L2 CLASSROOM TALK AND SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING: A UNIVERSITY STUDY OF CLASSROOM INTERACTION AND ITS EFFECTS ON ORAL PROFICIENCY AND LANGUAGE LEARNING

by

HANH TUYET KING

(Under the Direction of LIOBA MOSHI)

ABSTRACT

Research has shown that classroom interaction enhances the oral proficiency (or communicative competence) of learners of a second or foreign language (also called target language or L2). To be proficient in an L2 means that the learner is able to convey a meaningful message that is understood by the listener/interlocutor. This study reports on the development in oral skills of L2 students at the University of Georgia. Twenty L2 classrooms involving five languages--Mandarin Chinese, French, German, Russian and Swahili--were involved in the study. Of these, ten classrooms were observed and audio/video-taped.

Out of the five languages, French was considered the easier language to learn and speak. The students in French seemed to encounter the least difficulty in attaining the desired level of proficiency. Oral proficiency, in this study, is defined as the ability of the student to communicate in the L2 at his/her level of language learning (i.e. beginner or intermediate). At the beginner-level the learner is able to repeat isolated words and/or learned phrases; to make a two- to three-word sentences. At the intermediate level the learner is able to make simple sentences of learned material; to ask simple questions on

own initiative. This study also affirmed the commonly-accepted assertion that to be a proficient L2 speaker, one needs to speak the L2 often.

INDEX WORDS: Classroom interaction, L2 (Second language, Foreign language, Target language), Oral proficiency, Communicative competence, Language teaching, Language learning, Motivation, Comprehensible input, Output, Input hypothesis, Affective filter.

L2 CLASSROOM TALK AND SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING : A UNIVERSITY STUDY OF CLASSROOM INTERACTION AND ITS EFFECTS ON ORAL PROFICIENCY AND LANGUAGE LEARNING

by

HANH TUYET KING

M.A., Texas Christian University, 1980

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2005

L2 CLASSROOM TALK AND SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING : A UNIVERSITY STUDY OF CLASSROOM INTERACTION AND ITS EFFECTS ON ORAL PROFICIENCY AND LANGUAGE LEARNING

by

HANH TUYET KING

Major Professor: Lioba Moshi

Committee: Marlyse Baptista
Keith Langston

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
December 2005

DEDICATION

To the memory of Dr. William G. Provost

For his encouragement, his uplifting and gentle spirit

To my husband Calvin and our sons Anthony and Calvin Doan,

For their moral support

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to my major professor, Dr. Lioba Moshi, for her constant guidance, advice, and encouragement, and most of all for believing in me. I also want to thank Dr. Marlyse Baptista for her advice and moral support. I would like to thank Dr. Keith Langston for all his help and invaluable input and comments. He was always there and ready to help me when I needed him. I am most greatly indebted to the professors, instructor, teaching assistants and students who participated in my study in the spring and fall semesters of 2004, for without their help and expertise, this project would not have been possible. I thank my sister Jan Collins and her husband Jeff for letting me use the study in their home to work on my thesis proposal. My thanks also go to my husband Calvin for formatting the thesis. Last but not least, thanks to Lynnette for her word of encouragement. She cheered me up and kept me going when I needed it most.

Most of all I thank GOD for giving me this wonderful opportunity of learning and for walking with me through my darkest moments.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The objective of this thesis is to study the development of oral proficiency of students in speaking a second or foreign language. This thesis will have five chapters. Chapter One is the introduction. In Chapter Two, I will review the literature on L2 classroom interaction and its effects on oral proficiency and language learning while Chapter Three provides the methodology that will be adopted in the study. Chapter Four will contain the analysis of the data, and Chapter Five will summarize the findings and offer concluding remarks.

A learner of a second language (L2) often encounters many barriers that will prevent him/her from attaining the best competence and performance possible at his or her level of language learning. One of those barriers is the lack of oral proficiency, the main problem that will be investigated in this thesis. This problem has been studied by a number of researchers in the field of second language acquisition (SLA), yet there is no consensus among them with respect to the root of the problem. Krashen (cited by Gass and Selinker 2001: 201, 202) claims that a learner with a "weak" or "low affective filter" will be a successful L2 learner. The "affective filter" is a metaphor used by Krashen to refer to the process of L2 acquisition. The "affect" refers to such factors as "motivation, attitude, self-confidence, and anxiety." If the "Filter" is low, the input is allowed to go through the "language learning device" (I call it the human brain); thus, there is acquisition. Conversely if the "Filter" is up, the input is prevented from passing through the learning device, and consequently there is no acquisition. The learner with a "low affective filter" will be more open to the input of language learning, will seek more input,

and consequently will obtain more input. On the other hand, one that has a “high affective filter” would fail to reach the desired level of oral proficiency at the completion of a specific L2 learning period. The learner with a high affective filter fails because he/she does not seek more input. Krashen defines input or "*i*" as a learner's current state of L2 knowledge (or oral skills) and "*i* + 1" as the next stage. The concept of the “*i* + 1" or “comprehensible input” (Gass and Selinker, 201) lends to the idea that the learner should be provided with an input that is at the next level (of complexity) beyond the previous (learned) one. As hypothesized by Krashen, there is only acquisition when the learner is exposed to "*i* + 1." This concept is assumed to play a crucial role in the outcome of the language learning process. Nevertheless, the process of learning an L2 can not always benefit the learner if there is no review session. Therefore, at times the *i* from the teacher alone should be sufficient. To proceed in a progressive linear fashion without reviewed session is pedagogically not considered very productive for the learner. I intend to use Krashen's concept of "*i* + 1" and his "*Affective Filter Hypothesis*" as a background information in my study of the development of oral language skills in the L2.

The importance of this research project to the field of SLA is its attempt to deal with the very core of the problem, namely, the reasons (which can be as various as lack of motivation, attitude, age, or aptitude) an L2 learner fails to speak the target language. With my data, I hope to show that a learner can have the very best teacher to provide him or her with a comprehensible oral input but still fail to develop oral skills if he or she is not highly motivated. I would argue that learner motivation is the key to oral proficiency and the impetus for speaking in the classroom. Thus, I concur with Gardner and Lambert (1972: 132) that motivation is a key factor to success in foreign language acquisition. Defined as the learner's inner drive to learn, motivation is outwardly expressed by his/her boldness in speaking the L2 without fear of making mistakes. This strong desire leads to success in oral skills. I will limit the scope of this thesis to the development of oral proficiency and will only use the concept of *motivation* as a background information.

I then argue that a learner of L2 will be successful in speaking the target language (the other variables are understood) if 1) he/she is motivated to learn, 2) he/she is provided with a "simplified" or "comprehensible" input, 3) and he/she is provided with a good opportunity to interact with the instructor and the other students in the L2. It is true that, even though, this is not an original claim, I do, nonetheless, intend to use this conceptual framework as a guide in my study.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The authors reviewed here stressed the importance of an interactive approach between the teacher and the students, in the L2 classroom, to facilitate the development of the oral proficiency of the students. When the input of language teaching is simplified according to this approach, there is an output from the learner that is meaningful and socially acceptable; thus, there is acquisition of oral skills.

Keith Johnson (cited by C. J. Brumfit and K. Johnson 1979:192) in his paper entitled *Communicative approaches and communicative processes* notes the problem that plagues most students of a second or foreign language and states that these students may be“structurally competent, ”but they“ cannot communicate appropriately.” D. Hymes (cited by Brumfit and Johnson 1979:14) defines“communicative competence”as the ability of the learner to include in his/her spoken sentences“rules of appropriateness.” The learner is said to be orally proficient when he/she can relate“appropriateness to context.” Hymes defines "appropriateness" as the ability of the speaker-listener to speak in a socially acceptable (appropriate) manner. A sentence is said to be appropriate when it is used to convey a message. According to Hymes’s definition, a learner has oral competence when he/she is able to give an output that can serve various linguistic functions.

M. Berns (1990 p. v), in the preface of her book *Contexts of Competence* recognizes the role of context in language learning and use, given that the immediate and ultimate goal of second and foreign language teaching and learning is communicative competence. Research by Sandra Savignon (1972 & 1983) on the concept

of“communicative competence”as cited by Berns in her book (p. 88) has made a considerable impact on the teaching of French and other modern languages in the United States and Canada, and more recently on the teaching of English as a second and foreign language. Savignon extends and reinterprets Hymes’s concept of “communicative competence.” Basing her idea on the work by Canale and Swain (1980, refined by Canale in 1983), she proposes four components of communicative competence: “grammatical competence (knowledge of the sentence structure of a language), socio-linguistic competence (ability to use language appropriate to given context), discourse competence (ability to recognize different patterns of discourse), and strategic competence (ability to compensate for imperfect knowledge caused by factors such as ‘fatigue,’ ‘distraction,’ or ‘inattention’ (Berns: 89). These four parts are interwoven into every meaning-related communicative linguistic output, to ensure the validity and appropriateness of the message (output) conveyed by the learner. The success of Savignon’s work depends on her belief that each L2 learner should be able to produce an output in which all four components come into play.

Patsy M. Lightbown and Nina Spada (1999: 42,43) in their book *How Languages Are Learned* mention the viewpoint of the interactionist theorists, who claim that second language acquisition takes place through“conversational interaction.” One such theorist, Larry Andrews (2001: 76, 77), in his book *Linguistics for L2 Teachers,* states the needs of an “interactive classroom.” According to Andrews, the students who are learning English as a second language must have ample opportunity to practice their English during class, and the teacher should orient practice time toward the students and not toward his/her self-display of English proficiency.

Michael Long (cited by Gass and Selinker 2001: 274), another of the interactionists, sees the necessity of modifying the interaction to make the input comprehensible, so as to "promote acquisition.” Long describes modified interaction as including“ elaboration, slower speech rate, gesture, or the provision of additional

contextual cues." There is a mutual conversational modification between the native speaker and the learner-listener. The L2 classroom teacher and even the more advanced L2 learner are considered by Long to play the same role as the native speaker. A modified input or output includes such linguistic items as"comprehension checks," "clarification requests," "self-repetition" or " paraphrase." All these conversation strategies help the learner's comprehension, which in turn gives him/her confidence in his/her oral production.

Gisela Häkansson (cited by Gabriele Kasper 1986: 83), in her paper *Quantitative Aspects of Teacher Talk,* further emphasizes the importance of the effect of the language input in language acquisition. The input has to be simplified in order for the learner to comprehend and to facilitate his/her "communicative competence in the target language."

In addition to the obligation of the L2 classroom teacher to modify the interaction in order to promote comprehensible input, the role of the learner is also important. The idea of a successful, or"good"language learner is postulated by Robert J. Di Pietro (1987: 13) in his book "*Strategic Interaction - Learning languages through scenarios*." Di Pietro quotes in his work some scholars' attempts to posit a number of traits of a good language learner. Among these are two traits that are seen as most characteristic: one is to be ready to face risk without reluctance or fear of losing, and the other is the ability to restate what is not clearly understood. It is true that in an interaction setting there are other linguistic and social variables that can hinder the oral performance and production of the language learner, but, if he/she possesses these two mental traits, he/she will eventually overcome the fear of communicative failure.

J. Holmes (cited by Jack C. Richards 1978: 134), in his paper entitled Sociolinguistic Competence in the Classroom, states that the task facing any language learner is to acquire socio-linguistic competence, one which requires the learner" to use language appropriately for a variety of functions in a wide range of different situations." Bruce Fraser, Ellen Rintell and Joel Walters (cited by Larsen-Freeman 1980: 77) co-

author a paper entitled *An Approach to Conducting Research on the Acquisition of Pragmatic Competence in a Second Language* in which they define pragmatic competence as the ability of the L2 learner to use a number of strategies in producing a speech act that is appropriate to a certain social context. A speech act is defined as the way of the learner to use the target language to make a request, to voice a complaint, to assert authority, to issue a declaration, to make a promise, to address an apology, and the like.

Karen Johnson (1995: 160) in her book *Understanding Communication in Second Language Classrooms* emphasizes the importance of classroom communicative competence in second language acquisition. The teacher needs to identify her students' linguistic ability and provide an 'acceptably-adjusted' socio-cultural context in the classroom to create opportunities for maximizing the learner's oral performance. Johnson affirms the importance of a good teaching plan that allows every student a chance to talk. The learner will not be willing to talk, to interact with the teacher and with other learner(s), if he/she is not given the optimum opportunity to speak in the most communicatively-conducive classroom.

What do these scholars have in common? They all seem to define a proficient or orally competent L2 learner as one who speaks the target language in a grammatically and socially acceptable manner. I argue against this, for it is difficult to measure the social appropriateness of an L2 output at the 1001 level especially during the early stages of language teaching and learning. Would a learner be considered any less proficient if he/she left out polite forms such as "please," "May I?", "Would you mind?" I argue not. To measure oral proficiency or oral competence of a learner by the above criteria will result in distorted results. Communication or spoken language is a spontaneous speech act in the native language as well as in the target language. At the 1001 and 2001 levels, the L2 learner should not be expected to utter at any time a sentence that fits all the four components of communicative competence as set by Savignon: grammatical, socio-

linguistic, discourse and strategic. The learners (especially during the early stages of language acquisition) will not always be conscious of grammatical mistakes and they are even less conscious of cultural mistakes.

I argue that the learner's oral skills will be greatly improved if he/she is encouraged to express himself/herself in an interruption-free interactive classroom. By "interruption-free," I mean an environment with minimal correction by the teacher, either in pronunciation, morpho-syntax, or cultural appropriateness. So, should there be no interruptions/corrections? Teachers' corrections should be justified and kept to a minimum, and preferably used as the last resort, after the learner has failed at least twice to produce the correct sentence. After the first failed attempt, the teacher should help the learner restate his or her output without giving him/her the correct answer. I have noted from my lifelong L2 learning and teaching experience that teachers of L2 are understanding, and they are willing to work in creative ways with the learners to help them improve their oral skills. However, it has been widely noted by scholars that most learners, even when provided with a comprehensible input and given optimum thinking and speaking time, will fail in producing a simple, meaningful sentence.

I will also hope to find examples of student(s)' output in the L2 to illustrate the metaphor "classroom pidgin" made by Hector Hammerly in his book *Fluency and Accuracy - Toward Balance in Language Teaching and Learning* (Hammerly 1991: 132) – to see whether Hammerly's concern is representative of the problem of language teaching and learning in the L2 classroom at the university level. Hammerly's metaphor "classroom pidgin" can be found repeated nine different times throughout his book. In one instance, Hammerly claims that nearly all methods in SL learning/(teaching) ignore the immediate need of learning the sounds of the new language. On the contrary, "many methods put much emphasis on the vocabulary sub-component from the start." Students' vocabulary, according to Hammerly, will grow far ahead of their control of structure. The students will soon develop a classroom pidgin, because they opt for the use of vocabulary

at the expense of accuracy. It is proven by researchers and scholars that students of L2 will at times mix L1 and L2, and will use uninflected word forms. This linguistic mixture may last a short period or it may last for an extended period. However, teachers should not be alarmed, but should use this linguistic"phenomenon" as a teaching resource. Students should be taught how to avoid making the same mistakes by doing guided oral drills to acquire the acceptable patterns.

Pidgin is defined as a mixed language, a language that is not considered as a standard language, a jargon-type language that is not well thought of by the academic community and the educated speaker. Pidgin is a contact language, a trade language that grows out of a need to communicate between speakers of non-mutually intelligible languages. Communication in the target language, within the classroom-setting, albeit at times full of mistakes, should not be seen as a permanent hindrance to oral proficiency. Caution should be taken, however by the L2 teacher and learners not to fall into the unwanted learned behavior of "classroom pidgin."

It is true that Hammerly's claim is not without merit—it is crucial to speak an L2 grammatically and appropriately. A target language taught in a classroom environment should not be seen as a "classroom pidgin" if the students occasionally make a few grammatical mistakes. The student will, in most cases, learn what the instructor teaches him/her. This is especially true during the early stages of language learning. No instructor will teach his/her students to speak the L2 ungrammatically. Hammerly [out of a deep concern in the area of "L2 language teaching and learning"] points out the danger and the resulting lasting damage when a learner is allowed and encouraged to speak the language before learning its structure (resulting in incorrect sentence structure). I hope to show that Hammerly way of thinking is conservative and that his strong and overt focus on grammar illustrated by" structure first and speaking last" would be a claim against the more modern and current trend of a communicative method of teaching and learning an L2. I propose the concept of "the sooner the speech act, the better the oral proficiency."

The sooner the learner speaks the second or foreign language, the more likely that he/she will be motivated to learn and to use the grammatical structures that fit specific learned speech acts, which in turn will lead to more creative oral production.

I will also consider, in this multilingual research project, the effects of teaching and learning strategies to the acquisition of oral proficiency. The L2 teacher and students should equally cooperate in classroom interaction if the ultimate goal of both parties is that of the oral skills proficiency of students. Communication in any language, whether first or second (this latter also includes all subsequent learned languages) is a two-way socially-communicative speech act.

CHAPTER 3

METHOD AND PROCEDURE

3. 1. Method

This research project on classroom talk in a second language classroom and its effect on L2 oral proficiency and learning is a qualitative one that was conducted at the University of Georgia in the spring and fall semesters of 2004. Oral proficiency is defined here as the ability of a student to produce, at a first attempt, a meaningful output in the target language at his or her level and to be able to sustain communication in the direction desired by the instructor and student. (The term "meaningful" should be understood as an utterance carrying and conveying a message to the interlocutor, who is understood as being either the instructor or the other student(s)). Students who are motivated to learn and who are at the same time being provided with a good opportunity for interaction will be successful in their language learning. One needs also to consider the amount of classroom time available for practice as a contributing factor to the learner's success in L2 oral skills. Three linguistic aspects of the L2 output of the student are included in this study. They are 1) grammatical accuracy (are the sentences structurally acceptable?) – 2) the quality of the sounds produced (do the sounds from the native language interfere with the rendering of the output in the target language?) -- and 3) the ability to access lexical items from memory or by comprehension. The gestures and metalinguistic elements were also a part of the project. Any attempt of a student to initiate a speaking-turn that ends in a meaningful speech act should be counted as a sign of oral proficiency, the rationale behind this argument being based on Di Pietro's

assumption (1987) that a learner will be successful in speaking an L2 if he/she is "ready to face risks without reluctance or fear of losing."

The project was comprised of two separate but closely related phases. The first phase was observation in ten designated L2 classrooms in the spring of 2004. Five classes were at the 1002 level and five at the 2002 level. The researcher was present in the classrooms for the entire class period to observe how students interacted in the target language with the instructor and with other students. The target languages included Mandarin Chinese, French, German, Russian and Swahili.

The second phase involved audio- and videotaping of classroom activities in the fall of 2004. There were two recordings in this phase of the project: the first was done at the beginning of the 2004 fall semester, and the last at the end of the same semester. Again, there were ten L2 classes involved in the project: five classes at the1001 level, and five classes at the 2001 level.

Participants

All the participants were students at their first- and second-year level of L2 and their instructors. The project included males and females age 18 or older. The students in the five 1002- level classes met four days a week for a total of three hours and twenty minutes of language contact per week for fifteen weeks, a total of fifty hours of classroom teaching and learning. The students in the five 2002- level classes met three times a week for a total of two hours and thirty minutes per week for a period of fifteen weeks. This level provided the researcher with a total of thirty-seven hours and thirty minutes of language teaching and learning. The students exhibited various language backgrounds (cf. Appendix B, p. 64), while the instructors were either native or near-native speakers of the target language.

3. 2. Procedure

Because there exist great phonological and morphological differences among the various languages, it is important to give a brief description of each target language under

study. On the linguistic level of inflectional morphology and word order, Russian is classified as a “highly inflected language” with a SVO (subject, verb, object) word order. English is described as an "inflected language" with a strict word order. French is also considered as an “inflected language,” but, unlike English, it has some variation in its word order. German is classified as a "verb-second language" where conjugated finite verb forms occupy the second position in a sentence. It is also inflected. Swahili is a "prefix and a noun classes language" (Moshi 1998: 252). It is also inflected. Swahili uses various prefixes for various grammatical purposes, yet the basic word order still remains an SVO order. One other identifying characteristic of Swahili is the presence of the eighteen noun classes. These classes represent names of various things that include anything from “plant life” and “physical features” to "body parts." Mandarin Chinese is a "non-inflected language." It is basically an SVO language with some variation in its word order. Given the fact that each L2 under research is very different from the other in both underlying and surface forms and that each L2 is also very different from the English language, these differences are taken into account when I analyze the data. Any small deviation from the syntax of the target language should not be considered a deficit in oral proficiency.

The second phase of the study, in the fall semester of 2004, which involved audio- and videorecordings of five elementary and five intermediate L2 classes offered the researcher twenty hours of data that were later transcribed and evaluated for oral skills. All the data were transcribed in the individual L2 (or target language). In this study, the transcribed version of each target language was followed by an in-depth analysis of data, that was the most critical, in determining the causes of lack of oral language skills .

The researcher was present in every session to observe and to take notes on how students interacted (communicated) orally in the target language with the instructor and with the other students. On the day of the recording, the students were not required to do

anything different. The individual instructor was asked to carry out the classroom activities according to his/her usual planning.

A detailed report of the recorded data was then written, along with recommendations for possible new research projects under the same topic of oral proficiency (better known in the second language literature as“communicative competence”).

The students were also given an eleven-item questionnaire (cf. Appendix A) to fill out prior to the first recording. This questionnaire was instrumental in my understanding of the findings of the research in L2 classroom interaction and its effect on oral proficiency. It also helped in the interpretation of the findings to identify the causes of oral proficiency deficiencies in students of L2. Nevertheless, the overall focus of this study was to report on the development of oral skills of the students of L2 at the University of Georgia.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The collection of the first set of data was done from classroom observation in the spring semester of 2004 at the University of Georgia. In the first session, in February, students of five L2[1] classes--Swahili, French, Chinese, German and Russian at the elementary level participated in an oral proficiency study. During the second session of the observation of the same elementary level, in April, students of another five L2, but at the intermediate level (second semester), also participated in the study. The first observation of the intermediate level also took place in February, followed by a second observation in April.

In the second set of L2 data collected in the fall semester of 2004 using audio- and video-recording of classroom interaction, there were five L2 classes at the beginner, or first semester, level (Swahili 1010, French 1001, Chinese 1001, German 1001 and Russian 1001). This data was gathered in two sessions: in September of 2004, and in November of 2004. Similarly, five L2 classes at the intermediate, or third semester, level (Swahili 2010, French 2001, Chinese 2001, German 2001 and Russian 2001) were also audio- and video-recorded for the first session on various days in August and September of 2004 with the second session audio- and video-recorded in November of 2004.

Thus, this discussion will focus on the data collected from the sessions involving students at the elementary and intermediate levels.

---

[1]L2, throughout the thesis, refers to second language/foreign language/target language.

Stage 1: Novice – Elementary classes

1. I. Analysis based on observation

A number of similarities across languages were evident at the beginner-level that can be classified as structural. All the instructors emphasized the teaching of L2 pronunciation, grammar, and oral drills to practice and reinforce the new grammatical structures learned. All the L2 students of the individual L2 classes repeated verbatim or almost verbatim what the individual instructor modeled. When called on to give an answer to a question, the majority of the students tended to take a long time to think, and when they responded, the answer was often truncated and incorrect. There were also occasional hesitations, where they repeated the same words a couple of times as they searched for the correct answer. It was obvious that these L2 learners at the beginner-level were experiencing difficulty in communicating their original ideas. Their input required more linguistic knowledge provided by the instructor. Consequently, their output of mainly "isolated words" or strings of phrases was limited and often incohesive. Thus, the majority of the L2 students at the beginner-level could be classified as *Novice-Mid* to *Novice-High* levels as described by *The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages*[2], which states:

(i) Oral production (of speakers at the novice-mid level) continues to consist of isolated words and learned phrases … Utterances rarely consist of more than two or three words and show frequent long pauses and repetition of interlocutor's words.

(ii) Speakers at the Novice-High level can ask questions or make statements involving learned material. … Show signs of spontaneity … Speech

---

[2]Heidi Byrnes and Michael Canale. 1987. *Defining and Developing Proficiency: Guidelines, Implementations, and Concepts.* National Textbook Company. Chicago, Illinois.

continues to consist of learned utterances … Vocabulary centers on areas such as basic objects, places, … Pronunciation may still be strongly influenced by first language. Errors are frequent. … (Heidi Byrnes and Michael Canale 1987: 16)

-- *Observation of Elementary French*

The elementary French class (February 16, 2004) had 19 students present, among whom 7 were male and 12 were female. At the start of the session the instructor warmed up the class by a discussion on their *Saint-Valentin* ("Valentine's Day") weekend. To her question, *Vous voulez réussir, qu'est-ce qui vous préoccupe (inquiète*)? ("You want to succeed, what preoccupies (worries) you?"), one female student answered: *Je m'inquiète mon travail. Oui, j'ai besoin de l'argent, l'argent et l'école.* ("I worry about my work. Yes, I need money, money and school.") One male student also answered, but with some help from the instructor: *Mon travail m'inquiète. En général, mon travail et la famille m'inquiètent.* ("My work worries me. In general, my work and the family worry me.")

The conversational exchange continued and the instructor addressed the following question to her class: *Quand vous pensez à votre avenir, qu'est-ce que vous espérez? (*"When you think about your future, what do you hope for?") I was able to write down the answers from three students. The first answer was given by a female student: *Que je vais avoir une famille heureuse. J'ai espéré que je *vas*,* (I noticed here that she self-corrected her mistake at once) *que je vais être heureuse.* ("That I will have a happy family. I hoped that I will be happy.") Another female student answered in complete sentences, with some minor mistake that did not affect intelligibility by the other students or the intended meaning: *J'espère *trop de l'argent. J'espère être heureuse et riche.* ("I hope too much money. I hope to be happy and rich.") One male student shared his thought in complete and correct sentences: *Je ne pense pas à ce sujet. Je ne pense pas à l'avenir, pas beaucoup, pas trop.* ("I don't think about that subject. I don't think about the future, not a lot, not too much.")

This learner displayed a good range of vocabulary selection. He knew how to expand and combine the lexical items previously learned to communicate his idea, even though he did not directly answer the instructor's question. Based on the *ACTFL* proficiency guidelines, this student's oral competence could be classified as *Novice-High*. His L2 output could be described as "shows signs of spontaneity" (Byrnes and Canale 1987: 16) because he expressed his personal meaning with ease and he did not need much time to search for the correct words.

In all classes observed there were similarities in the techniques of L2 teaching at the beginner-level, especially in the emphasis on the relationship between spelling a word and pronouncing it.

1. II. Analysis based on audio- and videorecording

1.II. A. Elementary Swahili

In the Swahili class the instructor taught the students how to pronounce Swahili sounds by encouraging them to make correct sentences using the grammatical pattern that they have learned, for example, to illustrate the impact of Swahili tenses on the spelling of the verb used. It appeared to be a difficult task for the learner to remember the correct prefix and/or the correct ending vowel. In the first session the instructor explained the negative of *hu* and *na* tenses. The simple present (or so-called habitual tense) in Swahili is formed with *hu*. *Mimi hucheza*. ("I play.") The negative of it is *Mimi sichezi*. ("I don't play"). While the prefix for the simple present is the same for both singular and plural, the prefix changes in the simple present negative for singular and plural. For example, we have in the singular *wewe huchezi* ("you don't play"), but in the plural, *nyinyi hamchezi* ("you don't play"). After having explained the need of the subject prefix for the plural and the need to change the ending of any verb that ends with "a" to "i," the instructor called on students to make sentences. (I) (Instructor) "Who can try?" One male student volunteered. (M) (male student) **Wananyanua*. The instructor repeated slowly what the student said *wa-na-nya-nyua- nya-nyua* (I) "huh?" (M)

"Supposed to spell" *n-u-n-u-a* … (I) *wa-na-nya-nya-nyua* "ah-hah … How you spell it?" (M) "Alright and the negative is" *hawa* (pause) *nyanui*? (The student's voice was raised, indicating uncertainty.) (I) Articulated the sentence slowly *ha-wa-nya-nyu-i "* meaning what? What's the meaning of this sentence?" (M) ("They don't buy.") (I) "Oooooh this not the word." (M) Spelled *n-u-n-u-a* (I) "That's not *nya*, that's why. Let me write it down *hawa* … Who can read this sentence for us?" (M) *Wana-*nanua*. (I) *Wananunua.* ("They buy.") "Then the negative comes" (the instructor articulated slowly*) ha-wa-nu-nu-i*. ("They don't buy.").

The above excerpt highlighted two linguistic aspects of the Swahili language--structure and articulation--that are difficult for the students. Since the teacher's goal was to achieve both at one stage, students were performing two tasks: dealing with pronunciation, which is "repetition" (per teacher's help), and mastering the grammar, which needs understanding/competence. The intended performance depended on both, but the example showed that the student experienced some difficulty with the simple present negative, and he was given the opportunity and the time to correct his own mistake. [Due to a larger class, thinking time of student--when called upon--was kept to a minimum, though this has not been the intent of the instructor].

1. II. B. Elementary French

In French 1001 class the instructor also emphasized the teaching of pronunciation and introduced elementary French through the teaching of French sounds, grammar and oral drills of currently learned material. The first class was audio- and video-recorded on September 14, 2004, with 20 students present, among whom 7 were male and 13 were female. The class was rather large, but there seemed to be a rapport between the instructor and the students. The instructor spoke with a soft voice, he articulated every word very clearly, he used a lot of repetitions, and he had a gentle sense of humor that reduced intimidation and helped the students to feel at ease. As a result, they were enthusiastic and volunteered to speak more using the target language. This class had the

most interaction compared to the others observed. Noticeably, the students repeated after the teacher (oral repetitions of vocabulary terms relating to the discourse topic to facilitate the students' retention of learned material), answered the instructor's question(s), or volunteered answers. [Choral repetitions, in an L2 class, can be seen as a form of interaction because of teacher/students involment resulting in learned behavior: retention of L2 material].

The following dialogue illustrated the interaction between the instructor and students on the French partitive *du, de la, des, de l'* ("some"), a new grammatical item. First, the instructor modeled some words that require the use of the partitive (the words came from a menu that the students had prepared that resembles a menu found in a French restaurant). The students repeated *de l'agneau*, ("some lamb"), *de l'alcool*, ("some wine"), *de l'argent*, ("some money"), *de l'huile*, ("some oil"). Then the interaction continued with the instructor providing input in the students' L1 (English) while the student output remained in French. *Comment est-ce que vous diriez? ("*How would you say*?") "* Pierre wants some vegetables. Pierre wants some vegetables." (M) *Pierre a envie des légumes*.

The instructor first praised the student by saying *très bien* ("very good"), thus indicating that he approved of the sentence, that it is a grammatically correct sentence. He gave immediate feedback to the student as to how well he performed in that particular context. Next the instructor repeated the sentence *Pierre a envie des légumes* (and thus helped reinforce the listening skills of the students). Again he praised the student by saying *très bien*, uh-huh, *bien*. The teaching of *avoir envie de* continued, and this time the instructor gave an input that was more challenging. "Comment est-ce que vous *diriez* uh-mmmmmm (very long pause) Pierre wants uh-mmmmm a fried egg?" One male student in the class repeated the sentence as a comprehension-check "Pierre wants a fried egg." A few other students attempted to translate the sentence into French, an attempt which they all failed.

The instructor helped the class by writing the following translated version on the board--*Pierre désire un oeuf*--to which one male student completed with *sur le plat*. (which literally means "on the plate"). The instructor repeated *un oeuf sur le plat*, *un oeuf sur le plat*, *sur le plat*. Then he pointed out to the students that structural problem will occur when they use *avoir envie de* instead of *désire*. "*Mais si vous avez …* : *Pierre a envie*. *On a un oeuf sur* le plat. *Ça, c'est problématique. Qu'est-ce qu'on fait?* "But if you have … : Pierre wants. There is one fried egg. That is problematic. What does one do?" One male student answered *de* ("of"). The instructor continued talking "he wants, he wants and this *a envie de* always stays the same *avoir envie de.* One male student provided the correct answer to which the instructor showed his approval by saying *Voilà, voilà*. ("That's it, that's it.") …

Seeing that the class had finally grasped the grammatical concept of the partitive use in the verbal expression *avoir envie de*, the instructor proceeded with his teaching. He wrote something on the board, then said *Pierre a envie d'un oeuf sur le plat*. *Pierre désire un oeuf sur le plat*. *Ah, il a envie de l'oeuf sur le plat*. *Pierre a envie, Pierre a envie des oeufs. Pierre a envie d'un oeuf. Pierre a envie d'un oeuf.* At this time the students were asked to repeat after the instructor. By listening and hearing over and over of the same sentence structure, the students seemed to improve their pronunciation while learning the correct grammatical patterns such as: (S) (Students) *Pierre a envie d'un oeuf*. (I) *Pierre a envie* (S) *Pierre a envie* (I) *des oeufs*. (S) *des oeufs*. (I) *Voilà*. *Parce que là on a le pluriel, on ne prononce pas le -s.* ("Because we have the plural there, we do not pronounce the –s*") On ne prononce pas le -s.* (M) "If you say he wants the egg you need the *du* right?" (I) "If he wants the egg, just one, Pierre wants the egg *Pierre désire l'oeuf*." (M) "So you don't use *du.*"(I) "No, because it supposed to be "the egg."" (I) "Pierre wants an egg. *Il désire un oeuf. Il a envie d'un oeuf. Il a envie des oeufs* some eggs" … Voilà, très, très bien.

From viewing this excerpt, it is clear that the class was highly motivated with the instructor encouraging active participation from the students. The grammatical concept of the "French partitive," though difficult for the L2 students to grasp, appeared manageable to the students, because they were provided with good input from the instructor. Thus, they succeeded in learning the concept of *avoir envie de* and they began to apply to an actual real-life situation *Pierre a envie d'un oeuf.* "Pierre wants an egg."

The activities of the Swahili 1010 and French 1001classes that included pronunciation, drills on grammatical patterns and oral proficiency were evident in another class, Chinese 1001.

1.II. C. Elementary Chinese

> Here, the students learned how to recognize and to pronounce individual characters by using flashcards and practicing specific grammatical patterns. Students also practiced tones through individual tasks required by their instructor. These included making sentences or answering question(s.) The following examples are extracts from the class where two (Mandarin) Chinese characters were taught. One of the characters is a picture-representation of a country whose equivalent meaning in English is 'China.' This is the Chinese character *Zhongguo.* The other character was a picture of an older man intended to signify 'teacher.' The class had 10 students in attendance, among whom 4 were male and 6 were female.

As the instructor showed each character at a time on various index cards, she also pronounced each character and required the students to repeat after her over and over until everyone mastered the pronunciation and the associated tone of the character. In the following activity, the instructor showed the class how to use the character in a context. Holding one card up, she asked, "This one *shenme*?" (" What is this one?") to which the students replied *Zhongguo*. The instructor repeated *Zhongguo* to reinforce the pronunciation and tone and then continued to describe what the character represented.

"Remember, this one is just like the walls around the country. Sometimes the wall circles … Actually the one in the middle means jade, like a kind of jewelry jade … but I'm not sure how they come up with jade. They don't have jade, but anyway you can imagine." Another character that the class learned was *laoshi.* The instructor presented this character by helping her class learn Chinese culture. (I) *lao* "what that means anyone knows?" The students together answered "old" (I) *laoshi* means "old tutor," *shi* means "tutor." "In ancient China the image of a teacher is normally, the teacher is normally, a home school teacher. They don't open school. In ancient China the image is, to me, the teacher is an older man … so that's where "old tutor" comes, that's the reason." Since tones in Chinese facilitate the meaning of each character, the instructor emphasized their importance. In Mandarin Chinese, each character may have four different meanings, depending on which tone it carries. For example, the character represented by the "Yale romanization *ai"* means: *ai*-1(first tone) ("Alas! That's too bad"); *ai*-2 (second tone) ("be stupid, be idiotic"); *ai*-3 (third tone) ("be short" (not tall)); *ai*-4 (fourth tone) ("to love.") To teach the students how to change tones within a sentence, the instructor held up another character and said *zhege ne*? ("how about this one?"). The students together said *bu* ("not; negative"). The instructor repeated *bu* clearly with the correct tone, which is the fourth tone. *Bu* was then repeated once by the students and again the instructor repeated *bu.* She then asked the class: "What is *bu*?" to which they answered "no." The instructor then repeated "no." The interaction continued:

I: What is the opposite?

S: Yes.

I: *Shi* ("Yes").

I: *Ni shi xuesheng ma*? ("Are you a student?") *Shi, wo shi xuesheng*. ("Yes, I am a student.") *Bu* How do you say I'm not.

S: *bu shi*

I: *Wo bu shi xuesheng*. "Be careful when you use this in a sentence, you change the tone. That's what happened. You change the tone from the fourth tone to the second tone. *Wo bu shi xuesheng*. You never say *Wo bu shi xuesheng*. … That's very rare. Only foreigners … [And the rest of what the instructor said was unclear]

F [female student]: So when you have two syllables one after the other and they have the same tone you change the first tone?

I: It's not necessary, only for this one. You cannot. A lot in most cases we don't change tone … It's not the rule only for this one. *Wo shi xuesheng. Ni bu shi xuesheng*. … *Bu Wo bu shi xuesheng*. So that's the change. *Wo bu* [emphasis on second tone] *shi xuesheng*.

Another part of the transcription showed the instructor assisting two students to produce the correct sounds. (M) ["male student"] Wo **she* (like the English long 'e*') zhongguo xue*sheng* [The student pronounced the wrong "e" sound instead of the correct "schwa" sound.] *bu *she meiguo xue*sheng*. ("I am a Chinese student not an American student.") (I) "*hen hao, bu shi* make sure *shi* (M) *shi* (I) *shi meiguo xuesheng, xuesheng* (M) xu*e**sheng*." … (F) "*Wo *she Li lao*she bu *she Wang lao*she*. ("I am teacher Li and not teacher Wang") (I) *Hen hao.* The instructor modeled the correct pronunciation. *Wo shi Li Lao shi bu shi Wang Lao shi*. *shi* (F) *shi* (I) Yeah *shi, hen hao*."

The instructor of Chinese 1001 class provided her students with careful practice on tones to enhance their communicative skills and to avoid the possibility of conveying the wrong message (which at times can be very embarrassing). This demonstrates the importance of speaking the target language with accuracy, a concept promoted by Hammerly. Here, the significance and uniqueness of Chinese characters with its various tones and meanings are comparable to the significance of the Swahili prefixes and their role in a Swahili sentence structure and the need to acquire the correct form and

pronunciation in order to preserve context-based meanings. The comparison can also be extended to the use of the French partitive and the associated grammatical patterns.

I. II. D. Elementary German

The students in the German 1001 class were motivated to listen to the instructor teaching them pronunciation. The instructor of elementary German also used the same teaching techniques as those noted in Swahili 1010, French 1001 and Chinese 1001. The teaching of grammatical patterns and oral drills of isolated words and/or complete sentences was emphasized. The first session of the German 1001 class was video- and audio-recorded on September 22, 2004. There were 9 students in attendance, among whom 4 were male students and 5 were female. The instructor of German 1001 explained each element of grammar in detail, and consistently asked questions to get the students to participate. Structures such as "the plural of nouns," "verbs with vowel-stem changes," *gern* ("gladly"; *gern* (+ verb) "to like to do something") *nicht gern* ("not like"), "weak masculine nouns" were taught, discussed, and used in sentence building. The following excerpt will illustrate how the class learned to use *gern* and *nicht gern* through a highly interactive teaching and learning activity.

(I) ("Instructor") *Was bedeutet gern*? ("What does *gern* mean?") (F) ["female student"] "like" (I) "Yes, to like something." "Let's go with eating. I like to eat." *So wie sagt man?* ("How does one say that?") (F) *Essen macht mir Spaß*. ("Eating is fun.") (I) *Gut. Essen macht mir Spaß. So wie sagt man?* "I eat." (F) *Ich esse.* (I) *Sehr gut.* "All right." "Now comes this word *gern* which is that we like to do, say an activity. All we do is just add it right after the verb. *Ich esse gern.* You can put anything you want beside it. … that we like to eat. *Ich esse gern Bratwurst*. *Ich esse gern Sauerkraut*. *Ich esse gern Hamburger*." (I) "OK. *Wie sagt man* "I read books."" (S) *Ich lese Bücher.* (I) *Ich lese Bücher. Bücher macht mir lesen Spa*ß "Of course we don't want to do that". … "I like to

read books." (S) *Ich lese gern Bücher*. (I) "Just keep the *gern* together with the verb. Anybody recalls this word here *nicht. Was is nicht*?" (F) "not" (I) "Yes, it means "not." It's some kind of a negating word. It brings us to *nicht gern*. That's all you have to do. So if I like to read books *Ich lese gern Bücher*. What's your best guess to "I don't like to read books."" (S) *Ich lese nicht gern Bücher*. (I) "*Ich lese (*pause*) nicht gern Bücher*. Yes*, ich lese (*pause) *nicht gern*. (I) *Ich lese nicht gern Bücher*. (I) *Ich spiele gern Computerspiele*. ("I like to play computer games.") But as long as you keep *nicht* with *gern* you'll be fine." So *Ich esse gern. Ich esse nicht gern. Ich spiele nicht gern Computerspiele. Ja, alles klar? Sehr gut.*

We see from this excerpt that the instructor of German 1001 used a comprehensive teaching approach to present various words and their functions within a given sentence and that the teaching covered material that ranged from easy to difficult and from simple to complex. This interactive query-type strategy required extra attention from students in order to stay on task and to be able to respond promptly when called upon. In this class there was one student that did nothing but just that. She was very attentive and she gave answers to the majority of the questions. Overall the whole class performed well for their level in utilizing the L2 at the level of *Novice-Low* to *Novice-Mid* level of the ACTFL oral proficiency guidelines, even though this audio- and video-recording was done at the beginning of the first session and after a little over four weeks of L2 language learning.

The subsequent session, with the same class, November 18, 2004, was also audio- and videotaped. On that day the class worked on the past tense, and the goal at the end of the session was for the students to be able to talk about their past, what they had done in their childhood. To apply the rule learned, the instructor gave an exercise to the class to do after he explained everything in detail. The students were then given 2 minutes to interact with one another and discuss their past (childhood) and what they liked / did not

like to do or what they had to do or did/not do. Later each one was called on to share his or her past likes and dislikes with the whole class. Some examples of the students' performance: (I) "Now that (name of student) told a story." (Laughter) (I) "Let's wrap this one up. Let's hear about your childhood." Instructor addressed a male student to which he replied: (M) *Ich wollte nicht am Wochenende das Auto waschen*. ("I didn't want to wash the car on the weekend.") (I) *Ja, so was bedeutet das? Ich wollte nicht am Wochenende das Auto waschen.* Following the request of the instructor for the sentence to be given in its English translation, a female student volunteered and she translated her peer's response as "I wanted to wash the car," to which the instructor replied back in German as (I) *Nicht. Ich wollte nicht*. (F)"Oh, I didn't hear that." (I noticed here that the instructor did not supply the student with the correct translation, but rather he used the L2 to direct her to the right translation.) (I) *Yeah, er wollte, er wollte nicht das Auto waschen*. [*er* is "he"] (I) *Ja? Ja?* (S) *Ja.* (I) "OK *gut.*" The instructor now called on a female student (F) *Ich musste um acht im Bett sein*. ("I had to be in bed at 8:00PM.") (I) *So sie* ("she") *musste um acht im Bett sein. Ja*?" Another female student exclaimed: *um acht*? ("at eight?") (F) I didn't actually do it. (I) "Yeah … rebellious child." Next he again asked another female student to speak (F) *Uh, Ich* (pause*) wollte* (pause*) uh uh uh Brokkoli Brokkoli essen*. ("I wanted to eat broccoli.") (I) *Ich wollte, ich wollte Brokkoli essen*. or you can say "I liked to" *ich mochte, "*it's also good; they both mean the same." And then the instructor called on a male student. (M) *Ich durfte abends nicht fernsehen*. ("I was not allowed to watch TV at night.") (I) *Ja?* (M) "during exam."

We just exemplified the significance of correct pronunciation and performance in the German class through targeted drills on pronunciation [the instructor modeled with students repeating the phrases/sentences learned that day] and oral pattern/sentence. Emphasis was placed on the student's practice in using the concept of *gern* and the past tense in a real-life contexts. The conclusion is that performance in the L2 is an important

variable in measuring students'competence and performance in the language, and that this has to be evaluated from the beginning of the learning process.

1. II. E. Elementary Russian

Similar observations were made in the Russian 1001 class where the emphasis was also on the acquisition of oral sustainable proficiency. Like the other classes, this class was also audio-/video-taped on September 22, 2004. The class had 20 students in attendance, among whom 12 were male and 8 were female. The entire session was very engaging and the majority of the students had a number of opportunities to use their skills in elementary Russian. Included here are excerpts to illustrate some of the interactions between the instructor, who showed much enthusiasm in the class, and the students, who were very eager to learn how to communicate in Russian.

The instructor engaged the students in the learning process by first providing a warm-up to get the students to focus on the activities of the day in Russian. He called on students, provided each with a "comprehensible input," and gave them an opportunity to produce the correct answer to prompting questions. He encouraged each person to sustain the dialogue by providing him/her with extra grammar cues. For example, when addressing a male student about his living arrangements, the instructor started out by saying: (I) *A u vas dom, kvartira ili komnata*? ("Do you have a house, an apartment or a room?") (M) *komnata* The instructor then reinforced what the student said by repeating *komnata* and the interaction went on with another question. (I) *A kakaja komnata*? *Vaša komnata bol'*š*aja*? (" And what kind of room? Is your room big?") (M) *malen'kaja* ("small") (I) repeated *malen'kaja* (I) then made another inquiry *novaja?* ("new?") (M) *staraja* ("old") (I) *xoro*š*o* ("fine.") Next, of a female student, the instructor asked: *U vas dom*? ("Do you have a house?") (F) *Kvartira* (I) *kakaja*? ("what kind?") (F) *bol'*š*aja* (I) repeated *bol'*š*aja* and carried on the dialogue: *novaja, xoro*š*aja*? (F) (answered softly and it was unclear) (I) *A kakie okna*? ("And what kind of windows?") (F) *bol'*š*ie okna* (I) reinforced the student's answer by repeating *bol'*š*ie okna* and he added a personal note to

the conversation: *U menja doma tože oèen' bol'šie xorošie okna*. ("My house also has big nice windows.")

The instructor emphasized pronunciation through the use of drills for the entire period, particularly when he taught the class how to name items visible in the picture of a living room in an apartment building. He pronounced each word slowly and clearly, from right to left, and from left to right of the picture, while encouraging the students to repeat what was said. Sensing that the class has mastered the new vocabulary words, the instructor proceeded with the reading exercise from the same lesson. He presented the various characters in the picture (in the Russian textbook) to the class, engaging a male student in a dialogue. (I) *Kto sleva? Kto sleva*? ("Who's on the left"?) (M) hesitated (I) repeated *Kto sleva? Vova sleva*? *Vova sleva? Na kartine Vova sleva*? ("In the picture *Vova* on the left?") (M) *Net* (I) *Kto sleva*? (M) *Aleksandr sleva* (I) *Aleksandr sleva Oèen' xoroš*o. (I) *A kto sprava*? ("And who's on the right?") (M) *Vova* (I) *Oèen' xoroš*o. ("Very good.") The instructor used praise to reward and to encourage the students for their contribution and to make them more willing to use Russian. His persona and ability to entertain the class with his humor contributed to the receptiveness of the students and the relaxed class atmosphere, which increased productivity from the students.

In addition to emphasizing spoken Rusian, the instructor stressed the role of the culture in the language. The following passages demonstrate the cultural/socio-linguistic aspect of the L2 classroom interaction. Although the instructor used a meta-language (English), he did so to create the foundation for the classroom interaction. The objective of the class was for the students to learn how "new neighbors get acquainted." In the first reading (which is a dialogue), "*Vova,"* one of the characters, greeted "Jim," another character" (who is a graduate student in a Russian University), with " How do you do, Jim! I am *Vova, Vladimir*." The instructor used *Vova*'s greetings to bring out linguistically-related cultural background:

> "It is true that many Russians who are just beginning to learn English fifteen or twenty years ago speak with very British accent. Some even speak with a Bombay accent when attempting to speak English. During the Cold War India, where the official language is English, was the largest country to welcome Soviet visitors without complex visa formalities. It is the case that many English teachers in Russian high schools even today were trained formally in Bombay or Calcutta. Most of the textbooks for English that were for Soviet soldiers were printed in India. So *Vova* presumably reflects this influence of Indian English and British English when he attempts to say "How do you do?""

The rendition above set the socio-cultural background to help the students understand the formal greeting of Vova (a young Russian schoolboy) when he says "How do you do?" to Jim, a graduate student from the United States. In another instance the students learned about the gender difference in voice quality between Russian men and women, something that I found quite intriguing:

> "This is interesting. It's true that in Russian a woman [exhibits] a much higher range of pitch than most men do. You know already that the voice jumps up to signal a question. The voice tends to go much higher for the women when they ask a question than the male speaker."

This was the instructor's response to a comment made by a male student on the difference in voice quality between Russian men and women. Through this remark the instructor introduced his class to one aspect of Russian culture that is gender-specific.

Stage 2: Intermediate – Intermediate classes

2. I. Analysis based on observation of intermediate Swahili

At the intermediate level, the classes were also structurally similar. All the instructors presented the material in the form of a reading and the students were encouraged to listen and to actively participate afterwards in a conversational exchange under the form of an easy discussion-type question-answer between the instructor and the

student(s). The level of oral proficiency of the majority of the students at the intermediate level fit the description of the *Intermediate-Mid* to *Intermediate-High* levels based on the ACTFL proficiency guidelines that shows that Intermediate-Mid speakers are

> Able to handle successfully a variety of uncomplicated, basic and communicative tasks and social situations. … Can ask and answer questions and participate in simple conversations … , [might make] frequent long pauses. … Pronunciation may continue to be strongly influenced by first language … (Byrnes and Canale 1987: 16)

At the first observation of the intermediate Swahili class (February 16, 2004), there were 4 male and 2 female present. Here the students used Swahili to discuss what they did during the Valentine's weekend. At the end of the session, the class played a 'word-game' guided by the instructor. The point of the game was for each learner to be able to listen to the word that the previous one said and then to come up with another word that fit, and produce a cohesive utterance. The final product of the class oral word-game was a short story that challenged and motivated the students to participate and to focus on their listening and communication skills.

2. II. Analysis based on audio- and videorecording

2. II. A. Intermediate Swahili

In the Swahili 2010 class, audio- and video-taped on September 1, 2004, there were 4 students in attendance, among whom 2 were male and 2 were female. This was a personalized L2 language class where opportunities to interact with the instructor and with each other are available. Furthermore, a sense of bonding was cultivated to encourage mutual support and self-esteem and cooperation between the instructor and the students, and among the students themselves. Language learning and teaching can be very difficult and stressful, and so for me to sense this type of bonding is what appears to be the unique feature of the Swahili 2010 class. Some of the interesting activities included the instructor reading a story very carefully to the students with a lot of

repetitions of specific terms, phrases, and/or sentence, taking time to explain and/or illustrate every new vocabulary item with various examples. A few isolated excerpts from her reading will show how she tried to captivate the students and cultivate their thinking in Swahili by continuous repetition and by limiting the use of the L1 (English)[3]. (I) ("Instructor") *Kwenda shule kwenda shule kwenda shule Rehema na Tina ni wanafunzi wa shule ya msingi.* (*kwenda:* "to go" – *shule:* "school" – *Rehema na Tina*: "Rehema and Tina" – *ni* : "are" -- *wanafunzi*: "students" *shule ya msingi*: " primary school") *Rehema na Tina ni wanafunzi wa shule ya msingi. Rehema na Tina ni wanafunzi wa shule ya msingi. … Tina anasema kwa nini utakwenda shule mapema sana* ("*anasema: "says" – kwa nini:* "for what?, why" – *utakwenda:* "you will go to school" – *mapema:* "early" – *sana*: "much, a lot, here is "so"") *mapema sana mapema mapema mapema mapema mapema … mapema sana … mapema sana mapema sana mapema* (a female student gave a translation for "*mapema"* but it was unclear) (I) *mapema* ("early") *mapema mapema*. … The instructor repeated the term *mapema* 11 times before she gave the equivalent meaning in English, and only after a student had tried, but failed to give the correct translation. She then repeated the word *mapema* 2 more times before going on to the next sentence. … (I) *Juma anasema ... unafanya usafi wa mazingira usafi usafi usafi usafi… unafanya*: ("you are working, doing") -- *usafi:* ("(the) cleaning") *wa mazingira*: ("of the environment") (I) *Kila darasa darasa darasa… kila*: ("each") – *darasa*: ("classroom")

Because this was a very small language class and the students were at the first half of the intermediate level (i.e., they had one whole year of language learning), they all came with a good L2 foundation, and they were all very attentive to the classroom activities facilitated by the instructor. The physical space of the classroom was also

---

[3]L1 refers to the first language. In this thesis, it always represents English.

small, thus allowing interaction between the participants. Neither the instructor nor the students had to strain their voices in order to be heard at any one time. The instructor was very encouraging and coached her students when language problems occurred instead of giving them the correct answers as soon as they made a mistake. The students learned in a very relaxing and non-intimidating atmosphere that was ideal and conducive for a goal-oriented teaching and learning.

Another interesting aspect of the class included a review of a homework assignment. The instructor called on a male student to translate an English sentence ("I want a key") into Swahili. (M) (Male student) **Ninatoka ufungua ufunguo*. (I) *Ninatoka?* (her voice was raised signifying surprise!!! or rather disagreement) **Ninatoka au ninataka* (F) (Female student) *Ninataka* (I) *Ndiyo lakini ni vizuri kusema ninaomba ufunguo ninaomba ninaomba*. *Ninataka si vizuri sana si vizuri sana*. "You are demanding. You don't demand in the language. The polite form is *–omba -taka* is ("want") the key. *Si vizuri*, not good in the content to say "I want." You can say that in America. "I want." You're right. That's not right in Swahili. In Swahili *Ninaomba.* You beg their mercy. They know you don't have a key." *Ninaomba ufunguo. ...*
In another example, the instructor was asking students on how well they did on exercise number 10 (about sentence completion). (I) *Habari za zoezi la kumi* ("news of exercise 10"), *habari za zoezi la kumi. Nzuri*? ("good") *Mbaya* ("bad")? *Habari za zoezi la kumi. Nzuri au* ("or") *mbaya. Sawa* ("correct, OK"), *sawa* (F) *nzuri* (I) *nzuri vizuri*. The instructor called on a female student to complete a sentence. The student used the wrong personal pronoun. The correct sentence in English means: "The students want the books." Demonstrating her unique teaching technique, the instructor used repetitions to point out to the student that she had misused the pronoun. (F) *Wanafunzi *unataka vitabu*. (I) *wanafunzi* (I) *una* (I) Hah – *wana wa wa wa wanafunzi? Wana* (F) *Wanafunzi* (pause) *wanataka vitabu.*

Besides learning how to speak, read and write in Swahili, the class also experienced (as the above transcriptions demonstrated) the learning of Swahili (Tanzanian) culture when the instructor pointed out some pragmatic aspect of language in a day-to-day, people-to-people context. Being polite and showing respect to other people, especially to those who are helping us during our time of need ("a key"), is a well-accepted concept in Swahili. The class included the teaching of pragmatics and socio-linguistic issues that are critical in accurate performance in the language.

The instructor also taught the class how to sing an African song*: Bwana Tumbo* ("Mr. *Tumbo*"). The lyrics use the "Yankee Doodle" tune and describe a farmer who squanders his wealth in the city. The song is intended to contrast country and city life in Tanzania, a contrast that each learner is expected to understand in order to realize the diversity of cultures in Tanzania.

2. II. B. Intermediate French

The students in French 2001 class also showed enthusiasm to learn. The focus of the class was to develop techniques for interaction in the target language through conversational exchange, listening activity and question-answer type discussion. The session was audio- and videotaped on August 30, 2004, and 25 students were in attendance, among whom 8 were male and 17 were female. As a warm-up exercise, the instructor gave the class the opportunity to ask her 5 questions of any kind. This prompted personal questions which the instructor did not seem to mind answering. Instead, she used the opportunity to encourage the students to speak and to elicit more questions. Furthermore, on the linguistic level, the activity exhibited a different level of grammatical difficulty (the use of the preterite as opposed to the present), as exemplified in the following excerpt: (M) *Comment avez-vous passé votre weekend*? ("How did you spend your weekend?") … (I) *J'ai fait beaucoup de choses à la maison. J'ai fait le linge et j'ai corrigé beaucoup de papiers parce que j'ai quatre cours de français*. ("I did a lot of things at home. I did the laundry. I corrected (graded) lots of papers because I have 4

courses (classes) of French.") (F) *Combien de filles avez-vous*? (" How many daughters do you have?") (I) *J'ai une fille et j'ai un un garçon*. *Donc j'ai 2 enfants*. ("I have a daughter and a son. Therefore I have 2 children.") (F) *Qu'est-ce que tu *mangé uh un déjeuner?* ("What did you eat for lunch?") (I) *Moi j'aime manger le déjeuner. Mais aujourd'hui je n'ai rien mangé. Donc rien.* (Laughter) ("Me I like to eat lunch. But today I did not eat anything. Therefore nothing.") *Je n'ai pas mangé. Je n'ai pas de temps.* ("I did not eat. I don't have time.") (F) Ç*a va?* ("How are things?") (everyone laughed out loud) … (I) *Oui, ça va très bien* ("literally is Yes, that (thing) goes very well") … (F) *Combien de langues parlez-vous*? (" How many languages do you speak?") The instructor misunderstood the question and answered saying that ("she is 49 years old.") (I) **Bon j'ai quarante-neuf ans. C'est ça c'est ça la question*? ("Isn't that isn't that the question?") Realizing that she was misheard, the student repeated the question (F) *Combien de langues* The instructor did a comprehension check *Combien de* (F) *Combien de langages parlez-vous? (*I) *ah bon donc je parle anglais c'est ma langue maternelle et j'ai passé des années* enseignant l'espagnol. *Maintenant j'enseigne le français, c'est la première fois*. ("ah well so I speak English that's my mother tongue and I have spent years teaching Spanish. Now I teach French, this is the first time.")

The next excerpt exemplifies a segment where the students interacted among themselves, to show their oral proficiency. The students were asked to get up and out of their chair and to move around the room asking people questions using the "passé composé." The instructor asked a female student to come and ask the researcher some questions on her list. This was initiated by the teacher's directive: (I) *Peut-être tu peux aller poser des questions à Madame King*. ("Maybe you can go ask Mrs. King some questions.") (F) *Est-ce que tu as acheté quelque chose par le téléachat*? ("Have you bought anything online?") (King) *Non, je n'ai rien acheté par le téléachat*.? ("No, I have not bought anything online.") The researcher asked the student the same question to which she answered: *oui, des jeans.* (King) *Quoi encore*? ("What else?") (F) *des blousons*. (King)

oh des vêtements. (“oh clothes.”) (F) *des vêtements.* (F) *Est-ce que tu as passé à la télé*? (“Have you been on TV?”) (King) *passé à la télé? Non, jamais jamais*. *(jamais* (“never”) (F) **Moi aussi.* (This should be *Moi non plus*) (“me neither”) (King) *Je ne suis pas fameuse*. (“I am not famous.”) (F) **Moi aussi.* The dialogue continued. (F) *Est-ce que tu as travaillé* con* [the instructor used a Spanish word on her list of questions.] *les SDF*? (“Have you worked for the SDF?”) (King) *Je ne sais pas*. (“I don’t know.”) Qu’est-ce que ça veut *dire les SDF*? (“What does SDF mean?”) (F) *uh uh c’est comme le projet.* (“It’s like the project.”) (King) *un projet à l’école à l’université?* (“a project at school at the university?”) (F) *les centres domiciles.* (*domiciles* (“houses, residences”)) (King) *Oh les centres domiciles*. (F) *Les les personnes qui* (King) *n’ont pas de maisons*. (“people who don’t have houses.”) (F) *Oui.* (King) *Uh uh non, je n’ai pas travaillé avec les centres domiciles*. (F) *c’est quoi*? *Familles sans domiciles*. Toward the end of the conversation the student realized that the researcher said the wrong word the whole time, and so she corrected the mistake and provided the exact word for the letter *S,* which stands for *sans* (“without.”) And since both the student and the researcher did not know the acronym, the researcher suggested to the student that they should ask the instructor. She said *merci* (“thank you”) and moved on to another person.

The passage mentioned above clearly showed that the student was pretty fluent. Her listening comprehension was very good and her communicative ability in French was also good. This student’s level of oral proficiency apparently matched the *Intermediate-High* mark because she was able to exchange basic information about a topic that she was familiar with and to carry on that conversation with ease and confidence with the researcher as an interlocutor who was unfamiliar to her. Even though her responses were mostly short and simple, she was able to maintain and lead the interaction within a consistently connected and meaningful discourse pattern.

2. II. C. Intermediate Chinese

Like the students in Swahili 2010 class and French 2001 class who were provided with much opportunity to think and to speak in their respective L2, the students in Chinese 2001 class also were encouraged to think in Chinese and to speak Chinese, a classroom teaching and learning technique which were displayed through the use of famous quotes, cultural notes and folk songs. The Chinese 2001 class was audio- and video-recorded, the first session on September 10, 2004, in a class of 6 students, among whom 3 were male and 3 were female. A few examples will illustrate how the learners used Chinese in an interactive context of situation. Due to the nature of Chinese characters and the importance of character-recognition to the development of oral proficiency of the students, the instructor had to emphasize the practice of tones and character-drill. The instructor drilled the students on the different tones and called on each student to pronounce the different characters that he had planned for them to memorize for that day. The students had to repeat each character several times (if necessary) until they got the tones right. This tone practice was incorporated into all class activities, and at times the instructor had to exaggerate the contour of some tone (causing a roar of laughter, a light humor that helped to make the students more relaxed) to facilitate the distinctions in tone. For example, at the start of class, when they came to the character *niu rou* (which means "beef"), the instructor pronounced *niuiuiuiuiuiuiu* (second-tone) – *rouououououou* (fourth-tone) as if he were practicing a musical scale from high to low. The video clip showed that the students achieved the intended participation in the learning process even though they had problems with some tones.

The instructor gave the students adequate time to think of an answer to all his questions so they could produce it in Chinese. If a student was unable to understand, the instructor would either write the character on the board or would take time to reword the question slowly and clearly. As a result, the students were not afraid to perform even though they knew that they would make mistakes. In the case of one female student who

had a very difficult time trying to get the tones right and to produce a correct sentence, the instructor patiently helped by repeating the correct tones several times and asking her to repeat after him. Even that student improved toward the end of the session. All the tone/character repetitions not only benefited that one student but reinforced the performance of the whole class.

As part of his teaching plan, the instructor also included Chinese idiomatic expressions (famous sayings, proverbs, tongue-twister type character practice with emphasis on tone as a warm-up exercise) as well as cultural information and songs in his lesson. The session started out with the instructor leading everybody in saying a well-known idiomatic expression: *Dao ke dao fei chang dao*. *Ming ke ming fei chang ming*. The researcher was given the English translation to this saying by another Chinese instructor, and the meaning in English goes something like this: "Truth that can be explained is not permanent truth." "The name that can be named is not the name." And when the researcher asked the meaning for the second part of the idiom, the same instructor asked "Does everybody call a horse "horse," or do they call a horse by some other name also?"

The students got to develop their oral skills as they had the opportunity to recite the idiom/idioms every time class started. They also learned Chinese through singing. When the researcher came for the second session, the instructor ended the class with everybody singing a folk song. There is some benefit, as one can perceive, to the way this instructor chose to start out his Chinese class by reciting a proverb, and to end it with a popular song. Such technique helped motivate the students and kept them involved. The students cooperated in the teaching and learning process and were prepared to give an answer when called upon.

In the second session that was filmed on November 19, almost two and half months later, there were 5 students in attendance with 2 male students and 3 female students. This was a small class and they met in a small classroom, a setting conducive

to the interaction between the instructor and the students and among the students themselves. In the second session, after reciting the proverb and taking a very difficult dictation, the class had to read one and a half pages out loud. The reading was all in Chinese characters. The instructor called on each student and he/she would read, translate and answer his question(s) in Chinese. The class used English sparingly, so as not to affect their goal of improving oral competence in the target language.

Transcription showed that the students overall recognized the characters fairly quickly and read their part adequately. The translation into English was only to help them get the meaning in order to answer the instructor's questions. The following excerpt demonstrates the progression in oral proficiency. As part of a reading comprehension exercise, a student was asked the following question: (I) *Ni shi gen baba mama zhu zai yiqi ma?* ("Do you live (together) with your parents.") (M) *Mei you. Tamen ban zou le.* ("No. They moved away.") At another time the instructor talked and compared different universities such as Beijing University, Nanking University, and the University of Georgia, and he turned to a student and asked this question: "*qiao da de tushuguan zenme yang?* ("How is UGA's library?") (M) answered in incomplete sentence *hen hao, danshi tai da le* ("very good, however too big."). The above interaction illustrates the students' proficiency, in both listening and speaking. Both students were able to use Chinese to give answers to the questions of the instructor. They demonstrated desired performance because they did not hesitate and did not make any socio-linguistic mistake, even though it was clear that their responses were short and incomplete.

In the second session students appeared more confident in using the language. Their reading topic was on "higher education": Two students *Li zhe* and *Zhang Tianming* were talking about their study plans at the university. *Tianming* is taking Chinese language as one of his four courses. When the instructor asked how *Tianming* thinks about Chinese (is it difficult to learn?), one male student answered: *bu nan rongyi uh yinwei tade fumu zai jia chang chang shuo Zhongwen. uh suoyi Zhang Tianming juede*

shuo Zhongwen dou hen rongyi. (“ not difficult … easy because his parents always speak Chinese at home; therefore, *Zhang Tianming* thinks that learning Chinese is all very easy”). The instructor also asked what the students know about *Li Zhe*’s plan after he graduated, to which one male student answered: “Uh mmm *Li Zhe biye yihou dasuan nian yanjiu suo, yaome shi gong xue yuan*, *yaome shi guanli xue yuan* (“ After he graduated, *Li Zhe* planned on going to graduate school, taking either a graduate program of engineering or management”).

2. II. D. Intermediate German

Even though Swahili, French, and Chinese belong to different language families, the techniques used by the instructors to emphasize interaction, conversation, and cultural understanding expressed through the current trends of lifestyle, are reflected in the teaching and learning process. There appeared similarities of communicative teaching and learning activity in the German 2001 class audio-/video-taped on September 10, 2004, with 16 students participating in my L2 oral proficiency study, among which 5 are male and 11 are female. I will highlight the importance of conducting the class in the target language and how the instructor engaged all her students into the learning and interaction.

Using mainly German to teach her class, she started the session out by giving the students a few minutes to look over the 10 sentences that they had prepared previously. The focus of this assignment was the story of a young woman who has to make a transition to independent life. She has a very boring job working as a secretary, so, to compensate for the monotony of her life, she dreams of exciting things during her *Mittagspause* (“middaybreak” or “lunchbreak.”) The instructor called 10 students to the board to write one sentence each (based on the story) and to tag *Richtig* (“Right”) or *Falsch* (“Wrong”) by each sentence. Then she led the class to do the correction. Two examples will illustrate how she helped them pinpoint the mistakes that they made in their sentences and to think of the right word(s). Student’s sentence on the board: *Ihr*

Lieblingswort ***sind*** (“are”)*Katastrophe*. (I) *so Ihr Lieblingswort ist das singular oder plural* (S) *singular* (I) *so ist Katastrophe ein Lieblingswort*. *Ihr Lieblingswort ist Katastrophe*. (“Her favorite word is catastrophe.”) *so Ihr Lieblingswort ist langweilig*, *ist* (“Her favorite word is boring,” is wrong.) (I) *Sie möchte sich verlieben*. (M) wrote *Sie kann sich verlieben*. … (I) *OK Sie kann sich verlieben oder sie möchte sich verlieben.* … (I) *Sie möchte sich verlieben Sie möchte* (“would like, she would like to fall in love.”) “Here she can, she physically can fall in love.” “Here she would like to.” “Yeah” *Sie möchte sich verlieben das is richtig. Sie möchte sich verlieben*. The instructor explained the distinction between the two German verbs *können* and *möchte*. It is true that those two verbs could be used interchangeably, but the students were taught to choose *möchte* in this story that is about a secretary and her personal life. The students became proficient in their pragmatic skills when they knew how to use *können* and *möchte* in the appropriate social setting.

The instructor of German 2001 engaged the students in the discussion after they had finished writing their sentences on the board. The writing assignment on the board and the lively discussion that ensued took up most of the class time. The students heard and practiced German and learned the different linguistic components of the language such as vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, as well as the social-cultural related component (such as issues of human relationships). During group work and student-to-student interaction, the instructor walked around to listen to how the students spoke German. She also used familiar objects that belong to her or to the students to teach a grammatical concept (like the accusative) or some skill in pragmatics, for instance “ May I have such-and-such a thing back.” Ordinary personal things such as a water bottle, a helmet, a brush, a Georgia cap, permanent markers, a hairbrush, a roll of dental floss were good teaching aids that she used to engage her class to speak more German in the second session.

On November 5, 2004, almost two months after the first recording, the researcher held a second video and audio-recording. There were 18 students in attendance, among whom 6 were male and 12 were female. The main activities of the day were the teaching of grammar *der unbestimmte Artikel* ("the indefinite articles *ein* and *kein,* nominative and accusative") *das Possessivpronomen* ("the possessive adjectives"), and then the application of learned patterns through oral practice of textbook exercises and enjoyable interactive classroom activity (mentioned above). All the students participated well in all the class activities, and both male and female students were equally interested in the subject taught. There were no latecomers in both sessions. Therefore, the environment was most conducive to learning and there was no interruption.

German 2001 with its 18 students can be considered a medium-to-large L2 class, but they met in a medium-size classroom. The instructor had control of the class and everything that was going on. Interaction was facilitated because of a smaller size classroom, which allowed the instructor to hear the students speaking better. Consequently, participants tended to cooperate more and to stay focused on the task. The various activities such as grammar explanation, conversation and/or group interaction were all carried out at a steady forward pace. Even group work was very brief, well engaged and well managed.

One excerpt from each session will illustrate the L2 teaching and learning styles of the German 2001 class. In the first filming, each student had the opportunity to share with the class what his/her partner(s) would do. [Because the audio-recording did not turn out well, there will only be a few sentences.] (I) *Was wird ihr werden*? ("What will you become?") (F) ("female") *Er* ("he") *wird on the tennis team und* (the rest is unclear.)" (I) *Er wird Gericht studieren.* ("he will study law.") (I) *so Gericht studieren*. (M) *Sie wird* (this student says a long sentence but it is unclear)… *und sie wird *eine Mann*. (I) *Sie wird einen Mann* "a masculine man." … (Laughter) (F) *einen Mann* (I) "a masculine man" (Lots of laughter) (F) *Sie wird in Washington wohnen* ("to live") *und er*

wird (the rest was unclear) … (M) *Sie wird Medizin studieren und sie wird* (the rest was unclear) (F) *Sie wird Medizin studieren und sie wird* (unclear term) … (M) *Er wird Gericht studieren*. (M) *Er wird Journalist?* [The instructor corrected the student's pronunciation of the word "Journalist."] (I) *Er wird Journalist*. (M) *Sie wird einen GBI Chemikerin* (I) … *wird sie GBI Chemikerin?* (F) *Sie wird Gericht studieren*. (F) *Sie wird in Canada wohnen*. The example above showed that all the students got a chance to speak and that the instructor was there to encourage and to help them when needed. I also noted that the students enjoyed learning German and that each person paid careful attention to the other's speech.

The second excerpt comes from the second filming: After explaining in detail the use of the "indefinite articles," the "possessive adjectives," the "nominative and accusative cases" and writing the paradigms of the articles and adjectives on the board, the instructor taught the students how to apply the structures they just learned, using objects that they had brought with them to class that day. The students then were required to ask for their items back. The instructor facilitated the interaction by demonstrating to the class how to ask questions. (I) *Kann ich meinen Hut haben?* ("Can I have my hat back?") So when the male student asked the instructor for his hat back, she said: (I)"No, I gave it to (name of female student). Now we have to ask "her" for "his" hat. (S*) Kann er* ... (I) "it is your hat?" (S) It's (name)'s hat." (I) "How are we going to help (name) out?" (S) *Kann er* … (I) "We got the first part: *kann er"* (S) *seinen Hut* (I) "yes," *seinen Hut haben*. (M) *Kann ich meinen Hut haben*? (F) *Du kannst.* (" You can.") … (F) *Kann ich mein Buch haben*? ("Can I have my book?" (M) *Ja, du kannst dein Buch haben.* ("Yes, you can have your book.") (M) **Kann Sie (Kann ich) bitte meine Zahnseide ... haben*? (" Can you please … me back my dental floss?") (F) *Du kannst deine Zahnseide haben*. ("You can have your dental floss.") We see from this transcription that the students were very animated in the interaction and that they were always ready to give a response (or output) based on the instructor's input. These data

clearly indicated that the students of German 2001 class were making steady progress in oral proficiency from the first to the second filming.

2. II. E. Intermediate Russian

My observation and analysis would not be complete without the addition of the Russian 2001 class, which was audio- and video-taped on September 15, 2004, with 19 students in attendance, among whom 12 were male and 7 were female. Like the other intermediate L2 classes (Swahili, French, Chinese and German) that the researcher has discussed earlier, the students in intermediate Russian also had much opportunity to hear spoken Russian and were encouraged to speak and to interact in Russian. I will now include a few examples that will highlight the different classroom activities of the Russian 2001 class.

The instructor spoke Russian very clearly and was ready to start the interaction as he entered the classroom. As a warm-up activity, he talked about a current weather condition and at once he got everyone's attention. (I) *Kakaja segodnja pogoda? Kakaja segodnja pogoda*? ("How's the weather today?")

A student gave a response but it was not clear. (I) *Da, pogoda ploxaja oèen' ploxaja*. ("Yes, the weather is bad very bad.")… (I) *A žarko?* ("Is it hot?") (F) *Net* ("No") (I) *Net ne žarko* ("No not hot"). *Segodnja ... ne žarko ... poka* "for the time being" … *budet dožd'* ("it's going to rain")… *budet uragan. Da, uragan* ("There's going to be a hurricane") … *budet dožd'*.

The conversation allowed the instructor to review or to introduce the new word *uragan* through a series of relevant simple question-answer activities without the use of English. The learner was provided with a "comprehensible input" (Gass and Selinker, 201), a cue that was at his/her L2 level *Kakaja segodnja pogoda*? to which an accurate response was encouraged.

The instructor was knowledgable of the subject, and he encouraged each person to participate in the interaction, giving every learner an opportunity to perform in Russian

and ample time to think of an acceptable answer to questions asked. For those who seemed to have listening comprehension difficulties, he used some English to guide them successfully toward the correct answer. The two following excerpts will highlight the conversation between the instructor and two female students. The topic was … first class. It begins, (I) *Vo skol'ko na*è*inaetsja na*š*e zanjatie? Va*š*e pervoe zanjatie*? … *Vo skol'ko na*è*inaetsja va*š*e pervoe zanjatie*? "your first class." (F) "uh uh uh mmm *v devjat'* è*asov*" ("9:00 AM") (I) repeated the answer "*v devjat'* è*asov ... Da, xoro*š*o.* And the same question was addressed to another female student: *Vo skol'ko na*è*inaetsja va*š*e pervoe zanjatie*? to which she replied: (F) "You see I don't know." (I) *U Vas tot* ž*e ... eto tot* ž*e vopros* the same question." (F) "OK" (I) *Vo skol'ko na*è*inaetsja va*š*e pervoe zanjatie*? "your first class" (F) "uh mm uh m uh m" è*asov devjat* (I) corrected the time given: è*asov v devjat'* "around nine o'clock … doesn't start right at nine."

The third excerpt is the interaction between the instructor and a male student on the same topic of "time": (I) *Vo skol'ko vy oby*è*no lo*ž*ites' spat'*? ("What time do you usually go to sleep?") (M) ah *v desjat'* è*asov* (I) *v desjat'* è*asov; eto o*è*en' rano* ah ha. ("10:00PM very early") *Vo skol'ko vy vsta¸te? ... (I) Vo skol'ko vy vsta¸te? Kogda esli vy lo*ž*ites' devjat'* è*asov* ("When do you get up, if you go to bed at 10:00PM"). The student did not understand the question. (I) "What time you go to sleep?" (M) *desjat'* è*asov* (I) *Kogda vy vsta¸te*? "When you get up?" (M) uh *v sem'* è*asov* ("7:00 o'clock") (I) *v sem'* è*asov (eto) rano, da?*

Learning a language should be an enjoyable experience for both the one who teaches and the one who learns. In the first session the class played in Russian, a game called *Simeon govorit* ("Simon says"), during which the students expressed themselves proficiently through body language. They made some mistakes now and then because of not listening carefully to the caller and stepped on each other once, but that was insignificant compared to the immediate results. After the game everyone was energized, more engaged and ready to continue with the learning process. They could think more

clearly and they were more motivated to listen to the grammar section, to work and to interact in Russian with their peers.

In the second session that was filmed and audio-recorded on November 10, 2004, almost two months after the first one, there were four more female students attending (these were absent at the first session), bringing the total attendance to 23 with 12 male students and 11 female students. The instructor emphasized oral drills of new vocabulary items such as *cvety* ("flowers") and *cveta* ("colors"), the "ordinal numbers," and the "dates and the months," with the class learning the pronunciation of each lexicon through numerous repetitions. Other interactive activities such as group work, student-to-student conversation, and a question-answer session also allowed the learners to develop their oral skills under the guidance of the instructor.

The data from Russian 2001 indicated that the students were very engaged in all the L2 activities. They were motivated to interact in Russian, even though its inflections make it a difficult language to master easily. Both male and female students were equally involved; however, the data did indicate that male learners were more aggressive. The students' oral performance was good in the first session and better in the second session in the sense that they were able to speak in more complex grammatical sentence structures. In contrast to earlier examples that showed L2 learners' output in the first filming (pages 46,47) are a few responses that the students gave in the second session after having learned the names of the different flowers and having applied their knowledge to answer the teacher's questions. (I) asked a male student *Vy da¸te cvety mame*? ("Do you give flowers to your mother?") (M) *Da, ja daju margaritki, rozy i tjul'pany*. ("Yes, I give daisies, roses and tulips"). And after a time of student-to-student interaction, a female student was asked by the instructor what "flower and color of flower" a classmate likes. (I) *Kakie cvety ljubit* (name)? ("What flowers does (name) like") (F) "(name) *ljubit' krasnye rozy*. ("likes red roses.")

Note that the class spoke only Russian during group practice time. This is a good L2 learning strategy and does put into question the claim made by Hector Hammerly (1991) that a learner needs to be " confident with the grammar before he/she can attempt to speak." Reading out loud in the L2 is also proven to be a good learning technique in developing oral proficiency. My data showed that one female student who experienced some difficulty speaking Russian in the first session was doing much better in the second session because she was taking the time to read her class-work assignment out loud to herself. This is in theory not considered a production performance or L2 output, but this style of learning behavior helped reinforce and strengthen the oral skills.

Needless to say, the class size and available space affect the class performance. Fewer students in a smaller classroom (space) facilitates the learners' language skills. The Russian 2001 class met in a smaller classroom. The instructor and students were able to understand one another easily without having to repeat or to raise their voices; therefore, any mistake could be heard easily and corrected adequately. The instructor was in control of the teaching and learning situation and there was no apparent lack of discipline, even though the Russian 2001 class was a large class with 23 students.

To summarize, let me make a general observation. All the instructors who taught the various L2 emphasized the importance of speaking the target language, and they encouraged their students to interact extensively in the target language. Their main goal was to promote interaction in the classroom. Individually, instructors provided the learners with good comprehensible input at the level of $i+1$, with which they were able to produce in return an output that reflected the acquisition of communicative competence in their individual L2, to achieve the appropriate level of oral proficiency as it is defined in this study (cf. Abstract). According to the concept of L2 acquisition put forth by Krashen, there will not be acquisition of new material if the i is not at the next level of difficulty. For the most part, $i+1$ (this is an acceptable concept; but it is difficult to define and measure $i+1$ cognitively) was achieved by the instructors in the first and second

sessions. Although there were noticeable differences in the ability of some individual(s) or group(s) to interact in the L2 in the second filming, this was in part due to the difficulty of the material covered. The class questionnaire survey administered also indicated that out of the 169 participants in one of the multilingual studies of L2 oral proficiency, only 11 of them, or 6.51%, claimed that their native language was other than English. This being the case, let me offer a panoramic picture of the overall profile of the study of the L2 classroom interaction, giving the reader a glimpse of the qualitative final results compiled.

A language such as French can be considered in this study as the language easier for native English speakers to learn to speak: its flexible SVO (subject-verb-object) word order is similar to English. There is a substantial amount of French words that are part of the English language system. These primary linguistic traits attributed to French are reflected in the findings of the study and attested to by the results that were compiled from the transcriptions, which show that students of French 1001 and French 2001 as a whole encountered less difficulty in speaking the L2. The students of German 1001 and German 2001 were able to communicate in German at their own level. German is also similar to English in that it is an inflected language, with a SVO order; but its uniqueness lies in its verb-second in a sentence structure. The cases and agreement etc., in German are however difficult for native English speakers. Chinese seems to stand out in the list of L2 as being totally unrelated to any of the languages in this study, because of its characters that constitute the most difficult part of language learning. The transcriptions showed that the instructors of Chinese spent a valuable amount of time teaching the students how to recognize the characters and to use the tones correctly, to maintain the lexical meaning that is associated with each symbol. Nevertheless, overall progress was not easily noticeable. The same problem of slow development of oral proficiency by students of Swahili was also apparent. Swahili is a language which appears to be easy to learn to speak, but in reality is a difficult language for a beginner to master. One can

attribute this to the complex prefix system with eighteen different classes of nouns. These prefixes determine the intended meaning in every sentence and control the grammaticality, since their main function is concord-agreement. In a sentence such as *Wanafunzi wanasoma vitabu* ("The students are reading books") the learner had to deal with the multiple tasks of getting the right noun class, and the associated agreement prefix for the nouns *wanafunzi* (representing people) and *vitabu* (representing a plural thing), and the right personal subject pronoun plural *wa* that is in concord-agreement with the preceding plural noun subject *wanafunzi*. Russian, as noted earlier, is the most difficult language to learn because of its highly-inflected linguistic aspect [yet according to one UGA professor of Russian, it is "probably not more difficult than Chinese"]; but according to my transcription, the majority of the students managed to make some slow but steady progress in their oral performance.

This study also reflects the importance of L2 oral language skills as the main concern of both instructors and students alike (though it is difficult to make valid claims from two classroom visits.) However, to some extent there seems to exist a difference in the progress in oral skills noted in some individual L2 learners or group(s). How would one attempt to explain the reason attributed to such difference? First and foremost one would expect, as the results of this study show, that the level of difficulty of the individual L2 is the main reason for the slow progress in the acquisition of oral skills of some L2 learners. The level of complexity would reduce the student's likelihood of attaining the level required. However, other variables also contributed to the seriousness of the problem. Factors such as insufficient time (official schedule set by the university) spent in formal classroom learning, the larger class size and larger student population (the case of Swahili 1010 class is most representative of all cases), the lack of a consistent and continuing effort in language learning from one level to the next, the level of motivation and participation (which was very difficult to gauge) as well as various affective conditions--all these and more were most likely not within the control of the instructor in

charge. As noted by Karen Johnson (1995), in her work entitled "*Understanding Communication in Second Language Classrooms,*" it is evident that an L2 teacher should design a teaching plan that will maximize the learner's oral performance by giving every person a chance to talk and to converse in the target language. This advice, played out in all the L2 classrooms, was observed and audio- and video-taped. However, this study showed that not all 160 students attained the desired level of oral proficiency. From the linguistic point of view, I estimated that the student may have had difficulty understanding the instructor's input. From a pedagogical perspective, the instructor may not have provided his/her students with good teaching (this is very difficult to gauge, for how can one define a good from a mediocre teacher?). From the learner's perspective, he/she may have not been motivated to learn. This attitude of non-involvement and "I don't care" is detrimental to L2 learning; so as to quote Gardner and Lambert (1972: 132) who stress the importance of motivation in L2 learning "we have found that factors of …motivational sort play very important roles in the acquisition of a second or foreign language…."

Caution should be exercised here, because the corpus for this study was limited and may not offer us firm conclusions. Needless to say, this provides a good start for a more comprehensive study.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to look at the development of oral proficiency of students, through observation of L2 classroom activities, in the spring semester of 2004. In addition, the study capitalized on the audio- and videorecorded data of classroom interaction, of 169 students (and their instructors) enrolled in various L2 classes at the University of Georgia in the fall semester of 2004. The hypothesis was that the "sooner the speech act begins in the target language, the better the oral proficiency will be."

Ten L2 language classes that made part of this study were Swahili 1010 and Swahili 2010, French 1001 and French 2001, Chinese 1001 and Chinese 2001, German 1001 and German 2001 and last but not least difficult, Russian 1001 and Russian 2001. All the transcriptions did indicate a comparability between the teaching skills of the various instructors. The general objectives of providing learners with a comprehensible input at the level of *i,* and then at the next level of *i+1* were carried out, with the instructors giving the learners sufficient time to think and to communicate, in a comfortable and interactive classroom-setting. Grammar and structure were taught in conjunction and within an interactive and contextual realm. This teaching strategy does support Hammerly's basic idea of the importance of the concept of accuracy in an L2 sentence.

From viewing the videotaped data numerous times, I was able to pinpoint a few learners with the most difficulty in speaking the L2: several students in the Swahili 1010 class (with a total attendance of 31), one male student in the Chinese 1001 class (with 10 students), one female student in Chinese 2001 class (with a total of 6 students), one male

student in Russian 1001 class (a class of 20), and one female student in Russian 2001 class (with a total of 23). These students were provided with the same input, and they benefited from the same teaching, yet they did not achieve the intended progress. Several of the students in the Swahili 1010 class had difficulty in remembering isolated vocabulary words previously learned. They were unable to make two- to three-word sentences at the second visit. One male student in the Chinese 1001 class, a graduate student, experienced difficulty with the characters learned, and according to the instructor, the others laughed at him every time he attempted to speak in Chinese. This could have influenced his lack of progress. One female student in Chinese 2001 struggled with the various tones, and therefore had problems with her oral performance. One male student in Russian 1001 remained silent during the whole session. He looked down in his book for most of class time, and did not appear to be engaged in the learning process. He did at one time interact briefly with a female student during one of the group activities. When the researcher visited the class for the second time this student did not come to class. One female student in Russian 2001 experienced some difficulty understanding the question(s) that the instructor asked her during class interaction.

I do not know whether these same students exhibited difficulty in speaking in public (i.e., were introvert) or whether their problem was in their ability to comprehend when the instructor or their classmates used the target language on a regular basis. Obviously, two visits to the class were not adequate to draw conclusive predictions.

The problem of a lack in L2 oral development in some isolated cases, which can be corrected with some extra work (this requires time and effort) coming from the student and some extra help from the instructor, might be linked to language teaching and active interaction in a formal L2 classroom. Both are necessary to facilitate the acquisition of communicative competence as noted by Sandra Savignon (cited by Margie Berns, 1990), who suggested that a meaningful sentence should include the four linguistic components: grammatical, socio-linguistic, discourse-related and strategic. The data bears this out.

For example, the students in the Swahili 2001 class acquired pragmatic skills in making requests. The students in the Russian 2001class acquired pragmatic/social skills associated with the customs of giving flowers to female relatives, friends and/or acquaintances on National Women's Day (a communist holiday of Russia). The students in the Russian 1001 class discussed one aspect of Russian culture and practice in its present-day society: the problem of alcoholism. According to the instructor, "liquor stores" in Russia are the most easily recognized establishments because they have the longest lines. He also mentioned to the class the following statistics: "You know that the average lifespan for a Russian man is well below 60. It is assured that it is largely due to alcoholism." The German 1001 class acquired the social skills necessary to ask for a few free chairs at a near-by table at a restaurant. The students in French 2001learned the necessary skills to enable them to shop smart in a global market system (*mondialisation* – "globalization"). The students in French 1001 were exposed to the culinary idea of eating French fries dipped in mayonnaise, Belgian-style. The Chinese 2001 class enjoyed talking about the Chinese culture through some thought-provoking proverbs. These were the socio-pragmatic and linguistic skills that the students acquired through L2 language teaching and language learning.

To conclude, this multilingual classroom study has been inspired by the ideas of several scholars in the field of second/foreign language acquisition. Margie Berns (1990) recognizes the role of *context* in language learning and use. Michael Long (1983) sees the necessity of modifying the interaction to provide a *comprehensible input* in order to "promote acquisition." Robert J. Di Pietro (1987) stresses the role of the learner to *face risks* without reluctance or fear of losing. To become orally proficient in an L2 the learner should speak the L2 often.

Overall, the research shows that the L2 instructors at the University of Georgia (graduate teaching assistants, instructor and professors) used different creative teaching techniques to encourage the students to speak the target language and to enhance their

communicative competence at the desired level (note the difficulty in measuring level of oral skills in the L2 in this study.) Interaction between the instructor and students has been the highlight for this research. Classroom time and activities have been carefully tailored toward improving conversation in the target language.

The variation in the degree of difficulty from one language to another also explains the difference in the development of oral skills of learners. The research shows that the students of French encountered less difficulty in speaking the target language, as did the students of German. The students of Swahili experienced some problems in their oral skills because of the use of prefixes, as did the students of Russian because of the highly-inflected nature of that language. The students of Chinese experienced barriers in the form of the tones of the language. In all the ten classes, students were encouraged to make correct sentences. The teaching and learning of grammar were not exclusive, but were interwoven with other language activities such as culture, conversation, songs, proverbs, games, and question-answer. The goal was for the learner to be able to convey simple ideas in the target language at the start of the learning stage.

Limitations of study

This study lacked validity and firm conclusions for various reasons. First and foremost is its multilingual aspect and the lack of a uniform testing device (i.e.,similar activities for all classes). To conduct a mass study or oral proficiency has proven not to be predictive of student's strengths or weaknesses. Evaluation of teacher's output and its comprehensibility to learner was difficult because it lacked uniformity. Consequently evaluation of student's output has been seriously hindered. On the liguistic level of sounds, words, and forms, much were left to be done before one can draw valid conclusions.

To close, this brief study on *oral proficiency* in a second or foreign language is not original in its nature, but it will help set the momentum for a more thorough research especially into the affective factors (such as motivation, risk-taking, emotion) and the

disposition (such as age, sex, aptitude, attitude and even learning styles) of the learner who studies a language other than his/her own native language. These cognitive aspects are very difficult to measure and will require extensive empirical studies and researches into the human behavior and its capacities to learn an L2.

It still remains an unanswered question to scientists/researchers to why some learners are successful in speaking an L2 while others are not, all variables understood.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Andrews, Larry. 2001. *Linguistics for L2 Teachers*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Berns, Margie. 1990. *Contexts of Competence*. *Social and Cultural Considerations in Communicative Language Teaching*. New York: Plenum Press.

Brumfit C. J. and Keith Johnson. 1979. *The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University press.

Byrnes, Heidi and Michael Canale. 1987. *Defining and Developing Proficiency: Guidelines, Implementations, and Concepts*. National Textbook Company. Chicago, Illinois.

Di Pietro, Robert J. 1987. *Strategic Interaction. Learning languages through* scenarios *Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.*

Gardner, Robert C. and Wallace E. Lambert. 1972. *Attitudes and Motivation in Second-Language Learning*. Newbury House Publishers, Inc. Rowley, Massachusetts.

Gass, Susan and Larry Selinker. 2001. *Second Language Acquisition*. *An Introductory Course*. Second Edition. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hammerly, Hector. 1991. *Fluency and Accuracy - Toward Balance in Language Teaching and Learning*. Multilingual Matters LTD. Clevelon, England.

Johnson, Karen. 1995. *Understanding Communication in Second Language Classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kasper, Gabriele. 1986. *Learning, Teaching and Communication in the Foreign Language Classroom*. DK 8000 – AARHUS C: AARHUS University Press.

Larsen-Freeman, Diane. 1980. *Discourse Analysis in Second Language Research*. Rowley: Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

Lightbown, Patsy M. and Nina Spada. 1999. *How Languages are Learned*. Second edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Long, Michael. 1980. *Input, interaction and second language acquisition*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

McNaughton, William. 1991. *Reading And Writing Chinese*. Japan: Charles E. Tuttle Company, Inc.

Moshi, Lioba. 1998. *Kiswahili Language and Culture*. Kensington, Maryland, USA. MRM, Inc.

Richards, Jack C. 1979. *Understanding Second & Foreign Language Learning*. *Issues & Approaches*. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newberry House Publishers, Inc.

Romaine, Suzanne. 1995. *Bilingualism*. Second Edition. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers, Inc.

Yao, Tao-Chung and Yuehua Liu. 2005. *Integrated Chinese*. Second Edition. Published by Cheng & Tsui Company, Inc. Boston, MA.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

L2 Classroom Talk and Second Language Learning

1. How many languages do you speak proficiently? Name all.
2. What languages do you speak in the following places?

   home only public only both only in public
3. Based on your answer to question 2, which of these languages do you consider your native language?
4. What language are you currently learning in this class?

   Swahili Russian German French Mandarin Chinese
5. What is the level of this class?

   Beginner (first year) Intermediate (second year)
6. From a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being easy and 5 being very difficult describe the degree of complexity of the language that you are currently learning?

   1 2 3 4 5
7. What part of the currently learned language do you consider difficult or is giving you the most problems? (circle one)

   pronunciation vocabulary grammar conversation
8. How many languages have you learned? Which language(s) are you most proficient in?
9. How would you rate your level or oral proficiency (skills in speaking) in the language you are learning in this class? (Circle one) (1 as being not proficient and 5 as being very proficient)

   1 2 3 4 5
10. Briefly share the main reason why you are taking this second language.

11. Are you willing to take risks and speak in the language that you are currently learning even when you know that you will make mistakes?

Yes No

APPENDIX B

TABLES

APPENDIX B

TABLES

Native language of students as indicated in survey questionnaire
"Based on your answer to question 2, which of these languages do you consider your native language?"

Native Lang	English	Dutch	Korean	Swedish	Chinese	Punjabi	Bengali	Eng/ Gujarati	Malayalam	Ukrainian	Eng/ Russian	Unclear
SWAH 1010	28	1										
SWAH 2010	5											
CHNS 1001	6		1	1								
CHNS 2001	7				1							
FREN 1001	20					1						
FREN 2001	24						1					
GRMN 1001	6							1	1			
GRMN 2001	19											
RUSS 1001	18									1	1	
RUSS 2001	25											1

Total number of students in each class *willing to speak* the language learned as indicated in survey questionnaire.
"Are you willing to take risks and speak in the language that you are currently learning even when you know that you will make mistakes?

Risk Taking	Yes	No
SWAH 1010	27	2
SHAH 2010	5	0
CHNS 1001	8	0
CHNS 2001	8	0
FREN 1001	19	2
FREN 2001	23	2
GRMN 1001	8	0
GRMN 2001	19	0
RUSS 1001	19	1
RUSS 2001	26	0

Degree of complexity of language learned and total number of students rating in each category as indicated in survey questionnaire
"From a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being easy and 5 being very difficult, describe the degree of complexity of the language you are currently learning."

Scale of Complexity	1 (easy)	2 (somewhat difficult)	3 (moderately difficult)	4 (difficult)	5 (very difficult)
Swahili 1010	2	6	16	4	1
Swahili 2010	0	0	3	1	1
Chinese 1001	1	0	1	3	3
Chinese 2001	0	1	0	2	5
French 1001	0	3	15	3	0
French 2001	0	2	15	8	0
German 1001	0	0	8	0	0
German 2001	0	3	11	4	1
Russian 1001	1	3	10	5	1
Russian 2001	0	0	5	16	5

Level of oral proficiency of students in each class as indicated in survey questionnaire "How would you rate your level or oral proficiency (skills in speaking) in the language you are learning in the class? 1 as being not proficient and 5 as being very proficient."

Scale of Proficiency	1 (Not proficient)	2 (somewhat proficient)	3 (moderately proficient)	4 (proficient)	5 (very proficient)
Swahili 1010	8	12	7	1	0
Swahili 2010	1	1	3	0	0
Chinese 1001	3	2	2	1	0
Chinese 2001	2	1	3	0	2
French 1001	4	12	4	0	1
French 2001	0	8	13	4	0
German 1001	2	3	2	1	0
German 2001	1	2	13	1	2
Russian 1001	4	5	5	5	1
Russian 2001	6	10	7	1	2

Total number of students in each class and their rating of the level of *difficulty* of each of the four *linguistic components* as indicated in survey questionnaire.
"What part of the current learned language do you consider difficult or is giving you the most problems?"

	Pronunciation	Vocabulary	Grammar	Conversation
Swahili 1010	10	6	5	5
Swahili 2010	0	0	0	4
Chinese 1001	5	2	1	0
Chinese 2001	1	0	4	2
French 1001	10	1	4	4
French 2001	1	3	12	7
German 1001	0	0	4	1
German 2001	0	4	10	4
Russian 1001	6	3	9	2
Russian 2001	0	1	16	8

Five *main reasons*, with one reason being a "No Response," for *taking this second language*, were given by students in survey questionnaire number 10 – Each column indicates the total number of students in each class giving one main reason "Briefly share the main reason why you are taking this second language."

	Graduation Requirement	Personal Interest	Career Preparation	Learn the Culture	No Response
Swahili 1010	13	7	1	5	3
Swahili 2010	3		2		
Chinese 1001		3	3	2	
Chinese 2001		7		1	
French 1001	10	9	2		
French 2001	9	12	3		
German 1001	1	7			
German 2001	9	6	3	1	
Russian 1001	1	14	3	2	
Russian 2001	11	10	3	1	1

Total number of student-participants in the two videorecordings of fall semester 2004
First recording (grand total) 160 participants Males 76 Females 84
Second recording (grand total) 141 participants Males 60 Females 81

Participants	First recording	Second recording	First recording		Second recording	
	Total	Total	Males	Females	Males	Females
Swahili 1010	31	26	19	12	16	10
Swahili 2010	4	4	2	2	2	2
Chinese 1001	10	6	4	6	2	4
Chinese 2001	6	5	3	3	2	3
French 1001	20	16	7	13	5	11
French 2001	25	23	8	17	6	17
German 1001	9	7	4	5	3	4
German 2001	16	18	5	11	6	12
Russian 1001	20	13	12	8	6	7
Russian 2001	19	23	12	7	12	11

Fall Semester 2004

The University of Georgia
Classroom Teaching – Agenda

SWAH 1010	First session I Grammar structure Second session Grammar structure	First session II Oral drills Second session Oral drills	First session III Group Work Second session Group Work	
SWAH 2010	First session I Story reading Second session Picture-story	First session II Correction of homework Second session Picture-story (continued)	First session III Classwork/oral Word game Second session Picture-story (continued)	Second session Cultural notes/Discussion Grammar notes throughout session Song Mr. *Tumbo* to the tune of Yankee Doodle
FREN 1001	First session I Conversation Second session Conversation	First session II Grammar (the indefinite articles, the partitive) Second session Grammar (i.e., *Faire du vent* ("it is windy")), *avoir chaud/froid* ("to be hot/cold")	First session III Oral drills Second session *Travail dans le Cahier* ("Written classwork")	Second session IV Group Work V *Les Activites/Le Nouveau Vocabulaire*
FREN 2001	First session I Conversation as warm-up exercise Second session Oral presentation	First session II Guided conversation (Topic: *Mondialisation* ("Globalization") Second session Oral drills (*le passe compose* ("the preterite") agreement) Discussion/hand-out	First session III Travail en groupe Work on written class assignment Second session Application of grammatical pattern (*le passe compose)* learned Student-to-student interaction class activity (students up-out-of-chair-and-about)	First session IV *Journal intime* ("Diary") (10-15 minutes) Second session Student-led Question-Answer activity

GRMN 1001	First session I Grammatical patterns & Oral drills – *Gern (*"to like to do something") Second session Play the "Guessing game" of "the Lost Theater Ticket"	First session II Instructor-led Reading & Oral practice of learned material in textbook Second session Practice the "past tense" under the form of interaction	First session III Thorough Review for test	
GRMN 2001	First session I Students write prepared sentences on board Instructor-led Correction of sentences Second session Grammatical patterns (definite articles - possessive adjectives)	First session II Group work/Student-to-student interaction Second session Application of learned material through oral practice of exercises in textbook	First session III Instructor-led Class Interaction Second session Fun-Interactive Classroom-Activity	
RUSS 1001	First session I Interaction as a warm-up exercise Second session Predominantly culture	First session II Reading in textbook followed by Discussion/Question-Answer Second session Pronunciation modeled after Instructor	First session III Group work with Oral Report following Second session Question-Answer Interaction	First session IV Listening Comprehension (tape) Discussion following Group work
RUSS 2001	First session I Question-Answer as an opening activity Second session Oral Drills New Vocabulary	First session II Listening to a Dialogue in lesson 11 on the CD Second session Group work Student-to-Student Interaction	First session III Group work/Class work (3 times) throughout to apply/learned material, grammatical structures Second session Question-Answer activity	First session IV Play the Game *Simeon Govorit*
CHNS 1001	First session I Dictation of Chinese characters Second session Correction of quiz 2 Instructor talked the entire session	First session II Review of learned material Vocabulary drills with flashcards Patterns drills Second session Correction of quiz 2 continued	First session III Learn dialogue Second session Correction of quiz 2 continued	First session IV Group work to reinforce all material learned on that day Second session Correction of quiz 2 continued

CHNS 2001	First session I Learn a well-known Chinese proverb Tone/Character drill Second session Review of proverbs/idioms Reading & Translation	First session II General conversation (review of learned material) Second session Question-answer activity	First session III First Reading Comprehension followed by Question-Answer session Second session Sing Folk song	First session IV Explanation of Second Reading comprehension Reading & Translation