DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 359 256 TM 020 025

AUTHOR Gall, M. D.; Gall, Joyce P.
TITLE Teacher and Student Roles in Different Types of Classroom Discussions.
PUB DATE Apr 93
NOTE 16p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Atlanta, GA, April 12-16, 1993).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Techniques; Constructivism (Learning); *Cooperative Learning; *Discussion (Teaching Technique); Elementary School Students; Elementary School Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; *Group Discussion; Mastery Learning; Secondary School Students; Secondary School Teachers; *Student Role; *Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS *Learning Through Discussion

ABSTRACT

Different kinds of discussion methods have been developed to help students achieve different kinds of instructional objectives. The following discussion methods are analyzed from the perspective of the role demands that they make of students and teachers: (1) cooperative learning discussions; (2) the subject mastery discussion method; and (3) issues-oriented discussions. Developers of all three methods strongly recommend training students and teachers in their respective roles, and manuals have been prepared to specify role behaviors. In cooperative learning or in subject mastery discussions, the teacher is a resource expert and process observer, rather than a participant, but in issues-oriented discussion, the teacher participates as a moderator. When student discussions do not go well, there may be many explanations, such as role complexity, ambiguity about the nature of knowing, or ambiguity about the curriculum. Analysis of discussion methods indicates that they are most appropriate for helping students construct personal understandings of academic content. Three tables summarize teacher and student role behaviors in the three discussion types. (SLD)

diskname: Articles & Papers II
filename: AERA '93 discussion paper
updated: 4/4/93

Teacher and Student Roles in Different Types of Classroom Discussions

M. D. Gall and Joyce P. Gall
University of Oregon

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, April 1993

Introduction

Many educators (e.g., Wilen, 1990) advocate discussion as a teaching method. Discussion, however, is not a unitary teaching method. Rather, different types of discussion methods have been developed to help students achieve different kinds of instructional objectives. The purpose of this paper is to analyze several of these methods from the perspective of the role demands that they make of students and teachers. By analyzing these role demands, we hope to understand each method better and how they are similar and different from each other. Also, we can understand better how to solve potential problems for teachers and students that arise in using these methods.

In deciding which discussion methods to use in our analysis, we referred to the definition of classroom discussion offered by Gall and Gall (1976). They defined discussion as a method of teaching in which "(1) a group of persons, usually in the roles of moderator-leader and participant, (2) assembles at a designated time and place, (3) to communicate interactively, (4) using speaking, nonverbal, and listening processes, (5) in order to achieve instructional objectives" (pp. 168-169). The most important of these attributes, in our opinion, is interactive communication, particularly communication between students. Some educators use the term, "discussion," to refer to teaching episodes in which the interactive communication is dominated by teacher-student interchanges. We believe, however, that the term, "discussion," should be reserved for interactive communication dominated by student-student interchanges.

We identified three discussion methods for which there are detailed descriptions in the literature and that are generally familiar to educators: cooperative learning discussions (Johnson, Johnson, Holubec, & Roy, 1984), the Learning thru Discussion method (Hill, 1977), and issues-oriented discussions (Gall, Weathersby, Lai, & Elder, 1973). In the next

section of this paper, we briefly describe each method's instructional objectives, context of use, and teacher and student role demands. Then we compare the role demands of each method and explore the types of difficulties that these demands might create for teachers and students. Finally, we suggest implications of the analysis for classroom teaching and research.

Instructional Objectives

Cooperative Learning Discussions. Some educators do not consider the discussion method to be an aspect of cooperative learning, which has been among the most highly promoted teaching methods during the past decade. However, Circles of Learning (Johnson, Johnson, Holubec, & Roy, 1984), one of the classic books about cooperative learning and co-authored by two of its primary developers (the Johnson brothers), makes explicit links between the two methods by such phrases as "the discussion process in cooperative learning groups" and "the discussion among students within cooperative learning situations" (p. 15).

The various forms of cooperative learning are intended to promote several important instructional objectives: academic achievement, positive attitudes toward the subject being studied, continuing motivation to learn more about the subject, improved self-esteem, and collaborative competencies (Johnson et al, 1984). With respect to academic achievement, the emphasis appears to be on knowledge acquisition and understanding, as reflected in these statements from Circles of Learning:

> The discussion process in cooperative learning groups promotes the discovery and development of higher quality cognitive strategies for learning than does the individual reasoning found in competitive and individualistic learning situations. (p. 15)
>
> The discussion among students within cooperative learning situations promotes more frequent oral repetition of information; stating of new information; and explaining, integrating, and providing rationales. Such oral rehearsal of information is necessary for the storage of information into the memory; it promotes long-term retention of the information; and it generally increases achievement. (pp. 15-16).

An emphasis on knowledge acquisition and understanding, particularly of subject content in school texts, is also found in the various cooperative learning activities described by Slavin (1991): student teams-achievement divisions; teams-games-tournament; jigsaw; and team accelerated instruction.

Subject Mastery Discussion Method. The developer of the LTD (Learning thru Discussion) method, Hill (1977), states explicitly that its objective is "subject matter mastery" and "learning of the course material" (p. 21). (Because of its objective, we call it the "subject mastery discussion method" rather than the LTD method.) Students are expected to read an assigned text beforehand and then to have a discussion that covers nine topics:

1. definitions of terms and concepts in the text.
2. the author's overall message.
3. identification of major themes or subtopics.
4. allocation of discussion time for each theme or subtopic.
5. the author's statements about each theme or subtopic.
6. relationship of the text content to ideas and concepts acquired in previous discussions or other learning situations.
7. applications and implications of the text content.
8. criticism of the author's statements.
9. evaluation of the group and individual performance during the discussion.

The first seven topics reflect the instructional objective of subject matter mastery. The eighth topic involves the development of students' critical thinking skills; and the last topic involves the development of group process skills. The emphasis on these two types of skills, however, is minor compared with the emphasis on subject matter mastery.

Issues-oriented Discussions. Public policy issues constitute important content in various academic disciplines (e.g., government, history, economics, sociology) that shape the social studies curriculum. For this reason, social studies educators are among the chief advocates of issues-oriented discussions in classroom instruction. However, if we define an issue as any matter that is in dispute between two or more persons, it is clear that issues can be found in any academic discipline. Thus there is opportunity for issues-oriented discussions in any school subject, if teachers choose to make issues part of their curriculum.

Gall and Gillett (1980) identified the following objectives of issues-oriented discussions:

> The most basic purpose of this type of discussion is to increase students' awareness of their own opinions and the opinions of others. Other purposes are to help students analyze and evaluate opinions, and to modify their own opinions in a way consistent with their analysis and evaluation. Some teachers use the issues-oriented discussion to help their students reach a *consensus* opinion on an issue. (p. 99)

This analysis implies that there is no correct or best opinion to be learned. Instead, the emphasis is on learning how oneself and others feel and think about an issue, and why. In the process of discussion, certain facts may be stated and learned, but such learning is of secondary importance.

Some issues-oriented discussions conceivably would take the form of a debate. In this case, the instructional outcomes might involve learning debating skills. Also, students might learn how others think about an issue, but this would not be an end in itself; the primary purpose would be to use this learning to develop counter-attacks that lead to winning the debate.

Teacher and Student Roles

The developers of the three discussion methods described above strongly recommend training both teachers and students in their respective roles. Various manuals and training programs for this purpose have been developed, among them: for cooperative learning discussions, Circles of Learning (Johnson et al., 1984) and Student Team Learning: A Practical Guide to Cooperative Learning (Slavin, 1991); for subject mastery discussions, Learning thru Discussion: Guide for Leaders and Members of Discussion Groups (Hill, 1977); and for issues-oriented discussions, Discussing Controversial Issues (Gall et al., 1973).

We used these manuals to derive the role behaviors shown in Table 1 (cooperative learning), Table 2 (subject mastery method), and Table 3 (issues-oriented discussions). They are "role" behaviors because they specify how the teacher or individual student is expected to act while the discussion is in progress. Also, the concept of role implies constancy across situations. For example, once students learn their role in a cooperative learning discussion, they are expected to perform that role in each discussion that the teacher asks them to hold.

The manuals for the three discussion methods specify additional role behaviors for teachers and students before and after the discussion. However, the lists of role behaviors shown in Tables 1, 2, and 3 are those that are enacted during the actual discussion.

Inspection of the tables indicates that all three models specify role behaviors for both teacher and students. Also, all the models include role behaviors that focus on the instructional task and other role behaviors that focus on group processes. For example, task behaviors in the cooperative learning discussion method include, "State and restate the purpose of the assignment" and "Summarize out loud what has just been read or discussed as completely as possible without referring to notes or to the original material." Group process role behaviors in this method include, " Encourage everyone to participate" and "Set or call attention to time limits." Similar examples of task and group process role behaviors can be found in Tables 2 and 3 for the other two discussion methods.

Another similarity between the three methods is that they include different discussion stages marked by the occurrence of particular role behaviors. For example, in issues-oriented discussions, "State the issue at the beginning of the discussion" obviously would occur at the start of the discussion; "Ask for temporary agreements to break deadlocks" would occur during the body of the discussion; and "Review the main points of the discussion" would occur at the end of the discussion.

The three discussion methods appear to differ substantially in the role assigned to the teacher. The teacher does not participate in the actual discussion process in cooperative learning discussions or in subject mastery discussions. The teacher's role is primarily that of resource expert and process observer. In issues-oriented discussions, however, the teacher

participates throughout the discussion in a moderator role. According to Gall and colleagues, the teacher as moderator guides the discussion, but does not offer opinions even if asked to do so by a student. However, they also state that, once students have learned this discussion method, the teacher can organize the class into small groups and assign a student moderator for each group. If this happens, the teacher could serve in the same roles as those specified in the other two discussion methods, namely, resource expert and process observer.

Problems with Role Behavior Demands

We have had the opportunity to observe discussions in classrooms at many grade levels, from elementary school through graduate school. They sometimes do not go well, and many students fail to get involved or express dislike for this method of instruction. Why? The following are possible explanations.

Role complexity. For a discussion to go well, students must perform two roles simultaneously--the task role and the group process role. In other words, they must attend to both what is being said and how it is being said and by whom. Teachers, too, will need to perform both roles if they moderate the discussion. If teachers do not serve as the moderator, they still are expected to be process observers and resource experts; and in those roles, they must be sensitive to students' enactment of task and process roles.

Rigorous training is necessary if teachers and students are to perform effectively the complex roles required of them by the three discussion methods described above. Present techniques of staff development, which usually consist of brief lectures and workshops, are likely to be inadequate for training teachers. Also, given the emphasis on subject matter content in most curriculums, it seems unlikely that most teachers would be willing to devote the time required to teach students their complex role behaviors.

Ambiguity about the nature of knowing. Philosophers have long argued about how learners come to acquire knowledge. These philosophical arguments recently have attracted the interest of cognitive psychologists and of curriculum developers, especially in mathematics education. Cobb, Yackel, and Wood (1992), for example, contrast the representational view of learning with the constructivist view. In the representational view, "To know is to represent accurately what is outside the mind" (Rorty, 1979), and the teacher's job is to create expert representations of knowledge, which students then learn. By contrast, in the constructivist view, students develop their own ways of knowing the world, and the teacher's work is to guide students but without interfering with their natural ways of knowing. Cobb, Yackel, and Wood accept the constructivist position, but suggest that teaching involves a process of

negotiation so that students develop ways of knowing that are compatible with socially accepted practice.

To our knowledge, the developers of the discussion methods described above have not articulated a theoretical position about the ways in which students come to learn within a discussion group. Hill's description of subject mastery discussions, however, suggests that he would be oriented to the representational view:.

> ...the expression of personal reactions is postponed until the group has discussed the text. The idea of being acquainted with what authorities in a field actually say is, in itself, a novel development in many discussion circles. For example, most people have very decided opinions on evolution, psychoanalysis, and communism and yet have read little or nothing by Darwin, Freud, or Marx. *LTD* is intended to counteract this condition, but the instructor will find resistance to a method which curbs the members' self-expression. (p. 27)

In effect, Hill is arguing that there is a meaning inherent in the text, and the student's job is to learn it.

By contrast, issues-oriented discussions, as described by Gall and colleagues, would be more closely aligned with the constructivist position. They assume that there are not inherently correct attitudes and opinions, although some can be better defended than others. The primary job of students in discussion is to construct their own attitudes and opinions, using as they wish the facts and opinions offered by other members of the discussion group.

We wonder whether the lack of clarity in theoretical assumptions about knowing that underlie the various discussion methods is confusing to students (and perhaps to teachers as well). Evidence that this may be the case can be found in a recent study of the learning behavior of Navaho children (McCarty, Lynch, Wallace, & Benally, 1991). The researchers found that these children do not respond well to teachers' questions asked within a typical recitation format. They responded much better to questions asked within an inquiry format. The researchers attributed the difference in the students' behavior to the Navajo philosophy about the nature of knowledge:

> Considered a personal possession, knowledge is more prized than material possessions, since it can be endlessly expanded and it neither diminishes, nor can it be taken away. Because of its value, knowledge is meant to be both shared and protected. It cannot be given to another or passively received. To learn something of value requires that individuals actively seek that knowledge. (p.51)

Informal out-of-school learning on Navaho reservations reflects this philosophy of knowledge.

We wonder, then, whether different discussion methods are based on different philosophies of knowledge, and therefore require the teacher and students to play different

roles in each method. Our analysis of the three discussion methods described here suggests that this is the case. If so, the question arises whether some students resist discussion methods because the philosophy of knowledge that underlies them conflicts with their own philosophy. It is possible that the conflict is felt, but cannot be verbalized, because these philosophies tend to be implicit rather than to be made explicit either by the teacher or by the student.

Ambiguity about what constitutes appropriate curriculum. The content of traditional school curriculum is taken from the academic disciplines. For example, scholars of American history attribute importance to the colonial period leading up to the Revolution, and therefore all students are expected to study it, usually by reading a chapter in a school textbook. The discussion method can be used in this context, for example, by incorporating the content into the cooperative learning technique called Jigsaw II (Slavin, 1991).

In Jigsaw II, the instructional material "should usually be a chapter, a story, a biography, or similar narrative or descriptive material" (Slavin, p. 47). The history textbook chapter would qualify. The teacher identifies, let's say, four different topics or themes in the chapter and lists them on an "Expert Sheet." Slavin provides the following example of an Expert Sheet for a textbook unit on Blackfoot Indian tribes:

1. How were Blackfoot men expected to act?
2. What is a group and what does it do? What are the most important groups for the Blackfoot?
3. What did Blackfoot bands and clubs do?
4. What were the Blackfoot customs and traditions? (p. 49)

Students are assigned to teams of four students, with each student assigned to a different theme or focus. All students read the chapter, but focusing on the topic or theme that has been assigned to him or her. Next, all students in the class who were assigned the same topic or theme assemble as "experts" to discuss it for about 20 minutes. Each "expert" discussion group should have a leader, whose job it is "to moderate the discussion, calling on group members who raise their hands and trying to see that everyone participates" (Slavin, p. 53). In discussing the topic, students "should try to locate information on their topics in their texts and share the information with the group. Group members should take notes on all points discussed" (p. 53). The discussion group "experts" then return to their teams and teach what they have learned to their teammates. Afterwards, students take a quiz on the chapter content, and teams that have done particularly well on an absolute basis or relative to past performance are given special recognition.

Research has shown that Jigsaw II and other cooperative learning techniques have positive effects on student learning, but one can question whether it is worth the time and effort.

Students might well be able to learn the same content more efficiently using individual learning techniques. However, one can argue that students also are learning discussion and teamwork skills, and that these skills comprise important content in the school curriculum. Interestingly, we have talked to teachers who say that some parents question the value of students learning such skills. These parents argue that it is more important for their children to learn how to compete as an individual against others for rewards such as good grades.

Another illustration of the problem of what constitutes appropriate curriculum can be found in a research study by Alpert (1991). Alpert found subtle resistance among upper middle-class high school students to the recitation method, which was the prevalent mode of instruction in two of the three classrooms that were studied. As Alpert describes recitation teaching, it "emphasizes standard, proper use of language as it seeks to reinforce acquisition of cultural knowledge" and "turn allocation...is exclusively the teacher's role" (p. 359). Alpert found no student resistance in the third class, where "responsive teaching" predominated. In responsive teaching, "the 'evaluation' component was often eliminated in discourse sequences, teacher and students had equal rights in turn taking, and informal, everyday language use was legitimate" (p. 359). These instructional characteristics typify the discussion method--especially the issues-oriented discussion--as we have observed it in practice.

The appropriateness of the discussion method, then, depends upon whether the primary instructional objective is to teach students curriculum content using "standard, proper use of language." Alpert's research findings also suggest that its appropriateness depends on whether students' personal knowledge is considered appropriate curriculum content. In the two classes where student resistance was observed, the teachers focused on:

> ...descriptive, factual, 'known information' questions dealing with subject-matter concepts related to the literary works taught. Examples of such questions are: 'What's the significance of the dream [in the poem]?" or 'What's being implied [by the author] in that scene? (p. 358)

By contrast, in the class where no student resistance was observed, the teacher:

> ...made room for personal knowledge in classroom discussions. He often asked students questions about their experiences in relation to the literary works they read, for example: 'Why the [literary character] is so angry...think of what kinds of things make you angry, really angry?' He also asked questions that referred to students' involvement with the works, their feelings about the literary work, for example: 'Do you feel sorry for any of the characters?' 'Do you want Eliza to marry Freddy?' 'Did you see his ways as somewhat less worthwhile than hers?' (p. 359)

Alpert's research findings, then, suggest that students' willingness to play a role in classroom discussion depends on what they consider to be appropriate curriculum.

Implications for Practice and Research

Our analysis of the teacher and role demands in three different discussion methods suggests several issues that teachers and other educators will need to address if discussion methods are to be used more frequently and effectively in classroom instruction.

Discussion methods make complex role demands of both teachers and students. Extensive training of both groups appears necessary for them to learn their respective role behaviors. There is considerable overlap between the different methods, at least with respect to group process role behaviors, so if teachers and students are trained in one method, training in other methods is likely to be easier.

Teachers need to make explicit their theory of knowing, and test its compatibility with the discussion method. If their theory leans toward the representational position, they probably will be more comfortable with lecture and direct instruction than with the discussion method, which is more compatible with the constructivist position. Students might profit, too, if teachers encouraged them to consider how they come to know the world and how their view of learning is reflected in the teacher's instructional methods and in their own methods of studying.

Educators need to consider more carefully what constitutes appropriate knowledge when developing curriculum. If the curriculum is drawn from knowledge produced by the academic disciplines, discussion methods may be awkward, unless used in highly structured formats such as Hill's subject mastery method or Slavin's Jigsaw II method.

As for research, more needs to be known about what actually occurs during classroom discussions and its effectiveness. In designing studies, researchers must be careful about how they decide which aspects of discussion to observe and which learning outcomes to measure. For example, different discussion methods involve different role behaviors, so the researcher needs to know which method the teacher is using before deciding which classroom events to observe and record. Also, teachers and students not only enact roles in discussion, but they have perceptions about their roles and their role behavior. More needs to be known about the nature of these perceptions and how they affect the discussion process and outcomes.

In doing research on discussion effectiveness, researchers will need to consider carefully how they measure learning outcomes. Traditional achievement tests are the assessment measures most often used. However, our analysis of discussion methods suggests that they are most appropriate for helping students construct personal understandings of academic

content. Unfortunately, methods for measuring personal understandings are not yet part of the classroom research tradition.

References

Alpert, B. (1991). Students' resistance in the classroom. Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 22, 350-366.

Cobb, P., Yackel, E., & Wood, T. (1992). A constructivist alternative to the representational view of mind in mathematics education. Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 23, 2-33.

Gall, M. D., & Gall, J. P. (1976). The discussion method. In N. L. Gage (Ed.), The psychology of teaching methods (the 75th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gall, M. D., & Gillett, M. (1980). The discussion method in classroom teaching. Theory Into Practice, 19, 98-103.

Gall, M. D., Weathersby, R., Lai, M., & Elder, R. (1973). Discussing controversial issues. San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Hill, W. F. (1977). Learning thru discussion (2nd rev. ed.). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., Holubec, E. J., & Roy, P. (1984). Circles of learning: Cooperation in the classroom. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

McCarty, T. L., Lynch, R. H., Wallace, S., & Benally, A. (1991). Classroom inquiry and Navajo learning styles: A call for reassessment. Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 22, 42-59.

Rorty, R. (1979). Philosophy and the mirror of nature. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Slavin, R. E. (1991). Student team learning: a practical guide to cooperative learning (3rd ed.). Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.

Wilen, W. W. (Ed.) (1990). Teaching and learning through discussion. Springfield, IL: Thomas.

Table 1
Teacher and Student Role Behaviors in Cooperative Learning Discussions

Teacher Role Behaviors during the Discussion

1. Observe group members in order to see what problems they are having in completing the assignment and in working collaboratively.
2. Clarify instructions.
3. Review important procedures and strategies for completing the assignment.
4. Answer questions.
5. Suggest more effective procedures for working together.
6. Do not intervene in the groups any more than is absolutely necessary.

Teacher Role Behaviors at the End of the Discussion

1. Summarize the major points in the lesson.
2. Ask students to recall ideas or give samples.
3. Answer any final questions.
4. Talk about how well the discussion groups functioned, what things were done well, and what things could be improved.

Student Role Behaviors to Establish and Maintain a Functioning Group

1. Move into groups without undue noise and without bothering others.
2. Do not move around the room during group time.
3. Speak quietly.
4. Encourage everyone to participate.
5. Use the student's name when speaking to him or her.
6. Look at the speaker.
7. Do not engage in "put downs."
8. Keep one's hands (and feet) to one's self.

Student Role Behaviors to Get Tasks Completed and Maintain Effective Working Relationships with Each Other

1. State and restate the purpose of the assignment.
2. Set or call attention to time limits.
3. Suggest procedures on how most effectively to complete the assignment.
4. Express support and acceptance through eye contact, enthusiasm, praise, and seeking others' ideas and conclusions.
5. Ask for help or clarification of what is being said or done.
6. Offer to explain or clarify.
7. Energize the group when motivation is low or by suggesting new ideas or by using humor.
8. Describe one's feelings when appropriate.

Student Role Behaviors to Develop Understanding, Mastery, and Retention of the Assigned Material

1. Summarize out loud what has just been read or discussed as completely as

possible without referring to notes or to the original material.
2. Seek accuracy by correcting a member's summary.
3. Seek elaboration by asking other members to relate the material being learned to earlier material and to other things they know.
4. Seek clever ways to remember the important ideas and facts by using drawings, mental pictures, and other memory aids.
5. Demand vocalization to make overt the implicit reasoning process being used by other members and thus open to correction and discussion.
6. Ask other students to plan out loud how they would teach the material to another student.

Student Role Behaviors to Challenge Each Other's Conclusions and Reasoning in order to Stimulate Academic Controversies

1. Criticize ideas, not people.
2. Differentiate where there is disagreement within the learning group.
3. Integrate a number of different ideas into a single position.
4. Ask for justification of why the member's conclusion or answer is the correct or appropriate one.
5. Extend another member's answer or conclusion by adding further information or implications.
6. Probe by asking questions that lead to deeper understanding or analysis.
7. Generate further answers by going beyond the first answer or conclusion and producing a number of plausible answers from which to choose an alternative.
8. Test reality by checking out the group's work with the instructions, available time, and other examples of reality.

Note.--This list was compiled from Johnson et al., 1984.

Table 2
Teacher and Student Role Behaviors in
Hill's Subject Mastery Discussion Method

Teacher Role Behaviors

1. Serve as resource expert when students do not have the background to resolve their confusion, and the text is not of much help.
2. Hold meetings of the entire class once a week and answer questions that have originated in the small group discussions.
3. Make observations of the students' discussion process, note difficulties, feed back his observations to the group, and offer suggesting for overcoming difficulties that the students have encountered.

Student Task Role Behaviors

1. Initiating. Getting the discussion started or resuming it when a lull falls upon it.
2. Giving and asking for information. Stating the text's general message and the ideas contained in the subtopics; or asking someone else to do so.
3. Giving and asking for reactions. Reacting to someone understanding of a point in the text; or asking someone else to do so.
4. Restating. Paraphrasing what a group member has said to provide a test of whether the member accurately communicated what she intended.
5. Giving examples. Stating an example to illuminate for the group the meaning of what is being said in the text.
6. Confronting and reality testing. Suggesting that someone else's statement is not entirely accurate; or checking whether a statement in the text is accurate.
7. Clarifying, synthesizing, and summarizing. Making remarks that clarify the tangles that groups can get into when trying to understand the text; making remarks that synthesize various restatements of the topic by group members; and summarizing what has been said about a topic to provide closure and to help the group to move on to the next item on the agenda.

Student Process Role Behaviors

1. Gatekeeping and expediting. Spreading communication among the group members; and moving the group from one step to the next in discussing various aspects of the text.
2. Timekeeping. Keeping the group within its time budge for each topic to be discussed.
3. Evaluating and diagnosing. Discussing the effectiveness of the group as a whole and individual members of the group.
4. Standard setting. Reviewing the standards of performance that the group has implicitly or explicitly set for itself.

5. Sponsoring and encouraging. Drawing out silent group members; and making encouraging remarks to group members in order to create a warm and accepting climate, which in turn encourages voluntary participation.
6. Group tension relieving. Kidding, telling jokes, making diverting and off-target remarks when the discussion becomes deadly serious or when group members become frustrated with the discussion steps or the text itself.

Nonfunctional Student Role Behaviors

1. Aggressing.
2. Blocking.
3. Self-confessing.
4. Competing.
5. Seeking sympathy.
6. Special interest pleader.
7. Horsing around (playboy).
8. Status seeking.
9. Withdrawing.
10. Dominating.

Note.--This list was compiled from Hill, 1977.

Table 3
Teacher and Student Role Behaviors in Issues-oriented Discussions

Process Goal: Encourage students to feel free to say what they think.

Teacher Role Behaviors

1. Support everyone's right to his or her own opinion.
2. Use supportive silence to promote group interaction.
3. Distribute participation by calling on silent group members.

Student Role Behaviors

1. Talk to each other, not just to the teacher.
2. Don't monopolize.
3. Ask others what they think.
4. Don't engage in personal attack.

Process Goal: Listen to each other and keep the discussion focused.

Teacher Role Behaviors

1. State the issue at the beginning of the discussion.
2. Restate the issue to keep the discussion focused.
3. Summarize students' comments.

Student Role Behaviors

1. Listen to others' ideas.
2. Acknowledge others' ideas.
3. Question irrelevant remarks.

Process Goal: Analyze different points of view.

Teacher Role Behaviors

1. State areas of agreement or disagreement.
2. Ask for temporary agreements to break deadlocks.
3. Ask for clarification.
4. Ask for reasons why someone holds a particular viewpoint.

Student Role Behaviors

1. Ask for clarification.
2. Ask for reasons for others' opinions.
3. Give reasons for your opinions.

Process Goal: Evaluate the discussion.

Teacher Role Behaviors

1. Ask for a brief review.
2. Ask students to explain viewpoints different from their own.
3. Ask students their current opinion and how the discussion affected it.
4. Ask about the next step for the group or individuals.

Student Role Behaviors

1. Review the main points of the discussion.
2. Explain viewpoints different from your own.
3. Tell your current opinion and how the discussion affected it.
4. Suggest the next step for the group or for you personally.

Note.--This list was compiled from Gall et al., 1973.