e.g. participant structures were identified in the Phase I observations. These guided the selection of episodes (lessons) for taping in Phase Two. All coding and analysis was done with regard to the participant structures. Second, attention was given to partipants' local strategies and plans for elaboration in ways of speaking. Because coding was done not on single sentences or utterances, but on stretches of discourse, taking the course and development of the conversation into consideration, the actor's strategies and intentions were included. In addition, the qualitative analysis in many respects focused on just this aspect of discourse. Particular attention was given to the questioning strategies each teacher employed in conducting parrticular lessons. Third, since all coding was done on relatively large stretches of language, situational meanings were taken into account. In coding the data, consideration was given to the speakers' utterances in context. What was said before, after, and in contexts more removed in time was taken into account in the coding. Finally, the present study was sensitive to the multiple functions of utterances in context. The C-act system allows for multiple coding so that important meanings and intentions are not lost. Further, in this study, the observers' fieldnotes provided a running description of the context which contributed to the coder's knowledge of and sensitivity to the interaction. The fact that the data collectors conducted the coding also contributed to its validity.

The use of Conversation-acts rather than other coding systems contributed to a mitigation of some of the other weaknesses Cicourel identified in speech act analyses. First, because Conversational-acts are sensitive to grammatical form, semantic content, and illocutionary force, and not just one of these, they provide a link between form and function. As Cole et al. (1978) point out, Conversational-acts mediate between the grammatical and the social, between the "grammatical forms .

19

. . and the interactional purpose for which they are used" (p.74). In other words, they integrate speakers' interests and purposes.

CHAPTER THREE

QUANTITATIVE DATA ANALYSIS

A total of 19 lessons/events were selected for analysis. The focus was on four types of classroom lessons/events, (1) Reading in English, taught by Teacher A and Oral Language, taught by Teacher B. The number of lessons by type and by teacher are given in Table 3, along with the time of recording and total number of utterances in each lesson.

Table 3

Sample of Lessons Analyzed

	Teacher A (bilingual)	Teacher B
Type	Reading	Oral Language
No. of Lessons	11	8
Minutes	185	155
Utterances	7456	8297

Data analysis has proceeded in the following manner. Beginning with a large corpus of data, nearly six hours (340 minutes) of tape recordings consisting of 15753 coded utterances, our first task was to begin to "slice" that data in ways which would make it meaningful. Each utterance was coded according to (1) the speaker, (2) speaker's oral English proficiency, (3) language of the utterance, and (4) the conversational-act (C-act) of the utterance performed. By treating each of these as an independent variable, we began to answer questions concerning children's and teachers' language use. For example, how does the langauge use of the two teachers vary across groups of students with different English language proficiencies? The system of Conversational-acts employed in the study (see Appendix) can also be reduced to six broad Function Types: (1) Assertions, (2) Organizational Devices, (3) Performatives, (4) Requests, (5) Responses, and (6) Special Speech Acts. For an examination of language use at a more general level, analyses can be conducted at that level.

Molar Analysis

The first task undertaken in the analysis of teachers' language use was to examine possible differences in the overall number of Conversational-acts (C-acts) across lessons and student proficiency groups. This was accomplished by calculating the frequency of C-acts performed by each speaker in each lesson. From this were determined several proportions upon which other analyses were conducted.

We looked at, for instance, the proportion of the total C-acts within a lesson contributed by the teacher and students. This served as an index for comparison of teachers and student groups. For example, if in a lesson all the speakers, including the teacher, produced 1000 utterances, and 500 of those were the teacher's, the teacher would have contributed 50 percent of the talk. In Table 4 are given the proportions of overall talk contributed by Teacher A and Teacher B in the different instructional groups. Student group totals have been averaged for individuals. As can be seen, Teacher B contributed somewhat less than 50 percent in both the low and medium/high groups. Teacher A, on the other hand, performed nearly 60 percent of the C-acts in two of her groups, and 52 percent in the other. The higher proportion of talk with the Middle and Low groups might indicate that Teacher A more directly controlled the interaction with those students. Green and Wallat (1982), for instance, found that the teacher who talked more also took more control. The average amount of talk contributed by individual target students was remarkably consistent across lessons and classrooms.

Table 4

Proportion of Talk in Two Types of Lessons

	Reading		Oral Language	
	Teacher A	Student Avg.	Teacher B	Student Avg.
High	.52	.06	.49	.08
Middle	.58	.07	.47	.07
Low	.58	.05	--	--

Microanalysis

Once the molar analysis was complete, more fine-grained analyses were conducted at the level of the individual C-act. Two kinds of proportions formed the basis for this analysis. First, we examined for each speaker, the relative frequency of each C-act and Function Type within a lesson. In this way, we could see what percentage of a speaker's C-acts in reading lessons, for example,

were particular kinds of requests or responses. In the discussion which follows, this quantity is referred to simply as the proportion.

The second proportion was calculated in order that comparisons across lessons could be made. Since the instructional time for lessons varied in length from 8 to 24 minutes, valid comparisons of raw frequencies across lessons would be impossible. We thus kept careful count of the exact number of minutes in each lesson and multiplied frequencies of C-acts by the portion of an hour constituted by the lesson. This quantity is referred to as the rate.

As mentioned above, the system of Conversational-acts (C-acts) employed in the study can be broken into six broad Function Types: (1) Assertions, (2) Organizational Devices, (3) Performatives, (4) Requests, (5) Responses, and (6) Special Speech Acts. Definitions and examples of these are contained in Appendix A. Once we had examined overall C-act use in the various lessons, we next turned to an investigation of differences in terms of Function Types. From this we were able to determine that certain of these, notably Special Speech Acts, occurred so infrequently that data on them could tell us little. We thus focused our attention on these Function Types: Assertions, Organizational Devices, Performatives, Requests, and Responses. Within each, C-acts having especially high or low usage relative to independent variables were further examined.

In the analysis of teacher language use, two questions directed the analysis. First, are the differences in language use for the two teachers greater, or the differences for one teacher with different groups of students? Previous research has shown (Cherry, 1978; Enright, et al., 1981-82) that teachers differ more from each other in the ways they use language than they do from themselves when they interact with various sets of students. In this study, therefore, we sought to explore this issue in a Chinese bilingual situation. It might be predicted, for example, that Teacher B, because he spoke no Chinese, would exhibit greater differences in language use between his interactions with the two groups of students than he would with Teacher A.

The second question asked what the nature of those differences were, where they occured, and what accounted for the variations in language use.

To address these questions, then, both between-teacher and within-teacher comparisons were conducted. Comparisons were made at the individual C-act level, and criteria for establishing difference were as follows. Following Green and Harker (1982), we chose to establish an arbitrary criterion for the investigation of differences. Only C-acts of relatively high frequency were considered; this was arbitrarily set at 5 percent or more of the speaker's contribution to that lesson. The .05 proportion level eliminated all but eight or ten C-acts for each speaker; these

23

were the C-acts through which most of his or her speech was conducted. Where it appeared relevant, rate was also considered. The results of each analysis are presented below.

Between Teacher Comparisons

Between teacher comparisons were made to determine whether teachers' language use differed in interaction with the same sets of children. These were conducted across each of two groups, Middle/High and Low. The group in this case is defined from the teacher's perspective, regardless of the fact that one or more of the individual members might have been rated somewhat differently in terms of oral English proficiency. In Table 5 are given the proportions of the most frequent C-acts for each teacher with Low and Middle/High groups. If the proportion for one teacher did not meet the five percent criterion for a particular C-act, that proportion is enclosed in parentheses. In Table 6 are given the mean rates (C-acts per hour) of those same most frequent C-acts.

Table 5

Teachers' Use of C-acts: Proportions

C-Act	Low Group			Middle & High Group		
	Tch A	Tch B	Difference	Tch A	Tch B	Difference
ADC	0.09	0.11	0.02	0.13	0.09	0.04
OAG	(0.02)	0.06	0.02	(0.01)	(0.02)	0.01
OBM	0.08	0.10	0.02	0.08	0.07	0.01
OSS	0.06	(0.02)	0.04	0.07	0.07	0.00
PPR	(0.03)	0.07	0.04	(0.01)	0.05	0.04
QAC	0.11	0.13	0.02	0.06	0.09	0.03
QCH	0.07	0.06	0.01	0.08	(0.04)	0.04
QPR	0.12	0.10	0.02	0.09	0.11	0.02
RAG	0.10	0.05	0.05	0.09	0.11	0.02
RAK	(0.02)	0.07	0.05	(0.02)	0.05	0.03

Table 6

Teachers' Use of C-acts: Rates

| | Low Group | | Middle & High Group | |
| | Teacher A | Teacher B | Teacher A | Teacher B |
C-Act	Rate	Rate	Rate	Rate
ADC	105.39	177.11	184.51	137.57
OAG	27.54	95.18	15.49	29.14
OBM	99.17	160.24	120.42	99.43
OSS	74.85	30.12	101.41	101.14
PPR	30.54	116.87	16.20	80.97
QAC	127.54	209.64	88.73	134.29
QCH	77.84	107.23	114.79	57.71
QPR	134.73	159.04	135.21	168.00
RAG	113.77	83.13	134.51	168.00
RAK	22.75	108.43	28.17	74.86

Middle/High Group Comparisons

With the Middle/High group, it was found that the two
teachers used similar sets of C-acts; only three of the C-acts in
Table 6 did not meet the frequency criterion for both teachers.
It might be surmised, therefore, that their interactional tasks
were relatively similar and could be compared. They used Boundary
Markers (OBM) and Speaker Selections (OSS) in practically the same
proportion, which suggests that they organized the lessons in
similar ways.

Boundary Markers may have much to do with a teacher's
personal speaking style, e.g., the use of "okay" or "now" to set
off lesson segments. Speaker selections, on the other hand,
indicated the type of turn-taking routine operative in the
exchange. When a teacher verbally nominates speakers, a very
different way of allocating turns is in force than when, say,
students bid for turns, or turns are automatically distributed.
Notice that a proportion of .07 of each teacher's lessons with
this group was devoted to OSS, and was remarkably close in terms
of rate as well.

However, some salient differences did emerge. Of those C-acts in which the teachers revealed differences of use with the Middle/High group, the bilingual teacher (A) used more Complete Descriptions (ADC) and Choice Questions (QCH). The Anglo teacher (B) used relatively more Protests (PPR), Requests for Action (QAC), Product Requests (QPR), Acknowledgements (RAK), and Agreements (RAG).

These findings might suggest that (1) the bilingual teacher was providing the group with more information through the use of Complete Descriptions (ADC)(see Enright, et al., 1982); and (2) the Teacher B was engaging in more questioning behavior. However, an examination of the complete data set revealed that Requests of all types occupied only 30 percent of his speech to the group as opposed to 33 percent of Teacher A's. Teacher A, it seems, used a wider range of Request types, including Process Requests (QPC), Requests for Verbal Response (QVB), and Suggestions (QSU). The proportions for QPC, QVB and QSU in her speech approached the high frequency level of five percent established for the analysis (QPC and QVB = .04; QSU = .03).

Other of the C-acts above deserve comment as well. The higher frequency of Protests (PPR) and Requests for Action (QAC) could be an indication of management difficulties on the part of Teacher B. In coding the data, Requests for Action, for instance, could include both procedural instructions (Turn the page) and behavioral sanctions (Be quiet and listen). An examination of Teacher B's Requests for Action in one lesson revealed that sanctions outnumbered procedures almost three to one. In the following exchange, Teacher B tells students individually to put his or her papers away. In line 101, the Attention Getter (OAG) also serves as a Request for Action (QAC), as shown by Charles' response of "I know."

Line	Spkr	C-act	Utterance
093	Teacher B	QAC	Put the paper in your desk,
094		OAG	Stanley (Student 24),
095		QAC	Put the paper in your desk,
096		OAG	Hieu-Nàn (Student 21),
097		QAC	In your desk.
098	Student 25	UNT	: : : :
099	Student 24	AIR	I know that.
100		ADC	I'm cutting.
101	Teacher B	OAG/QAC	Charles (Student 25)
102	Student 25	AIR	I know.

Acknowledgements (RAK) and Agreements (RAG) are common ways in which teachers react to student responses. Acknowledgements coded those teacher reactions which were noncommital, e.g., "yeah," "okay." Agreements, on the other hand, provide the student with an evaluation: "right," "yes," or "no." In the coding of these, distinctions frequently had to be made on the

basis of the speaker's intonation. The fact that Teacher B revealed a higher proportion of both Acknowledgements and Agreements indicates that students in the High group received frequent feedback on their responses. Approximately one-third of Teacher B's feedback was in the form of Acknowledgments (RAK) and thus contained little information in regard to the correctness of student answers. Teacher A showed much more of a preference for Agreements (RAG), using them at a ratio of more than four to one over Acknowledgments (RAK).

Low group comparisons

Comparisons across teachers' language use with the low group revealed somewhat similar patterns of differences. These are presented in Tables 5 and 6.

Consider first those C-acts which were used in similar proportions by both teachers, i.e., differ by two percent or less. These include Complete Descriptions (ADC), Boundary Markers (OBM), Requests for Action (QAC), Choice Requests (QCH) and Product Requests (QPR). That these show similar frequencies of usage suggests that the overall questioning strategies employed by the teachers were comparable, and that the task demands for the students were much the same. Notice, however, the rate with which Teacher B employed Requests for Action (QAC) -- over 200 per hour, or nearly 3.5 per minute. In the sample data, this is the highest rate for either teacher with any C-act. By comparison, one teacher in the Enright, et al. (1982) study used "directives" at a rate of 2.8 per minute, but that coding system would presumably include other C-acts such as Suggestions (QSU) and Requests for Verbal Action (QVB).

The greatest differences in proportion appear more in regard to the ways of organizing and managing the group, and in responding to student answers. The bilingual teacher (A), for instance, showed higher proportions of Speaker Selections (OSS) and Agreements (RAG), while Teacher B used relatively more Attention Getters (OAG) and Protests (PPR).

Differences also emerged in the responses to student answers made by the two teachers. As can be seen on Table 7, both teachers used a combination of Acknowledgments (RAK) and Agreements (RAG), and, interestingly enough, the total proportion of RAG and RAK for each teacher was 12 percent. As with the High group, Teacher B showed a preference for Acknowledgements (RAK). Notice, however, that the bilingual teacher employed a much higher proportion of Agreements (RAG) than did Teacher B; these constituted fully 10 percent of her overall speech to the group. This difference suggests that the bilingual teacher provided more informational feedback to the students than did the Anglo teacher. Good examples appear in the passage quoted below. Here the teacher is asking the students in the group to describe the illustration in their text.

27

Line	Spkr	C-act	Utterance
389	Student 11	RVB	The man is looking.
390	Teacher A	RAG	Oka-ay.
391		QPR	Who is the man looking at?
392		OSS	Harriet (Student 52).
393	Student 52	RPR	The girl.
394		RPR	The man is looking at the girl.
395	Teacher A	RAG	Right.
396		QPR	And what is the girl doing?
397		OSS	Hieu-Nan (Student 24).
398	Student 24	RPR	The girl said, "Hi."
399	Teacher A	RAG	The girl said, "Hi."
400		OEX	Aiya. [Chinese exclamation.]
401		RAG	That's right!

The use of Speaker Selections (OSS) or Attention Getters (OAG) represent complementary aspects of the organization of interaction within an instructional group. In a situation in which students are on task and attending to what the teacher says, Speaker Selections may be used to allocate turns; however, when students are off task, Attention Getters must be employed. These data suggest that Teacher B was forced to follow the latter route more often than was Teacher A. Six percent of his talk was composed of Attention Getters with the Low group. The above excerpt from a Reading lesson reveals how Teacher A, on the other hand, distributed turns within that group using Speaker Selections (OSS).

As mentioned earlier, Teacher B employed a slightly higher frequency of Requests for Action in lessons with the Low group, but at a very high rate. As with the Middle/High group, these were predominantly behavioral rather than procedural. The bilingual teacher, on the contrary, made use of a high proportion of procedural Requests for Action. In the following excerpt from a Low group Reading lesson, for example, she is asking the group to pretend they are different musical instruments.

A comparison of this exchange with that quoted earlier from Teacher B's lesson reveals the difference between their use of Requests for Action.

Consider next the teachers' use of Protests (PPR) with the Low group. The higher frequency of Protests in the talk of Teacher B are a further indication of the management difficulties he experienced. Protests occupied seven percent of Teacher B's total speech to the group, and were used at a rate of nearly 117 per hour, nearly two per minute. Teacher A used Protests only three percent of the time and at a rate of only 30 per hour.

Line	Spkr	C-act	Utterance
430	Teacher A	QAC	I want you to close your eyes.
431		QAC	Close your eyes.
432		PPR	Excuse me. (To other group.)_
433	Student 11	SAL	(giggle).
434	Student 24	ADC	[I pretend . . .]
435	Teacher A	QAC	Close your eyes.
436		QMA	I want you to pretend that you're big.
437		QAC	You have to close your eyes.
438		QMA	And have a long neck.
439		OBM	Okay.
440		QCH	You pretending?
441	Student 99	RCH	Yeah.
442	Teacher A	QMA	And you have five strings on the front of you.
443	Student 11	RAG	No.
444	Teacher A	ADC	And I'm going to come around with a bow,
445		ADC	And I'm going to rub the bow across your tummy.

Summary. In order to compare the total amount of difference between the teachers' use of language across instructional groups, the differences in proportions were totaled for each group. In other words, for ADC in the High group comparison there was a difference of 0.04 (0.13 - 0.09). The sum of all differences for the High group was 0.26, and for the Low group, 0.31. This would seem to indicate that in a more or less global sense, the level of differences was quite similar.

Within Teacher Comparisons

Comparisons were also made of each teacher's language use with different groups. For this analysis, students were once again considered in Middle/High and Low groups, i.e., the four groups in Teacher A's class were collapsed into two.

Teacher A. Teacher A's most frequently used Conversational-acts with the two groups are given in Table 7. These figures reveal a remarkable consistency in her language use across the groups; indeed, the only C-acts which are significantly different in proportion are Complete Descriptions (ADC), Requests for Action (QAC), and Product Requests (QPR). All other high proportion acts were found to be more or less equivalent. These included Organ-izers (OBM and OSS), Requests (QCH), and Responses (RAG). The pattern for Teacher A then is consistent with that reported by Cherry (1978) and others that, while teacher expectations cause variations in their interaction with different groups of children, these differences are not so great as those across teachers.

Table 7

Within Teacher Comparisons in C-act Use: Teacher A

C-act	Middle/High		Low		Difference
	Prop.	Rate	Prop.	Rate	
ADC	0.13	184.51	0.09	105.39	0.04
OBM	0.08	120.42	0.08	99.17	0.00
OSS	0.07	101.41	0.06	74.85	0.01
QAC	0.06	88.73	0.11	127.54	0.05
QCH	0.08	114.79	0.07	77.84	0.01
QPR	0.09	135.21	0.12	134.73	0.03
RAG	0.09	134.51	0.10	113.77	0.01
					Total 0.15

Following the interpretation used earlier in regard to
Complete Descriptions (ADC) and Requests for Action (QAC), we may
assume that Teacher A (1) provided more information to the High
group, (2) asked the Low group more informational questions, and
(3) gave the Low group more physical directions. An examination
of the actual C-acts employed by Teacher A with these groups
provides some explanation for these variations. First, in her
lessons with the High Reading group, Teacher A allocated more time
to the concepts related to the story. Beginning with a picture,
or the story title, she often engaged the students in a discussion
of ways it related to their own lives. How she did this is shown
in the following discussion of "lost and found," the title of the
story. Here she creates a verbal picture of a situation in order
to remind (or inform) students of the school "lost and found."

Although Product Requests (QPR) were used in a greater
proportion with the Low group, they ranked second only to Complete
Descriptions (ADC) with the Middle/High students. The rate,
furthermore, was essentially the same, about 135 per hour. In
regard to the more frequent use of Requests for Action with the
Low group, we can assume that interactions of the type quoted
earlier, in which students were asked to close their eyes and
pretend, could account for part of the difference. It is also the
case that the Low group was given more instructions on the order
of "Copy the sentences" and "Open your books."

Line	Spkr	C-act	Utterance
918	Teacher A	QPR	Where do you think you can find them?
919		OSS	Yvonne. (Student 47)
920	Student 47	RPR	At the place that you lost it.
921	Teacher A	RAK	Okay.
922		RAG	The place where you lost it.
923		ADC	If you lost them in the yard, you can find them in the yard.
924		QPC	But what if someone comes along and sees a hat on a bench?
925		ADC	"I wonder who that belongs to."
926		ADC	and the person takes the hat to the office.
927		ADC	And when you come back, you can't find it.
928		ORQ	Right?
929	Student 41	ADC	You go to the office.
930	Teacher A	QPR	Where would you go?
931	Student 41	ADC	You go to the office.

Teacher B. Similarities and differences in C-act use across the two instructional groups for Teacher B were also calculated and are presented in Table 8. Findings for this teacher were quite different from those which emerged from the data on Teacher A. Most obvious is the fact that the total difference amounted to .34, twice that for Teacher A. Most of the differences in proportion were not particulary great (the largest was 0.06), but there were several C-acts which showed different proportions and rates across the groups.

The patterns of differences in C-act use proved quite interesting. Those favored in the Middle/High group included Speaker Selections (OSS), Product Requests (QPR) and Agreement Responses (RAG). With the Low group, Teacher B used more Complete Descriptions (ADC), Attention Getters (OAG), Boundary Markers (OBM), Protests (PPR), Requests for Action (QAC), Choice Requests (QCH); and Acknowledgements (RAK). Teacher B's language use with the Middle/High group, then, is similar to that of Teacher A with her groups. Turns were allocated through Speaker Selections and feedback was given with Agreements (RAG).

Table 8

Within Teacher Comparisons in C-act Use: Teacher B

C-act	Middle/High Prop.	Rate	Low Prop.	Rate	Difference
ADC	0.09	136.57	0.11	177.11	0.02
OAG	(0.02)	29.14	0.06	95.18	0.04
OBM	0.07	99.43	0.10	160.24	0.03
OSS	0.07	101.14	(0.02)	30.12	0.05
PPR	0.05	80.57	0.07	116.87	0.02
QAC	0.09	134.29	0.13	209.64	0.04
QCH	(0.04)	57.71	0.06	107.23	0.02
QPR	0.14	204.00	0.10	159.04	0.04
RAG	0.11	168.00	0.05	83.13	0.06
RAK	0.05	74.86	0.07	108.43	0.02
				Total	0.34

Several of the C-acts used in greater proportion with the Low group have implications for the way in which the group was organized, e.g., Speaker Selections and Attention Getters. Others relate more to instruction. In terms of organization, Teacher B. seemed to have had some difficulty with the Low group. There were higher frequencies of Attention Getters, Protests, and Requests for Action. In regard to instruction, he provided them with more information in the form of Complete Descriptions, and also made more Choice Requests (QCH). He gave more directives, provided more information, and did relatively less questioning. The Middle/High group, on the other hand, was conducted in a basic Question-Answer-Evaluation format. Turns were allocated through Speaker Selections and there were few calls for attention or protests by the teacher.

Summary. Differences in proportion across groups for each teacher were calculated and summed. Teacher A had a total difference of 0.15, while Teacher B' differences added to 0.34. Obviously, then, the overall differences in language use across groups for the two teachers were in contrast. Teacher A appeared to be doing much the same thing with both groups, while Teacher B used language in very different ways.

Students' Language Use

Student language was analyzed in much the same way as that of the teachers. Two types of comparisons were made: 1) between teachers for the same English proficiency group, and 2) within teachers across English proficiency groups. These data are in relation to the English proficiency groups which resulted from the teachers' ranking, and do not necessarily coincide with the instructional groups, although there is of course some overlap.

Thus "low," "medium" and "high" in this discussion refer only to students' English language proficiency.

Because the number of students present in a lesson varied, the frequencies obtained in the analysis were divided by the number of students participating. Rates, then, represent the average rate for the students in the group. The results of these analyses follow.

Between Teachers Analysis

Low proficiency group. In Table 9 are given the proportions and rates of C-acts for those students ranked low in English language proficiency. It is in this comparison that the most dramatic differences of the anaysis emerged. The level of differ- ence between the various C-acts ranged from 0.07 for Product Responses (RPR) to 0.26 for Responses to Verbal Requests (RVB); the total difference for the group was 0.53.

Table 9

Students' Language Use Across Teachers: Low English Proficiency Group

C-act	Oral Language Prop.	Rate	Reading Prop.	Rate	Difference
ADC	0.15	31.29	0.06	4.31	0.09
AID	0.05	09.88	0.05	3.35	0.00
AIR	0.06	13.41	0.06	4.55	0.00
OAG	(0.03)	5.65	0.05	3.35	0.02
OFL	(0.04)	9.65	0.05	3.35	0.01
OVP	0.09	19.76	(0.01)	0.96	0.08
RCH	0.06	12.94	0.06	4.19	0.00
RPR	0.26	55.76	0.19	13.77	0.07
RVB	(0.01)	2.12	0.27	19.40	0.26
				Total	0.53

It is clear, then, that the Limited English Proficient (LEP) students were doing something quite different in each of the classrooms. In Oral Language, more than 25 percent of their talk was in form of Product Requests (RPR) and another 15 percent in Complete Descriptions (ADC). This would seem to indicate that the students were indeed getting valuable experience in the use of English. They were providing the teacher with responses to his requests for information. The high frequency of Verbal Play (OVP) is more difficult to interpret. It accounted for nearly 10 percent of the talk in Oral Language, but only one percent in Reading. On the one hand, it may be that Verbal Play reflects a lack of attention to the task at hand. This interpretation is supported by the high detree of Attention Getters, Protests, and Action Requests in Teacher B's language. On the other hand, it could be that at least some playing with language has a positive

effect and contributes to language learning. Consider the students' language in the following example. Here Teacher B is asking the group to identify pictures of zoo animals. When they answer "Go" and "Ding-dong," they are clearly off-task, but the playful repetition of "bear" (664-5) and the corruption of "giraffe" (671) may not be.

Line	Spkr	C-act	Utterance
658	Teacher B	QPR	What's this animal?
659	Student 99	RPR	Bear.
660	Teacher B	RAK	Okay
661		OFS	This is . . .
662	Student 12	OVP	Go.
663	Student 13	OVP	Ding-dong.
664	Student 15	OVP	Bear.
665		OVP	Bear.
666	Teacher B	RAG	No.
667		OBM	Okay.
668		OFS	This is . . .
669		QPR	What's this animal?
670	Group	RPR	Giraffe
671	Student 12	OVP	Pan raffe.

The largest difference in favor of the Reading lesson was in terms of Responses to Verbal Requests (RVB), which coded oral reading and repeating aloud. Obviously, and predictably, the students are engaged in more reading-like activities in Teacher A's class. The low proportion of RVBs in Teacher B's lessons show as well that he was not conducting the types of drills common to English as a Second Language lessons. Drill-like repetitions, substitutions, and the like were coded RVB.

Middle proficiency group. Table 10 shows the proportions and rates for students ranked in the middle for oral English language proficiency. In Oral Language, nearly one-third of students' C-acts were providing answers to the teachers Product Requests; this was followed by Complete Descriptions (ADC). In Reading, their language was more diverse in that the most frequent C-act (ADC) was used less than one-fifth the time. Product Responses (RPR) and Verbal Action Responses (RVB) occupied one-tenth of their talk. Overall differences for this group totaled .40.

The most dramatic differences between the lessons for these students were the greater proportion of Product Responses (RPR) in Oral Language and Choice (RCH) and Verbal Action Responses (RVB) in Reading. These contrasts are no doubt related to variations i task focus. There was more questioning for information in Teacher B's class and more reading in Teacher A's. However, Middle proficiency students also produced a higher frequency of Verbal Plays (OVP) in Oral Language.

34

Table 10

Students' Language Use Across Teachers: Middle English Proficiency Group

C-act	Oral Language Prop.	Rate	Reading Prop.	Rate	Difference
ADC	0.14	21.00	0.18	11.97	0.04
AID	0.07	10.42	(0.04)	2.69	0.03
AIR	0.05	7.00	(0.04)	2.69	0.01
OAG	0.05	7.00	0.05	3.29	0.00
OVP	0.06	8.85	(0.02)	1.35	0.04
RCH	(0.03)	5.29	0.09	6.29	0.06
RPR	0.28	38.00	0.15	10.18	0.13
RVB	(0.02)	2.61	0.11	7.64	0.09
				Total	0.40

High proficiency group. In Table 11 are given the proportion and rate figures across lessons for those target students who were ranked high in English language proficiency. For this group, the contrast is less pronounced. Differences in proportion total only 0.38, and most of that derives from one C-act. The greatest contrast involves the much higher proportion of Product Responses (RPR) in Oral Language. High proficiency students in that class performed that C-act over one-third of the time. Notice as well the higher proportion of Process Responses (RPC) by that group.

Table 11

Students' Language Use Across Teachers: High English Proficiency Group

C-act	Oral Language Prop.	Rate	Reading Prop.	Rate	Difference
ADC	0.13	19.55	0.16	9.77	0.03
AID	0.11	16.91	0.07	4.02	0.04
OFS	0.06	8.65	0.05	2.88	0.01
QAC	(0.01)	1.50	0.05	2.88	0.04
RCH	(0.04)	6.02	0.05	2.88	0.01
RPC	(0.01)	1.13	0.06	3.45	0.05
RPR	0.35	54.88	0.17	10.34	0.18
RVB	0.06	4.89	0.08	4.60	0.02
				Total	0.38

Summary. The analysis of the language use of the three English language proficiency groups reveals a pattern of progressivly less divergent language use across lessons (teachers) from low to high. Overall difference scores were the following: Low = .53; Middle = .40; and High = .38. The obvious implication

of these findings is that student language is more similar across the two teachers lessons as student English language proficiency increases. With the possible exception of Verbal Play in Oral Language, all the high frequency C-acts appear to be task-oriented. This suggests that while Teacher B may have had some difficulty in maintaining the attention of the Low group students, they were engaged in the lesson.

Within Teachers Analysis

Comparisons were made as well between the language use of students across lessons of the same type. These were once again conducted from the point of view of students' oral English language proficiency. Within each lesson type, comparisons were made across the three groups, i.e., Low to Middle, Low to High, and Middle to High.

Oral Language. Proficiency group comparisions in Oral Language are presented in Table 12 and revealed the following pattern. Contrasts were greatest between the Low and High proficiency groups; second was the difference between Middle and High. In both cases, the differences was mainly in terms of Product Responses (RPR) and Verbal Play (OVP). Whereas the High students did more answering, the Low and Middle group students were more often off task.

Table 12

Students' Language Use Within Teachers:
Oral Language

	Group						Differences		
	Low		Middle		High		L-M	M-H	L-H
	prop.	rate	prop.	rate	prop.	rate			
ADC	0.15	31.29	0.14	21.12	0.13	19.55	0.01	0.01	0.02
AID	0.05	9.88	0.07	10.43	0.11	2.63	0.02	0.04	0.06
AIR	0.06	13.41	0.05	7.00	(0.04)	6.03	0.01	0.01	0.02
OAG	(0.03)	5.65	0.05	7.04	(0.02)	3.38	0.02	0.03	--
OFS	(0.03)	7.06	(0.02)	2.87	0.06	8.65	--	0.04	0.03
OVP	0.09	19.76	0.06	8.85	(0.01)	1.88	0.03	0.05	0.08
RCH	0.06	12.98	(0.03)	5.26	(0.04)	6.01	0.03	--	0.02
RPR	0.26	55.76	0.28	43.25	0.35	54.88	0.02	0.07	0.09
						Totals	0.14	0.25	0.32

Reading. Proficiency group comparisons in Reading are given in Table 13. They produced the following results. First, the differences were much greater than in Oral Language (from 0.26 to 0.55). Second, the greatest contrast was once again between the Low and High groups; the next greatest, however, was between Low and Middle, rather than Middle and High. In Oral Language, the two lower groups performed a more similar array of C-acts, but in Reading, it was the two upper groups which were more alike.

In these comparisons, two C-acts accounted for most of the difference. The Low group performed far more Verbal Action Responses (RVB), and the Middle and High groups produced more Complete Descriptions (ADC). These differences can be attributed to the contrasting activities of the Low Reading group. These students did primarily decoding tasks, both with flashcards and from the board. The Middle and High speakers read more for meaning and engaged more in discussions with the teacher.

Table 13

Students' Language Use Within Teachers:
Reading

| | Group | | | | | | Differences | | |
| | Low | | Middle | | High | | | | |
	prop.	rate	prop.	rate	prop.	rate	L-M	M-H	L-H
ADC	0.06	4.31	0.18	11.98	0.16	9.77	0.12	0.02	0.10
AID	0.05	3.35	(0.04)	2.69	0.07	4.02	0.01	0.03	0.02
AIR	0.06	4.55	(0.04)	2.69	(0.03)	1.72	0.02	---	0.03
OAG	0.05	3.59	0.05	3.29	(0.01)	0.57	0.00	0.04	0.04
OFL	0.05	3.35	(0.03)	2.10	(0.04)	2.30	0.04	---	0.04
OFS	(0.04)	2.87	(0.04)	2.54	0.05	2.87	---	0.01	0.01
QAC	(0.01)	0.72	(0.02)	1.05	0.05	2.87	---	0.03	0.04
RCH	0.06	4.24	0.09	6.29	0.05	2.87	0.03	0.04	0.01
RPC	(0.01)	0.96	(0.02)	1.65	0.06	3.45	---	0.04	0.05
RPR	0.19	13.77	0.15	10.18	0.17	10.35	0.04	0.02	0.02
RVB	0.27	19.40	0.11	7.64	0.08	4.60	0.16	0.03	0.19
						Totals	0.42	0.26	0.55

37.

CHAPTER FOUR

QUALITATIVE DATA ANALYSIS

In this section is described the qualitative analysis con-
ducted on the transcipt and audiotape data. The focus of the
analysis emerged from the quantitative analysis described in the
previous chapter. In other words, those aspects of interaction
and instruction which appeared to be significant directed the
analysis. It was found, for example, that Teacher B and a higher
proportion of Attention Getters (OAG) and Protests (PPR) with the
Low group. Portions of the transcripts which contained a high
frequency of those C-acts were then located and examined. In this
way, different aspects of the interactions with both teachers were
considered. Overall, the qualitative analysis has been conducted
along the following dimensions: group management, questioning
strategies, and the use of L1 in instruction. Each of these is
discussed in turn. Teacher will be treated separately so that a
qualitative picture of each classroom may emerge, and comparisons
will be made at the end.

Oral Language Lessons

Group Management

As reported above, the interactions of Teacher B with the Low
Oral Language group were characterized by a higher proportion of
Attention Getters (OAG), Requests for Action (RAG), and Protests
(PPR). Taken in combination, these Conversational-acts describe
lessons in which there is a certain lack of order. In the pre-
vious section, examples of these efforts at regaining control over
the group were provided. What was not available in the reported
frequencies and proportions, however, was clear evidence for what
these aspects of language use look like in practice. It was
suggested that the particular turn-taking mechanisms employed in
the groups might have been a factor. To further examine this
possiblity and to explore the data for others, a detailed quali-
tative examination of the data was undertaken. At least two
aspects of Teacher B's instruction, the clarity of the instruc-
tions and the clarity of rules for interaction, were found to be
contributing to the confusion in the Low group lessons.

Clarity of Instructions. A clear statement of the task
demands for a lesson has been identified as a significant feature
of effective instruction (Good & Brophy, 1974; Tikunoff, 1983). -
When students are sure of the task, they are more likely to
perform and behave well. One factor which seemed to differentiate
the Low Oral Language lessons from the other lessons of Teacher B
(and Teacher A), was the degree of clarity with which instructions
were given. In the Middle/High group lessons sampled, Teacher B

was often found to carefully outline the task to follow. Students
were given explicit instructions for what they were to do and how
to do it. Consider, for example, Teacher B's instructions in the
following excerpt from a lesson beginning. Lesson and line
numbers are indicated in parentheses.

> All right, when I point to you, I want you to tell me
> your first name and your last name. And then I want you
> to go over your street address, uh, and your phone
> number (5:81-86).

When the first student began by reciting his phone number, Teacher
B interrupted and repeated the instructions: "When I point to
you, tell me your first name and your last name, your street
address and your phone number" (5:95-96). The effectiveness of
this approach is seen in the responses of the students.

Speaker	C-act	Utterance	(5:102-106;165-183)
Teacher B	(QPR)	(Teacher points at Student 23)	
Student 25	RPR	Harvey Ching.	
	RPR	2113 Stanton Street.	
	RPR	467, 474-3710.	
Teacher B	RAK	Okay.	
		*) * * * *	
Teacher B	OBM	Okay.	
	OSS	Your turn (points at Student 25).	
Student 25	RPR	Albert N.	
Teacher B	RAKQPR	Okay.	
Student 25	RPR	15 Walnut Place.	
Teacher B	QPR	Apartment?	
Student 25	RQL	Apartment, I don't know.	
Teacher B	RAK	Okay.	
	QPR	What's your phone number?	
Student 25	RPR	Phone number 939-9416.	
Teacher B	QPR	What's your mom's name, or your dad's?	
Student 25	RPR	Suki Ching.	
Teacher B	RAK	Okay.	

In contrast, when Teacher B attempted the same task with the
Low group, he was much less clear about what he expected the
students to do. For one thing, with the previous group, this task
was introduced at the beginning of a lesson. With the low group,
the lesson had begun with a discussion of a field trip to the city
aquarium. While students were telling what they had seen on the
field trip, Teacher B changed the focus. "Wait a minute now," he
said,"let's play a pretend game." He then asked the group to
pretend that they were in the aquarium looking at fish, but when
they looked around, both teachers and all the students were gone.
"What would you do?" he asked. This strategy seemed not to work;

39

the students were confused as to the task and its purpose.
Student 12, for instance, appeared to misunderstand completely the
conditional aspect of Teacher B's request.

Speaker	C-act	Utterance ·	(6:410-415)
Teacher B	OFS	Could you . . .	
	QCH	Could you go up to the police man and tell him that you were lost?	
Group	RCH	No-o-o.	
Teacher B	QPC	Why? ·	
Student 12	RPC	I didn't lost.	

Turning to a more direct approach, Teacher B simply asked
individual students for their addresses; but even then, the
straightforward set of rules given the Middle/High group were
omitted. Over and over, Teacher B appeared to struggle for the
group's attention, trying to initiate the new activity.

Evidence of the differential treatment of the two groups was
found in other lessons as well. Teacher B frequently used the
Oral Language lessons to give students practice in identification
and description of various types of pictures, e.g. animals and
people with different jobs. In the sampled lessons, for example,
he used a set of animal cards with each group. With the
Middle/High group Teacher B introduced the lesson with an explicit
statement of the task. The Low group lesson, on the other hand,
began with only a casual remark: "All right, we're going to talk
about pictures. Do you remember this picture?" (15:125-126).
While the teacher did follow this up with instructions to "point
to the mice that are going under the tree" (15:136), he never
really framed the lesson. It is not even clear that he had all
the students' attention, for several started to mumble and talk
among themselves. In a second lesson on students' addresses and
phone numbers, the teacher simply started asking questions, with
no introduction at all. The first portion of this lesson is given
below.

Speaker	C-act	Utterance	(14:21-84)
Teacher B	OAG	Wilson.	
Teacher B	OFS	Do you remember -	
Student 12	UNT	: : : : ::	
Teacher B	PPR	Excuse me.	
Teacher B	OAG	Fan-Ling.	
Teacher B	OAG	Wilson	
Teacher B	QCH	Do you remember your home phone number?	
Student 11	RCH	Yeah.	
Teacher B	OFS	Would	
Teacher B	QPR	Would you tell me your home phone number?	
Student 11	RPR	Nine.	

Teacher B	QAC	Go ahead.
	QAC	You say it.
Student 11	RPR	Nine.
Teacher B	RAG	Nine.
Student 15	AIR	Ngoh seung wan keuih [I want to look for it]
	ADC	Wan mhdou keuih. [But I can't find it.]
Student 11	RPR	Three.
Teacher B	RAK	Three.
	PPR	Sh. (To A-Chin.)
Student 11	RPR	Eight.
Teacher B	RAK	Eight.
Student 11	RPR	Eight.
Teacher B	RAK	Eight.
Student 15	OFS	Ngoh [I]
Student 11	RPR	Six.
Teacher B	RAK	Six.
Student 11	RPR	Seven.
Teacher B	RAK	Seven.
Student 15	UNT	: : : : .
Student 11	RPR	Four.
Teacher B	RAK	Four.
	QCH	Do you remember your house number, your address of the house?
Student 12	UNT	: : : : : :
Teacher B	OAG	Fan-Ling.
	PPR	Would you sit still?
Student 11	QPR	What address?
Teacher B	QCH	Do you know the number of the house and the street the house is on?
Student 91	OAG	Wilson.
Teacher B	QPCQSU	Could you tell that to
Student 11	RPR	Eight.
Teacher B	RAK	Eight.
Student 13	RAG	Mhhai eight. [It's not]
Student 11	RPR	Two.
Teacher B	RAK	Two.
Student 11	RPR	Two.
Teacher B	RAK	Two.
Student 16	ADC	Mhnahnggau chou [Can't sit :]
Student 11	RPR	One.
Teacher B	QPR	Eight, two, two.
Student 11	RPR	One.
Teacher B	RAK	One.
	OBM	Okay.
	QPR	What street name?
	QPR	What's the name of the street?
	AAT	You don't know.
	OBM	Okay.
	PPR	Sh!
	OAG	A-Chin.
Student 15	OCQ	What?

Because there are several points to be made about this segment, it has been quoted at length. First, not only did Teacher B begin without setting a frame for the lesson, he began without getting the attention of all the students in the group. Students 12 and 15, for example, were engaged in a side conversation in Chinese about a lost book. Second, he addressed the first question to perhaps the least confident of the Low group students, Student 11 (Wilson). Then, after having to literally drag the numbers out of him, the teacher continued to interrogate the same student, rather than switching to someone else. Perhaps a better strategy would have been to ask one of the more verbal students to start off, thus setting an example for Wilson.

Clarity of rules for interaction. Another factor which undoubtedly contributes to the management and discipline of a group is the clarity of rules for interaction. Students must not only know what the instructions are, but must also understand the acceptable ways for answering and how turns will be distributed. In the quantitative analysis, it was found that Teacher B used higher frequencies of Attention Getters (OAG) and Teacher A, Speaker Selections (OSS). We asked, then, exactly how students knew what the interactional demands were, and how they were enforced. Teachers can arrange for students to take turns in a number of ways. The teacher for example, might have students bid for turns by raising their hands or calling out, nominate students without their bidding, require students to take turns in a regular order, or allow turns to be negotiated in the group.

In his Middle/High Oral Language lessons, Teacher B insisted that students raise their hands for a turn, and he usually made that clear from the beginning. Consider the opening of Lesson 1.

Speaker	C-act	Utterance	(1:6-16)
Teacher B	OBM	Okay.	
Teacher B	ADC	Yesterday, we looked at animals.	
	APR	Today, we're going to look at different things that are not animals.	
	ADC	They are things you use around the house.	
		(Soft singing.)	
Student 91	SAS	And you have to tell me what	
Teacher B	QAC	it is and what you use it for.	
		Okay.	
Student 91	RCO	Da-da-da.	
Teacher B	QAC	Just look at it first and raise	
	QAC	your hand.	

In this excerpt, Teacher B first provided a context for the lesson, reminding the group what they did the day before. Next, he explained clearly what the task would be for this lesson: They would look at things used around the house and tell what they are

37   42

and what they are used for. Finally, he outlined the interactional demands for the lesson: "Just look at it first and raise your hand."

Teacher B was also careful to enforce the established task and interactional demands in lessons with the Middle/High group. Teacher B frequently restated the hand-raising rule in the course of a lesson and sanctioned those who spoke out of turn:

All right. Okay, raise your hand if you know what this guy is doing. Just raise your hand. Don't speak out loud. (5:400-402)

Don't say a word without my permssion. (1:979)

Hold it! Just raise your hand. (1:886)

Just don't call out, raise your hand, Janet. (5:492-493).

It is clear that the Middle/High students had been socialized into the interactional rules of the Oral Language lessons. They were aware of the hand-raising rule and held each other accountable for following it. As has been pointed out by McDermott (1976, 1978), people in interaction hold each other accountable for what transpires. In our examination of the High group transcripts, we found exactly that. Holding up a picture of a coffee pot, for example, the teacher asked what it was, selecting Harvey to answer. "I didn't raise my hand," he protested (1:507). They were also conscious of the fact that there should be an equal distribution of turns among the students. At the beginning of one lesson, for example, the following exchange took place. Notice again how explicit Teacher B is concerning the rules.

Speaker	C-act	Utterance (20:52-60)
Teacher B	ADC	I am going to show you pictures of stuff.
Teacher B	AEX	Things that you people wear or use on your bodies.
Teacher B	OBM	Okay.
Student 91	UNT	Bon.
Teacher B	QPR	You tell me what it is.
Teacher B	QPC	What you use it for and where you wear it?
Student 21	QCH	Everybody get a turn?
Teacher B	QAC	Raise your hand.
Teacher B	APR	Everybody will get a turn.

The same student, Stanley, monitored the allocation of turns of the other students in his group. At one point he was heard to tell another student, "You already have one time" (1:442), and on another occasion, when the teacher sanctioned a student, Stanley explained, "You already have a chance" (20:197).

...they are ...
emands for the lesson: "Just look at it first ...
d."

:cher B was also careful to enforce the established task
:ractional demands in lessons with the Middle/High group.
B frequently restated the hand-raising rule in the course
;son and sanctioned those who spoke out of turn:

l right. Okay, raise your hand if you know what this
y is doing. Just raise your hand. Don't speak out
ud. (5:400-402)

n|t say a word without my permssion. (1:979)

ld it! Just raise your hand. (1:886)

ist don't call out, raise your hand, Janet. (5:492-493).

t is clear that the Middle/High students had been socialized
he interactional rules of the Oral Language lessons. They
ware of the hand-raising rule and held each other account-
or following it. As has been pointed out by McDermott
1978), people in interaction hold each other accountable
at transpires. In our examination of the High group
ripts, we found exactly that. Holding up a picture of a
: pot, for example, the teacher asked what it was, selecting
: to answer. "I didn't raise my hand," he protested (1:507).
iere also conscious of the fact that there should be an equal
ibution of turns among the students. At the beginning of one
1, for example, the following exchange took place. Notice
how explicit Teacher B is concerning the rules.

Speaker	C-act	Utterance	(20:52-60)
Teacher B	ADC	I am going to show you pictures of stuff.	
Teacher B	AEX	Things that you people wear or use on your bodies.	
Teacher B	OBM	Okay.	
Student 91	UNT	Bon.	
Teacher B	QPR	You tell me what it is.	
Teacher B	QPC	What you use it for and where you wear it?	
Student 21	QCH	Everybody get a turn?	
Teacher B	QAC	Raise your hand.	
Teacher B	APR	Everybody will get a turn.	

same student, Stanley, monitored the allocation of turns of
other students in his group. At one point he was heard to
l another student, "You already have one time" (1:442), and on
ther occasion, when the teacher sanctioned a student, Stanley
lained, "You already have a chance" (20:197).

38   43

and what they are used for. Finally, he outlined the interactional demands for the lesson: "Just look at it first and raise your hand."

Teacher B was also careful to enforce the established task and interactional demands in lessons with the Middle/High group. Teacher B frequently restated the hand-raising rule in the course of a lesson and sanctioned those who spoke out of turn:

All right. Okay, raise your hand if you know what this guy is doing. Just raise your hand. Don't speak out loud. (5:400-402)

Don't say a word without my permssion. (1:979)

Hold it! Just raise your hand. (1:886)

Just don't call out, raise your hand, Janet. (5:492-493).

It is clear that the Middle/High students had been socialized into the interactional rules of the Oral Language lessons. They were aware of the hand-raising rule and held each other accountable for following it. As has been pointed out by McDermott (1976, 1978), people in interaction hold each other accountable for what transpires. In our examination of the High group transcripts, we found exactly that. Holding up a picture of a coffee pot, for example, the teacher asked what it was, selecting Harvey to answer. "I didn't raise my hand," he protested (1:507). They were also conscious of the fact that there should be an equal distribution of turns among the students. At the beginning of one lesson, for example, the following exchange took place. Notice again how explicit Teacher B is concerning the rules.

			(20:52-60)
Speaker	C-act	Utterance	
Teacher B	ADC	I am going to show you pictures of stuff.	
Teacher B	AEX	Things that you people wear or use on your bodies.	
Teacher B	OBM	Okay.	
Student 91	UNT	Bon.	
Teacher B	QPR	You tell me what it is.	
Teacher B	QPC	What you use it for and where you wear it?	
Student 21	QCH	Everybody get a turn?	
Teacher B	QAC	Raise your hand.	
Teacher B	APR	Everybody will get a turn.	

The same student, Stanley, monitored the allocation of turns of the other students in his group. At one point he was heard to tell another student, "You already have one time" (1:442), and on another occasion, when the teacher sanctioned a student, Stanley explained, "You already have a chance" (20:197).

unwilling) to develop a sustained exchange with students.
Consider the following example from a Middle/High lesson.

Speaker	C-act	Utterance	(1:113-144)
Teacher B	OSS	Janet.	
Student 31	RPR	It's a pan..	
Teacher B	QPC	Tell me about the pan.	
Student 31	RPR	You would put.	
Teacher B	QCH	I wash with this?	
	OFS	I	
	QCH	I take a bath sitting in a pan?	
Student 31	RCH	No.	
Group	SAL	(Laughter.)	
Teacher B	QPR	What do you use a pan for?	
Student 24	UNT	If you sit on it : : :	
Student 31	RPR	You cook it.	
Teacher B	QPR	Like what?	
	QPR	Name some things.	
Student 26	RPR	Cooking fish.	
Teacher B	QPR	What do I cook in a pan?	
	QCH	Do I cook soup?	
Student 91	RPR	(Whisper) pot.	
Student 21	RCH	Yeah.	
Teacher B	RAG	I could.	
	QPR	But what?	
	QPR	What do you cook in a pan?	
	QPR	What would you use this for?	
Student 21	RPR	Cook egg.	
Student 31	RPR	Steak.	
Teacher B	OCQ	What?	
Student 21	RPR	Cook.	
Student 31	RPR	Steak.	
Teacher B	RAK	You said it.	
	OCQ	What?	
Student 31	RCL	Steak. (Louder voice.)	
Teacher B	RAK	Okay.	

In this exchange, Teacher B used a series of Product Requests
(QPR) to get students to generate a description of a pan and its
uses. When Student 31 responded with "you cook it," the teacher
prompted the group to provide examples: "Like what? Name some
things." The following excerpt shows a slightly different
strategy.

Speaker	C-act	Utterance	(1:22-40)
Teacher B	QPR	What is it called?	
Student 91	RPR	Teapot. (Whisper.)	
Student 91	RPR	Teapot. (Whisper.)	
Student 21	RPR	A pot.	

Teacher B	OCQ	A what?
Student 21	RCL	A teapot.
Teacher B	RAG	A teapot.
Student 24	SAL	Hm-m-m (Giggle)
Teacher B	QPC	How do you use it for water?
	QCH	You put this in the refrigerator? -
Group	RCH	No.
Student 23	SAL	(Laughter.)
Student 24	UNT	: : : :
Teacher B	PPR	I asked Stanley.
Student 21	RPC	Give some water.
	OFL	And then and
	RPC	And put it in the stove and make it.
Teacher B	OEX	Oh.
	RAK	Okay.

Here Teacher B began with a Product Request (QPR), got the desired
Product Response (RPR), and gave a Response of Agreement (RAG).
Teacher B then followed with a Process Request (QPC). When no
response to the process question was immediately forthcoming, he
used a simpler Choice Request (QCH) to direct the students toward
the type of answer he sought. Student 21, for example, was able
to describe how a teapot is used.

In contrast, consider Teacher B's use of questions with the
Low group as shown in the long excerpt presented earlier in which
he attempted to elicit Wilson's address (see section above on
clarity of instructions).

Speaker	C-act	Utterance (15:388-405)
Teacher B	QPR	What color are the apples?
Student 12	OVP	Gohed.
	OVP	Ah wa.
Teacher B	QPR	Who can tell me the color of the apples?
Student 11	RPR	Red.
Student 13	RPR	Red.
Teacher B	RAG	Red.
	QPR	What color are the leaves?
Student 13	RPR	Red.
Student 11	RPR	Green.
Teacher B	RAG	Green.
Student 15	RPR	Green.
Student 12	RPR	Dark green and a green.
Teacher B	RAK	Okay.
	RAG	Dark green and light green.
Student 12	RAG	Dark green green.
Teacher B	QPR	What color is the sky?
Student 15	OFL	Mm-m-m.

Reading Lessons

An examination of Teacher A's Reading Lessons along the same dimensions as those presented above reveals a number of contrasts. As with the quantitative analyisis, these are primarily in regard to the teachers' interaction and language use with the Low group students. With the students relatively proficient in English, the teachers' ways of organizing and conducting the lessons are actually quite similar.

Group Management

Two aspects of group management have been considered, clarity of instructions and clarity of rules for interaction. Each of these is discussed in turn. In addition, Teacher A's use of the students' first language (L1) in instruction is examined.

Clarity of instructions. Teacher A was remarkably consistent in the manner in which she introduced lessons. She carefully explained in simple terms what the students were to do, and often repeated the directions more than once. The following is an example from a Middle/High group lesson.

Speaker	C-act	Utterance	(22:240-248)
Teacher A	OBM	Okay	
	QSU	Let's read it together.	
	OCQ	Okay?	
	QPR	That means after I say it who says it?	
Student 23	RPR	Me.	
Teacher A	QPR	Do you say it before I do?	
Group	RPR	No-o-o.	

In this way Teacher A let the group know exactly what they were to do. By rephrasing her instructions and giving an example, she made sure the group knew what they were to do.

Clarity of rules for interaction. Teacher A was also very clear about the way in which she expected students to interact during a lesson. Notice the way in which Teacher A directs students' attention in the following excerpt from a Middle/High reading lesson. She first announced her intention to tell something, implying that what she had to say was important. Students were to attend with all their senses. Then, by asking individual students, she ensured that everyone understood the task.

examination of Teacher A's Reading Lessons along the same
ons as those presented above reveals a number of contrasts.
the quantitative analyisis, these are primarily in regard
teachers' interaction and language use with the Low group
.s. With the students relatively proficient in English, the
·s' ways of organizing and conducting the lessons are
y quite similar.

Management

wo aspects of group management have been considered, clarity
tructions and clarity of rules for interaction. Each of
is discussed in turn. In addition, Teacher A's use of the
ts' first language (L1) in instruction is examined.

larity of instructions. Teacher A was remarkably consistent
manner in which she introduced lessons. She carefully
ned in simple terms what the students were to do, and often
:ed the directions more than once. The following is an
le from a Middle/High group lesson.

Speaker	C-act	Utterance	(22:240-248)
Teacher A	OBM	Okay	
	QSU	Let's read it together.	
	OCQ	Okay?	
	QPR	That means after I say it who says it?	
Student 23	RPR	Me.	
Teacher A	QPR	Do you say it before I do?	
Group	RPR	No-o-o.	

nis way Teacher A let the group know exactly what they were to
By rephrasing her instructions and giving an example, she
sure the group knew what they were to do.

Clarity of rules for interaction. Teacher A was also very
r about the way in which she expected students to interact
ng a lesson. Notice the way in which Teacher A directs
lents' attention in the following excerpt from a Middle/High
ling lesson. She first announced her intention to tell some-
g, implying that what she had to say was important. Students
: to attend with all their senses. Then, by asking individual
lents, she ensured that everyone understood the task.

48

Reading Lessons

An examination of Teacher A's Reading Lessons along the same dimensions as those presented above reveals a number of contrasts. As with the quantitative analyisis, these are primarily in regard to the teachers' interaction and language use with the Low group students. With the students relatively proficient in English, the teachers' ways of organizing and conducting the lessons are actually quite similar.

Group Management

Two aspects of group management have been considered, clarity of instructions and clarity of rules for interaction. Each of these is discussed in turn. In addition, Teacher A's use of the students' first language (L1) in instruction is examined.

Clarity of instructions. Teacher A was remarkably consistent in the manner in which she introduced lessons. She carefully explained in simple terms what the students were to do, and often repeated the directions more than once. The following is an example from a Middle/High group lesson.

Speaker	C-act	Utterance	(22:240-248)
Teacher A	OBM	Okay	
	QSU	Let's read it together.	
	OCQ	Okay?	
	QPR	That means after I say it who says it?	
Student 23	RPR	Me.	
Teacher A	QPR	Do you say it before I do?	
Group	RPR	No-o-o.	

In this way Teacher A let the group know exactly what they were to do. By rephrasing her instructions and giving an example, she made sure the group knew what they were to do.

Clarity of rules for interaction. Teacher A was also very clear about the way in which she expected students to interact during a lesson. Notice the way in which Teacher A directs students' attention in the following excerpt from a Middle/High reading lesson. She first announced her intention to tell something, implying that what she had to say was important. Students were to attend with all their senses. Then, by asking individual students, she ensured that everyone understood the task.

Student 23	RCH	Telling.
Teacher A	QPC	How can you tell?
	QPC	How do you know it's an asking sentence?
	OSS	Carlton.
Student 40	RPC	The question mark.
Teacher A	RAGAEX	Because there is a question mark.
	AEX	Also from the sound that you can tell that is an asking sentence.
	ADC	"Can you run?"

A final tactic of Teacher A's which the analysis uncovered involved the use of hints in the form of descriptions (ADC). While not strictly questioning, the overall effect was that she was able to elicit more complete answers from the group. In the example below, Teacher A wanted the students to remember the word "bow," which they had been introduced to earlier. Here she used rhymes and initial sounds as clues.

Speaker	C-act	Utterance	(13:241-250)
Teacher A	QPR	It's called a -- ?	
Student 51	OFL	A . . .	
Teacher A	ADC	It rhymes with slow.	
Student 13	RPR	Blow.	
Teacher A	ADC	And it begins like	
	OFS	And it	
Student 11	RPROVP	Slow-o-o.	
Teacher A	ADC	And it begins like boy.	
Student 52	AID	Blow.	
Teacher A	QPR	So what is it? (bow)	

Use of L1 in Instruction

Perhaps the most obvious source of difference between the two instructors was in the use of the children's first language. This is an area that has been widely studied and discussed (Duran, 1981; Gumperz, 1982; Gumperz & Hernandez-Chavez, 1972; Valdes-Fallis, 1977), but little attention has been given to the actual purposes to which teachers put L1. In this study, instances in the Reading lessons in which Teacher A employed L1 were examined in context. Possible reasons why she might have chosen to alternate languages were devised and then discussed with the teacher.

Clearly, Teacher A did not employ Chinese to any great degree in her Reading lessons. The quantitative analysis revealed an average of less than seven percent over all such sampled lessons. This is in contrast to her language use in other lessons and throughout the school day, when she frequently made use of the language. Research has shown, however, that code-switching or language alternation among bilinguals is seldom random and usually

has a purpose, albeit unconscious. This was clearly the case with Teacher A, for which she used Chinese very rarely in English Reading lessons, when she did it was for a distinct reason. Teacher A told us later she tried to avoid using Chinese during those lessons. Thus she chose those occasions for introducing Chinese very carefully.

Teacher B, of course, never spoke Chinese with the students, but perhaps more important was the fact that he often sanctioned students whenever they did. Very often, what students said in Chinese was related to the task. Unable to tell whether it was or not, however Teacher B frequently shushed students he caught speaking Chinese, assuming they were not paying attention. In one lesson, for instance, the group was discussing the seal they had seen at the aquarium. One student said the seal was fat, and Teacher B agreed. But when another repeated that in Chinese, he quietened her.

Speaker	C-act	Utterance	(15:754-758)
Student 13	ADC	He too fat.	
Teacher B	RAG	He's too fat.	
	OBM	Now.	
Student 12	ADC	Hou feih. (So fat.)	
Teacher B	PPR	Sh-h-h!	

The analysis of Teacher A's use of Chinese revealed that she employed it for at least five distinct purposes: (1) for translation, (2) as a "we-code", (3) for procedures and directions, (4) for clarification, and (5) to check for understanding. The first three of these were employed in several of the lessons, but not with the frequency of the final two, and will therefore only be briefly described. First, Teacher A used Chinese to translate particular words which students appeared not to know or were obviously beyond the range of their vocabulary. Once, for example, she used the work "aisles," but provided the Chinese equivalent as well in order to maintain students' understanding. Second, she used Chinese as what Gumperz (1982) has termed a "we-code," a language which indicates group membership and personal connection. Third, she occasionally gave procedures and directions in Chinese, e.g., to get students to use a key word in a complete sentence. The fourth and fifth uses of Chinese were to clarify and explain concepts presented in English and to check for student understanding. These final two will be treated in more detail.

Clarification. One of the new vocabulary words introduced to the Middle and High groups was the work "lost." Teacher A took care to make sure the groups understood what the word meant and in what ways it contrasted with the Chinese words for the same thing. In one lesson, two of the students appeared to confuse the transitive and intransitive uses of the English word and said, for example, "I lost one day" (18:332). In Chinese, this confusion is

47 52

not possible, since there is a different lexical item for each
meaning. Teacher A paused at one point to help the group map
these meanings onto the two forms in English.

Speaker	C-act	Utterance	(18:451-468)
Teacher A	QPR	What does "I lost my pencil" mean?	
Student 23	RPR	Ngoh mhginjo ngohge bat. (I don't see my pen.)	
Teacher A	RAG	Okay.	
	OFS	Where does, uh . . .	
Student 25	TRA	Mhgin yuhnbat. (Don't see pencil.)	
Teacher A	ADC	I was lost in the park.	
	QCH	Haih mhhaih mhginjo neih jinhgei a? (Does it mean you don't see yourself?)	
	QCHRPC	Does it mean that?	
Student 23	RPC	Ngoh mhginjo hai hai park. (I can't be seen in the park.)	
Teacher A	AEX	Mhginjo jikhaih dohng-sat-louh gam gaai. ("Can't be seen" means "got lost".)	
	ORQ	Okay?	
	AEX	Mhhaih wah mhginjo. (It doesn't mean "don't see".)	

Check for understanding. Teacher A also used Chinese to
check for understanding. It appeared from the observations and
the tapes that, at certain points, she sensed that one or more of
the group did not quite understand. She thus switched to
Cantonese or asked for a Cantonese equivalent from the students.
In the following excerpt from a Low group lesson, students were
reading English vocabulary words off the board. Suddenly she
stopped and asked in Cantonese for the meaning of "likes."
Students' responses reveal they had confused "likes" with
"lights." The teacher then attempted to clarify using English:
"He likes the dog."

This example points up an additional benefit of the teacher's
facility with Cantonese. By using the students' first language,
she was able to ferret out those areas of confusion and misunder-
standing. By asking directly for the equivalent word in
Cantonese, Teacher quickly and efficiently assessed how well the
students understood. This strategy is not available to the
monolingual English speaker. If a teacher not proficient in
Cantonese sensed the same lack of understanding, he or she could
of course ask the student to provide an English synonym or use the
word in a sentence. For the limited English proficient student,
however, these techniques would often be ineffectual, particularly
with students like Wilson (Student 11). As Teacher A put it, he
needed a lot of "language support," he was uncomfortable using
English and insecure about it. Had he therefore been asked to use
"likes" or "lights" in a sentence, it is unlikely that he could

ng. Teacher A paused at one point to help the group map
meanings onto the two forms in English.

Speaker	C-act	Utterance	(18:451-468)
Teacher A	QPR	What does "I lost my pencil" mean?	
Student 23	RPR	Ngoh mhginjo ngohge bat. (I don't see my pen.)	
Teacher A	RAG	Okay.	
	OFS	Where does, uh . . .	
Student 25	TRA	Mhgin yuhnbat. (Don't see pencil.)	
Teacher A	ADC	I was lost in the park.	
	QCH	Haih mhhaih mhginjo neih jinhgei a? (Does it mean you don't see yourself?)	
	QCHRPC	Does it mean that?	
Student 23	RPC	Ngoh mhginjo hai hai park. (I can't be seen in the park.)	
Teacher A	AEX	Mhginjo jikhaih dohng-sat-louh gam gaai. ("Can't be seen" means "got lost".)	
	ORQ	Okay?	
	AEX	Mhhaih wah mhginjo. (It doesn't mean "don't see".)	

Check for understanding. Teacher A also used Chinese to
k for understanding. It appeared from the observations and
tapes that, at certain points, she sensed that one or more of
group did not quite understand. She thus switched to
onese or asked for a Cantonese equivalent from the students.
he following excerpt from a Low group lesson, students were
ling English vocabulary words off the board. Suddenly she
ped and asked in Cantonese for the meaning of "likes."
ients' responses reveal they had confused "likes" with
ihts." The teacher then attempted to clarify using English:
likes the dog."

This example points up an additional benefit of the teacher's
ility with Cantonese. By using the students' first language,
was able to ferret out those areas of confusion and misunder-
nding. By asking directly for the equivalent word in
tonese, Teacher quickly and efficiently assessed how well the
dents understood. This strategy is not available to the
olingual English speaker. If a teacher not proficient in
tonese sensed the same lack of understanding, he or she could
course ask the student to provide an English synonym or use the
d in a sentence. For the limited English proficient student,
ever, these techniques would often be ineffectual, particularly
h students like Wilson (Student 11). As Teacher A put it, he
ded a lot of "language support;" he was uncomfortable using
lish and insecure about it. Had he therefore been asked to use
kes" or "lights" in a sentence, it is unlikely that he could

CHAPTER FIVE

PASSAGE TO SECOND GRADE

As originally conceived, this project was to be conducted over one school year, from September through June. It was not possible to begin, however, until December, 1981. While this delayed start-up meant we were unable to study students as they entered first grade, it provided us with an opportunity to follow them into their second grade classroom. We were thus able to collect information on how limited English proficient Chinese children learn to cross "borders," such as summer vacation.

This portion of the study, then, represents a partial verification of the Phase Two findings. Two questions guided the data collection and analysis:

1) How do the second grade teacher's ways of constructing interactions with the same group of children compare to those of the original two teachers?

2) Does the target students' language use suggest they have had difficulty in acquiring a different teacher's rules for classroom interaction?

The first question seeks information which would help to generalize the findings from Phase Two. How did the second grade teacher's distribution of C-acts, for example, compare to those of the previous two teachers? Further, were the qualitative aspects of langauge use similar to those of either Teacher A or B, or both? The second question asks whether target students successfully adjusted to a new class and new teacher. Were their English language skills and/or knowledge of classroom rules affected by the three-month hiatus?

Methods and procedures employed with Teacher C were identical to those used in the ealier phase of the study. In the collection of data, two lavaliere microphones were placed in the middle of the reading table. Observers once again divided responsibilities as outlined in Chapter Two; one monitored the taping while the other took descriptive fieldnotes. Transcription and coding were also conducted as before. Since the same data collectors as in Phase Two continued, no additional training was found necessary. As before, all coded transcripts were entered into a computer and analyzed.

This chapter begins with an overview of Teacher C and her class, followed by a description of the findings from the analysis

of data from her lessons. Comparisons with the ......
Phase Two are made throughout.

The Second Grade: Teacher C

Although the first grade class did not move on to the second
grade as a group, most of those selected as target students for
the study happened to have been assigned to the same teacher. We
thus negotiated entry into the classroom of that teacher and
concentrated our efforts on her lessons.

The second grade teacher (Teacher C) taught in a self-
contained class. For certain subjects, such as reading and
Chinese, she and another second grade teacher formed groups
composed of students from both classes, but otherwise she met with
the same 30 students all day long. Teacher C was Chinese and a
native speaker of Cantonese. She had been teaching seven years,
five of those in a bilingual class.

While we had hoped to begin taping the first week of school,
Teacher C indicated that she was uncomfortable with having us
observe until she had decided upon Reading group assignments. For
the first two weeks, she taught all lessons in a whole group
format, estimating as she did the reading level of different
children. It was to be several weeks, however, before students
were grouped for other subject areas, such as Chinese and Oral
Language. We therefore decided to limit out data collection to
the Reading lessons, but increase the number of lessons sampled.
Once the Reading groups were formed, then, we began data collec-
tion as before.

Reading Lessons

Teacher C and the other second grade teacher next door
divided their combined classes into six Reading groups. Teacher C
taught three of the lower groups, which were named for their
reading textbooks, Amigos (low), Ups and Downs (middle), and
Believe it or Not (high). Followed students and their reading
group assignments are given in Table 14.

All reading lessons were conducted at the front of the room
around a semi-circular table. Teacher C sat with her back to the
chalkboard, facing out toward the rest of the class. The students
took seats around the table in no particular order.

In general, Teacher C organized her reading activities around
the lessons in the textbooks. Accompanying the book were over-
sized pages which contained several sentences from the lesson and
an illustration. Teacher C usually placed one of these in the
chalkrail and referred to it in the course of the lesson. Stu-
dents were often asked to read aloud from the oversized pages,
wither individually or as a group.

Table 14

Target Students' Second Grade Reading Group Assignments

Students	Grade One	Grade Two
11	Low	Mid
12	Low	Mid
13 ß	Low	--
15	Low	Low
16	Low	Low
21	Mid/High	High
22	Mid/High	Mid
23	Mid/High	--
24	Low	Low
25	Mid/High	--
31	Mid/High	--

Observers' overall impression of Teacher C's lessons was that they were highly structured and orderly. Students normally took turns reading and answering questions about what they had read.

Quantitative Analysis

A total of nine of Teacher C's lessons were analyzed, three for each reading group. The number of minutes of recorded data collected in the third phase of the study is given in Table 15. This accounts for an additional two hours of tape and another 5000 coded utterances.

Although the number of lessons recorded was roughly equivalent to that for the other two teachers (11 for A; 8 for B), the average time of each was somewhat less. Teacher A's lessons averaged 17 minutes and Teacher B's nearly 20, while Teacher C's were only about 14 minutes long.

Table 15

Amount and Proportion of Talk in Second Grade Reading

	Proportion		Amount	
	Teacher A	Target Student Avg.	Minutes	Utterances
High	0.65	0.04	41	1282
Middle	0.64	0.08	37	1307
Low	0.64	0.08	51	1909
		Total	129	4498

Also reported in Table 15 are the relative proportions of talk for the teacher and target students. As can be seen, Teacher C was very consistent in accounting for nearly two-thirds of the utterances with each group. This figure is highter than that for either A or B, who spoke closer to half. The proportion of target student talk was similar to that found in the other classes.

Teacher Language Use

One of the questions asked in Phase Three concerned the comparability of Teacher C's use of language with that of the other two teachers. One way in which this question will be addressed is in regard to the relative proportion of various Conversational-acts in her speech. In Table 16 are given the proportions for those C-acts most frequently used by any of the three teachers. Proportions less than five percent are enclosed in parentheses. In Chapter Three, comparisons were made both between and within (across instructional groups). This pattern is followed here as well.

Between Teacher Comparisions.

In Chapter Three, comparisons across Teacher A and B were made by group, middle/high and low. Grouping in Teacher C's class, however, was not exactly comparable to that in the other teacher's classes. She and the other second grade teacher formed six groups out of the combination of both classes; the three lowest groups were instructed by Teacher C, while her colleague taught the upper three. Teacher C's groups were made up of a combination of limited English proficient students and native speakers had some difficulty in reading.

Because of the different grouping patterns in the second grade class, in interpreting Table 16, it is perhaps more useful to simply seek patterns of consistency and exception across all groups, rather than make group-by-group comparisons.

It should be pointed out, however, that for Teacher C, the six or seven most frequent C-acts were identical for all three groups: Complete Descriptions (ADC), Boundary Markers (OBM), Speaker Selections (OSS), Requests for Action (QAC), Product Requests (QPR), and Agreement Responses (RAG). Their rank order varied somewhat across groups, but not significantly (see Table 16).

This suggests, of course, that Teacher C constructed her discourse and interaction in a consistent manner, regardless of the reading level of the group. One interesting exception is the relatively high proportion (.06) of Process Requests (QPC) used with the high group. With the more proficient students, she asked questions which required more thought. This reflects the pattern found in Teacher A's language use as well.

Table 16

Teachers' Use of C-acts: Proportions

C-Act	Teacher C			Teacher A		Teacher B	
	Low	Middle	High	Low	Mid/Hi	Low	Mid/Hi
ADC	0.09	0.07	0.07	0.09	0.13	0.11	0.09
OAG	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.01)	0.06	(0.02)
OBM	0.09	0.10	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.10	0.07
OSS	0.10	0.10	0.07	0.06	0.07	(0.02)	0.07
PPR	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.03)	(0.01)	0.07	0.05
QAC	0.05	0.07	0.06	0.11	0.06	0.13	0.09
QCH	0.05	(0.03)	(0.04)	0.07	0.08	0.06	(0.04)
QPR	0.15	0.14	0.12	0.12	0.09	0.10	0.11
QPC	(0.01)	(0.02)	0.06	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.02)	(0.02)
RAG	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.10	0.09	0.05	0.11
RAK	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	0.07	0.05

Consider now the C-act proportions across teachers. First, certain C-acts were used to a high degree by all teachers with each group; these were Complete Descriptions (ADC), Boundary Markers (OBM), and Product Requests (QPR). Two other C-acts, Speaker Selections (OSS) and Agreement Responses (RAG), occupied a relatively large portion of the speech of Teachers A and C, and Teacher B with his middle/high students. With the low Oral Language group, however, they took up only two and five percent of his talk.

With the exception of Teacher B with his low group, it seems that these five C-acts somehow form a common basis for teacher talk in directed activities. Teachers describe and explain (ADC), mark off lesson parts (OBM), allocate student turns (OSS), ask factual questions (QPR), and give feedback (RAG). From the point of view of language function, these are the building blocks of a teacher's lesson.

As was discovered in the Phase Two analysis, Teacher B used a somewhat different array of Conversational-acts with his low group. Obviously, the proportion of his speech not devoted to the five C-acts mentioned above was diverted to some other purpose.

Teacher B used Attention Getters (UAU), ... Two of these
Acknowledgements (RAK), where the others did not. Two of these
three C-acts were described as indicators of a lack of group
control. Because Teacher B was unable to manage the low group
adequately, he frequently sought students' attention and sanc-
tioned their off-task behavior. The high proportion of Acknowl-
edgements, rather than Agreements, suggested that the overall
feedback supplied by Teacher B carried little useful information.

In contrast, notice that Teachers A and C allocated no more
than two percent of their talk to Attention Getters. As for
Protests, Teacher C had virtually none (raw frequencies across
groups totaled 7 out of 2892 utterances). While Acknowlegements
were employed somewhat, they were far outnumbered by Agreements,
which accounted for fully 15 percent of Teacher C's utterances
with each group. In fact, Agreements were the C-act she used most
often.

In regard to the distribution of C-acts employed by Teacher
C, it appears that she was in many respects similar to Teacher A,
and Teacher B with his higher group. In fact, the pattern of
C-acts across these six groups is remarkably consistent. By the
same token, when Teacher C's speech is compared to Teacher B's low
group, none of the apparent management difficulties he experienced
show up.

Students' Language Use

Analyses were conducted on students' language use as in Phase
Two. Conversational-act rates and proportions for Phase Three are
given in Table 17. In Phase Two, the focus of the analysis and
interpretation of results was on variations across groups. In
this phase, we diverge somewhat from that approach. First, the
second grade groups represent a more limited range of student
proficiencies. Second, the primary question regarding students'
language use in Phase Three was whether they showed confusion over
the teacher's rules for instruction and interaction; whether they
had difficulty in crossing the border to second grade. In this
section, therefore, we mainly explore the degree to which student
language appears to complement and coincide with that of the
teacher. Where contrasts across groups appear significant,
however, they will be pointed out.

As in the analysis of teachers' language, certain C-acts
were common to all, or most, of the instructional groups in Phase
Three, e.g., Product Responses (RPR) and Complete Descriptions.
The first of these accounted for over 30 percent of target stu-
dents' speech in each group. They were also prominent in stu-
dents' speech in the first grade lessons, although at a lower
proportion. In the various reading lessons with Teachers A and C,
Verbal Responses (RVB) were frequently used, although the highest
of the second grade groups had a proportion of only five percent.

60

These data indicate that in all teacher-directed lessons, students responded to informational questions, and in reading lessons they often read aloud or repeated words and phrases.

Certain other C-acts are of interest because of their low level of occurrence in Phase Three. Recall that a critical distinction of students' language in Teacher B's low group was the high incidence of Attention Getters (OAG) and Verbal Play (OVP). In Teacher C's lessons student used these almost never, suggesting that, even more than in Teacher A's class, they were attending to the tasks at hand.

Finally, notice the high proportion of Process Responses (RPC) found in the high group (15%). Compared to the number of higher-level responses elicited in the other lessons in the study, this is a remarkably high figure. Apparently, Teacher C was able to get even limited English proficient students to answer questions that required some thought.

Qualitative Analysis

Qualitative analyses were also conducted as in Phase Two. Transcripts were examined for evidence of C-acts and patterns of C-acts that appeared to be significant in the quantitative analysis. Additionally, the same dimensions of classroom language use were explored: group management (including clarity of intructions and rules for interaction), questioning strategies, and the use of Chinese. Other features which appeared to be particularly salient in Teacher C's lessons are also mentioned.

Group Management

The quantitative analysis, as well as the observers' accounts of the lessons, indicated that Teacher C was a very efficient manager of her lessons. Intructions were clearly given, and students seemed to have already learned the teacher's rules and were following them carefully. There were only a few off-task utterances by students, turn-taking was orderly, and lessons moved along at a reasonble pace. These indications were borne out in the qualitative analysis of the lessons transcripts,

61

Table 17

Students' Use of C-acts: Second Grade

C-act	Low Group Rate	Prop.	Middle Group Rate	Prop.	High Group Rate	Prop.
ADC	10.84	0.06	11.29	0.07	10.29	0.13
AID	6.02	0.03	3.23	0.02	5.88	0.07
AIR	3.61	(0.02)	3.23	(0.02)	1.47	(0.02)
OAG	6.02	(0.03)	0.00	(0.00)	0.00	(0.00)
OCQ	2.4	0.01	8.06	0.05	0.00	0.00
OFL	3.61	(0.02)	1.61	(0.01)	1.42	(0.02)
OFS	0.00	(0.00)	9.68	0.06	4.41	0.05
QPR	3.61	(0.02)	0.00	(0.00)	4.41	0.05
OVP	0.00	(0.00)	0.00	(0.00)	1.47	(0.02)
QAC	0.00	(0.00)	0.00	(0.00)	0.00	(0.00)
RCH	13.25	0.07	11.29	0.07	1.42	(0.02)
RPC	1.20	(0.01)	4.84	(0.03)	11.76	0.15
RPR	65.06	0.36	56.45	0.33	25.00	0.31
RVB	51.81	0.29	46.77	0.28	4.41	0.05

Clarity of instructions. Teacher C consistently made the instructional task clear to her students. In the following excerpt from this low group lesson, for example, we can see the way in which Teacher C introduced an instructional task. First, she made sure the students knew the page number, and gave them the overall task. This task of discussion is reminiscent of those found in Teacher B's lessons, but the way it was conducted is very different. Teacher C next complimented A-Chin for following directions, which she repeated, and provided background inform- ation on the focus of the task, the name-chain. Finally, she directed their attention to the "A" and asked a question.

62

Speaker	C-act	Utterance (33:340-360)
Teacher C	APR	Today we are going to read page sixteen.
	APR	We are going to look at page, sixteen, and we are going to talk about it.
Student 91	AID	Page thirty-five.
Student 92	RAG	Not twenty-five.
Teacher C	AID	Page sixteen.
Student 54	OVP	Yeah, yeah.
Teacher C	ADC	I like the way A-Chin follows directions.
	ADC	She turns to the correct page right away, and waits for directions.
Student 48	AID	Sixteen.
Teacher C	OBM	Okay.
	ADC	On page sixteen, we have something called a name, name chain.
Student 48	AID	A name chain.
Teacher C	AEX	Name-chain. A chain is something that you connect one by one, and you lead from the beginning to the end.
	APR	We are going to use a-b-c's here.
	QAC	Look at "A".
	QPR	What picture is under "A"? (students raise hands)
	OSS	A-chin.

In the next example, also from the lowest group, a similar concern for clarity is evident. In this case, the teacher was leading the students through an excercise in their reading text. Teacher C read the directions for the students first, and then for each question, asked a student to first read the question, then all three choices, before giving an answer. This not only insured that they considered all alternatives, but gave them further practice in reading as well.

Speaker	C-act	Utterance (36:187-196)
Teacher C	ADC	These are the questions for "Mouse wants a friend."
	ARU	Now it says, read the question about the picture, draw line under the correct answer.
	OBM	Alright.
	AID	Number one.
	QVB	Read me the question. Read me the three answers and choose the best answer.
	OPM	The first one, please,
	OSS	Anh-quoc.

Rules for interaction. Teacher C was no less clear in her establishment and maintenance of rules for interaction. In virtually every lesson observed and taped, she followed a consistent pattern of asking students to bid for turns. Her signals seldom consisted of an explicit call for bids, however; more often, she did so with a question, or by reference to a question number in the book or worksheet. In the first example given above, for instance, Teacher C simply asked, "What picture is under 'A'?" and several students raised their hands. In the second excerpt, she merely referred to the first question and got a similar response.

This is not to say that Teacher C never stated rules for interaction, as the following example shows. In addition, she C used some of the same techniques found in Teacher A's speech, such as denying turns to those who spoke out of turn: "I'm not going to call on you unless you can follow the directions" (33:631). On another occasion, she accepted Stanley's answer, but told him that next time he should raise his hand; and with the higher group even said, "Hands up" (34:406). Teacher C was also found to be aware of equally distributing turns: "Anybody else? Did I get you already?" (33:774-784).

Speaker	C-act	Utterance	(32:461-469)
Teacher C	QPC	What's happening in the picture?	
Student 91	AIR	I don't know.	
Student 44	AIR	I know.	
Teacher C	QAC	Raise your hand if you know what's happening in the picture.	

Questioning Strategies

Teacher C employed some of the same questioning strategies as the other two teachers. After students identified a picture, for example, Teacher B sometimes threw out a Process Request (QPC), such as "How do you use it?" This, he would then follow up with simpler Choice (QCH) and Product (QPR) Requests. In a similar fashion, Teacher C, in the following excerpt, first established that a pictured animal was a raccoon; then she immediately inquired how the students knew. To assist them with this more conceptual "why" question, she provided a hint in the form of a Product Request (QPR) about the raccoon's face.

Speaker	C-act	Utterance	(33:529-545)
Teacher C	AID	It's a raccoon.	
	QPC	How do you know it's a raccoon?	
	QPR	What does he have on his face?	
	OSS	Hieu-nan.	
Student 10	RPR	Black eyes.	
Student 24	RPR	Black eyes.	
Teacher C	RAG	He has black eyes.	

Student 48	RAG	No, he got a mask.
Teacher C	ADC	He looks like he wears his holloween mask everyday.
Student 10	RAG	Yeah.
Teacher C	AEX	He wears a mask everyday, and that's how you know he's a raccoon.
Student 48	ADC	He got a tail.
Teacher C	OSS	Vickie.
Student 54	ADC	He has whisker.
Teacher C	RAG	He has whiskers too,
	ORQ	right?

One strategy used by Teacher A was to question students about their reasons for an answer, using a Process Request (QPC). THis strategy was found in Teacher C's lessons as well. In the following passage, Teacher C was reviewing spelling rules. After a student correctly spelled "turned," she asked the group why the child had not added another "n".

Speaker	C-act	Utterance	(32:84-95)
Teacher C	QSU	Could you spell the word "turned" for me,	
	ADC	like a "We turned the chair around."	
Student 37	RPR	t-u-r-n-e-d.	
Teacher C	RAG	E-d.	
	OBM	Alright now.	
	ADC	She didn't add another "n" here.	
	OBM	Now.	
	QPC	Why not?	
	QPR	Who can tell us? (students raise hands)	
	OBM	Alright.	
	OSS	Lonna.	
Student 43	RPC	Because they don't got any vowel letter.	

CHAPTER SIX.

DISCUSSION

The study considered in detail the interaction and language use of a group of Chinese-American students and their two teachers. In the pages that follow, I will summarize the findings and attempt to bring together those elements of the findings which may have implications for instruction in bilingual settings.

In Phase One of the study, two teachers and target students were selected. Then in Phase Two, audiorecordings of teacher-directed lessons were made in the two classrooms, but with the same groups of students. Data from this phase were analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively.

One thing evident from this analysis was that both teachers, despite certain differences, were creating instructional tasks for the students. Both teacher and student language was made up of a distribution of questions, answers, responses, and so on. In Oral Language, the task was largely one of question-and-answer exchanges between the teacher and students; in Reading, students spent some amount of their time reading aloud. On the surface, the lessons looked very much like first grade lessons in any other public school. However, as the analysis probed deeper, some distinctions emerged.

One goal of the Phase Two analysis was to investigate the notion that between teacher differences are stronger than those within. Here, it was discovered that Teacher B's speech across groups varied more than did his and that of Teacher A. A good portion of these across group differences were in the area of management and control. C-acts which had to do with sanctioning, attention-getting and protesting occurred in higher frequency with the limited-English-speaking group.

This finding might be due to a combination of factors. First, and most obvious, is the fact that he spoke no Chinese and was thus unable to communicate with the children in their first and dominant language. An unfortunate outcome of this situation was that Teacher B often sanctioned the use of Chinese, since as far as he could tell all uses were unrelated to the lesson tasks. Even though Teacher A employed Chinese only a small portion of the time in reading lessons -- less than seven percent -- she carefully selected those occasions on which she did. She made a conscious effort to use Chinese as little as possible during English reading. She employed Chinese for a variety of purposes; the "we-code" function was only one of several. Most of the time, in fact, she used it for clarification and to further under-standing. Her use of the language revealed a sensitivity to the

variable meanings in Chinese and English that made it possible for her to pick out likely sources of confusion.

This was something Teacher B could not do. Even when students were obviously confused, he was often unable to get at the root of the problem, simply because of the language barrier. Many times the confusion arose because students in the Low group had difficulty making themselves understood, and lacked the English skills necessary to rephrase their statements. Clearly, had Teacher B been able to better communicate with the Low group, he might have avoided the frequent loss of student attention. So, while neither of the bilingual teachers used Chinese to any large degree -- Teacher C almost not at all -- the understanding of the students' first language, and its availability as an alternative code, did appear to be an important variable in the lessons observed.

The data from Teacher B's class serve to point up just how difficult teaching non- and limited-English-speaking children can be, for teachers who do not speak their first language. The task of communicating with them becomes formidable indeed. If they have one, teachers have been known to delegate the instruction of NES/LES students to a bilingual instructional aide (Fillmore, 1982). Teacher B's aide was a monolingual English speaker and thus no more equiped than he to deal with the LES/NES children.

A second factor which must have contributed to Teacher B's management problems -- and is no doubt related to the first -- had to do with the participation structures (Philips, 1972) and rules for turn-taking he employed in the two groups. Both observations and lesson transcripts show that the High group was required to raise their hands for a turn, but that the Low group was not. In those lessons, any student could call out an answer. As long as only one or two children responded, this procedure worked, but as more students sought a chance to speak, chaos broke out. Judging from the procedures used with the other group, it is likely that a more structured turn-taking mechanism had been used, and had simply broken down. If, because of limited English proficiency, students in the Low group were unable to respond individually to the teacher's questions, he might have relaxed the rules so that he might at least get an answer from someone. In Teacher A's lessons, both High and Low, turn-taking was controlled, either by bidding or teacher assignment. It may be, therefore, that if Teacher B imposed a more rigid structure on the Low group activities, student attention would follow.

Findings from other studies of turn-distribution are relevant here. McDermott (1976), for example, also found a difference in turn-taking procedures across high and lwo reading groups, but of a different order. The high group in his study took turns in a round-robin fashion, one after the other, insuring an equal number of turns for each student. The low group, on the other hand, bid for turns, much like Teacher B's upper group. McDermott concluded that since turns had to be constantly renegotiated in the low

meanings in Chinese and English that made it possible for
ck out likely sources of confusion.

; was something Teacher B could not do. Even when stu-
·e obviously confused, he was often unable to get at the
the problem, simply because of the language barrier. Many
: confusion arose because students in the Low group had
ty making themselves understood, and lacked the English
:cessary to rephrase their statements. Clearly, had
3 been able to better communicate with the Low group, he
ve avoided the frequent loss of student attention. So,
ither of the bilingual teachers used Chinese to any large
- Teacher C almost not at all -- the understanding of the
' first language, and its availability as an alternative
d appear to be an important variable in the lessons

data from Teacher B's class serve to point up just how
t teaching non- and limited-English-speaking children can
eachers who do not speak their first language. The task
nicating with them becomes formidable indeed. If they
, teachers have been known to delegate the instruction of
students to a bilingual instructional aide (Fillmore,
Teacher B's aide was a monolingual English speaker and
more equiped than he to deal with the LES/NES children.

econd factor which must have contributed to Teacher B's
nt problems -- and is no doubt related to the first -- had
th the participation structures (Philips, 1972) and rules
i-taking he employed in the two groups. Both observations
ion transcripts show that the High group was required to
ieir hands for a turn, but that the Low group was not. In
:ssons, any student could call out an answer. As long as
: or two children responded, this procedure worked, but as
idents sought a chance to speak, chaos broke out. Judging
: procedures used with the other group, it is likely that a
-uctured turn-taking mechanism had been used, and had
oroken down. If, because of limited English proficiency,
: in the Low group were unable to respond individually to
:her's questions, he might have relaxed the rules so that
t at least get an answer from someone. In Teacher A's
, both High and Low, turn-taking was controlled, either by
or teacher assignment. It may be, therefore, that if
B imposed a more rigid structure on the Low group
ies, student attention would follow.

ndings from other studies of turn-distribution are relevant
McDermott (1976), for example, also found a difference in
king procedures across high and lwo reading groups, but of
rent order. The high group in his study took turns in a
obin fashion, one after the other, insuring an equal number
s for each student. The low group, on the other hand, bid
·ns, much like Teacher B's upper group. McDermott concluded
nce turns had to be constantly renegotiated in the low

discover whether target students experienced difficulty in acquiring a different teacher's rules for classroom interaction.

In the students' second grade class, the interactions were in many ways similar to those with Teacher A, but in some ways they were different from both the first year teachers. Teacher C (the second grade teacher) was at least as structured as Teacher A in her lessons. The instructional and interactional patterns were clear-cut and organized. Rules for turn-taking were explicit and the teacher appeared to have very good control over the three groups taped. She had, for example, very few Attention Getters (OAG). She had more Speaker Selections (OSS) with the Lower groups, perhaps because turn-taking in the High group was in order. Teacher C also used a higher frequency of Process Questions (QPC) than either of the other teachers, and like Teacher A, she employed more of these with the higher groups.

Student language in Teacher C's group was similar to that in the Middle/High group in the earlier grade. In other words, there was very little off-task talk or verbal play. Students appeared to have suffered not at all from crossing the "border" of summer into second grade and knew the rules very well, at least by the third week of school.

69

References

Au, K.H. Participant structures in a reading lesson with Hawaiian children: Analysis of a culturally appropriate instructional event. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 1980, 11, 91-115

Baker, K. & deKanter, A. Effectiveness of bilingual edcuation: A review of the literature. Final draft report, Office of Technical and Analytic Systems, Office of Planning and Budget, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C., 1981.

Boggs, S.T. The meaning of questions and narratives to Hawaiian children. In C.B. Cazden, V. John, & D. Hymes (Eds.), Functions of language in the classroom. New York: Teachers College Press, 1972.

Bossert, S. Tasks and social relationships in classrooms. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.

Carrasco, R., Vera, A., Cazden, C. Aspects of bilingual student's communicative competence in the classroom: A case study, In R. Duran (Ed.), Latino language and communicative behavior. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1981.

Cazden, C.B. Learning to read in classroom interaction. In L. Resnick & P.A. Weaver (Eds.), Theory and practice in early reading (Vol. 3). Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum, 1979.

Cazden, C., John, V, & Hymes, Functions of language in the classroom. New York: Teachers College Press, 1972.

Cherry, L. A Sociolinguistic Approach to the Study of Teacher Expectations. Discourse Processes, 1978, 1, 373-393.

Cherry Wilkinson. (Ed.), Communicating in the classroom. New York: Academic Press, 1982.

Chomsky, N. Aspects of a theory of syntax. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1965.

Cicourel, A. Three models of discourse analysis: The role of social structure. Discourse Processes, 1980, 3, 101-132.

Cole, M., Dore., J., Hall, W., & Downley, G., Situation and task in children's talk. Discourse Processes, 1978, 1, 119-176.

References

Participant structures in a reading lesson with Hawaiian
children: Analysis of a culturally appropriate
instructional event. Anthropology and Education
Quarterly, 1980, 11, 91-115

(. & deKanter, A. Effectiveness of bilingual edcuation: A
review of the literature. Final draft report, Office of
Technical and Analytic Systems, Office of Planning and
Budget, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C.,
1981.

S.T. The meaning of questions and narratives to Hawaiian
children. In C.B. Cazden, V. John, & D. Hymes (Eds.),
Functions of language in the classroom. New York:
Teachers College Press, 1972.

, S. Tasks and social relationships in classrooms.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.

o, R., Vera, A., Cazden, C. Aspects of bilingual student's
communicative competence in the classroom: A case
study, In R. Duran (Ed.), Latino language and communi-
cative behavior. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing
Corporation, 1981.

, C.B. Learning to read in classroom interaction. In L.
Resnick & P.A. Weaver (Eds.), Theory and practice in
early reading (Vol. 3) Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum, 1979.

, C., John, V, & Hymes, D. Functions of language in the
classroom. New York: Teachers College Press, 1972.

, L. A Sociolinguistic Approach to the Study of Teacher
Expectations. Discourse Processes, 1978, 1, 373-393.

Wilkinson. (Ed.), Communicating in the classroom. New
York: Academic Press, 1982.

y, N. Aspects of a theory of syntax. Cambridge, Mass.:
M.I.T. Press, 1965.

el, A. Three models of discourse analysis: The role of
social structure. Discourse Processes, 1980, 3, 101-132.

M., Dore., J., Hall, W., & Downley, G., Situation and task
in children's talk. Discourse Processes, 1978, 1,
119-176.

Fillmore, L. Wong. Instructional language as linguistic input: Second-language learning in classrooms. In L. Cherry Wilkinson (Ed.) Communicating in the Classroom. New York: Academic Press, 1982.

Flanders, N. A. Analyzing teaching behavior. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1970.

Fuentes, E.J. & Wisenbaker, J.M. The use of teacher rating of oral English proficiency as a covariate in the analysis of reading scores. Paper presented at the AERA Annual Meeting, San Francisco California, 1979.

Good, T. L. & Brophy, J. E. Looking in classrooms. New York: Harper and Row, 1974.

Green, J.L. Teaching as a lingusitic process. In E. Gordon (Ed.), Review of research in education (Vol. X). Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock, 1982.

Green, J.L. & Harker, J.O., Gaining access to learning: conversational, social, and cognitive demands of group participation. In L. Cherry Wilkinson (Ed.) Communicating in the Classroom. New York: Academic Press, 1982.

Green J.L. & Wallat, C., Ethnography and language in educational settings, Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1981.

Grice, H. P. Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), Syntax and semantics III: Speech acts. New York: Academic Press, 1975.

Gumperz, J.J., Conversational inference and classroom learning. In J.L. Green & C. Wallat, Ethnography and Language in Educational Settings, Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1981.

Guthrie, L.F. & Hall, W.S. Language continuity/discontinuity and schooling. In E. Gordon (Ed.), Review of research in education (Vol. X). Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock, 1982.

Guthrie, L.F. The task variable in children's language use: Cultural and situational differences. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of Illinois, 1981.

Guthrie, L.F. & Hall, W.S. Ethnographic approaches to reading research. In P.D. Peason (Ed.), Handbook of Reading Research, New York: Longmans, in press.

Hall, W.S., & Cole, M. On participant's shaping of discourse through their understanding of the task. In K. Nelson (Ed.) Children's Language (Vol.1). New York: Gardner Press, 1978.

Hall, W.S., & Guthrie, L.F. Cultural and situational variation in language function and use: Methods and procedures for research. In J. Green & C. Wallat (Eds.), Ethnography and language in education settings. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1981.

Hymes, D. Introduction. In C.B. Cazden, V.P. John, & D. Hymes (Eds.), Functions of language in the classroom, New York: Teachers College Press, 1972.

Hymes, D. Foundations in sociolinguistics. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1974.

Labov, W. The social stratification of English in New York City. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1966.

Labov, W. Language in the inner city: Studies in the Black English Vernacular. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972.

Labov, W. & Fanshel, D. Therpeutic discourse: Psychotherapy as conversation. New York: Academic Press, 1977.

Legarreta, D. The effects of program models on language acquisition by Spanish speaking children. TESOL Quarterly, 1979, 13, 521-534.

Legarreta-Marcaida, D. Effective use of the primary language in the classroom. In Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework. Los Angeles: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, California State University, Los Angeles, 1981.

McDermott, R.P., Kids make sense. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Stanford University, 1976.

McDermott, R.P., Relating and learning: An analysis of two classroom reading groups. In R. Shuy (Ed.) Linguistics and Reading, Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1978.

Mehan, H., Learning Lessons, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Michaels, S. & Cook-Gumperz, J. A study of sharing time with first grade students: Discourse narratives in the classroom In Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society (Vol. V), 1979.

Milk, R. An analysis of the functional allocation of Spanish and English in a bilingual classroom. CABE Research Journal, 1981, 2, 11-26.

73

Mohatt, G. & Erickson, F. Cultural differences in teaching styles in an Odawa School: A sociolinguistic approach. In H.T. Trueba, G.P. Guthrie, & K.H. Au (Eds.) Culture and the bilingual classroom: Studies in classroom ethnography. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1981.

Moll, L., Diaz, E., Estrada, E., & Lopes, L. Making contexts: The social construction of lessons in two languages. In M. Saravia-Shore & S. Arvizu (Eds.), Cross-cultural and communicative competencies: Ethnographies of educational programs for language minority students. Washington, D.C.: Council on Anthropology and Education, in press.

Philips, S. Participant structures and communicative competence. In C. Cazden, V. John, & D. Hymes (Eds.), Functions of language in the classroom. New York: Teachers College Press, 1972.

Pung Guthrie, G. An ethnography of bilingual education in a Chinese community. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1982.

Pung Guthrie, G. An ethnography of bilingual education in a Chinese community. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum, in press.

Rist, R. The urban school: A factory for failure. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1973.

Tikunoff, W. An emerging description of successful bilingual instruction: An executive summary of Part I of the Significant Bilingual Instructional Features Study. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1983.

Trueba, H.T., Guthrie, G.P., & Au, K.H. (Eds.), Culture and the bilingual Classroom: Studies in classroom ethnography. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1981.

74

APPENDIX A:

CODES, DEFINITIONS AND EXAMPLES OF CONVERSATIONAL ACTS

Codes, Definitions, and Examples of Conversational-Acts

Code	Definition and Examples

Assertives report facts, state rules, convey attitudes, etc.

AAT **Attibutions** report beliefs about another's internal state: "He does not know the answer."; "He wants to."; "He can't do it."

ADC **Descriptions** predicate events, properties, locations, etc. of objects or people: "The car is red."; "It fell on the floor."; "We did it."; "We have a boat."

AEV **Evaluations** express personal judgments or attitudes: "That's good."

AEX **Explanations** state reasons, causes, justifications, and predictions: "I did it because it's fun."; "It won't stay up there."

AID **Identifications** label objects events, poeople, etc.: "That's a car."; "I'm Robin."

AIR **Internal Reports** express emotions, sensations, intents, and other mental evnts: "I like it."; "It hurts."; "I'll do it."; "I know."

APR **Predictives** states expectations about future events, actions, etc.: "I'll give it to you tomorrow."; "It'll arrive later this week."

ARU **Rules** state procedures, definitions, "social rules," etc.: It goes in here."; "We don't fight in school."; "That happens later."

Organizational Devices control personal contact and conversational flow.

OAC **Accompaniments** maintain contact by supplying information redundant with respect to some contextual feature: "Here you are"; "There you go."

OAG **Attention Getters** solicit attention: "Hey!"; "John!"; "Look!"

OBM **Boundary Markers** indicate openings, closings, and shifts in the conversation "Okay"; "All right"; "By the way."

OCQ **Clarification Questions** seek clarification of prior remark: "What?"

OEX **Exclamations** express surprise, delight, or other attitudes: "Oh!"; "Wow!"

OFL **Fillers** enable a speaker to maintain a turn: "...well..."; "...and uh..."

OFS **False Starts** indicate aborted utterances: "We... they"

OPM Politeness Markers indicate ostensible politeness: "Please"; "Thank you."

ORQ Rhetorical Questions seek acknowledgement to continue: "Know what?"

OSS Speaker Selections label speaker of next turn: "John"; "You."

OVP Verbal Play indicate language in which meaning is secondary to play.

Performatives accomplish acts (and establish facts) by being said.

PBT Bets express conviction about a future event: "I bet you can't do it."

PCL Claims establish rights for speaker: "That's mine"; "I'm first."

PJO Jokes cause humorous effect by stating incongrous information, usually patently false: "We throwed the soup in the ceiling."

PPR Protests express objections to hearer's behavior: "Stop!"; "No!"

PTE Teases annoy, taunt, or playfully provoke a hearer: "You can't get me."

PWA Warnings alert hearer of impending harm: "Watch out!"; "Be careful!"

Requestives solicit information or actions.

QAC Action Requests seek the performance of an action by hearer: "Give me it!"; "Put the toy down!"

QCH Choice Questions seek either-or judgments relative to propositions: "is this an apple?"; "Is it red or green?"; "Okay?; "Right?"

QMA Requests for Mental Action seek specific mental activity by the hearer: "Think"; "Remember."

QPC Process Questions Seek extended descriptions or explanations: "Why did he go?"; "How did it happen?"; "What about him?"

QPM Permission Requests seek permission to perform action: "May I go?"

QPR Product Questions seek information relative to most "WH" inter-rogatives" "Where's John?"; "What happened?"; "Who?" "When?"

QSU Suggestions resommend the performance of an action by hearer or speaker or both: "Let's do it!"; "Why don't you do it?"; "You should do it."

QVB Verbal Action Requests seek performance part of an instructional routine such as reading aloud, conducting language-learning exercises, repeating, or spelling: "Read this word"; "Repeat after me"; "I go, you go, he ...."

77

Responsives supply solicited information or acknowledge remarks.

RAG **Agreements** agree or disagree with prior non-requestive act: "No, it is not!"; "I don't think you're right."

RAK **Acknowledgements** recognize prior non-requestives and are non-commital: "Oh"; "Yeah."

RCH **Choice Answers** Provide solicited judgments of propositions: "Yes."

RCL **Clarification Responses** provide solicited confirmations: "I said no."

RCO **Compliances** express acceptance, denial, or acknowledgement of requests: "Okay"; "Yes"; "I'll do it."

RPC **Process Answers** provide solicited explanations: "I wanted to."

RPR **Product Answers** provide Wh-information: "John's here"; "It fell."

RQL **Qualifications** provide unsolicited information to requestives: "But I didn't do it"; "This is not an apple."

RVB **Response to Requests for Verbal Action** provide solicited speech, such as reading aloud, repeating in chorus, or spelling.

Special Speech Acts are prescribed utterances expressed in a special way.

SAC **Counting** indicates naming numerals or counting objects.

SAL **Laughing** codes laughter.

SAS **Singing** indicates singing, either words or sounds.

MKE **Microphone talk** codes speech directed at the tape recorder microphone, often silly or nonsensical.

NVB **Nonverbals** code important nonverbal acts.

TRA **Translation** codes conscious, direct translations.

UNT **Uninterpretables** indicate uncodable utterances.

APPENDIX B:

SAMPLE LESSON TRANSCRIPT

1:8Feb. 11th, 1982			Lesson 7
2:	CLASS 19 MINS. ENGLISH READING (FLINTSTONE)		
3: 99RVB	● 2	Sit, sits.	
4: 52UNT	● 0	? ?	
5: 01QAC	● 6	All on the board here now,	
6: 01PPR	● 4	I don't hear Hieu-Nghi.	
7: 99RVB	● 5	Sit, sits, little, like, look.	
8: 52RVB	● 2	Sit, like,	
9: 52SAS	● 3	On top a (singing).	
10: 01RAG	● 1	Okay.	
11: 01QCH	● 5	Can you use this in a sentence?	
12: 01OSS	● 1	Hieu-Nghi.	
13: 24RCH	● 1	Yes.	
14: 52SAS	● 0	(Henrietta is still singing).	
15: 01QVB	● 6	Use this word in a sentence	
16: 24RVB	● 1	Can.	
17: 52SAS	● 0	(Henrietta is still singing).	
18: 01QVB	c 5	做了讲话是 [Make a sentence for me.]	
19: 24RVB	● 5	Can you ride?	
20: 52SAS	● 0	(Henrietta singing).	
21: 01OSS	● 1	Wyman.	
22: 11DFS	● 1	?	
23: 01OAG	● 1	Henrietta.	
24: 01PPRQSUe	4	Would you sit down	
25: 01QPH	● 1	please?	
26: 11RVB	● 3	I can't ride.	
27: 01QVB	● 1	But.	
28: 11RVB	● 4	But I can ride.	
29: 01RAG	● 1	No.	
30: 01QVB	● 6	I can't ride, but I can	
31: 24RVB	● 1	jump.	
32: 01AEV	● 4	That's a good one.	
33: 01TRAQPCc	11	你能够走车,但你用大哭? [Can't ride a bike, but can do what?]	
34:			
35: 16RVB	c 1	我 [read.]	
36: 24RAG	c 2	半价 [No.]	
37: 01AID	● 1	Jump.	
38: 24AID	c 3	能够走 [can walk.]	
39: 01AID	● 1	Jump	
40: 15RAG	c 1	跳 [Jump.]	
41: 24RAG	c 1	跳 [Jump.]	
42: 01RAG	● 1	Okay,	
43: 01OSS	● 1	Hieu-Nghi.	
44: 01OAG	● 1	Ah-Ngat	
45: 01PPRQSUe	7	you want to go to your seat.	
46: 01PPRQSUe	7	You want to put your head down.	
47: 01ORQ	● 1	Ha.	
48: 01PPRQSUe	3	you want to?	
49: 01QCH	● 3	Are you sure?	
50: 01OBM	● 1	Okay.	

80

51: 01UNT	w	0	What does this word mean?
52: 01QPC	e	5	Can you use this word in a sentence?
53: 01QPC	e	8	
54: 16DAG	w	1	No.
55: 01UNT	e	0	
56: 01QPR	m	8	底饮牛饮 [Do you know] what does sit mean?
57: 01QPR	w	4	What does sit mean?
58: 01DSS	e	1	Ah-Ngat.
59: 13RPR	e	1	sit.
60: 01QPR	w	4	What does sit mean?
61: 13RPR	c	2	坐从 [Sit down.]
62: 52QVP	c	2	坐低 [Sit down.]
63: 01QVB	c	3	做个字牛我 [Make a sentence for me.]
64: 16AIR	e	2	I know.
65: 52QVP	e	2	[Sit down.]
66: 01DAGQSS	e	1	My Danh.
67: 16RVB	e	4	The little boy sit.
68: 01RAG	e	4	The little girl sits.
69: 01AIDQVB	e	3	Use this one
70: 01QRQ	e	1	okay (T points to runs).
71: 01QVB	e	4	How about this one? (T points to runs).
72: 01DSS	w	1	Hieu-Nghi.
73: 24QFS	e	2	I. No.
74: 24RVB	e	4	The little dog run.
75: 24QFS	w	1	run.
76: 24RQL	e	1	runs.
77: 01DSS	e	1	Henrietta.
78: 52QCC	w	1	Who?
79: 01QVB	e	3	Use this word in a sentence.
80: 01QVB	e	4	What is this word?
81: 52RVB	w	1	little
82: 01RAG	e	3	This isn't little.
83: 01AID	e	5	This is "rides a bike."
84: 52RVB	e	1	like.
85: 01DBM	e	1	Okay.
86: 01QCH	e	7	Can you use this in a sentence?
87: 01UNT	e	0	I like.
88: 52UNT	e	2	I like.
89: 01QVB	e	3	I like what?
90: 92RVB	e	3	I like you.
91: 52RVB	e	3	to ride bike.
92: 01RAG	e	6	I like to ride a bike.
93: 01DBM	e	1	Okay.
94: 01QVB	e	4	What this word is?
95: 16DAGAIR	e	2	I know.
96: 01DSS	e	1	Nyman.
97: 11RVB	e	1	likes.
98: 01QCH	e	4	You need some water?
99:	e	0	(Tape unclear)
100: 24AIR	e	5	I need some water too.
101: 01QVB	e	4	What is this word.

81

#	Code			Utterance
51:	01UNT	w	0	
52:	01QPC	e	5	What does this word mean?
53:	01QPC	e	8	Can you use this word in a sentence?
54:	16OAG	w	1	Me.
55:	01UNT	e	0	,
56:	01QPR	m	8	你知道 [Do you know] what does sit mean?
57:	01QPR	w	4	What does sit mean.
58:	01OBB	e	1	Ah-Ngat.
59:	13RPR	e	1	sit.
60:	01QPR	w	4	What does sit mean?
61:	13RPR	c	2	坐低 [Sit down.]
62:	52OVP	c	2	坐低 [Sit down.]
63:	01QVB	c	3	做句说话俾我 [Make a sentence for me.]
64:	16AIR	e	2	I know. [Sit down.]
65:	52OVP	e	2	[Sit down.]
66:	01OAGOSS	w	1	My-Oanh.
67:	16RVB	e	4	The little boy sit.
68:	01RAG	e	4	The little girl sits.
69:	01AIDQVB	w	3	Use this one
70:	01ORQ	e	1	okay (T points to runs).
71:	01QVB	e	4	How about this one? (T points to runs).
72:	01OSS	w	1	Hieu-Nghi.
73:	24OFS	e	2	I. No.
74:	24RVB	e	4	The little dog run.
75:	24OFS	w	1	run.
76:	24RDL	e	1	runs.
77:	01OSS	e	1	Henrietta.
78:	52OCC	w	2	Who?
79:	01QVB	e	3	Use this word in a sentence.
80:	01QVB	e	4	What is this word?
81:	52RVB	w	1	little
82:	01RAG	e	3	This isn't little.
83:	01AID	e	5	This is "rides a bike."
84:	52RVB	w	1	like.
85:	01OBM	e	1	Okay.
86:	01QCH	e	7	Can you use this in a sentence?
87:	01UNT	w	0	..
88:	52UNT	e	2	I like.
89:	01QVB	e	3	I like what?
90:	52RVB	w	3	I like you.
91:	52RVB	e	3	to ride bike.
92:	01RAG	e	6	I like to ride a bike.
93:	01OBM	w	1	Okay,
94:	01QVB	e	4	What this word is?
95:	16OAGAIR	e	2	I know.
96:	01OSS	w	1	Wyman.
97:	11RVB	e	1	likes.
98:	01QCH	e	4	You need some water?
99:		e	0	(Tape unclear)
100:	24AIR	e	5	I need some water too.
101:	01QVB	e	4	What is this word.

102:	16RVB	e 1	likes.
103:	11RVB	e 1	like.
104:	52RVB	e 1	likes
105:	52RVB	e 2	like, like
106:	01DCH	e 8	Can you use this word in a sentence?
107:	52RVB	e 2	Like, likes. [Make a sentence for me.]
108:	01QVB	c 5	做句子给我
109:	11RVB	e 2	I like.
110:	01RAG	e 3	Yes, I like.
111:	01UNT	e 0	
112:	01QVB	e 1	He.
113:	99RVB	e 2	He likes.
114:	11RVB	e 4	He likes big dog.
115:	01RAG	e 5	Okay, he likes big dog.
116:	52RVB	e 4	He likes big dog.
117:	01ADC	e 6	Now we are ready to read.
118:	24ADC	e 5	My nose will be bad.
119:	01QAC	e 4	Pass the book down.
120:	52SAS	e 2	Hip, hep.
121:	24DAG	e 2	Mrs. Ling.
122:	52DSS	e 2	Give book.
123:	13QAC	e 3	Look at her.
124:	13DAGFPRe	1	My-Oanh.
125:	24AIR	e 4	I need the water.
126:	01QAC	e 4	Take the top one.
127:	01UNT	e 1	Okay.
128:	24AIR	e 4	I need the water.
129:	01QAC	e 5	Just take the top one.
130:	01DRQ	e 1	Okay?
131:	01QAC	e 4	Take the top one.
132:	01QAC	e 4	Take the top one.
133:	24DFB	e 3	I am to,
134:	24AIR	e 4	I need some water.
135:	13DACPPRe	3	Look at Henrietta.
136:	01QAC	e 4	Take the top one.
137:	01DAG	e 1	Henrietta.
138:	01DRQ	e 1	Okay?
139:	11AAT	e 4	He wants a half :
140:	11AID	e 1	Here.
141:	52SAS	e	(Singing.)
142:	01PPR	e 1	Sh.
143:	01QSU	e 5	Let's see who is ready?
144:	01ADC	e17	Those people who are ready will have the books closed and
145:		e	the markers on top like this.
146:	52AID	e 3	On page three.
147:	01QSU	e 5	Let's see who is ready?
148:	01ADC	e 3	Carletta is ready.
149:	01ADC	e 3	Ah-ngat is ready.
150:	01DAG	e 1	Henrietta.
151:	01DCH	e 3	Are you ready?
152:	01DPM	e 3	Thank you Ah-ngat.

Best Available Copy

153:	O10PH	# 5	Thank you for showing me.
154:			(Pause.)
155:	O10BM	# 1	Okay.
156:	O1AEV	# 5	Very nice.
157:	O1ADC	# 3	You are peeking.
158:	O1OAC	# 8	Turn to page 3, to the table content.
159:	O10BU	# 7	Let's check and see if you remember.
160:	O10PR	# 8	What is the name of the first story?
161:	O10FL	# 1	Uh.
162:	O10SS	# 1	My-oanh.
163:	16RPR	# 1	Can.
164:	O1RAB	# 1	No.
165:	O10PR	#11	What is the name of the title of the first story?
166:	16RPR	# 1	One.
167:	O1RAB	# 0	No, not one.
168:	O1AID	# 3	That's not one.
169:	O1AID	# 3	That's a letter.
170:	O1RPR	# 1	I.
171:	O1QPR	# 2	I what?
172:	16RPR	# 1	Can.
173:	O1RAI	# 1	Okay.
174:	O1QPR	# 4	What page is that, 1?
175:			(Unclear.)
176:	O10BM	# 1	Okay.
177:	O10FS	#10	I want you to tell me, what's the, no
178:	O1QPR	#11	What is the name of the story found on page 30?
179:	O1QPR	#10	What is the name of the story found on 30?
180:	24RPR	# 2	The, can.
181:	O10FL	# 1	Uh.
182:	O1OAB	# 1	Elaine. (Teacher talks to the side.)
183:	O1QSU	# 6	Would you tell with the Snoopies?
184:	O10PH	# 1	Please.
185:	O1ADC	# 3	They are getting noisy.
186:	O1QSU	# 7	They can go back to their seat.
187:	24RPR	# 7	The little man and the little man.
188:	O1OAB	# 2	Come again.
189:	O10PM	# 3	I am sorry.
190:	O10FS	# 1	The,
191:	24RPR	# 7	The, the little man and the, and the big man.
192:	O1UNT	#	: : : : : : : :
193:	O1PPR	# 5	That goes to Joseph too. (T talks to the other group.)
194:	O1OAB	# 2	Joseph, Joseph.
195:	O1AIR	# 6	I don't want that much noise.
196:	O1AEX	# 4	I can't hear them.
197:	O1APRPPR	#22	And if you guys are going to make that much noise, you go back to your seat and put your heads down.
198:		#	You lost, you lose your game previledge.
199:	O1APR	#	Is that understood?
200:	O1QCH	# 3	Yes.
201:	45RCH	# 1	You better remind your friends.
202:	O1ADC	# 5	Okay?
203:	O1ORQ	# 1	

84

```
204: 01AIR    e 0    I don't want that much noise.
205: 01AEX    e 3    I can't hear.
206: 01DRQ    e 1    Okay?
207: 01QPM    e 1    Thank you.
208: 01DBM    e 1    Okay.
209: 01QPR    e11    What's the name of the story found on page 30 again.
210: 01DSS    e 1    Hieu Nghi?
211: 24RPR    e 7    The little man and the big man.
212: 01RAG    e 1    Right.
213: 01RAG    e 7    The little man and the big man.
214: 01QPR    e11    And what page is "the little man and the big man?"
215: 99RPR    e 1    30.
216: 01RAG    e 1    30.
217: 01QACQSUe 6    Can you find that for me?
218: 01DSS    e 1    Ah-Ngat?
219: 01QAC    e 4    Put your marker down.
220: 01QAC    e 4    Put your marker under.
221: 01RAG    e 1    Okay.
222: 01AID    e 2    Right here.
223: 01RAG    e 1    Okay.
224: 01QPR    e 4    It's found on page?
225: 99RPR    e 1    30.
226: 01QACQSUe 5    Let's turn to page 30.
227: 01UNT    e 0    .
228: 01QPM    e 2    Thank you.
229: a01UNT   e 0    
230: 01QAC    e 5    Find the story for me.
231: 52AID    e 7    The big man and the little man.
232: 01QPR    e 4    Where would you look?
233: 01DSS    e 1    Hieu Nghi?
234: 01QPR    e 5    What page will you look?
235: 24RPR    e 1    30.
236: 52AID    e 3    The big man.
237: 01QPR    e 7    Where would you look for that story?
238: 24RPR    e 1    30.
239: 63RPR    e 2    30. 30.
240: 52RAK DEXe 1    Oh.
241: 01FPRAPRe 9    I will only call in those people who raise
242:           e 3    their hands nicely.
243: 01QPR    e 4    I do not hear.
244: 13RAG    e 3    No, not 30.
245: 13AID    e 2    There there.
246: 01PPR    e 5    I can't see loud voices.
247: 01AEX    e 4    I can only see hands go up.
248: 13UNT    e 0    
249: 01DBM    e 1    Okay.
250: 01QPR    e 8    What do you see in the page of.....
251: 01QAC    e 5    Move over a little bit.
252: 52AID    e 1    30.
253: 52PPR    e 5    He is on page 37.
254: 52RAK    e 1    Okay.
```

255:	010ACOSU	4	Can you help him
256:	010PM	# 1	please?
257:	52RCH	# 1	No,
258:	52RCH	# 1	yes.
259:	010PM	# 2	Thank you, Henrietta.
260:	010BM	# 1	Okay.
261:	010PR	# 7	What do you see in the page
262:	010SS	# 1	Henrietta?
263:	51RPR	# 7	A big man and a little man.
264:	01RAG	# 1	Okay.
265:	010PR	# 4	What are they doing
266:	010SS	# 1	Wyman?
267:	51RPR	# 7	A big man and the little man.
268:	11RPR	# 1	Read.
269:	01RAG	# 1	No,
270:	010PR	# 4	What are they doing?
271:	010FS	# 2	What are
272:	11RPR	# 1	sitting.
273:	01RAG	# 3	They are sitting.
274:	11RVB	# 3	They are sitting.
275:	11RVB	# 3	They are sitting.
276:	010BM	# 1	Well,
277:	010FS	# 4	what do you think,
278:	010FL	# 1	Ah
279:	010PR	# 5	where are they?
280:	010SS	# 1	Hieu-Nghi
281:	010PR	# 3	where are they?
282:	24RPR	# 2	In the park.
283:	01RAG	# 5	They are in the park,
284:	010BM	# 1	and,
285:	010CH	# 10	is the park in the city or in the country
286:	010SS	# 1	Ah-Ngat?
287:	51RCH	# 3	In the city.
288:	13RCH	# 1	Country.
289:	01TRAAEXm	7	Country 打D农场 [Country is farm.]
290:	51RCH	# 1	City.
291:	010CC	# 1	Ha!
292:	010AC	# 3	Raise your hand.
293:	010SS	# 1	Hieu-Nghi.
294:	24UNT	# 3	In the city.
295:	010FC	# 4	How do you know?
296:	24RFC	# 7	Because they got the house and tree.
297:	24RFCADCe	4	Looks like a park.
298:	01ADC	# 6	They have houses in the country too.
299:	010PC	# 6	What kind of houses are they?
300:	010CH	# 2	Short, tall
301:	13RPC	# 1	Building.
302:	99RPC	# 1	Building.
303:	010PC	# 4	What kind of building?
304:	13RPC	# 3	Because too tall.
305:	99RCH	# 1	Tall.

306:	01RAG	• 4	They are tall buildings
307:	01ADC	• 7	you see tall buildings in the city.
308:	01ORQ	• 1	Right.
309:	16AID	• 1	Here,
310:	16ADC	• 3	I see it.
311:	01RAG	• 1	Okay,
312:	01QCH	• 9	you want Elaine to take you to the nurse?
313:	01QCH	• 5	You want to go the (T talks to Carletta)
314:	11QAG	• 2	Mrs Ling,
315:	01QPR	• 1	Ha?
316:	11ADC	• 3	there's got one.
317:	01RAG	• 1	Yeah,
318:	01ADC	• 7	there is one over on the .
319:	11AID	• 3	That's Joseph Lives down there.
320:	01QCH	•10	Are we in the city now or in the country?
321:	16RCH	• 1	Country.
322:	24RCH	• 1	City.
323:	01RAG	• 3	In the city. [In the city.]
324:	01TRA	c 5	[In the city.]
325:	11ADC	m 3	Joseph Lives down there.
326:	01ADC	• 4	Looking at the picture,
327:	01QCH	•10	would you say the big man the little man are sad?
328:	24RCH	• 4	No, they are happy.
329:	11RCH	• 1	Happy.
330:	16UNT	• 1	....
331:	91OSS	• 1	Hieu-nghi.
332:	24RCH	• 3	They are happy.
333:	01QPC	• 6	Why, why would they be happy?
334:	16RPC	• 4	Because he is talking.
335:	01RAG	• 4	Because he is talking.
336:	01QPR	• 3	Who is talking?
337:	16RPR	• 7	The little man and the big man.
338:	01QPR	• 7	Who is the little man talking to.
339:	51RPR	• 3	The big man.
340:	16RPR	• 2	Big man.
341:	01QCH	•10	Do you think the big man answers him or not?
342:	16RCH	• 2	Answers him.
343:	13RCH	• 2	Answers him.
344:	01QCH	•10	Do you think he will talk to the little man?
345:	13RCH	• 1	No.
346:	01RAGOCQe	1	No?
347:	99RCH	• 1	Yes.
348:	01RAG	• 3	Yes, he would.
349:	01OFS	• 2	And the
350:	01ADC	• 6	Looks like they are having fun,
351:	01ORQ	• 2	Isn't it? Huh?
352:	01QACOSUe	7	Let's find out what they do together.
353:	51RCO	• 1	Yes.
354:	01QAC	• 4	Turn to page 32.
355:	24ADC	• 4	We didn't read this.
356:	01RAG	• 1	No,

87

81

ERIC

357:	01ADC	• 3	we read that.
358:	13AID	• 1	33, 33.
359:	01RAG	• 1	32
360:	01DBM	• 1	now.
361:	01QACDSU• 6		Let's see who is on 32.
362:	91RVB Q • 2		The little.
363:	51RVB	• 4	The big, the little.
364:	01QACFPR• 7		I didn't ask anybody to read it.
365:	01QAC	• 5	I only asked you to look.
366:	01QAG	• 1	Henrietta
367:	01QPR	• 5	What did Mrs. Ling say?
368:	01QAC	• 4	Look at page 32.
369:	01DBM	• 1	Okay.
370:	01QACAIR• 5		I want you to look.
371:	01PPR	• 1	Sh.
372:	01QACAIR• 9		I want you to read to yourself with your eyes.
373:	91RAK	• 1	Okay.
374:	01QACAIR• 7		I don't want to hear any noise.
375:	92PPR	• 1	Sh.
376:	01QAC	• 3	With your eyes.
377:	16RVB	• 5	The little man. (Children are reading out.)
378:	11RVB	• 1	. . jump.
379:	01QAC	• 4	Read with your eyes. (Teacher murmurs.)
380:	01QAC	• 6	Use your marker to help you.
381:			(T tells Wyman to read silently)
382:	16QPR	• 3	What this word?
383:	01AAT	• 2	You remember that word, told you.
384:	16RPR	• 1	likes.
385:	01RAG	• 1	Likes.
386:	11RVB	• 1	He.
387:	13RVB	• 3	The little man.
388:	11RVB	• 1	to jump.
389:	16RVB	• 6	He like, he likes to jump.
390:	11QFR	• 2	What's this?
391:	01UNT	• 0	He
392:	11QPR	• 2	What's this?
393:	01RPR	• 2	That's "so".
394:	13QPR	• 2	What's this?
395:	13QAG	• 2	Mrs. Ling.
396:	13QAG	• 2	Mrs. Ling.
397:	24QFR	• 4	What is this word?
398:	01RFR	• 3	He [is he.]
399:	11ADC	• 3	I read here.
400:	24RVB	• 4	He likes to jump.
401:	01ADC	• 2	page 32.
402:	01QAC	•10	Stop, when you get to the end of page 32.
403:	01DRQ	• 1	Okay.
404:	16QFR	• 3	What's this word?
405:	01QFS	• 1	Let's
406:	01QAC	• 4	Put your marker right here.
407:	01QFS	• 3	Now I want to talk to

2. MARY'S CLASS 18 MINS. ENGLISH READING (FLINTSTONE)

2.1

88

408:	01QAC	@ 5	Put your marker right there.
409:	01QAC	@ 3	Close your book.
410:	01QPC	@10	Who knows why I ask you to close your book?
411:	01QPC	@ 1	Why?
412:	24RPC	@ 5	Because we are too noisy.
413:	01RAG	@ 7	No, it wasn't because you are noisy.
414:	13RPC	@ 4	Because listen to teacher
415:	01QPR	@ 7	What did Mrs. Ling say at first.
416:	24RPR	@ 7	Mrs. Ling said uh, uh look at your book.
417:	24RPR	@ 4	Don't move with mouth.
418:	01QPR	@ 5	What else did I say?
419:	13RPR	@ 4	You look your eyes.
420:	01QPR	@ 9	What page did I tell you to look at.
421:	51RPR	@ 2	Page 32.
422:	01QCH	@ 9	Did I ask you to look at page 33?
423:	99RCH	@ 1	No.
424:	01QACAIR	@11	I want to stop at the end of page 32
425:	01QAC	@ 6	stop after finish the last line.
426:	01QRQ	@ 1	Okay?
427:	01QACQSU	@ 7	Now, let's open up our book again.
428:	01QBM	@ 1	Now,
429:	01ADC	@ 4	from what you read.
430:	01QBM	@	Okay,
431:	01		what does the little man do?
432:	9		jump
433:	01QAIR	@	Who can read the sentence that tells me about.
434:	01		Ah,
435:	01QSS		Henrietta.
436:	51		The little man jumped.
437:	01		Very good.
438:	01	@ 6	What does he like to do.
439:	01QSS	@ 1	Ah-Ngat?
440:	01QAC	@	Use your marker.
441:	01QVB	@ 6	What does he like to do?
442:	01QBM	@ 1	Okay.
443:	51RVB	@ 5	A little man in the
444:	13RVB	@ 5	A little man in the
445:	51UNT	@ 2	passing gum.
446:	01QVB	@ 8	You have to read me the whole sentence.
447:	13AIR	@ 5	I don't know this sentence.
448:	01QCQ	@ 1	Ah.
449:	13AIR	@ 5	I don't know this sentence.
450:	16QAG	@ 2	I know.
451:	01QVBAID	@ 1	He.
452:	16RVB	@	He likes
453:	13RVB	@ 4	He little to down
454:	01RAG	@ 2	Not "little"
455:	01QVB	@	What's that word
456:	01QSS	@ 1	Henrietta?
457:	51RVB	@ 2	He likes
458:	51RVB	@ 4	He likes to jump.

89

```
459: 15RVE    e 4     He likes to jump.
460: 01RAG    e 1     Okay.
461: 010PR    e 5     So what does he do
462: 01055    e 1     My Danh?
463: 51RPR    e 4     He likes to jump.
464: 010PR    e 5     So what does he do
465: 01055    e 1     My Danh?
466: 16RFR    e 4     He likes to jump.
467: 51RPR    e 3     So he jump.
468: 010PR    e 4     What does he do?
469: 51RFR    e 3     So he jumps.
470: 16RPR    e 3     So he jumps.
471: 51RPF    e 3     So he jumps.
472: 01RAG    e 3     So he jumps.
473: 51RPR    e 3     So he jumps.
474: 51RPF    e 3     So he jumps.
475: 51RFR    e 3     So he jumps.
476: 010A00SUe 5     Let's get to page 33
477: 51RPF    e 3     So he jumps.
478: 51RFR    e 3     So he jumps.
479: 51RAG    e 1     33
480: 010AC    e 5     This time with your eyes
481: 010AC    e 8     when you get to the last line stop.
482: 11RVE    e 3     The big man.
483: 1c0AG    e 1     Hey.
484: 16DFR    e 3     What's this word?
485: 010VP    e 3     You read now.
486: 11RVE    e 7     I can't jump. But I can sit.
487: 11RVE    e 7     I like to sit. So I sit.
488: 51CFF    e 5     What does that I like.
489: 11AIC    e 1     This.
490: 11RAG    e 4     no I am not,
491: 51RVE    e 7     I like to jump, but I like.
492: 11AIC    e 3     That's not like.
493: 51UNT    e 1     I::::
494: 11AIC    e 1     can't
495: 51RVE    e 2     I can't
496: 130CC    e 4     What did he what
497: 51RCL    e 3     I can't.
498: 13RCL    e 3     I can't
499: 51RCL    e 1     jump.
500: 16CVE    e 3     What's this word?
501: 13RVE    e 3     I can't jump, but
502: 13UNT    e 3     I
503: 51RVE    e 7     I can't jump but I can sit.
504: 13RVE    e 3     I can't jump but I can sit
505: 51RVE    e 1     I
506: 51OFS    e 1     little
507: 51UNT    e 3     like to sit. So I sit.
508: 13UNT    e 1     I
509: 13UNT    e 1     little
```

90

84

510:	15RVB	e 8	like to sit. So I sit.
511:	51RVB	e 3	So I sit.
512:	01OACFFRe	1	Shhh-
513:	01OBM	e 1	Okay.
514:	01OFR	e 6	What does the big man say?
515:	01OPR	e 6	What does the big man say?
516:	51RPR	e 3	So he jumps.
517:	24UNT	e 3	The big man.
518:	24QVB	e 3	What is this?
519:	01PVB	e 1	says.
520:	24RVB	e 3	Says I like to.
521:	510AG	e 2	I know.
522:	01OAC	e 4	You have to look at the book.
523:	51RVB	e 5	The big man can't jump.
524:	13AJR	e 4	I like to read.
525:	01PFRADCe	7	I don't think anybody is paying attention.
526:	01OAGFFRe	2	Especially Ah-Ngat.
527:	010VBOSUe	4	Let's read it again.
528:	01OFR	e 6	What does the big man say?
529:	01OAG	e 1	Everybody
530:	01OAC	e 3	take your marker.
531:	01OAC	e 7	and put it under the 1st line.
532:	01AEX	e 4	, So Hieu-Nghi can read
533:	01OAC	e 3	you follow along.
534:	24OCC	e 2	I read again.
535:	01RCL	e 1	Yes.
536:	24OFS	e 2	The, no
537:	24OVB	e 3	the big man doesn't.
538:	01AID	e 1	says.
539:	24RVB	e 3	says I can,
540:	24RVB	e 2	can not.
541:	01AID	e 1	can't
542:	24RVB	e 2	can't jump.
543:	01OCC	e 5	What else does he say?
544:	01CVB	e 1	but
545:	24RVB	e 8	But I can sit. I like to sit.
546:	24RVB	e 3	So I sit.
547:	01RAG	e 1	Okay.
548:	01OSS	e 1	Ah-Ngat.
549:	01OCH	e 4	Can you find it?
550:	01OBM	e 1	Okay.
551:	010VBOSUe	4	Let's read it together,
552:	01PEZAJRe	9	because I don't think Ah-Ngat can find the line,
553:	01OFC	e 1	Okay?
554:	010VBOSUe	5	Can we read it together?
555:	01OCH	e 1	Ready?
556:	59RVB	e 11	The big man says I can't jump. But I can sit.
557:	05RVB	e 7	I like to sit. So I sit.
558:	01HEV	e 4	That was much better.
559:	01OFS	e 2	Now the,
560:	01ADC	e 3	everybody followed along.

561:	01ORD	1	Right?
562:	01AEX	6	look how much easy it is.
563:	01OBM	1	Okay.
564:	01UNT	0	1 1 1
565:	01OAC	4	Turn to page 34.
566:	13OCG	1	35.
567:	24OEX	1	boy.
568:	24ADC	1	Finish.
569:	51RAG	1	34.
570:	01ADC	7	The little man did something else besides jumping.
571:	01ADC	1	jumping.
572:	01AID	1	34
573:	01OAC	5	Read with your eyes again.
574:	91OBM	1	Okay.
575:	01OAC	9	When you get to the last line you stop.
576:	01UNT	0	(Cr all read with sound:)
577:	01FFROACe	4	With your eyes. eyes. (To all Cs).
578:	51RAGO4Ce	4	Read with your eyes.
579:	01OACFFFRe	1	Shhh.
580:	11RVE	4	The little man run.
581:	13RVE	4	The little man run.
582:	13OCT	2	What is this?
583:	01OVBAIDe	1	He
584:	11RVE	4	He like to run.
585:	13RVE	4	He like to run.
596:	01OCH	6	Are you reading with your eyes?
587:	01RAG4IRe	4	I don't think so.
588:	01OFS	2	You mate.
589:	01ADC	4	Your mouth is moving.
590:	01AEV	2	Very nice.
591:	01AID	1	Henrietta.
592:	11UNT	0	; 1
593:	01OFS	4	You see how Henrietta read.
594:	01OAC	1	everybody
595:	01OAC	4	watches how Henrietta reads.
596:	01NVE	0	(Henrietta reads silently).
597:	01OAG	1	Ah-Ngat.
598:	01OAC	1	Watch.
599:	01OCH	5	Does she make any noise?
600:	01OCH	1	No very quietly.
601:	13RVE	2	The little man.
602:	01OAC	1	Ah-Ngat.
603:	01OAG	1	Watch
604:	01OFS	2	does he.
605:	01OCH	5	does she make any noise?
606:	13RCH	1	No.
607:	01ADC	5	She moves with her eyes.
608:	01OACOSUe	5	Can you do the same?
609:	11VE	0	(Ngat nods head).
610:	01OBM	1	Okay.
611:	01OFR	6	What does the little man do?

```
612:  01C99     w 1    My Danki
613:  16RPR     e 4    The little man run
614:  01RAG     e 1    Okay.
615:  16ROL     e      He /lites
616:  01FFROADCe 1     Stop.
617:  01OAC     e 1    stop.
618:  01AEVADCe 1      I just asked you what does the little man do?
619:  01ADC     e 4    "The little man runs."
620:  01DBM     e 1    Now.
621:  01CFF     e t    What does he like to do?
622:  01DFL     e 1    Uh.
623:  01C99     e 1    Ah-Ngat.
624:  01C9FF    e t    What does he like to do?
625:  01CFRADCm 9      我问你 [I asked you.] "What does he like to do?"
626:  16FFF     e 4    He like to run.
627:  01OACO9ue e      Can you find the sentence and tell me.
628:  01OCH     e 8    Does this tell me he likes to run?
629:  01ADC     e 7    This say that the little man runs.
630:  01ORC     e t    Right?
631:  01OCH     e10    Does this sentence tell me what he likes to do?
632:  13RVE     e 2    He little.
633:  01FAC     e 2    Not little.
634:  13FVE     e 1    says.
635:  OWAID     e 1    likes
636:  13FVE     e 2    likes to run.
637:  01FAG     e 1    Okay.
638:  01RAG     e 7    He likes to run, so he runs
639:  01DBM     c 1    Okay.
640:  01OAC     e 3    We'll stop here.
641:  01AEVADCe 8      Because I want you to go see Miss——
642:  01AFF     e 6    And she is going to work with you.
643:  01CFF     e 4    How many people finish
644:  01DFEM    e 1    the.
645:  01OFF     e 2    the Lincoln.
646:  16FFF     e 1    me.
647:  16RAG     e 2    Not me.
648:  16FAE     e 2    Not me.
649:  1341F     e 3    I don't know.
650:  01AFRADCe 7      You are going to write something about.
651:  11FFF     e 2    I didn't.
652:  01OEY     e 1    Oh.
653:  01ADC     e 2    you were absent.
654:  01OAC     e      Close your book.
655:  51FFF     e 2    I didn't.
656:  01OAC     e      Put your marker on top.
657:  NOE       e 8    to stand up and wait to leave.?
658:  01FFF     e 1    Ah.
659:  01OACFFFe 3      Don't go yet.
660:  01OAC     e t    Sit down.
661:  99SAL     e 0    (Cs laugh).
662:  01OAC     e 6    Pass your books to the left.
```

663.717 1

663:	010AC	2	Pass your markers to the right.
664:	240FM	3	May I have
665:	99NVB	0	(Cs pass books and markers.)
666:	010AC	2	Pass your markers to the right.
667:	240AC	1	Here's
668:	240AG	1	Wyman.
669:	240FM	5	May I have the book
670:	240FM	1	please?
671:	010AC	3	Pass the marker
672:	010AC	3	Don't push it.
673:	010FF0ACe	5	Give it to him nicely.
674:	240AG	1	Wyman.
675:	240AC	4	Give it to me.
676:	010DC	3	They are coming.
677:	240FM	5	May I have Carletta's book?
678:	240FM	5	May I have Carletta's book?
679:		0	(T talks to Elaine for a few second.)

94

APPENDIX C:

SAMPLE C-ACT FREQUENCIES AND PROPORTIONS

Teacher A: Frequencies and Proportions

Teacher B: Frequencies and Proportions

Low Group: Frequencies and Proportions

	ORAL			READING		CHINESE		SEATWORK	
"LOWALL" ALL PROPORTIONS	TOT.FRQ: 915.00		GROUP: LOW TOTFRQ: 611.00			TOTFRQ: 87.00		TOTFRQ: 355.00	
TIME:	51.00	0.85	TIME: 100.00	1.67		TIME: 52.00	0.87	TIME: 54.00	0.90
CODE	FRQ	SPKPRN	FRQ	SPKPRN		FRQ	SPKPRN	FRQ	SPKPRN
AAT	3.00	0.00	1.00	0.00		0.00		1.00	0.00
ADC	133.00	0.15	36.00	0.06		23.00	0.26	109.00	0.31
AEV	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		1.00	0.01	6.00	0.02
AEX	2.00	0.00	6.00	0.01		0.00	0.00	8.00	0.02
AID	42.00	0.05	28.00	0.05		2.00	0.02	66.00	0.19
AIR	57.00	0.06	38.00	0.06		3.00	0.03	13.00	0.04
APR	3.00	0.00	1.00	0.00		0.00		2.00	0.01
ARU		0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00		1.00	0.00
	245.00	0.27	110.00	0.18	66.00	29.00	0.33	206.00	0.58
DAC		0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00		0.00	0.00
DAE	24.00	0.03	30.00	0.05		3.00	0.03	5.00	0.01
DBM	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00		1.00	0.01	1.00	0.00
DCQ	21.00	0.02	9.00	0.01		2.00	0.02	12.00	0.03
DEX	28.00	0.03	9.00	0.01		2.00	0.02	12.00	0.03
DFL	41.00	0.04	28.00	0.05			0.00	5.00	0.01
DFS	30.00	0.03	24.00	0.04		2.00	0.02	9.00	0.03
DPM		0.00		0.00		1.00	0.01	6.00	0.02
DRG	2.00	0.00	1.00	0.00			0.00	3.00	0.01
DSS		0.00		0.00			0.00	0.00	0.00
DVP	84.00	0.09	8.00	0.01			0.00	3.00	0.01
	231.00	0.25	110.00	0.18	66.00	11.00	0.13	57.00	0.16
PBT		0.00		0.00			0.00	0.00	0.00
PCL		0.00		0.00			0.00	0.00	0.00
PJD	11.00	0.01	4.00	0.01			0.00	0.00	0.00
PPR	5.00	0.01	3.00	0.00		1.00	0.01	1.00	0.00
PTE	7.00	0.01	3.00	0.00			0.00	3.00	0.01
PMA		0.00		0.00			0.00	0.00	0.00
	23.00	0.03	10.00	0.02	6.00	1.00	0.01	4.00	0.01
QAC	24.00	0.03	6.00	0.01		1.00	0.01	21.00	0.06
QCH	11.00	0.01	2.00	0.00		1.00	0.01	1.00	0.00
QMA		0.00		0.00			0.00	0.00	0.00
QPC		0.00	1.00	0.00			0.00	0.00	0.00
QPM	4.00	0.00	1.00	0.00		1.00	0.01	12.00	0.03
QPR	6.00	0.01	13.00	0.02		4.00	0.05	9.00	0.03
QSU	4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			0.00	0.00	0.00
QVR		0.00	3.00	0.00			0.00	0.00	0.00
	49.00	0.05	26.00	0.04	15.00	7.00	0.05	50.00	0.14
RAE	36.00	0.04	23.00	0.04		4.00	0.05	24.00	0.07
RAK	3.00	0.00	1.00	0.00		3.00	0.03	1.00	0.00
RCH	55.00	0.06	35.00	0.06		2.00	0.02	5.00	0.01
RCL	4.00	0.00	1.00	0.00		1.00	0.01	0.00	0.00
RCD	2.00	0.00	2.00	0.00			0.00	1.00	0.00
RPC	9.00	0.01	8.00	0.01		7.00	0.06	1.00	0.00
RPR	237.00	0.26	115.00	0.19		16.00	0.18	5.00	0.01
RQL	10.00	0.01	8.00	0.01			0.00	1.00	0.00
RVE	9.00	0.01	162.00	0.27		6.00	0.07	0.00	0.00
	367.00	0.40	355.00	0.58	213.00	39.00	0.45	38.00	0.11
SAC	40.00	0.04		0.00		5.00	0.05	35.00	0.07
SAL	32.00	0.03	15.00	0.02		2.00	0.02	1.00	0.00
SAS	3.00	0.00	4.00	0.01		1.00	0.01	3.00	0.01
MIK	1.00	0.00	3.00	0.00			0.00		0.00
NVE		0.00		0.00			0.00		0.00
TRA		0.00		0.00			0.00	77.00	0.16
UNT	143.00	0.13	96.00	0.13		8.00	0.08	116.00	0.25
	219.00	0.19	118.00	0.16	70.00	16.00	0.16	371.00	
TOTAL	1134.00		729.00			103.00			

"MEDALL" ALL PROPORTIONS   GROUP: MED

CODE	ORAL TOT.FRQ: 1070.00 TIME: 105.00 1.75 FRQ	SPKPRN		READING TOTFRQ: 452.00 TIME: 100.00 1.67 FRQ	SPKPRN		CHINESE TOTFRQ: 101.00 TIME: 37.00 0.62 FRQ	SPKPRN		SEATWORK TOTFRQ: 356.00 TIME: 75.00 1.25 FRQ	SPKPRN	
AAT	2.00	0.00		6.00	0.01		0.00	0.00		5.00	0.01	
ADC	147.00	0.14	0.06	80.00	0.18	0.15	29.00	0.29		83.00	0.23	0.09
AEV	5.00	0.00		1.00	0.00	0.02	2.00	0.02		5.00	0.01	0.01
AEI	4.00	0.00		9.00	0.02		0.00	0.00		6.00	0.02	
AID	73.00	0.07		18.00	0.04	0.02	5.00	0.05		28.00	0.06	
AIR	49.00	0.05	0.01	18.00	0.04	0.03	8.00	0.08		17.00	0.05	
APR	1.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		5.00	0.01	
ARU	0.00	0.00		1.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	
	281.00	0.26	160.57	133.00	0.29	79.80	44.00	0.44	71.35	149.00	0.42	119.20
DAC	0.00	0.00		1.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	
DAG	49.00	0.05		22.00	0.05		5.00	0.05		24.00	0.07	
DBR	5.00	0.00		2.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		2.00	0.01	
DCG	17.00	0.02		6.00	0.01		5.00	0.05		7.00	0.02	
DEI	48.00	0.04		8.00	0.02		1.00	0.01		32.00	0.09	
DFL	37.00	0.03		14.00	0.03		3.00	0.03		7.00	-0.02	
DFS	20.00	0.02		17.00	0.04		1.00	0.01		2.00	0.01	
DPM	2.00	0.00		1.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		3.00	0.01	
DRB	1.00	0.00		3.00	0.01		0.00	0.00		1.00	0.00	
DSS	1.00	0.00		1.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	
DVR	62.00	0.06		9.00	0.02		2.00	0.02		35.00	0.10	
	242.00	0.23	138.29	84.00	0.19	50.40	17.00	0.17	27.57	113.00	0.32	90.40
PBT	1.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	
PCL	0.00	0.00		1.00	0.00		10.00	0.00		2.00	0.01	
PJC	6.00	0.01		2.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		1.00	0.00	
PPR	9.00	0.01		1.00	0.00		1.00	0.01		2.00	0.01	
PTE	7.00	0.01		0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		2.00	0.01	
PWA	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	
	23.00	0.02	13.14	4.00	0.01	2.40	1.00	0.01	1.42	7.00	0.02	5.60
QAC	10.00	0.01		7.00	0.02		0.00	0.00		23.00	0.06	
QCH	7.00	0.01		8.00	0.02		2.00	0.02		11.00	0.03	
QMA	0.00	0.00		1.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	
QPC	0.00	0.00		5.00	0.01		0.00	0.00		3.00	0.01	
QPM	5.00	0.00		8.00	0.02		0.00	0.00		4.00	0.01	
QPR	19.00	0.02		5.00	0.01		2.00	0.02		15.00	0.04	
QSU	3.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		4.00	0.01	
QVP	0.00	0.00		1.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		6.00	0.00	
	44.00	0.04	25.14	35.00	0.08	21.00	4.00	0.04	6.49	60.00	0.17	48.00
RAG	42.00	0.04		14.00	0.03		3.00	0.03		8.00	0.02	
RAW	3.00	0.00		2.00	0.00		3.00	0.03		9.00	0.03	
RCH	37.00	0.03		42.00	0.09		4.00	0.04		4.00	0.01	
RCL	3.00	0.00		1.00	0.00		2.00	0.02		0.00	0.00	
RCO	2.00	0.00		5.00	0.01		0.00	0.00		3.00	0.01	
RPC	44.00	0.04		11.00	0.02		1.00	0.01		0.00	0.00	
RPR	301.00	0.28		68.00	0.15		13.00	0.13		3.00	0.01	
RQL	28.00	0.03		2.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	
RVB	20.00	0.02		51.00	0.11		9.00	0.09		0.00	0.00	
	480.00	0.45	274.29	196.00	0.43	117.60	35.00	0.35	56.76	27.00	0.08	21.60
SAC	2.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		3.00	0.03		11.00	0.03	
SAL	144.00	0.09		11.00	0.02		1.00	0.01		24.00	0.05	
SAS	24.00	0.02		6.00	0.01		2.00	0.02		5.00	0.01	
RIK	0.00	0.00		5.00	0.01		0.00	0.00		4.00	0.01	
NVB	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00			0.00	
TRA	0.00	0.00		2.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		112.00	0.22	
UNT	303.00	0.20		28.00	0.06		9.00	0.08		156.00	0.30	124.80
	473.00	0.31	270.29	52.00	0.10	31.20	15.00	0.13	24.32	512.00		
TOTAL	1543.00			564.00			116.00					

Microfilmed F...

Best Avail...

High Group: Frequencies and Proportions

"HIALL" ENGLISH PROPORTIONS			GROUP: HIGH			CHINESE TOTFRQ: 0.00			SEATWORK TOTFRQ: 118.00		
ORA. TOT.FRQ: 413.00			READING TOTFRQ: 104.00			TIME: 100.00 1.67			TIME: 40.00 0.67		
TIME: 80.00 1.33			TIME: 52:00 0.87								
CODE	FRQ	SPKPRN	FRQ	SPKPRN		FRQ	SPKPRN		FRQ	SPKPRN	
				0.00	0.00		0.00	ERROR	ERROR	0.00	0.00	0.00
AAT		0.00	0.00					ERROR	ERROR	33.00	0.28	0.77
ADC	52.00	0.13	0.46	17.00	0.16	0.59		ERROR	ERROR	0.00	0.00	0.00
AEV	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		ERROR	ERROR	1.00	0.01	0.02
AEZ	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	0.02	0.07		ERROR	ERROR	8.00	0.07	0.19
AIE	45.00	0.11	0.39	7.00	0.07	0.24		ERROR	ERROR	1.00	0.01	0.02
AIF	16.00	0.04	0.14	3.00	0.03	0.10		ERROR	ERROR	0.00	0.00	0.00
APF	1.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00		ERROR	ERROR	0.00	0.00	0.00
ARV		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		ERROR	0.00	43.00	0.36	64.50
	114.00	0.28	85.50	29.00	0.28	33.46	0.00	ERROR	ERROR	0.00	0.00	0.00
OAC	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		ERROR	ERROR	13.00	0.11	0.50
OAE	9.00	0.02	0.14	1.00	0.01	0.04		ERROR	ERROR	1.00	0.01	0.04
CPN	1.00	0.00	0.02	2.00	0.02	0.13		ERROR	ERROR	3.00	0.03	0.12
OCE	8.00	0.02	0.13	3.00	0.03	0.19		ERROR	ERROR	3.00	0.03	0.12
OEZ	12.00	0.03	0.19	0.00	0.00	0.00		ERROR	ERROR	1.00	0.01	0.04
OFL	5.00	0.01	0.08	4.00	0.04	0.25		ERROR	ERROR	2.00	0.02	0.08
OFE	23.00	0.06	0.37	5.00	0.05	0.31		ERROR	ERROR	1.00	0.01	0.04
OPR		0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		ERROR	ERROR	0.00	0.00	0.00
ORE		0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		ERROR	ERROR	0.00	0.00	0.00
OSE	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		ERROR	ERROR	2.00	0.02	0.08
OVE	5.00	0.01	0.08	1.00	0.01	0.08		ERROR	0.00	26.00	0.22	39.00
	62.00	0.15	47.25	16.00	0.15	18.46	0.00	ERROR	ERROR	0.00	0.00	0.00
FET		0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		ERROR	ERROR	0.00	0.00	0.00
PCL		0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		ERROR	ERROR	0.00	0.00	0.00
PJC		0.00	0.00					ERROR	ERROR	2.00	0.02	0.67
PEF		0.00	1.00	1.00	0.01	1.00		ERROR	ERROR	1.00	0.01	0.33
PIE		0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		ERROR	ERROR	0.00	0.00	0.00
PWL		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		ERROR	ERROR	3.00	0.03	4.50
	2.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.01	0.15	0.00	ERROR	ERROR	3.00	0.03	0.17
GAL	4.00	0.01	0.17	5.00	0.05	0.31		ERROR	ERROR	7.00	0.06	0.25
GCH	3.00	0.01	0.10	4.00	0.04	0.25		ERROR	ERROR	0.00	0.00	0.00
GME	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		ERROR	ERROR	5.00	0.04	0.21
GFC	4.00	0.01	0.17	1.00	0.01	0.08		ERROR	ERROR	2.00	0.02	0.08
GEV	2.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.01	0.06		ERROR	ERROR	6.00	0.05	0.25
GFF	18.00	0.04	0.55	4.00	0.04	0.25		ERROR	ERROR	1.00	0.01	0.04
GEV		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		ERROR	ERROR	0.00	0.00	0.00
GVE		0.00	0.00	1.00	0.01	0.06		ERROR	0.00	24.00	0.20	36.00
	31.00	0.08	23.25	16.00	0.15	18.46	0.00	ERROR	ERROR	6.00	0.07	0.36
RAE	2.00	0.02	0.07	1.00	0.01	0.02		ERROR	ERROR	2.00	0.02	0.05
RAN	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.01	0.02		ERROR	ERROR	6.00	0.05	0.22
RCH	16.00	0.04	0.08	5.00	0.05	0.12		ERROR	ERROR	0.00	0.00	0.00
RCL	5.00	0.00	0.07	0.00	0.00	0.00		ERROR	ERROR	2.00	0.02	0.05
RCC		0.00	0.00	1.00	0.01	0.02		ERROR	ERROR	3.00	0.03	0.14
RFC	3.00	0.01	0.01	6.00	0.06	0.14		ERROR	ERROR	0.00	0.00	0.00
RFF	146.00	0.35	0.72	18.00	0.17	0.43		ERROR	ERROR	0.00	0.00	0.00
RGL	15.00	0.04	0.07	2.00	0.02	0.05		ERROR	ERROR	1.00	0.01	0.05
RVE	13.00	0.03	0.08	8.00	0.08	0.19		ERROR	0.00	22.00	0.19	33.00
	203.00	0.49	152.25	42.00	0.40	45.46	0.00	ERROR		1.00	0.01	
SAC	1.00	0.00		1.00	0.01			ERROR		1.00	0.01	
SAL	34.00	0.08			0.00			ERROR		2.00	0.01	
SAS	1.00	0.00		1.00	0.01			ERROR		0.00	0.00	
NIK		0.00			0.00			ERROR		0.00	0.00	
NVE		0.00			0.00			ERROR		0.00	0.00	
TRA		0.00			0.00			ERROR		41.00	0.25	
UNT	76.00	0.14		16.00	0.13			ERROR	0.00	45.00	0.28	67.50
	112.00	0.21	84.00	18.00	0.15	20.77	0.00			163.00		
TOTAL	525.00			122.00			0.00					

100

94